A Pragma-Discoursal Functions of Soliloquies in English Drama[1]

Noor Hassan Obeed

University of Mosul, College of Basic Education, Department of English, Iraq

ABSTRACT

Language is used to mediate ideas, points of view, emotions, etc. from one user to another, and Shakespeare's soliloquies are as well used for such goals. What this study is concerned with is analyzing language taken from Shakespeare's tragic plays to arrive at the hidden and apparent ideologies of texts. When people are encountered with a text, based on the experience they have, they can associate the text to a certain type or genre that is familiar to them (Verdonk, 2002: 11). For example, readers can usually distinguish between the language of poetry and the language of newspapers based on the pragmatic conventions that they are acquainted with. This is part of people's socialization in the culture they belong to (ibid).

It is an obvious fact that time is time, but there is more to that which the author means, and soliloquies may predict several implied meanings and functions that can be analyzed pragmatically and discoursally. As a result, this thesis investigates how soliloquies might be interpreted and how these interpretations convey different implications and different intentions by authors. About 3 texts of soliloquies collected from different English dramatic works of William Shakespeare will be analyzed to explore the soliloquy used of this literary genre depending on Simpson (1993) conceptual functional theory, Van Dijk (1998) theory of ideology and Searle (1979) theory of speech acts. Moreover, investigation of the linguistic features of soliloquies will be conducted.

Keyterms: *Soliloquy; Pragmatics; English Drama.*

INTRODUCTION

Soliloquy is a term used to describe the relationship between notions. It is a literary phenomenon that the author uses in order to build his given piece of art. Thus, this study aims via using soliloquies to seek the reader's or audience's interpretation, which is complicated by the difficulties of delivering the exact same picture in different contexts and time periods. Soliloquy could be vital in connecting communication tools and conveying a moral message between old and new writings in William Shakespeare's plays. Authors actually employ soliloquies to communicate additional and multiple implied meanings. Thus, a single soliliquy might predict multiple functions and interpretations which might lead to conflicting ideas in grasping the real intention of the author in English language in general and literature in plays in particular.

Precisely, as far as English dramatic texts are concerned, this study sets itself towards answering the following questions:

1. What are the Soliloquies' functions used by authors in English drama?
2. What are the pragma-discoursal strategies via which power and ideology are fulfilled in Soliloquies types?

The present study basically aims at answering the questions above as follows:

1. Identifying the Soliloquy functions used by authors in English drama.
2. Highlighting the pragma-discoursal strategies via which power and ideology are fulfilled in Soliloquies types.
3. Developing an eclectic model to analyze Soliloquies through pragma-discoursal strategies of the data under scrutiny via adopting the qualitative and quantitative methods of analysis. In relation to the aims mentioned above, it is hypothesized that:

---

[1] *How to cite the article:* Obeed N.H. (2023), A Pragma-Discoursal Functions of Soliloquies in English Drama, *Multidisciplinary International Journal*, Vol 9 (Special Issue), 163-170

a. English drama is considered as Soliloquy according to the presence of one or more of pragma-discoursal functions.
b. Each Soliloquy type is achieved by means of certain pragma-discoursal strategies.

Procedures of the Study

To achieve the aims of this study and test its hypotheses, the following procedures are adopted:

1. Reviewing the literature about soliloquy in general, and its pragma discoursal nature in particular.
2. Surveying relevant pragma-discoursal theories in relation to the nature of English drama that can be used in analyzing the data under scrutiny.
3. Randomly selecting data as representative examples of English dramatic texts to be analyzed by means of the eclectic model developed by this study.
4. Analyzing the data under scrutiny by means of the models developed for this purpose.

The present study is restricted to scrutinizing the pragma-discoursal aspects of Soliloquy, i.e., as it is related to pragma-discoursal theories of conceptual -textual functions depending on Simpson (1993) conceptual functional theory and Van Dijk(1998) theory of ideology and discoursal strategies in English dramatic texts. The researcher has chosen 3 extracts from different plays written by William Shakespeare, that is Hamlet (1603_1599), Macbeth (1623), and Julius Caesar (1599).

The model used in the present study is eclectic, consisting of two models adapted to suit the purpose of the study, they are: Conceptual Functional Theory by Simpson, P. (1993) and The Theory of Ideology by Van Dijk, T. A. (1998) , cf. Chapter three for more details.

Significance of the study

This study can be of value to those who are interested in the field of English drama and pragma-discourse. It will be for linguistic scholars attentive in studying pragma-discoursal approach as an interdisciplinary branch of analysis**.** Understanding Soliloquies as a practical, significant method of analyzing all types of literary written and spoken forms is critical in discoursal research, as it is a linguistic tool that allows scholars and writers to add additional depth of meaning and their personal affection to the work. Besides, the findings can be made use of in applied linguistics, especially by textbooks writers and pedagogic teaching and learning.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The origin of the term soliloquy comes from the Latin word soliloquium, which in turn translates as speaking alone. Although the soliloquy is a kind of solitary conversation, there may be a case where there is a receiver, but it must not necessarily intervene or interrupt the sender. From what has been said above, the fact arises that the soliloquy is a common resource in plays so that the audience knows the reflective nature of a character.

This form of expression is directly related to the monologue, in fact, the Royal Spanish Academy relates them as synonyms. Defining dramatic soliloquy seems easy. Its etymology tells us clearly that it consists of solus ("alone") and loqui ("to speak"). This "aloneness" of the speaker has given rise to the term's popular definition: "A speech given by a character that is alone on stage; generally represents a character's inner thought through this convention" (Brockett and Ball; 2004: 436).

Lioyd A. Skiffington (1985) also sees it as ". . . a locution dominating the stage and the attention of the theatre audience, delivered by a speaker who is alone on the stage,". What's interesting about the history of soliloquies though is that according to one online etymology dictionary, Shakespeare may well have been the first one to adapt the monologue (which is a speech the character gives on stage as part of the accepted action) as a window for the audience to see into the characters' inner thoughts.

While Shakespeare was one of the first and by far the most prolific user of soliloquy, some modern playwrights have incorporated the device. With the rise of realism at the end of the 18th century, writers worried that soliloquies would sound artificial, since people rarely talk to themselves in front of other people. As a result, modern soliloquies tend to be shorter than Shakespeare's. (ibid).

PREVIOUS STUDIES

There are many previous studies that is deduct other ideas that is different from mine as Hussein, R. (2021) when he wrote about soliloquy and clarified his thoughts on this phenomenon via his study that aims at investigating the critical stylistic analysis of soliloquies taken from Shakespeare's tragic plays (Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello and Julius Caesar). Soliloquies are monologues or speeches given by a character on stage alone expressing his/her thoughts and feelings. Language of all sorts is expected to exhibit ideology.

Shakespeare's language is, therefore, expected to show some of these ideologies within its structure, then what kind of ideology is found in Shakespeare's soliloquies?

Critical Stylistics studies what the text is doing, through the textual-conceptual functions proposed by Jeffries (2010). The analysis follows both the qualitative and quantitative methodological approaches. The qualitative analysis explores how the textual-conceptual functions are used and the quantitative analysis shows the frequency of these functions. After the application of these functions to the eight chosen soliloquies of the four plays (two from each), the study arrives at the conclusions that Shakespeare's language expresses a great deal of ideology both hidden and obvious. This ideology is dangerous and manipulative because it asserts dangerous actions such as the killing of others for different reasons; Hamlet asserts killing for revenge, Macbeth for ambition; Othello is manipulated to kill for revenge; Brutus tries to kill Caesar because Caesar is unfit to rule. However, Shakespeare's language has repetition of phrases, thoughts, and ideologies which enforce the effect of these instances.

THEORETICAL BACK GROUND

Language is a tool for people to communicate. Through language, people can express their feelings and messages. Paul Simpson's in (1993;45) stated that the function of a language is to make the communicants be able to understand the messages that they deliver. As to achieve the purpose of the study, the researcher subdivided the eclectic modal of soliloquy into three levels. In the first level, he gives importance to the main types and criteria that were stated by (Bevington, D; 1992: 34) as follow; Soliloquy Characteristics can be seen through such functions;

Soliloquies help to establish a vital part in a play, which is to reveal the character's emotions and thoughts. Not only does it effectively does that, but also deepens the plot and creates a strong atmosphere for any play. Without soliloquies, plays would lack depth and length, along with various key elements. No doubt, the soliloquy is the most powerful instrument into discovering the deepest ideologies of a character to reveal his true internal conflicts in which the play without soliloquies would have a far different effect. As it was mentioned before, a soliloquy is a speech that an actor gives while he or she is alone onstage and allows for the audience to hear the character's innermost thoughts. Thus, the core criteria of soliloquy are expression out loud, alone, subjectivity, reflexive, and it is used in dramatic texts. The overhead characteristics exemplify that the message is perceived by the same person who emanates it or by a receiver who does not contribute in what is conveyed. (ibid; 76).

Accordingly, authors and playwrights in which they often use many literary elements to help aid the audience in a further understanding of a character's thoughts, to advance the storyline and create a general mood for the play. Elements frequently used in Shakespearian's plays, is of various types of soliloquy. As such, soliloquies hold a significant role in any play. A soliloquy can be defined when a character speaks to themselves, essentially the audience, revealing their thoughts. Thus, in terms of the interrelationship between the soliloquist and his identified or unidentified addressees, the soliloquy can be distributed into four main functions: subjectivity, reflexive and plain texts, (Rimmon-K.S; 1983).

Soliloquies' functions offer a variety of different possible effects, regardless of whether they are being used in a Shakespearean play or a more modern drama, in which the exposition of types of soliloquies by Characters can reveal action that has taken place off-stage or off-screen but is critical to understanding the current story.

PRAGMA-DISCOURAL STRATEGIES OF SOLILOQUY

Pragma-Discourse analysis (PDA) is concerned with textual analysis, as it is a broad field of study that draws some of its theories and methods of analysis from disciplines such as linguistics, sociology, philosophy and literary texts. More importantly, discourse analysis has provided models and methods of engaging issues that emanate from disciplines such as education, cultural studies, and communication and so on. In accordance to discoursal analysis of literary texts, a soliloquy is a dramatic text that is considered as literary device used when a character gives a speech that reveals something about their thought process, (ibid). These are parts of plays that when read on the text or preformed help the reader better understand who the characters are and what it is that's driving them. As such, the researcher in his analysis of textual strategies of soliloquy in level two separated them into two constituents;

165

Pragmatic Strategies

Pragmatics is the study of language use in particular situations. Pragmatics, like discourse analysis, goes beyond structural study of the phrase and focuses on higher units: what is more, it focuses on its object of study through consideration of the context and its construction, through recognition of the speaker's intention and through the establishment of implicit elements which the hearer has to access (Searle; 1979). Doing discourse analysis certainly involves doing syntax and semantics, but it primarily consists of doing pragmatics; pragmatic facts are frequently necessary for explaining syntactic and semantic facts. The subject of pragmatics is now very familiar. Some twenty years ago, however, it was not so. At the time, pragmatics seemed to be the waste-paper basket in which formalist linguists threw what they thought to be irrelevant data. Now the outlook to pragmatics is quite different. Many would argue that we cannot really understand the nature of language itself unless we understand pragmatics.

Discoursal Strategies

Literary discourse is defined as an occasional mode of communication, which means it is not how authors write or talk all the time, but it is the product of a process activated only on certain occasions, a process that is both conscious and creative. At the same time, there is always a considerable input which is mainly unconscious linguistic habits from authors' everyday life. Coleman (1999, 26) drew attention on the imaginative nature of soliloquys' texts and statements that are used in literary discourse, emphasizing that they are more effective than ordinary and rational statements, and effective in promoting "thematic assent".

Paul Simpson's in (1993;47) contribution to the interface series is in an area which is central to literary discourse. It has long been an aim of literary discourse to account for point of view in drama texts. Language, power, ideology and Point of View provides precise and systematic frameworks for taking this account further with particular reference to the significance of linguistic choices in representation. At the same time, Simpson (ibid) does not describe these linguistic choices as if they were neutral; instead he relates language and context to the particular social, cultural and ideological positioning of the various narrative voices within a text. Therefore, the researcher has adopted Simpson's modal in dividing discoursal strategies into power and ideology in analyzing soliloquies in various dramatic texts;

Power

The majority of studies in discourse analysis focus exclusively on one aspect of the language/power relation, language as a context for power and domination. Simpson (ibid: 50) argues that power is "implicit within everyday social practices" and that it is predominant "at every level in all domains of life". The researchers analyzed the implicit meaning and the power dimensions of each speech act as to exhibit revenge and delay the revenge in soliloquies in Shakespearian plays based on the context and the classification of each speech act, "declarations, representations, expressives, directives and commissives."

Ideology

Language, ideology, systems and sets of beliefs which reside in texts, is seen to explore, in other words, ideology in language. There is, unfortunately, a proliferation of definitions available for the term ideology, and many of these are contingent on the dramatic text framework favoured by the analyst, (Van Dijk: 1998; 45). This study is enlightened and enlivened by showing the relationship between dramatic texts, underlining how studies of literary language are always more revealing if they do not presume that all discourses are discontinuous but that they are part of the same linguistic, textual and ideological fabric.

So, from a linguistic perspective, the term normally describes the ways in which what we say and think interacts with society. An ideology therefore derives from the taken-for-granted assumptions, beliefs and value systems which are shared collectively by social groups. Specially, when an ideology is the ideology of a particularly powerful social group, it is said to be dominant. In accordance with this study, dominant ideologies are mediated through powerful dramatic texts. As such, the present study will be shaped in part by the specific linguistic practices as in vengeances, grief and anger, despite the heterogeneity of the soliloquy texts examined, to discover, in other expressions, ideology in language.

Cohesive Devices

Guy Cook (1989:6-7) describes discourse as language in use or language used to communicate something felt to be coherent which may, or may not correspond to a correct sentence or series of correct sentences. Discourse analysis, therefore, according to him, is the search for what gives discourse coherence. He posits that discourse does not have

166

to be grammatically correct, can be anything from a grunt or simple expletive, through short conversations and scribbled notes, a soliloquy or dramatic texts (Jeffries; 2010;49). What matters is not its conformity to rules, but the fact that it communicates and is recognized by its receivers as coherent. Again, we affirm that what matters in the study of discourse, whether as language in use or as language beyond the clause, is that language is organized in a coherent manner such that it communicates something to its receivers.

As such, in analyzing soliloquy the notion of 'coherence' is important in the study of discourse. We also noted that discourse does not have to be composed of well-formed sentences or conform to grammatical rules. Cohesion therefore exists where the interpretation of some element of a discourse is dependent on that of another. That is, the meaning of a given presupposition cannot be effectively interpreted without recourse or reference to another.

Shakespeare's language

Shakespeare's language Shakespeare is definitely one of the most influential writers because of the effect he hashad on the development of the Early Modern English language. Kotchmer et al., (2014) argue that during the Elizabethan period ,there were many changes in grammar, for instance, in the use of inflectional endings (suffixes that serve grammatical functions, much like how it is now .(Such changes occurred because English language became more flexible during that era. In relation to this, Shakespeare was one of the leading playwrights who embrace the flexibility and changed the way the language was being used in his own works. Studies reveal that Shakespeare has, among others, used words in new contexts, thus creating new meanings of existing words. For example, in the utterance, 'The wild disguise has almost anticked us all.' (II.vii. 119-121), "antic" which is a noun was used as a verb which carries the meaning of 'to make a fool of' which showcases Shakespeare's unconventional writing style at that point in time. Another development at that time was the huge inflow of other European vocabulary into the English language as a result of Renaissance cross-pollination. This had also created changes in the in the usage of words to provide multiple meanings, which provided a multitude of interpretations ,making him one of the most respected writers in British history. Basically ,this development paved the way for 94 Shakespeare to have even greater freedom in the choice and use of words as evidenced in Love's Labours Lost, where Shakespeare uses words which convey multiple meanings quite prolifically.

For instance, the word 'light' in 'Light, seeking light, doth light of light beguile' carries the following connotations: 'intellect' ",wisdom' ,eyesight' and 'daylight' which is a classic example of the richness of Shakespeare's language. Although, the grammar of Early Modern English is identical to that of Modern English, Shakespeare's unconventionalwriting style is likely to pose problems to the modern reader or create anxiety to them. The mixture of words such as" thees "and" thous "alongside newer ones showcases the period of transition in the English language

Text (1) Hamlet 1

This play explores the fights challenged by Prince Hamlet who move toward the detail that his father, King Hamlet, was assassinated by his uncle, Claudius who turns out to be the ruling king momentarily afterward. All through the play, Prince Hamlet attempts but vacillates to avenge his father by murdering his uncle.

Each soliloquy of Hamlet is scrutinized in a diverse sub-section so as not to make the reader confused and to evade any deliberate combination of the two soliloquies. Accordingly, the study begins with Hamlet's first soliloquy, and then we will tackle the second soliloquy.

At this point, the analysis will be carried out through concentrating on these illustrative lines:

> *(57)   To be, or not to be: that is the question*
> *(58)   Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer*
> *(59)   The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune,*
> *(60)   Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,*
> *(61)   And, by opposing, end them? —To die, to sleep*

Hamlet's soliloquy shows how power in discourse' looks at the language itself, and how its relationships are demonstrated through language via clarifying the delay of revenge, specifically, when doubt and uncertainty play a huge role in Hamlet's "to be or not to be" soliloquy. By this point in the play, it is observed that Hamlet has struggled to decide whether he should kill Claudius and avenge his father's death .

According to Shakespearian's ideology, the play's exposition shows us that Hamlet is in the midst of crises: his nation is under attack, his family is falling apart, and he feels deeply grief and very angry. Hamlet manages to survive

167

long enough to kill Claudius. The general debated reasons for his delay are that Hamlet's melancholy or grief prevents him from acting, that mere reluctance to kill after he has resolved to avenge his father's death causes the delay, and that the simple mechanics involved, such as easing his doubts and catching Claudius alone where the deed can be done conveniently, standoff Hamlet's vengeance. People from all social and educational classes enjoyed Shakespeare's power and ideologies that were observed very clear in his plays because Shakespeare understood human nature. His plays were about situations and emotions that most people could understand: love, hate, jealousy, grief, anger and revenge. Like real people, most of Shakespeare's characters were neither entirely good nor entirely bad.

Text (2) Hamlet 2

At the present study, the analysis is achieved through focused on these descriptive lines:

(74)   Now might I do it pat. Now he is a-praying.
(75)   And now I'll do 't. And so he goes to heaven.
(76)   And so am I revenged.—That would be scanned .
(77)   A villain kills my father, and, for that,
(78)   I, his sole son, do this same villain send
(79)   . To heaven
(80)   Oh, this is hire and salary, not revenge .

These lines exemplifies the use of these criteria (**Alone, Subjective, and Reflexive**), which show that these characteristics of the soliloquy refer to the dialogue that hamlet swallows alone with himself at the commencement of this piece, signifies the subjectivity of certain notion that reflects the hidden ideology of revenge for his father that hamlet is seeking for achieving in a regular circumstance.

The type of soliloquy here is **attended soliloquy** which may amplify ideological outcome even where no actual overhearing happens. In Hamlet, King Claudius rudely walks out of the show Murder of Gonzago and goes to the chapel where he is seen kneeling and praying. Hamlet, who chances upon this scene, has been emboldened by what he saw in Claudius during the performance of the internal play and believes himself now justified to revenge his father murder and yet, just as he is about to finish off his uncle, when he says "*Now might I do it pat, now a is a-praying, / And now I'll do't*" a second thought suddenly dawns on him to choose another suitable time for his action.

Text (3) Macbeth 2
Macbeth Act 2 Scene 1, Lines (33-65)

33)   Is this a dagger which I see before me
34)   The handle toward my hand? Come, let me clutch
35)   thee
36)   I have thee not, and yet I see thee still
37)   Art thou not ,fatal vision, sensible
38)   To feeling as to sight? Or art thou but
39)   A dagger of the mind, a false creation

This soliloquy tells us that in a sudden darkened hall, Macbeth has a vision of a dagger floating in the air before him, its handle pointing toward his hand and its tip aiming him toward Duncan. Macbeth tries to grasp the weapon and fails. He wonders whether what he sees is real or a "*dagger of the mind, a false creation / Proceeding from the heat-oppressed brain*" (lines 38–39). Macbeth continues to gaze upon the dagger, he thinks he sees blood on the blade, as in the citation *"And such an instrument I was to use, Mine eyes are made the fools o' th' other senses, Or else worth all the rest. I see thee still, And on thy blade and dudgeon gouts of blood."* (Lines, 44-47). Then abruptly, he decides that the vision is just a manifestation of his unease over killing Duncan. The night around him seems thick with horror and witchcraft, but Macbeth stiffens and resolves to do his bloody work. A bell tolls, Lady Macbeth's signal that the chamberlains are asleep, and Macbeth strides toward Duncan's chamber.

So, the main common criterion of the soliloquy are "**Subjectivity**", "**expression out loud**", "**reflective**", and "**Use in Dramatic Works**" which convey that the citation *"Is this a dagger which I see before me, The handle toward my hand? Come, let me clutch, thee", "I have thee not, and yet I see thee still"* is confirmed out loud and the subject is fixed by the same character who reflects it in dramatic works or by an audience who does not contribute in what is excited.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the findings of the analysis conducted in the previous chapter, the following conclusions can be introduced: Soliloquy in dramatic text is linguistically achieved by means of: pragma-discoursal approach via three strategies of analysis; main characteristics, textual strategies, and conceptual textual functions of soliloquies. Soliloquy, as a dramatic literary device that is used when a character gives a speech that reveals something about their thought process, is a kind of dialogue.

 Each soliloquy type is proved to be achieved, by means of pragma-discoursal strategies specific to it. The discoursal strategies of three texts are used to fulfill the textual strategies via power & ideology and cohesive devices. Thus, the hypotheses are proved.

The whole pragma-discoursal structure of soliloquy comprises three distinct stages (components) each one has its own sub-stage(s) component(s) and strategies specifically adopted to achieve it/them. However, these stages are inseparable, i.e., the fulfillment of each stage leads to the other one next to it. As such, these textual-conceptual functions help us to understand how ideology can be embedded in a text, sometimes below the level of conscious notice. This is important for inducement and influencing the audience.

REFERENCES

1. Adam C. Schembri and Ceil Lucas. (2015). **Sociolinguistics and Deaf Communities**. Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom. Cambridge University Press.
2. Alexander, C.M.S. (ed.). (2004). **Shakespeare and Language**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Althusser, L. (1971). **Ideology and ideological state apparatuses**, Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays. New Left Books.
4. Austin, J. L., & Urmson, J. O. (1962). **How to Do Things with Words**. The William James Lectures Delivered at Harvard University in 1955.Edited by James O. Urmson. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
5. Chipman et al. (2014). **Figurative Language Definitions.** Retrieved November 23, 2020 (https://lnociar.weebly.com/reading resources1/figurativelanguage-definitions.
6. Clark, R. J. (1995). 'Developing critical reading practices', Prospect, 10.
7. Colemen, W. (1964). **Shakespeare's Soliloquies: The presidential address of the Modern Humanities Research Association**, London: Cambridge University Press.
8. Fairclough, N. (1989). **Language and Power**. London: Longman.
9. Fairclough, N. (2003). 'Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research'. London: Routledge.
10. Fowler, R. (1981). **Literature as Social Discourse**, London: Batsford (1981).
11. Gee, J. P. (2004). 'Situated language and learning: A critique of traditional schooling'. London: Routledge.
12. Grice, H.P. (1975). **Logic and conversation**. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts (pp. 41–58). New York, NY: Academic Press.
13. Halliday, M. A. K. and Matthiessen, C. (2004). **An Introduction to Functional Grammar (3rd edn).** London: Edward Arnold.
14. Hirsh, J., E. (2003). **Shakespeare and the History of Soliloquies**. London: Associated University Presses.
15. Huang, Y. (2007) **Pragmatics.** Oxford university press.
16. Ingham, R., and Ingham, M. (2011). 'Subject-Verb Inversion and Iambic Rhythm in Shakespeare's Dramatic Verse', in Ravassat, M., and Culpeper, J. (eds.), Stylistics and Shakespeare's Language Transdisciplinary Approaches. London: Continuum.
17. Jeffries, L. (2007). **Textual Construction of the Female Body: A Critical Discourse Approach**. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
18. Jeffries, L. (2010). 'Critical Stylistics. The Power of English'. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
19. Machin, D. and Mayr, A. (2012). **How to do Critical Discourse Analysis: A Multimodal Introduction**. London: Sage.
20. Saeed, J.I. (2016). **Semantics**. (4th Ed). MA, Oxford, and West Sussex: Blackwell Publishers.
21. Searle, J. R. (1969). **Speech Acts**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
22. Simpson, P. (1993) **Ideology and Point of View**. London: Routledge.
23. Simpson, P. (1993). 'Language, Ideology, and Point of View'. London: Routledge.
24. Simpson, P. (1997). 'Language through Literature: An Introduction'. London; New York: Routledge.
25. Teo, P. (2000). Racism in the news: A critical discourse analysis of news reporting in two Australian newspapers. **Discourse & Society.**
26. Thomas, J. (1995). **Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics**. London: Longman.
27. London: Sage.

Presented at 2nd International Conference on Research in Multidisciplinary Studies (ICRMS-2023)
Held on 06th August, 2023 through Google Meet

28. van Dijk, T., A. (2006). **Discourse and manipulation**. Discourse & Society,
29. van Dijk, T., A. (2006). **Ideology and Discourse Analysis**. Journal of Political Ideologies. 11 (2), 115-140.
30. van Dijk, T., A. (2008). **Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
31. van Dijk, T., A. (2014). **Discourse and Knowledge: A Sociocognitive Approach.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
32. Van Dijk. T. A. (1998) **Ideology A Multidisciplinary Approach**: London, SAGE Publications Ltd.

Website:

1. https://shakespeare-navigators.com/hamlet/H31.htm
2. https://myshakespeare.com/macbeth/act-1-scene-7
3. https://www.playshakespeare.com/julius-caesar/scenes/act-ii-scene-1