

The Speech Act of Greeting: A Theoretical Reading

Dr. Maysa'a Kadhim Jibreen

Department of English /College of Education/University of Al-Qadisiya

Abstract

The speech act of 'greeting' is one type of the expressive speech acts which reflect the psychological states of the speakers specified in the propositional contents. Each speaker may find himself/herself tending to express pleasure many times daily at meeting or seeing a hearer. Therefore, 'greeting' is one of the expressive acts mostly used in our daily life.

The present research aims at:

1. Examining the theoretical views adopted by linguists, philosophers and researchers concerning:
 - a. Definitions, classifications, types(forms and formulas)and strategies of the speech act of 'greeting'.
 - b.The defining properties that reflect its nature and main social function,i.e.,identifying separate cultures.
 - c.The semantic, the syntactic and the pragmatic structures of greeting.
- 2.Arriving at different and to some extent new theoretical views from those presented for discussion especially those concerned with the social function and the pragmatic structures of the speech act of 'greeting'.

الخلاصة

يعدّ فعل الكلام : التحية احد أنواع أفعال الكلام التعبيرية التي تعكس الناحية السيكولوجية للمتكلّم ، والتي تتعلق بالمضامين ومقاصد الفعل الكلامي ، إذ أنّ كل متكلّم يجد نفسه ميّلا إلى التعبير عن الفرح عند رؤية متلقّيه أو مقابلته ، وعلى هذا كان فعل الكلام التحية من أكثر الأفعال الكلامية انتشاراً وتنوّعاً .
لقد سعى البحث إلى أهداف بعينها لدراسة فعل الكلام: التحية، منها:

1. رصد التصورات النظرية التي تبناها اللغويون والفلاسفة والباحثون في تفسير فعل الكلام : التحية ، من حيث:
 - أ. التعريفات و الأنواع (الصيغ) و التصنيفات واستراتيجيات فعل الكلام: التحية.
 - ب. خصائص هذا الفعل التي تعكس طبيعته ووظيفته الاجتماعية الأساسية وهي التعرف على ثقافات مختلفة.
 - ج. تركيباته البنوية والدلالية والتداولية.
2. السعي إلى إيجاد تصورات نظرية مختلفة وجديدة إلى حدّ ما ، بناءً على مقولات العلماء والدارسين التي عرضناها للمناقشة ، ولاسيما الوظيفة الاجتماعية والتراكيب التداولية لفعل الكلام : التحية .

1. The Speech Act of Greeting

1.1 Definitions

Despite the attention greetings have received in the social sciences, today there is no generalizable definition of them and , therefore, no systematic way for deciding what qualifies as 'greetings' in a particular speech community. Nevertheless, linguists have felt at ease identifying greetings in different languages and providing hypotheses and definitions about what greetings do for or to people.

Malinowski (1923:315) cited in Nodoushan (2006:3) defines an expression of greeting such as 'How do you do' as a special kind of speech that is called 'phatic communication'.i.e, " a type of speech in which ties of union are created by a mere exchange of words". These words do not exchange meanings, instead, they fulfill a social function .Similar to such expressions are 'Nice day' and 'You are looking smart today'.

Jacobsen (1960:357) cited in Mey (1993:220) adopts Malinowski's term 'phatic communication' to identify communicative exchanges for the purpose of contact. Greetings are one of these exchanges. An example is borrowed from David Lodge's novel Paradise News is as follows: A question such as 'How are you this evening, sir?' is considered for Darlette, a servant, as phatic communication which for the sick person, Bernard, a British tourist in Hawaii, is considered as a question about his well-being (the relationship between the speech act of 'greeting' and social identity is going to be discussed below).

A final definition which causes some problems for anthropologists such as Duranti is the one adopted by Searle and Vanderveken (1985:215). For them, 'greetings' are marginally illocutionary acts since they have no propositional contents. For example, in saying 'Hello', one indicates recognition in a courteous fashion. Therefore, 'greeting' is defined as a "courteous indication of recognition, with the presupposition that the speaker has just encountered the hearer".

Having no propositional contents means a loose connection between social functions and the talks used to achieve them. As a consequence, differences in what people say can be ignored and one finally supports the view that "once you've seen a greeting, you've seen them all" or supports the more general principle "once you've seen a ritual, you've seen them all". Hence, the question will be: Why do you bother yourself with the study of different societies since all you need can be found in your own background? (Duranti, 1997:67).

The context for interpreting what people say during greetings means the culture that supports and is supported by the performers or encounters in which greetings occur or that are constituted by them. This is what Duranti (Ibid.) believes in contrast to Searle and Vanderveken (1985:215). The researcher agrees with what Duranti believes in the fact that greetings are speech acts or in particular illocutionary acts having meanings or propositional contents for achieving functions, i.e., identifying the cultures that are represented by the encounter of greetings (since each culture has its own types, forms and functions).

1.2 Classifications

Austin (1962) was the first to give the formulation of what is called Speech Act Theory (henceforth SAT). He classifies illocutionary acts into five categories taking into consideration English verbs (cf. Austin, 1962:150-162). These categories are as follows:

1. Verdictives: They are typified by giving a verdict by a jury.
2. Exercitives: They are typified by exercising powers, rights or influence.
3. Commissives: They are typified by assuming of an obligation or declaring of an intention.
4. Behabitives: They are typified by adopting of an attitude.
5. Expositives: They are typified by clarifying of reasons or arguments.

Austin (Ibid.:159) lists the speech act of 'greeting' within behabitives and says:

"Behabitives include the notion of reaction to other people's behavior and fortunes and of attitudes and expressions to someone's else's past conduct or imminence conduct".

Giving this definition, 'greeting' according to Austin's classification is considered as a kind of performatives concerns behavior towards others to exhibit attitudes and feelings. It is worthy to note that Austin's behabitives are included amongst Searle's expressives.

Searle (1979:10) claims that Austin's behabitives are not well defined, but they involve notions of what is good or bad for the speaker and hearer as well as expressions of attitudes. He calls them expressions.

Expressives are distinguished from other kinds of illocutionary acts by the types of psychological conditions they express. Norrick (1978:279) points out that expressives do not

express beliefs or intentions, but emotions. These emotions arise in response to given states of affairs.

According to the Searlean approach, the illocutionary point of this class is to express "the psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about the state of affairs specified in the propositional content".

The performance of an expressive act establishes an interpersonal relation between the speaker and the hearer because the former expresses a psychological state brought about by a state of affairs that involves the latter. From this point, Haverkate (1984:23) considers expressives to be "speaker and hearer centered acts", in which the speaker is neither trying to get the world to match his words, nor the words to match the world. Expressives then have no direction of fit. The speaker simply expresses a mental state about a state of affairs represented in the propositional content (Vanderveken, 1990:106)

Searle (1969) and Searle and Vanderveken (1985) proposed to analyze English greetings as an example of the expressive type of speech act, aimed at the "courteous indication of recognition" of the other party (Searle and Vanderveken, 1985:216).

Bach and Harnish (1979:51) classified greetings as 'acknowledgments', their reformulation of Austin's behabitives and Searle's expressives. Acknowledgements express "perfunctorily if not genuinely, certain feelings toward the hearer". These feelings and their expressives are appropriate to particular sorts of occasions. 'Greetings', for example "express pleasure at meeting or seeing someone". Such definition assumes that greetings have propositional contents, i.e., pleasure at seeing (or meeting) someone, in contrast with what Searle (1969) and Searle and Vanderveken (1985) cited in Duranti (1997:66) assume, i.e., greetings have no propositional contents.

Greetings then are Austin's (1962) behabitives, Searle's (1969) expressives and Bach and Harnish's (1979) acknowledgements.

1.3 Types, Forms and Formulas

The way individuals relate to each other is determined by very complex rules of behavior. These are learned at an early age and are intuitive for the native to that culture or society. Often forms of greetings vary extensively, a different form for each type or status of person. Whatever greetings accomplish, they do it by virtue of participant's ability to match routine expressions with particular sociohistorical circumstances. Greetings are constituted by forms and formulaic expressions, however, this is half of the importance of this section, the other half is that how such expressions and forms (which constitute different types) are adopted and at the same time helped to establish new contexts.

Jucker and Taavitsainen (2008:3) state that a linguist, Joachim Grzega, gathered numerous forms of greetings from various corpora in his article 'Greetings in English Language History'. These forms are "Hal, Hail, Hello and Hi". Grzega offers an inventory of all greetings throughout the history of English, and he examines where they come from and how they have changed. He discovers that in Old English, there were few greeting forms on an increase in Middle English. Greetings tend to lose their original core (functions of maintaining social communication) and become routinized formula. What are these types, formulas and forms in Modern English with reference to other cultures?.

A laboratory study of greetings was conducted by Krivonos and Knapp (1975) to discover the most frequent verbal and non-verbal behavior associated with them, and to investigate whether these behaviors varied according to relationships between interlocutors. (64) Subjects of their study were asked to fill out forms giving information concerning their "scale of acquaintance" with respect to all other participants in the study. With their information in hand, the researchers were able to divide their subjects into sixteen pairs of strangers. Each pair then participated in a task designed to elicit a greeting by one of the members of the pair (Nodoushan, 2006:6).

The results show that two types of greetings are involved: Verbal and non-verbal. The most common verbal greetings involved are topic-initiation, verbal salute and references to the interlocutor. Typical non-verbal greetings were found to be head gestures, mutual glances and smiles. Differences between the two sets of subjects manifested themselves in the fact that verbal greetings were less common than strangers. Moreover, the only non-verbal difference between acquaintances and strangers was that more smiling occurred with acquaintances. Despite the fact that greetings are regarded by the researchers as ritualized behavior, Krivonos and Knapp (1975) pointed out that their results could have been specific to the situation in which their study was conducted (Ibid.).

Types of greetings could be classified in ways other than the verbal-non-verbal dichotomy proposed by Krivonos and Knapp (1975). Halliday (1979) has another classification. Greetings are classified into time-free and time-bound. Out of the researcher's reading in this topic, i.e., the speech act of 'greeting' and according to what she is going to present, time-free and time-bound constitute two new forms of the verbal greetings that Krivonos and Knapp(1975)use.

Halliday (1979) uses these two forms according to American society since each society has its own particular customs and ways of acting. Over 290 million people live in the U.S.A., these people come from different backgrounds with regional and temperamental differences. However, Halliday (1979) states that generalizations about American manners and customs are difficult to make. This holds true with regard to greetings and their exchanges in the U.S.A. community. However, the following are the suggested forms of time-free greetings and time-bound greetings:

1. Time-free greetings:

- A. How do you do?
- B. Hello. How are you?
- C. Hi. How are you?
- D. Glad to meet you!
- E. (It's) Good to see you (again)!
- F. (How/very) Nice to see you (again)
- G. Long time no see you!
- H. (Ah) X [any first name or honorific], Just the person I wanted to see/was looking for/was after

2. Time-bound greetings:

A. Daily formal greetings:

- 1. Morning: Good Morning
- 2. Afternoon: Good afternoon.
- 3. Evening: Good evening
- 4. Day: Good day.
- 5. Night: Good night.

B. Seasonal (in) formal greetings:

- 1. Happy New Year!
- 2. Happy Anniversary!
- 3. Happy Easter!
- 4. Happy birthday (to you)!
- 5. Many happy returns (of the day)!
- 6. (A) Merry Christmas (to you)!
- 7. Many happy returns (of your birthday)!

(Halliday, 1979 cited in Nodoushan, 2006:9-10)

Halliday's (1979) term 'time-bound' greeting is replaced by Levinson's (1983) 'time-deixis'. He (1983:79) states that greetings are usually time-restricted, so that

1. Good morning,

Can be only used in the morning and

2. Good night,

Can be only used in the night especially in British English though it can be used as parting to create such an interaction between time and discourse deixis. The reader might notice that Halliday's (1979) classification of time-bound greetings imply additional terms to refer to different uses of time-bound greetings. These are formal vs. informal ones.

Halliday (1979) cited in Nodoushan (2006:10) states that American society has a certain amount of informality especially in customs of introductions and greetings. Generally speaking, Americans ignore social status. However, there are rules of social patterns and good manners that should be followed in official occasions as in the following situation:

A younger person is introduced to a woman, a guest to the host or hostess or a person to the group. One would say, for instance: "Margret, may I present Mr.Bradly" and then adds "Mr.Bradly, this is my friend Margret Hoskins from Chicago". In any case, one must make sure that each person knows the surname of the other. The usual reply to such an introduction is to use the following greetings: 'How do you do?' or "How do you do? I am pleased to meet you". It is also common to add the name of the person just introduced: "How do you do, Mr.Bradly ?"

Curious questions might be raised: Where do you use formal and informal forms of greetings or what are the forms of greetings that are formal and what are the informal ones?. In spite of the informality of Americans, they are not completely devoid of customs that show consciousness of social distinctions as stated above: For example, they use somewhat formal language when talking to superiors, while the less formal 'Hello' is an acceptable greeting from an employee to greet his/her employer, the employee is more linked to say "Hello, Mr. Ferguson", for example whereas the employer may reply: "Hello, Jim" or even "Hi, Jim". More formal greetings are 'Good morning, Good evening and Good afternoon'. 'Hello' is the most common greeting form in U.S.A. However, it can be uttered on most formal occasions as in the employee's greeting (Ibid.:11).

This is as far as the American society is concerned, what is about the British one? Greese (1991:43,45) states that generally, English people are formal, polite, indirect and cold as opposed to the Americans where are informal, loud, direct and pseudo-friendly. As far as forms of greetings are concerned, the following speech from a British person who has been in America since 1983 will illustrate his difficulty with American greeting formula:
Simon, British:

"Well you know there is the choice 'How are you?' greeting which is not a question, which is just a greeting and I still find difficulty in that kind of encounter because I am still not sure what I should say, because I used to say 'How are you?' as if it were a British 'hello' or 'good morning', but I think more is required".

In addition to that, Americans use first names more than the British who use titles and last names. Therefore, English society used to use formal greeting forms than the informal ones. So, what are these formal and informal greeting forms? Are these similar to Americans'?

Biber et al (1999:1086) suggest that in general, the briefer the greeting, the more former it is. Thus, 'Hi' is more informal than 'Hello', which is in turn less formal than the 'Good' forms (Good morning, etc). However, these 'Good' forms can be abbreviated by the omission of the word 'Good' itself. This is used in American English specifically:

3.A: Come on, Charles. Morning.

B: Morning (Am. E)

B: Good Morning (Br.E)

Dialectally, there are also rare restricted forms such as 'Hiya' and 'Wotcha' in Br.E whereas in America, there are 'Hey', 'How day' and 'How (are) you doing?'. The form 'Good day' is rare as a greeting form in both Am.E and Br.E, but it is commonly associated with Australian English.

Following Biber et al (1999), Leech, Cruickshank and Ivanič (2001:184-185) state the following greeting forms in G.B. and U.S.A:

1. *Hello* : < it is informal in U.S.A and G.B.>also spelt *Hullo* in G.B.

2. *Hi*: It is very informal especially in U.S.A.

3. *Good morning, Good afternoon...*etc are more formal in both.

4. *Do* is used with two forms: Firstly, informal in 'How are you doing?' which is a friendly greeting especially in U.S.A or 'How are getting on?' (A question about a person's life). Secondly, formal in 'How do you do?' which is used when one meets someone for the first time.

This is as far as verbal greeting types with its forms are concerned, what's about non-verbal greeting forms with its types, i.e., formal vs. informal?

Nodoushan (2006:10) states that shake hands and kissing the cheek are the most representative types of non-verbal greetings. The custom of shaking hands in the U.S.A., for example/varies in different parts of the country and among different groups of people. However, it is not an easy task to make a set rule. Shaking hands is considered as one of the formal types of non-verbal greetings. When men are introduced, they generally shake hands while women do this less frequently. Women never shake hands when they meet for the first time. If a man and a woman are being introduced, they may or may not shake hands; usually the latter extends her hand first. As it has been stated above, shaking hands is used in formal cases in U.S.A., therefore, if an American does not shake hands when he/she meets an acquaintance, he/she will not judged to be impolite.

Nodoushan (Ibid: 11) states that kissing the cheek is not so common among Americans. Hand kissing is only used in absolutely formal situations on certain occasions but he doesn't mention these situations.

The researcher notices that this non-verbal sign is so restricted. It can't be generalized as noticeable non-verbal greeting types due to its restrictions. Most of the authors don't consider it as a type or greeting but it is a type of non-verbal sign of language used for purposes other than greeting. In Iraqi society, for example, such a sign is used from lower status people to their religious representatives to express their respect and loyalty.

A more comprehensive account of non-verbal greetings is introduced by Jenkins (1993:1). He presents more than five types of non-verbal greetings in different cultures:

a. Shaking hands: Many cultures shake hands upon greeting. But it is found that there is an extreme variation on how people shake. Similar to what has been discussed above concerning Nodoushan's (2006:10) views on shaking hands in American society, Jenkins (Ibid.) refers to the fact that shaking hands in American society occurs in formal situations. However, "American shaking hands have diminished considerably over the last two generations". Similar to Americans are the British people, they shake hands with strangers not with people who work together.

b. Both hands: Such a type is not used in America or Britain but is noticed in African society. For British and American people, they use both hands to indicate greater honor, joy at seeing the person or other strong positive feeling.

Akikuya in central Kenya, for instance, would commonly hold their right forearm with the left hand or place the fingers of the left hand lightly on their own forearm, as they shake the hands of the other person. This is common with many peoples in Eastern and Southern African.

"They might pump the arms up and down to may be three times, or just down once firmly". They might hold the hand for an extended period, and then shake again one or more times (Jenkins, Ibid.).

Another form of shaking both hands is that two people clap hands as normal then grasp across the hand upward, the forward again. This is an extended shake rituals varying somewhat by tribe and it is actually similar to one variation of an American greeting which has also spread to general popular American culture (Ibid.:2).

c. Blessing: This is not used in British society or American one but in Maasai. There is a special blessing greeting of older people especially older women to younger people of either sex. The older person will spit into their right palm, then shake your hand passing the goodness of their spirit in the saliva as a blessing to you.

d. Touching: Touching is only used as a form of non-verbal greeting in Maasai in which the mother or father always greets a child by touching the hand. Some cultures reserve such gestures for personal and private situations. Maasai, for example reserve kissing for the relationship between mothers and babies while many African societies consider public hugging or even hand- holding as obscene gestures!

e. Prayer and How:

In Indian Hindu society, their prayer form of greeting is performed by holding two hands together. This is called 'Wai' in Thais which is accompanied by a slight bow of the head or even the body. "The higher you hold your hands, the more respect you show" (Ibid.: 3).

Americans will be familiar with the raised right palm of American Indians. "Whether they really said "How" while greeting with the palm is probably a matter of legend more than fact" (Ibid.).

f. Waves: The European hand wave is similar and is almost universal for a greeting across a distance. In Kenya, there is, however, a two-handed wave as in flagging down a car in an emergency or in the American gesture with your hands in front of your chest, among slightly up and down like: "It's OK" or "I'm not threat" (Ibid).

After such discussion on types of greetings (verbal vs. non verbal) with its forms (free-time, free-bound, formal and informal) in a number of societies, one might ask: Are these the only types?

Williams (1997) presents number of types of greetings. In addition to verbal and non-verbal types which are also adopted by Coffman (1971), Firth (1973) and Laver (1981), Williams (1997:57) uses his own types (1) mirrored. (2) greeting-response. (3) non-verbal. As far as the first type is concerned, it is defined as "one of the following forms where the response is an exact duplicate of the first part" :e.g.

4.A: Hi

B: Hi

The second type is defined as "the question following the first type", e.g.:

5.A: Good morning.

B: How are you?

'Type one' has a number of forms such as 'Hi, Good morning, etc, Hello and other'. 'Type two' is adopted by Schleicher (1997). It includes hand gestures, body language, and auditory sounds which may play a larger role in greetings.

To close off this section, a brief conclusion would be given concerning types of greetings with reference to its forms: All cultural groups have formulas for greeting. In this sense, patterns of greeting are universal. However, they vary with the cultures since the former are parts of cultures. This is a fact (language is part of culture) which all of linguists establish in their theories and researchers build their fields of study depending on it. Therefore, speech acts are not universal and consequently greetings.

1.4 Nature: Greeting as an Adjacency Pair

The emphasis on the sequential nature of greeting exchanges is the most important contribution of the work of conversational analysts. Therefore, the act of 'greeting' in this section will not be treated as an isolated act but as an exchange. Conversational analysts such as Schegloff (1968) and Sacks(1975), cited in Duranti (1997:65-66) work on conversational openings and closings. They show that greetings should not be analyzed as isolated acts but as a series of pairs,i.e.,adjacency pairs whereby "the uttering of the first part by one party calls for and at the same time defines the range of a possible "next turn" by a second party, the recipient"?.

Being as an adjacency pair, Nodoushan (20006:7) following Sacks (MS) maintain that greetings have two important features: *First*, they occur at the very beginning of a conversation and can't be alone elsewhere in the conversation. *Second*, they allow all the speakers a turn, right at the beginning of a conversation,e.g.:

6. Hello there, you two.

7. Hi.

8. Hi there,....

There are, however, two major occasions on which a conversation does not open with a greeting. Firstly, Coulthard (1985) cited in Nodoushan (20006:7) stats that this is a case in which a conversation occurs between people "who don't consider themselves co-conversationalists" such as strangers. They are not on greeting terms and therefore, do not exchange greetings. The speaker who opens must demonstrate in his/her utterance why he/she is beginning the conversation, e.g.,

9. Excuse me. Could you tell me the way to.....or

10. Hey. You've dropped your book(Ibid.:8).

Secondly, Schegloff (1968) cited in Nodoushan (2006:7) states that this is a case of telephone conversation. Schegloff (1968) argues that although the person who answers the telephone may say 'Hello', this is not a greeting. It is the answer "to summons from the caller embodied in the ringing of the telephone". Following this indication that the channel is open, there is often a greeting sequence to begin the conversation properly. Sometimes, if the answer is simply 'Hello', "there is first a checking sequence to make sure that the caller is talking to the right person".

Schegloff and Sacks (1973) cited in Williams(1997:49-50),defined adjacency pairs as

(1) "Two utterance lengths".

(2) "Adjacent positioning of compared utterances".

(3) Different speakers producing each utterance.

(4) Relative ordering of parts.

The notions of 'sequencing' and 'serial' moves are central to adjacency pairs and are used to explain the dynamic characteristics of verbal interaction.Schegloff and Sacks(1973)cited in Williams (Ibid.:50) view greetings as "a speech event composed of two parts side by side, serial and sequential, such as Greeting-Greeting",e.g.:

11. A: Hello.

B: Hi or

12. A: Good Morning.

B: Hello.

Such type 'Greeting-Greeting' has been modified by Williams (Ibid.:57)as 'mirrored'(as stated above)where "the response is an exact duplicate of the first part",e.g.,

13. A: Hi.

B: Hi.

Moreover, Biber et al(1999:1085)label it as 'symmetrical exchange' by which greetings are typically reciprocated,e.g.,

14. A: Hi Margaret.

B. Hi (AmE).

The second type that Schegloff and Sacks(1973) cited in Williams (1997:50) view greetings as is 'Greeting-Request' for information. This type occurs where the function of second pair pairs is replaced by another function,e.g.,:

15. A: Hello.

B: Did you just get home.

Williams (Ibid.:57) also uses the same term 'Greeting Response' for his second type of greeting where "the question following the first type", e.g.,

16. A: Good morning.

B: How are you?

Despite the fact that adjacency pairs constitute the most important part of the conversationalists' work in describing greeting exchanges, they have limitations and therefore include difficulties. Williams(Ibid.: 51) numerates these difficulties as follows:

1.The definition of adjacency pairs hold by Sacks and Schegloff(1973)doesn't adequately fit real life examples.Here,the researcher may analyze the reason behind this that since there are two interactants, one couldn't for example predicate the length and the nature of the answer of each of their utterance. This depends on the circumstances of the context, state of participants, their times,etc.

2.The use of adjacency pairs fail to make predications about interactions,i.e.,first parts may not indicate the person of second pair parts.

It has been stated by Mey(1993:218) for example ,that greeting as an adjacency pair is "a clear and an identifiable case of predictability: Given one part of the pair, the other is normally predictable", 'How are you?' for example, can be followed by the predictable 'Fine, and you?'.However,the researcher thinks that such an answer is predictable in its lexical meaning. Predictability means one part should be followed by another. What makes the researcher thinks so is Mey's(Ibid.:220) comment on such an answer: Mey (Ibid.) indicates that such an answer has lost its original content of "enquiring about somebody's health" and thus, serves only as a signal for possible openings of conversations; hence they become formal devices. Such a comment supports William's(Ibid.)first difficulty of using adjacency pairs, that they don't fit real life examples.Therefore,Mey(Ibid.)suggests that conversationalists can avoid such a problem by ignoring their 'pre-character' and answering such first part of greeting by a lengthy and detailed account of their bodily and mental state of health.Moreover,cultural differences play a great role in using greeting forms(cf.1.3 above)or greeting responses.

A good and comprehensive study on responses to forms of greetings as conversational exchanges that avoid the feature of predictability is made by Wierzbicka(1991:133-136).The researcher is not going to present the minute details of these responses since they are outside the real aim of this research (one who has an interest in these responses can come back to Wierzbicka's(1991:133-136)book Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction),however, the researcher presents simple references to these responses. Wierzbicka(Ibid.:133-136)states steps to these responses with their strategies. The researcher induces the following concluding remarks behind Wierzbicka's(1991)discussion: These steps and strategies reflect *first*, the psychological state of the recipient whether to answer with a detailed description of his/her state or to answer with the usual and brief answer such as 'Fine' to close off the conversation or even sometimes his/her answer takes the impolite form as 'lousy' which again reflects his/her bad psychological state.*Second*,the nature of the participants,i.e.,friends or strangers since strangers don't reflect the real nature of conversationalists using greeting as exchangeable moves(as indicated above).Moreover, they reflect the sex of the participants,i.e.,are they men or women? since sex plays a role in such a phenomenon.*Third*,the role of culture in presenting different answers that suit the cultural backgrounds of conversationalists,i.e.,participants.

Predictability and stereotyped answers for greeting exchanges reflect consequently the third difficulty that Williams(1997:51)refers to: Adjacency pairs have a static dimension in the sense that they can only "describe the observable behavior and fail to fully address the pragmatic interactional aspects of greeting exchanges". In other words, neglecting all the real functions behind using greeting as adjacency pairs as drawn from Wierzbicka's(1991)steps and strategies will make this act as a static phenomenon and not dynamic one and therefore fail to present its real aim behind using it in conversation,i.e.,cooperative social function.

Therefore, the use of this act as an adjacency pair in its literal and linguistic form leads to difficulties and therefore, its conversational role will not be representative of real life communication since there is no strong establishment of the relationship between form and pragmatic context .To fulfill this establishment ,one shouldn't neglect this conversational nature of this act but one should take this nature and strengthens it by maintaining the social function of using this act as a speech act(isolated or not)performed successfully in daily life for the sake of cooperative communication between a speaker and a hearer by using procdures,conditions,rules and proper structures,i.e.,the mixture of linguistic and non-linguistic structures since language is an interrelated system of systems and can't be worked successfully unless these systems are in support of each other. Such a conclusion will be the real aim of this research and take the titles of 'Greeting and Social Identity' and 'Structures of Greeting'.

2. Greeting and Politeness

2.1 Greeting as a Convivial Act

Trosborg (1994:29) states that Leech (1983) is the first person who classifies the illocutionary functions according to the notion of 'politeness'. Leech (1983) identifies four different types of situations that call for different degrees of politeness and attempts a classification according to "how illocutionary functions relate to the social goal of maintaining comity". He distinguishes the following four types: the competitive, the collaborative, the conflictive and the convivial functions(for further information, see Leech,1983:104-107).

The main focus of the researcher is the convivial class since it contains greetings. The convivial class involves acts in which the illocutionary goal coincides with the social goal. In addition to greeting, it contains offering, inviting, thanking and congratulating. All these acts are intrinsically polite and take the form of positive politeness asking for opportunities for comity. As with congratulating or complimenting, greeting somebody means or involves that "the speaker adheres to the listener's positive face.

2.2 Greeting as a FSA

Politeness is one of the most important aspects of human communication: In other words, human beings can only exist in peace together if certain basic conventions of politeness are observed.

To comment on these politeness conventions, one should start with the notion of 'face'. This is due to the fact that since Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson(1978) first developed a theory of linguistic politeness, most sociolinguistic studies have looked at politeness in terms of 'face'.

The term 'face' is taken from the metaphorical expression "to lose face". Although there is no equivalent expression in English like "to enhance face", one can say "to save face". Face, as a way of referring to personal self-image, is hence "closely linked to status or prestige and as such it can imply competition and corresponding degrees of prestige (Watts, Ide and Ehlich, 1992:7)

Social cohesion depends upon awareness and consideration of the term 'face needs'. Each participant in a normal society has two types of face needs: 'a positive face need' and 'a negative face need'. The former means "the positive consistent self-image or personality". In

other words, it is the positive aspect of 'face' which includes "the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of". The latter means "the basic claim to territories, personal preservers, rights to non-distractions". In other words, it is the negative aspect of 'face' which includes the desire to freedom of action and freedom from imposition (Rash,2004:1-2).

From such brief introduction on the notion of 'face need' with its two types, a question might be raised: To which type shall one include greetings? Since positive politeness attends to a person's positive face needs, speech acts of greeting are included with positive face need. In addition to greetings, there are other expressive acts such as compliments, invitations, thanks, etc. Threatens, indirectness, commissives, etc are included within negative face needs. Moreover, positive face needs "are associated with solidarity and friendliness" while negative face needs are "associated with power and (social) distance" (Ibid.:2).

Therefore, speech acts of 'greetings' are positive face needs, hence, they are face saving acts (henceforth FSAs) and not face threatening acts (henceforth FTAs). The researcher would like to comment more on greetings as FSAs in relation to the term, 'phatic communication'. But before that, she wishes to close of what is meant by a FTA since apposite will be the subsequent concern of the research itself.

One of the bad features of the Arabic society (in more particular) is that no one lets us to live in peace without intrusions into another's personal things or into another's territory. This is exactly what's meant by 'FTAs'. To establish this term in address of linguists' uniform, Rash(2004:2) states that FTAs are resulted from failure of interactants in a communicative act to respect the face needs of others. A FTA includes threats, insults, criticisms, etc. Such a "face redressive" involves linguistic indirections such as modal verbs, particles or hedges. Moreover, a FTA may also be mitigated by an apology as in:

17. I'm sorry to bother you, but would you please close the window?

According to what has been mentioned before (features of FTAs and FSAs), acts of 'greeting' are not FTAs. They are FSAs due to their positive politeness and since they are 'phatic communication'. If someone correctly performs the speech act of 'greeting' by using appropriate words, tone of voice and body language, such an act can alternate the force of a potential FTA, as a substitution, he/she will perform one of the face –saving function of greeting, i.e., establishing a relationship in a non-threatening atmosphere. This is referred to as "phatic communication". 'Phatic' refers to "a type of communication which signals one's readiness for interpersonal communication and /or one's willingness to interact within a particular community" (Crystal, 1987:427).

With reference to 'phatic communication', Kartin Züger (a Swiss linguist) documents two aspects of greeting: "Initial phatic" [initial phatic communication or initial greeting] and "Terminal phatic" [terminal phatic communication or leave –taking]. In both aspects, greetings exemplify how a phatic communication act may be 'other-oriented' or 'self-oriented'. 'Self-oriented' greetings may include declarative statements such as:

18. My legs weren't made for those hills (Laver, 1975 cited in Rash, 2004:3).

'Other oriented' greetings often contain a question, such as 'how are you?', or a comment such as 'that looks like hard work' (Ibid.).

Holmes (1995) cited in Rash (Ibid.) believed that women are to be more 'other oriented' than men since they feel more responsible for social harmony than men and "they are more interested in finding common ground and establishing solidarity". Consequently, as elsewhere, they are women who tend to perform the task of teaching conventions of greeting to their children (Ibid.).

3. Greeting and Social Identity

Types, forms and formulas of the speech act of 'greeting' taking into consideration various factors such as status, age, sex, etc, don't reflect the main function of this act i.e., identifying separate cultures. This conclusion is the outcome of one feature of

language,i.e.,language is universal: Generally speaking, all languages have two main types of greetings: verbal-non verbal in addition to its forms and formulas such as formal vs.informal,time-free vs. time-bound.Therefore,the researcher thinks that it is necessary to answer the following question: If one cannot depend on types of greetings to capture different cultures, in other words ,identify the social identity of human beings belonging to different cultures, so on what shall one depend?

According to the researcher's humble experience taking from reading pragmatic and social books and watching different social reports on speech communities concerning the speech act of 'greeting', she divides these communities into four societies:

1. Religious /Tribalism Societies: In these societies, greeting is considered as a religious ritual and shouldn't be therefore leave it or avoid it. Wolof and Maori are examples of such societies.

The behavior of greeting has a special place among the Wolof (a Niger-Congo language of Senegambia).Every interaction must begin with a greeting. Wolof society is divided into different casts:

a. In the country, greeting occurs between any two persons who see each other even if one of them has "to make a detour to accomplish it".

b.In crowded areas, everyone close to the speaker must be greeted.

c.In a conversational gathering, everyone must be greeted at the outset and if someone in the course of conversation, leaves and returns, it is often necessary to pause while all are greeted individually again(Crystal,1987:40).

One must not forget that in order to accomplish any speech event, factors such as status,sex, etc should be taken in even in such tribal societies.According to relative rank, this factor detemins"who greets whom". In this society with all of its casts mentioned above, it is customary that the lower rank person must greet the higher one. Therefore, the former must speak first when two people meet and the latter must be greeted before (Ibid.).

Variations in status also occur. This factor is the jest of the following Wolof proverb:"Sawaadyi, Sawaadyi, gatyanyyutya, ndamanyya ca" which means "when two persons greet each other, one has shame, the other has glory!". Hence, an upper caste person may not wish to adopt the higher ranking position, therefore, he/she would attempt to lower himself /herself by speaking first in a conversation for the sake of maintaining such glory (Ibid.).This is equally to the Islamic society in which there is a saying by the Prophet Mohammad (peace be upon him) which indicates the fact that the one who greets first will obtain higher virtues than the other.

There are also paralinguistic features that distinguish these ranks and status; they are classifiable on the dimension of stressed tempo/quality as follows:

<i>Stress</i>	<i>Tempo/Quantity</i>
Noble s [-high,-loud]	t [-rapid,-verbose]
Griot S [+High, +loud]	T [+rapid, ++verbose]

Thus, the opening greeting uttered by the lower ranks person has the associated paralinguistic features **ST** and the response will consequently be **st**.Sometimes a noble person who has taken the role of initiator will use **sT** to indicate that he/she is polite. In this case, she/he shows defense"(initiator role and T) even though he doesn't have to(s))"(Irvine,1974 cited in Nodoushan,2006:5).

Another religious /tribalism society is the Moraine. In such a society, rituals of greetings are marked by the elaborate and highly conventionalized forms of expression, often these rituals reflect the social aspects of the speakers. These rituals occur in different occasions such as weddings, funerals and visitations by dignitaries. For these rituals to be performed ,there are seven stages. All but two of these involve language, "in each case, accuracy of expression is eventual, otherwise evil will result". These two stages are as follows:

1. The Karanga which is "an exchange of high, chanted calls of greeting, and invocations to the dead between the old women and the local and visiting parties".
2. The Whaikoorero is the main part of the ritual since it is the oratory. The locals and each group of visitors have a 'team' of orators. Within the alteration of speeches, each speech beginning with a warning shout being followed by an archaic chant ,greetings for the dead and living , perhaps a topic for discussion and concluded with a traditional saying by a group as a whole .When high ranking foreigners make an official visit to New Zealand ,they are usually greeted by the elaborate "leaping and grimace of a Maori ceremonial challenge(wero)".Such ritual displays of strengths were always usual on the first encounter or meeting with strangers though early settlers often describe them as real belligerence with deadly results(Crystal,1987:49).

2.The Civilized Societies: Greetings in these societies (that have a highly religious sense) are fluctuating between the obligatory religious ritual and a customer tradition based on religious basis. In these societies, greetings will be an ethical task and not a religious one. Arabic society is one of these particularly the Saudian one.

Any attempt to analyze speech acts(henceforth SAs) in Arabic society must recognize Islam as their foundation; everything occurs as God wills since Arabic has its faith in Allah (God).Therefore, their ritual greeting is "Assalamu alaikum (peace be with you)" to the final party salutation "fi amanilah (may God safeguard you)"(Kharrat, 2002:3).

Away from its religious connection, Arabic greetings are expected in every social encounter and they indicate fixed patterns(asking about parents,children,relatives,one's health,etc).In an interest of intercultural understanding, a typical greeting exchange done almost every time people can encounter each other is stated below with their appropriate translation:

Sp1: Assaluma aleikum	peace be with you
Sp2:Wa aleikum assalaam	and peace be with you, too
Sp1:Keif al hal?	How are you?
Sp2:Alhumdu llila	may God be praised
Sp1:Ma Akhbar al 'aila?	what news about your family?
Sp2:Hum bekhair	they are fine
Sp1:Wa awlad?	and your children?
Sp2:Hum bekhair aydan	they are also fine(Ibid.:4)

Throughout the researcher's observation of the Saudian society by watching movies, series or social reports on their life, it is noticed that the form of greeting is fluctuating between what is wanted from religious as cited in the Holly Quran :

((وَإِذَا حُيِّتُمْ بِتَحِيَّةٍ فَحَيُّوا بِأَحْسَنَ مِنْهَا أَوْ رُدُّوهَا))((النساء 86/و))((فَإِذَا دَخَلْتُمْ بُيُوتًا فَسَلِّمُوا عَلَى أَنْفُسِكُمْ تَحِيَّةٌ مِنْ عِنْدِ اللَّهِ))((النور/16)) which is more used by old people or people who are pious even when they are young(such a form constitutes the majority of the society since Saudian is a religious society)and what is accepted as a social ritual no longer used by young civilized people who are preoccupied and influenced by modern societies.Therefore,such a society is classified as civilized one as mentioned above.

Similar to the Saudian society but not identical to, is the American one. In the latter society, there is also such fluctuating in the use of the forms of greetings between the society as a religious one (since the American people are being described as puritans who are scattered around the American society especially the countryside and other states: They persist in going to churches to pray) and the impact of ritual as a religious one. This is a fact for everyone who reads the history of American society or watches their movies or programs.Moreover,what proves this fact ,i.e., greetings in American society are ethical obligations not religious ones is resulted from the study made by Fieg and Mortlock(1989).

Fieg and Mortlock (1989) cited in Williams (1997:53-54) define greetings as "a speech event with pragmatic meaning and the meaning in turn, is affected by cultural perspectives". Therefore, they make an observational study comparing between Americans and Thais as far as this speech act is concerned. Their comparison is made in three situations: work, passing on the street and personal encounters. Their analysis is pragmatic and their means of analysis focuses on cross-cultural properties. In an example of greeting while passing on the street, Americans are reported to say "What's happening?" or "What's new?". These are "ritualistic expressions" which have an effect on the listener, causing on non-formulaic responses about events "impinging on the hearer or what new events have somehow affected the hearer's life". According to the American cosmology, this society is dynamic, open and engaging: Thus, such a society is said to welcome new experiences and offer them as conversation topics. Thais, however, influenced by Buddhism, view the universe as "transitory; consequently, events that impinge upon the hearer are too ephemeral to discuss in a causal greeting". In their study, Fieg and Mortlock (1989) attempted to generalize the utility of greetings initially as influences of social factors and then point out cross-cultural differences in the sense that how each culture's cosmological views influencing the meaning of their speech acts.

3. Societies that the sense of religion is diminished socially or societies in which the religious sense and the civilized one (which means societies that take the elements of civilization from Western society and imitate them) are mixed. In these societies, greetings will be considered as a norm and not an ethical or a religious obligation as most of the Arabic societies (with the exception of the Saudian society as mentioned above). Iraqi society is one of them. This is not in need of proves from books, TV or observation since it is something that Iraqi people are acquainted with. In different situations: Work, sitting in a bus, waiting for a bus, asking about unknown places, starting a lesson at schools or universities, etc., the speaker may greet others or not, if he/she does not do that, others will despise him/her or considered him/her impolite or unreligious persons.

This is also the same when someone visits the Holly places or enters the mosque to pray, either the person will say 'assaluma aleikum' for anyone who sits beside him/her or not. The situation might be different if there is conceit for Al-Imam Al-Hussein, council of mourning, religious orations in which the person who enters the first two places should greet with 'assaluma aleikum' otherwise, others will criticize him/her or consider him/her impolite (socially, such a person will not be accepted) as in the third place. The orator, for example should start with 'assaluma aleikum' before reciting his oration (such as Friday sermon).

4. Societies that are implicitly built on the principle of classes: In these societies, greetings are taken less role that take in other societies. It is neither considered as a religious ritual, an ethical ritual nor as a social obligation, they are routinized formulas. The British society is described as being class society. This is very clear from watching their programs, movies, reading their novels which reflect different ages or watching their plays to be dramatized. Such a society is one which is conservative for applying rules as they are with no flexibility, therefore, even when they use greetings, they tend to use the more formal one in contrast to the Americans society which are tend to be informal and happy to accept new experiences.

Anyone who continues examining the history of the English society will have the same opinion mentioned above and this is what Jucker and Taavitsainen (2008:3) later on state. Their statement concerning greetings become in Modern English as routinized formula as explained before.

To close off this section, the researcher does agree with Fieg and Mortolock's definition that greetings are speech acts with pragmatic meanings. Thus, such meanings are affected by cultural perspectives as denoted before by the use of different forms and formulas.

However, the researcher or anyone (who has an interest in SAT in general or who has read about the speech act of 'greeting' in specific) doesn't agree with the view held by Wierzbicka(1991).Wierzbicka(1991:134)states that acts of greeting are not used for comparison between cultures. He demonstrates his view point from such a question 'How are you?' which is considered by him as a question and not a greeting. Moreover, 'greetings', 'questions' and 'invitations' are English words which belong to the English folk-taxonomy of speech acts and they have no exact equivalents in other languages. Hence, they can't be regarded as useful tools for cross-cultural comparison. Such a phrase (as a conventional or conversational opening) is part of the English language and should be included in an adequate dictionary of English (along with 'Good Morning', 'Hello' and 'Hi').

The researcher, however, has the following reasons which state her different opinion from Wierzbicka: *First*, concerning the phrase 'How are you?' is considered as a question and not a greeting, the researcher presents before that such a phrase is one of the forms of greeting and as it is going to be discussed below, its illocutionary force is greeting but takes the linguistic type or the syntactic type of a question and not a statement and this is what Searle (1975b) names as indirect speech acts. *Second*, the researcher adopts the following couplet to support her point of view. These couplets are stated by Leech(1983:198):

"Don't tell your friends about your indigestion:

"How are you" is a greeting not a question".

This is part of the discussion. The other part has two sides: On one side, the researcher does agree with Wierzbicka's view that greetings are conversational openings. This is proved above in the sense that they don't play the same role that greetings play in other languages. Greetings in English society are routinized expressions since they are neither rituals nor ethical obligations.

On the other side, they are speech acts since events reflect meanings that performed by the speaker for sending a certain message or a force on the hearer. Therefore, there should be a pragmatic meaning indicated by illocutionary and perlocutionary forces. These are different due to participants, times, places, contexts (linguistic and situational) and the manipulation of all these factors in deciding the acts in focus to reach to the ultimate aim of SAT, i.e., the study of these acts with reference to different languages (or cultures) since each language is unique. 'Greetings' consequently, as many other SAs are useful tools for comparison between cultures and they are not merely conversational openings without their functional or pragmatic meanings.

4. Structures of Greeting

Searle(1969:41) demonstrates that to speak a language is to take part in "a rule governed form of behaviour". The form of this behavior, he proceeds is not only a result of syntactic, grammatical and semantic, as pre-transformational generative grammar believes in, but it is part of "a theory of action"(Ibid.:17).

The fact that speech acts are the production of the mixture of all these linguistic levels is furthermore stated by Searle(Ibid.:16)as follows: "speech acts are the basic or minimal units of linguistic communication". Thus, the social exchanges of speech acts are the production of phonetics, syntactics, morphology, semantics and pragmatics.

Hence, the researcher is going to present the work and the system of each structure in isolation for the sake of shedding light on the vital role each structure plays in producing this speech act, i.e., 'greeting'.

4.1 The Semantic Structures of Greeting

This section will be stated by raising the following question :What's the semantic (i.e., meaning) structure of the speech acts of greeting? The researcher will not adopt Leech's(1974:10-20)types of meaning which are seven since they are not useful for maintaining speech acts in general and 'greeting' in specific.Therefore,the researcher will adopt Vanderveken's(1990:166)view: "Actual languages like English,French,Spanish and Arabic have a great number of speech act verbs whose meanings can specify the possible illocutionary forces of the utterances of their sentences". The reason behind this adaptation is due to the felicity conditions(henceforth FCs) that take great role in producing it(in the pragmatic structure of this act ,these conditions will be discussed in detail).Part of Vanderveken's view is going to be discussed in this section and the other part is going to be left as mentioned above to the pragmatic structure of this act.

The first part is going to be stated by denoting the lexical meaning with its phonetic and grammatical information and not a lexical analysis(since the lexical analysis will constitute the other part of Vanderveken's view of greeting).

Hornby(2005:681-682) gives the following vocabulary information for the verb 'greet' and the noun 'greeting' as follows:

Greet/gri:t/(v):"Somebody with sht to say hello to sb" as in:

19.He greeted all the guests warmly as they arrived.

Greeting/gri:tiŋ /(n):"Something that you say or do to greet sb" as in:

20.She waved a Friday greeting.

In Arabic, Baalbaki(2000:641)states that the verb 'greet'(or to salute)means:

(سَلَّمَ عَلَى /sallim ala:/or /haya/ and its noun 'greeting' means(سَلام، تَحِيَّة) /salam or taheia/.

In addition to these lexical meanings of the verb 'greet' and its noun 'greeting', a section is devoted to presenting definitions of the speech act of 'greeting'(cf.1.1.above)with the one adopted definition that reflects the social function of this act,i.e.,identifying the cultures that are represented by the encounter of greeting acts(cf. section 3 above).

Moreover,Wierzbicka(1991:132-133) presents meanings of the implicit use of the speech act of 'greeting' by using the phrase 'How are you' as follows:

- 1.It is a conversational opener which has the meaning as in: "I know we can say things to one another because we are in the same place".
- 2.This phrase constitutes an established linguistic routine used in circumstances such as: "I want to say something to you because of this kind that people say to one another when they come to be in the same place".
- 3.It shows the friendly character of the phrase : "I want you to know :I feel something good toward you".
- 4.It indicates the speaker's (real or pretended)interest in the addresser's well-being": I say : "I want to know 'how are you now' ".
- 5.It is a phrase which is similar to a question that obliges the addressee to make a verbal response: "I want you to say something because of this".
- 6.It indicates a positive response : "I want to say :I am well". It may be taken to indicate the speaker's wish that the addressee should be well: "I want you to say that you are well because I want to know that you are well, because I want you to be well".
- 7.It indicates the speaker's optimistic expectation that the answer will be positive and at the same time betrays a reluctance to hear a negative one: "I think you will say something like this".
- 8.It suggests that a positive answer will be 'a pleasure' to both interlocutors and hints that this shared pleasure will be conducive to social harmony between them: "I think we will feel something good because of this".

The meanings denoted by the phrase 'How are you' as stated by Wierzbicka(1991), assure the facts that: *First*, such a phrase is mostly used in conversational structure since expressions of greeting are considered as adjacency pairs in corporation to its responses. *Second*, the real meaning of this phrase can't be successfully performed regardless a speaker and a hearer. These two participants play the major role in achieving the propositional content of this act.

Therefore, the semantic structure of this act can't be interpreted in terms of its lexical or to be precise vocabulary or dictionary meaning since it is an act which involves social exchanges with reference to a participant, a place, etc ,i.e., pragmatic components of uttering such an act ,taking into consideration FCs maintaining it and distinguishing it from other related acts. This conclusion will take the major part of 'the Pragmatic Structures of Greeting'.

4.2 The Syntactic Structures of Greeting

In dealing with the syntactic structure of this speech act, one should refer to the general features(syntactic features)of expressive acts that 'greetings' belong to. This is due to the fact that has referred to before that though speech acts are social exchanges, yet they are produced by the working of all linguistic levels.Hence,the syntactical facts of speech acts in general and expressives in particular are the consequences of the pragmatic ones.

This view is best elaborated by Searle(1975a:356-357) and Searle (1979:15-16,23).Searle(1975a:356)states that the illocutionary point of expressives is to "express the psychological states specified in the sincerity condition about a state of affairs specified in the propositional content". There is no direction of fit ,i.e., in performing an expressive ,the speaker is neither "trying to get the world to match the words nor the words to match the world, the truth of the expressed proposition is rather presupposed".Thus,for example ,"when I apologize for having stepped on your toe, it is not my purpose either to claim that your toe was stepped on nor to get it stepped". Having no direction between the words and the world is neatly reflected in the syntax of English by the fact that expressive verbs in their performative occurrences will not be permitted to take 'that clause' or 'infinitives', instead they will require a gerundive nominalization transformation or some other nominals:

For example, one cannot say:

***I apologize that I stepped on your toe or**

***I apologize to step on your toe .Similarly one cannot say,**

***I congratulate you that you won the race.**

***I congratulate you to win the race. One would rather say:**

21.I apologize for stepping on your toe or

22.I apologize for behaving badly.Similarly,one would say

23.I congratulate you on winning the race or

24.I congratulate you for winning the race.

Hence, *the deep structure of gerundive sentences* is :

I verb you+ I/you VP⇒gerundive nom

Searle(1979:16) states that these syntactical facts (impossibility of having 'that clauses' or 'infinitives') are the consequences of the zero direction of fit.Moreover,the truth of the proposition expressed in an expressive is presupposed. The symbolization of the this class is as follows:

E Ø (P) (S/H+property)

Where **E** indicates the illocutionary point common to all expressives, **Ø** is the null symbol indicating no direction of fit, **P** is a variable ranging over different and possible psychological states expressed in the performance of the illocutionary acts in this class, and the propositional content ascribes some property to either a speaker or a hearer. This property is not necessary an action such as in:

25.I congratulate you on your good looks.

Moreover, the property must be related to S or H: "I cannot without some very special assumptions congratulate you on Newton's first law of motion".

What is about the speech act of 'greeting'? It is similar to expressive verbs in the sense that it doesn't take 'that clauses' or 'infinitives' since there is no direction of fit between the words and the world. The researcher finds the only following examples in which the writers use the explicit verb 'greet'(since the speech act of 'greeting' is mainly expressed by expressions other than the explicit verb 'greet' or 'salute' for reasons the researcher tries to find out in the following section:

26.He greeted us with a simile.

27.She greeted all the guests.

28.Loud cheers greeted the news.[Sentences No.26-28 contain active voice of 'greet']

29.The changes were greeted with suspicion..

30.The team's win was greeted as a major triumph.

31.When she opened the door ,she was greeted by a scene of utter confusion.[SentencesNo.29-31 contain passive voice of 'greet']

32.He raised his hand in greeting.

33.They exchanged greetings and sat down to lunch.[Sentences No32-33 contain 'greeting' as a noun]

(Hornby,2005:681)

In all these examples, particularly in the examples that employ the verb 'greet', there is no 'that clause' or 'infinitives'.Hence,the researcher considers the following examples ungrammatical:

***Loud cheers greeted that the news were good or**

***Loud cheers were greeted to have good news.**

The only example that the researcher finds as far as the use of this speech act with 'infinitives' is concerned is exemplified by Hornby(Ibid.).He uses 'greeting' as a noun referring to Christmas or birthday cards,e.g.,:

34.My mother sends her greeting to you all.(Note here, that after **to**, there is a noun **you** and not a base verb function as **to**).

Other writers in which the researcher makes use of their examples of the verb 'greet' that is not followed by 'that' or 'infinitive'(particularly 'that clause') are Leech, Cruickshank and Ivanič(2001:171).They state that one can use direct speech for the following sentence:

35.Hello(how nice to see you).

In order to change this into indirect speech ,one would say :**She greeted me. She said 'hello'.**

According to Quirk and Greenbaum(1973:341-342),one of the rules of changing direct into indirect speech is by using 'said that' or 'told (pronoun)that',e.g.:

36.'I shall do it now', he said →He said that he would do it then.

But this is not applicable to expressive speech acts for reasons explained before.

What's about the structure of the expressions indicating 'greeting',i.e.,implicit use of the speech act of 'greeting' ? Quirk et al(1985:852)state that greetings are formulas used for stereotyped communicative situations and mostly are expressed by grammatical irregular structures (irregular in the sense that they don't maintain usual order that an English sentence takes as *SVOC*A) such as 'Good morning, Good afternoon, etc'(formal types);'Hello and Hi'(familiar types or informal)in addition to phrases that are referred to before such as 'Happy birthday, Merry Christmas, etc'. Similarly,irregularity can be found in farewells such as 'Good bye and All the best'(informal),'Cheers and Cheerio'(BrE,familiar),'See you, Bye(-bye) and So long'(familiar).

This is on one hand, on the other hand, the researcher classifies other expressions of 'greeting' such as 'How do you do', 'How are you',etc as questions,i.e.,this is the locutionary or the literal use of the act or to be more accurate the direct speech act while their illocutionary

act or their non-literal use or indirect speech act is 'greeting'(the locutionary act means the utterance itself while the illocutionary one means the function of such an utterance).In this sense, the researcher adopts Searle's(1975a:73-75) notion of 'indirect speech act' in which he defines it as "cases where a speaker says one thing and means that, but also means something else".(For more distinctions between direct or locutionary acts and indirect or illocutionary acts, see Searle(1973a:143-146)).

Therefore, the syntactic structure of this speech act (whether it is the explicit use of the performative verb 'greet' or is the implicit one,i.e.,using various expressions)is the outcome of the pragmatic concern of this act taking into consideration the explicit use of the performative verb or its implicit use,FCs that result in various syntactic facts or the use of the term 'indirect speech act'. After presenting the semantax(the result of the semantic and the syntactic structures) of this act ,it is the turn to discuss its pragmatic structure.

4.3 The Pragmatic Structures of Greeting

Since pragmatic concepts are the underlying and the major machine of the working of semantics and syntax as shown above, the term 'pragmatic structure' in this research means all these levels together.This conclusion is resulted from the proofs indicated above (cf.4.1 and 4.2) and basically from the fact that stated by Malinowski (1923)on which the researcher depends. This fact states that language is 'a network of interrelated elements', each element depends on the other and cannot work in isolation though each element has its own system and feature.

The first part of this section will be concentrated on the performative verb 'greet'. As indicated before, the speech act of 'greeting' is expressed mostly by expressions of time-bound as 'Good morning', etc or 'time-free' expressions such as 'Hi', 'How are you?', etc .Other lexes of this act are represented by the use of the verb 'greet' itself .However, in English society or American one, this verb is neither used in their real life communication nor in their text books. This conclusion is arrived at by the researcher for the following reasons:*First*,the researcher reads an article entitled 'An Evaluation of Greeting Exchanges in Textbooks and Real Life Settings' by Williams(1997). The researcher never finds in these two settings especially the first one explicit reference to its use or the use of the performative verb 'greet' .The writer makes comparison between these settings mainly as far as types of greetings are concerned and he never mentions anything to the explicit use of this performative verb. *Second*, the only examples that the researcher finds such a usage 'greet' is in the dictionary as mentioned before. This is due to the fact that dictionaries are made basically for learners to make use of them in learning other languages. In addition to such a type of dictionary, there is a book by Leech, Cruickshank and Ivanič(2001) An A-Z of English Grammar and Usage which is also written for learners ,i.e., academic texts. The only use of the act 'greeting' by native speakers of English is when they exchange greeting cards in certain celebrations and occasions such as Christmas or birthday.

The researcher may think that the principal reason behind using expressions of 'greeting' by native speakers of English in their daily life than the performative verb 'greet' is that people are after the intended meaning of 'greeting' other than the performative use of the verb: 'Greeting' simply means expressing pleasure at meeting or seeking someone, such a meaning or a function is well understood by mere use of 'Hi', 'How do you do?', etc not necessarily indicating such a meaning by saying for example 'I greet you and say how are you? Or Good morinnng'.Moreover, it has stated before the briefer the greeting ,the most usual and familiar form will be used.

Concerning the verb 'salute', no one of the writers(linguists),sociolinguists or pragmatists that the researcher depends on has mentioned this verb as a synonym with 'greet'. The only mentioning of such equivalent relation between them is mentioned by Baalbaki(2000)for the

sake of giving vocabulary meaning in Arabic with their counterpart in English. The verb 'salute' as mentioned by Hornby(2005:1342)has the following dictionary information: The verb 'salute'/sə'lu:t/ means to "touch the side of your head with the fingers of your right hand to show respect ,especially in the armed forces",e.g.,

37.The sergeant stood to attention and saluted.

Therefore, one may conclude throughout the use of the verb 'salute'⁽¹⁾ as stated above that the use of hands(the paralinguistic features)constitute the central part of producing this act for showing respect in addition to the context(military)unlike the speech act of 'greeting' which is understood whether it is accompanied by these features or not expect in certain cultures that produce this act depending mainly on paralinguistic features. Moreover, 'greeting' simply expresses happiness or pleasure at seeing or meeting someone.

The other part of this section will be the role of the participants in different FCs.The speech act of 'greeting' is defined simply as expressing pleasure at seeing or meeting someone. Therefore, it is essentially hearer-directed.Similarly,the speech act of 'welcoming' is defined as "an expression of pleasure or good feeling about the presence or arrival of someone".Therefore,it is also hearer-directed(Searle and Vanderveken,1985:215).

'Welcoming', however; is different from all expressive acts in two respects:*First*,it doesn't accept gerundive complement ,instead it is followed by a locative expression,e.g.,

38.Welcome to the party /in Australia/here.

Second, it has no propositional content at all expect in a case in which one may think of 'welcome home' as expressing the proposition 'you are home'. If so, then it is this proposition which is presupposed true. Even in this case, the possible complement of this act must be expanded to allow locative expressions(²). (Ibid.)

A quick reference(where it is necessary)has been made in the previous sections concerning the use of the term 'FCs'.Now,it is the turn to deeply investigate these conditions with reference to the act of 'greeting'. In this research, these conditions constitute one major part since the other has been already discussed,i.e.,the social aspect of this act.Moreover,these conditions constitute the major part of the pragmatic structure of 'greeting' since they investigate the mechanical procedures followed by the participants in producing this act.

A brief and simple introduction of these conditions with their types is going to be stated below with reference to all acts in general and expressive class in particular then the research has going to proceed stating others' FCs of this act then the researcher's own formulation.

The term 'FCs' has been first used by Austin(1962) in his book How to Do Things With Words. These conditions will determine whether any speech act is going to be successfully performed or not. In other words, Austin(1962:14-15) states that the utterance is said to be felicitous or happy if the illocutionary act (the pragmatic function of the sentence as mentioned above)of this sentence takes effect, while it is said to "be unhappy or infelicitous or misfiring if it goes away for some reason". These conditions are :Preparatory conditions, executive conditions, sincerity conditions and fulfillment conditions. Searle(1969:54-71)modifies Austin's(1962)FCs as follows and proposes a set of FCs for performing the act of 'promising' and claims that one can formulate other conditions:

1.Propositional Content Conditions: These conditions specify the proposition that can be expressed in the sentence, 'promising' for example, belongs to the commissive illocutionary acts, which according to these conditions ,the speaker predicates a further act himself/herself.

1.The researcher will not go on mentioning other differences between these acts(greeting and saluting) since such a comparison is outside the aim of the research.

2.The researcher will not go on comparing between these two acts(greeting and welcoming) since such a comparison is outside the aim of the research.

2.Presuppositional Conditions: Searle(1969) evaluates Austin's preparatory conditions.Presuppositional conditions specify conditional requirements for example in 'promising' act, the speaker promises to do something under the presupposition that his/her further action is good for the hearer, though it is clear that neither of them will do the action.

3.Sincerty Conditions: Searle(1969)uses the same sense of Austin's(1962)conditions in the sense they specify the required beliefs,intentions,etc for the speaker as they are reflected in the performance of illocutionary act(henceforth IA),for example 'promising' has the sincerity condition that the speaker intends to do what he/she promises herself/himself to do.

4.Essential Conditions: These are the constitute rules that determine the types of IA: For 'promising', the hearer should be informed of the speaker's intention to promise irrespective of what the speaker is sincere or not.

From these conditions, Searle(1969:62-63)derives a set of semantic rules(henceforth SRs)for determining the illocutionary force indicating device (henceforth IFID):

1.Propositional Rules: These rules focus upon "textual context".

2.Preparatory Rules: These rules focus upon "background circumstances".

3.Sincerty Rules: These rules focus upon "speaker's psychological state".

4.Essential Rules; These rules focus upon "the illocutionary point of what is said".

Norrick(1978)in his article 'Expressive Illocutionary Acts' suggests three conditions that must be obtained for the successful performance of the expressive illocutionary act:

1.The Factive Condition :Norrick's(1978:282)factive condition views the fact that the performance of any expressive act must require the speaker's acceptance of a certain state of affairs.Moreover,the speaker must presuppose the truth of the prepositional content of that expressive act.Norrick's(1978)factive condition stands for Grice's (1975)conventional implicature that "the S is expressing the emotion he expresses involves assumptions which go beyond the purely semantic".

2.The Value Judgment Condition: In this condition, the speaker is required to make his/her value judgment with regard to the effect of the state of affairs(Ibid.:283).

3.The Role Identification Condition: This is another condition which is necessary for successful performance of an expressive act. It requires that the speaker is identified as the agent "who is responsible for the state of affairs", while the patient is identified as the recipient (agent and recipient are two semantic roles of the subject and the object) "a person cognizant of the state beside the patient".

The value judgment condition and the role identification condition are Searle's(1969)preparatory conditions(Ibid.).

Given these three conditions,Norrick(1978:284)concludes his analysis with a generalized formulation of the kind of the expressive illocutionary act:

Schematically: (Agent /Value)X(Patient)(Observer)

Where() indicates optionality, // offers the choice of the positive or negative act and **X** stands for a state of affairs perceived as factual and judged to have positive or negative value for some person, the agent, the patient or in case neither the agent or patient role is filled, an additional person is required, the observer.

Applying this formula to the speech act of 'greeting', the researcher produces the following new formula:

Agent or Addresser/Positive Value/Patient or Addressee

Searle(1969:64,67)provides SRs for performing the illocutionary act of 'greeting'. He states that in uttering 'Hello', for example:

1.There is no propositional content rule.

2.There is no sincerity condition or rule(since these SRs are derived from their FCs as mentioned above).

3.The preparatory condition or rule is that the speaker must have just encountered the hearer.

4.The essential rule is that the utterance as 'Hello' counts as a courteous indication of recognition of the hearer. Therefore, his SRs for performing the speech act of 'greeting' are as follows:

1.The Propositional Content Rule : None.

2.The Preparatory Rule: S has just encountered(or has been introduces to,etc.)H.

3.The Sincerity Rule: None.

4.The Essential Rule: Counts as a courteous recognition of H by S.

Similar view(the act of 'greeting' has no propositional content)to Searle(1969)is Searle and Vanderveken(1985:215-216).They consider 'greeting' as marginally an IA since it has no propositional content. When one greets someone, for example by saying 'Hello', one "indicates recognition in a courteous fasion".Therefore,'greeting' is identified as "a courteous indication of recognition, with the presupposition that the speaker has just encounter the hearer".

According to Bach and Harnish(1979:51),'greeting' is one of the acknowledgment class which is the central class of Austin's behabitives and Searle's expressives..Acknowledgments express"perfunctorly if not genuinely, certain feelings toward the hearer". For example, 'greetings' express pleasure at meeting or seeing someone.

Moreover, this act has the following FCs:

In uttering e(an utterance),a speaker(henceforth S)greet a hearer(henceforth H)if S expresses:

i. Pleasure at seeing(or meeting) H ,and

ii.The intention that it believes that S is pleased to see(or meets)H,or

i. The intention that his utterance satisfy the social expectation that one expresses pleasure at seeing(or meeting)someone and

ii.The intention that H takes S's utterance as satisfying this expectation(Ibid.:52).

Allan(1986:198)proposes FCs for the speech act of 'greeting'. Similar to Bach and Harnish(1979),Allan(1986) labeled 'greeting' as an acknowledgment act. These conditions are :

Greeting : S greets H

1.[P] S encounters H

2.Either [Sa] S wishes to engage in social interaction with H or

[Sb] there is a social expectation that S not ignore H in encountering him.

3.[I] S reflexively-intends that H recognizes in U, S's attitude towards interaction with him at this encounter.

P means propositions , **S** means speaker, **H** means hearer, **I** means illocutionary intention,[**S**] means sincerity condition and **U** means utterance.

Therefore, the speech act of 'greeting' normally expresses co-operative interaction on S's part.

Nodoushan(2006:6) proposes a definition for 'a greet illocution' as "a speaker communicates thereby his awareness that the addressee is present as "potential interactant".Therefore,this act fulfills the following functions:

1.S wishes H to know that S has taken cognizance of H's presence.

2.In recognizing H's presence via a greet, S "ratifies H's social standing with himself /herself and implies a readiness on his/her part for social interaction".

According to these functions, 'greeting' indicates "continuity of personal relation and signals the recognition of the other participant as a potential agent in some activity".

The researcher tries to:**First**,be authentic in presenting Norrick(1978);Searle(1969);Searle and Vanderveken(1985);Bach and Harnish(1979);Allan(1986)and Nodoushan's(2006) models. **Second**, take them into her consideration.However,she will not adopt any of these models in her formulation of the FCs of 'greeting' since:*First*,Searle(1969)and Searle and Vanderveken(1985)present this act with neither its propositional content condition nor its sincerity condition.Duranti (1997:66-67)criticizes such a view(the speech act of 'greeting' has no propositional content)by

stating that ignoring the propositional content means ignoring the relation between social functions and the talk used to achieve them. As a consequence, differences in what people say can be ignored and finally "once you've seen a greeting, you've seen them all", a corollary of the more general principle "once you've seen a ritual, you've seen them all".

Second, the researcher thinks that saying 'Hello' or any form of 'greeting' has a propositional content since 'greeting' expresses pleasure (According to Bach and Harnish's definition) otherwise the S might neglect the H without using any greeting form. According to these proofs, 'greeting' has the propositional content and thus it has the sincerity condition (unlike what Searle (1969) and Searle and Vanderveken (1985) believe in) in the sense that using expressions of greeting require the sincere attitude to state such cooperative function (due to Allan's (1986) belief that 'greeting' act involves cooperative part of the S). *Third*, Norrick's (1978) conditions are general for all expressive acts. *Fourth*, Bach and Harnish's (1979) and Allan's (1986) FCs are not comprehensive and detailed to show the minute procedures of producing this act. *Fifth*, Nodoushan's (2006) functions of this act are not FCs. He never uses the term 'FCs' but the researcher puts these functions here since they have a simple reference to maintain FCs, i.e., the social relationship between S and H throughout 'greeting'.

The researcher evaluates all these conditions and produces her own formulation for the conditions which are specific for the speech act of 'greeting'. After presenting these models with the reasons behind not depending on them, the researcher thinks that the following FCs are appropriate to be applied to the successful performance of the speech act of 'greeting':

1. The Propositional Content Conditions: S expresses his/her context of his/her greeting in his/her utterance or behavior (if greeting is expressed only by using non-verbal forms).
2. The Preparatory Conditions:
 - a. There is a value related to the interaction between S and H, i.e., social interaction.
 - b. S expresses his/her appropriateness of this V, therefore, expresses his/her pleasure at meeting or seeing H by using the formulaic structure of greeting or behavior denoted this act.
 - c. Case (b) leads to (c) that S wishes to know that S is taken notice of H's presence and not ignoring the H on encountering him/her.
3. The Sincerity Conditions: These conditions require that S must feel with sincere evaluation of V.
4. The Essential Conditions: The S reflexively wishes the H to (a) recognize S's utterance or behavior as an expression of evaluation for V (towards interaction with H at this encounter) and consequently, (b) recognize that S is greeting.

From these FCs, the researcher adopts the following SRs (semantic not in the literal use of the term 'semantics' adopted on 4.1 above but in the sense they are related to pragmatics since they are derived from their FCs) to the successful performance of the speech act of 'greeting':

1. The propositional Content Rules: S expresses his/her greeting in his /her utterance or behavior.
2. The Preparatory Rules:
 - a. The value which is related to social interaction between Sand H is specific in S's utterance or behavior which positively affects S and hence,
 - b. By using the formulaic structure of greeting or behavior denoted this act, S expresses his/her pleasure at meeting or seeing H.
 - c. Case (b) leads to (c) that S wishes the H to believe that S is taking notice of H's presence and not ignoring him/her.
3. The Sincerity Rules: 'Greeting' is uttered or performed only if S feels with sincere or real evaluation of V.

4.The Essential Rules: The proposition of 'greeting' is uttered or performed only if S's utterance or behavior is counted as an expression of the evaluation of V to make H recognize that S is greeting .

These four suggested FCs with their four suggested SRs enable speakers of English and learners of English language to successfully perform the acts of 'greeting' in their daily life,i.e.,conversational usages. Can any of these conditions and rules be applied to other genres,i.e.,scientific,literary, etc?This could be a suggested topic for further studies.

To summarize the main points of 'Structures of Greeting', the researcher states the following concluding remarks:

First, 'greeting'(whether it is explicit or implicit)an illocutionary act occurs in different syntactic structures:Declarative,interrogative and irregular ones.

Second, it can be filled by nominal structures which simply expresses pleasure or happiness at meeting or seeing someone for the sake of social interaction.

Third, it is successfully performed(to take the other type of lexical information not the literal one)if:

- a. S expresses the context of his/her greeting which involves his/her sincere feeling to engage in social interaction with H.
- b. S is not ignoring the H on encountering him/her.
- c. S makes H recognize that S's utterance or behavior is counted as an expression of this interaction and consequently S is greeting.

Conclusions

The present research has arrived at the following main concluding remarks:

1. Explicit or implicit, verbal or non verbal, the speech act of 'greeting' is an expressive act performed simply for expressing pleasure at meeting or seeing someone.
2. Since the act of 'greeting', as many other speech acts, has its pragmatic meanings, such meanings are affected by cultural perspectives. Consequently, it is a useful tool for comparing between cultures and it is not merely a conversational opening.
3. Greeting has a set of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic structures that distinguish its usage. Therefore, it is not a speech act of 'welcoming' or 'saluting'. These latter acts have their distinctive uses, structures and functions which are different from the former, i.e., greeting.
4. A set of FCs with their SRs is put for the successful performance of 'greeting' and determining its IFID.

Bibliography

- Allan,K.(1986) Linguistic Meaning: Vol. 2.New York:Routledge and Kegan Paul,Inc.
- Austin,J.(1962) How to Do Things With Words.Oxford:Oxford University Press.
- Baalbaki,R.(2000) Al-Mawarid:A Modern Arabic-English Dictionary.Beirut:Dar El-Elm Lilmlayin,Thirteenth Edition.
- Bach,K.and Harnish,R.,(1979) Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts. Cambridge Mass: The MIT Press.
- Biber,D. et al(1999) Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English.China:Pearson Education Limited.
- Crystal,D.(1987) The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language.London:Cambridge University Press.
- Duranti,A.(1997) "Universal and Cultural-Specific Properties of Greetings" in Journal of Linguistic Anthropology,Vol.7,No.1.New York: American Anthropological Association.

- Greese,A.(1991) "Speech Act Variation in British and American English" in Journal of WPEL, Vol.7, No.2.
- Haverkate,W.(1984) Speech Acts, Speakers and Hearers.Amsterdam:John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hornby,A.(2005) Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, Seventh Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins,O.(1993) "Greetings", in Focus on Communication Effectiveness.
[www.orvillejenkins.com/what is culture/greetings cul.htm](http://www.orvillejenkins.com/what%20is%20culture/greetings%20cul.htm).
- Jucker,A.and Taavitsainen,I.(2008)"Speech Acts in the History of English".
www.lingistlist.org/issues19/19-3845.htm.
- Kharrat,Y.(2002) "Learning the Culture as Well as the Words" in Magazine of Humanizing Language Teaching, Year 4, Issue1, Short Article 2.
- Leech,G.(1974) Semantics.London:Hazell Watson and Viney Ltd.
- _____(1983) Principles of Pragmatics.London:Longman Group LTD.
- Leech,G.,Cruickshank,B.and Ivanič,R.(2001) An A-Z of English Grammar and Usage. Malaysia:Pearson Education Limited.
- Levinson,S.(1983) Pragmatics.Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- Mey,J(1993) Pragmatics: An Introduction.Oxford:Basil Black Well Ltd.
- Nodoushan,M.(2006) "The Socio-Pragmatics of Greeting Forms in English and Persia" in Journal of Language, Society and Culture, Issue 17.
- Norrick,N.(1978) "Expressive Illocutionary Acts" in Journal of Pragmatics, Vol.2.
- Quirk,R. and Greenbaum,S.(1973) A University Grammar of English.London:Longman.
- Quirk,R .et al(1985) A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. London: Longman.
- Rash,F.(2004)"Linguistic Politeness and Greeting Rituals in German-Speaking", Linguistik Online, Vol.20, No.3. www.linguitik-online-de/20-04/rash-htm.
- Searle,J.(1969) Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language.Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- _____(1975a) "Indirect Speech Acts". In: Cole,P.and Morgan,S.(ed.), Syntax and Semantic: Vol.3: Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press, Inc.
- _____(1975b) "A Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts". In: Gunderson, K.(ed.) Language, Mind and Knowledge, Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science, Vol.1.
- _____(ed.)(1979) Expression and Meaning.Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- Searle,J and Vanderveken,D.(1985) Foundations of Illocutionary Logic.Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- Trosborg,A.(1994) Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies.Berlin:Mouten de Gruyter.
- Vanderveken,D.(1990) Meaning and Speech Acts: Vol.1: Principles of Language Use. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Watts,R.,Ide,S.and Ehlich,K.(1992) "Politeness: A preface" in Journal of Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice.New York:Moutan de Gruyter.
- Wierzbicka,A.(1991) Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction. Berlin and New York:Moutin de Gruyter.
- Williams,K.(1997) "An Evaluation of Greeting Exchanges in Textbooks and Real Life Settings" in Modern Language Journal.