

AN ANALYSIS OF ILLOCUTIONARY ACTS IN THE UTTERANCES OF DETECTIVE INSPECTOR LESTRADE IN *SHERLOCK (BBC): A STUDY IN PINK MOVIE*

Iqbal Fatwa Resmana¹, Kurniawan², Yana³

¹ IKIP Siliwangi

² IKIP Siliwangi

³ IKIP Siliwangi

¹ qyu_helias@yahoo.com, ² nanakur720@gmail.com, ³ yanamulyana@rocketmail.com

Abstract

This study has an aim to identify the kinds of speech act which are used in the utterances of Detective Inspector Gregory Lestrade, in *Sherlock (BBC): A Study in Pink*. In conducting this study, qualitative method is used to find the types of speech acts based on Searle's theory in 1979, in the character's utterances throughout the series. In presenting the data of the study, it is conducted by using descriptions. From the result of analysis, it is found that four out of five kinds of speech act are used by Lestrade, those are representatives, directives, commissives, and expressives. The findings also show that the representative speech act is the most dominant (53%) among the other three; meanwhile, expressive speech act is the least dominant (2.83%). Representative speech act, which functions for the speaker to state something they believe as the case or not reflects the role of Lestrade as a supporting character in the series that often gives Sherlock Holmes a lot of information about the cases and the clues for the case, also this is to fulfill his role as a Detective Inspector which could gather information from many sources and inform them to other people.

Keywords: Pragmatics, Speech Acts, Illocutionary Acts

INTRODUCTION

Communication is crucial and is a need for people, because it is an activity that represents interaction to each other. Interaction cannot be avoided, and people cannot live alone without any help from other, that is why they need to communicate to fulfill the need. How a communication is performed can be seen in many aspects, such as economy, culture, social, and politics. Commonly, the performances is described in some media, and one example of the media is movie. Movie is regarded as the most influential media than any other media since it provides both audio and visual input for people getting interested to watch.

In attempting to express themselves, for example, to apologize, to complaint, to invite, to promise, and to request, people do not only produce utterances based on the sentences, words, and its grammatical structure, but people also state their action through the utterance itself, called speech act (Yule & Stalnaker, 1996). Those terms have different intention, and they are applied through different kind of speech acts.

There are three acts related to the actions performed through utterances. The first is **locutionary act**, which is according to Austin (Oishi, 2006), it is roughly equivalent to uttering a certain sentence with its semantic meaning. The second is **illocutionary act**, that is what the speaker wants to achieve, or what is the purpose of the speaker by uttering something, which can be the

act of asserting, promising, apologizing, threatening, etc. In addition, it is thought as the most important act in the speech acts. The last is **perlocutionary act**, which is regarded as the effect that will be received by the hearer.

In this study, *SHERLOCK (BBC)* movie is chosen to be analyzed since the characters in this movie have unique and various ways in doing communication. More specifically, the title of the movie is *A Study in Pink*, it is the first episode of the first season of the movie. It was written by Steven Moffat and is based on Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes detective story 'A Study in Scarlet'. The series tells about the introduction of Sherlock to Doctor Watson and their investigation into a series of deaths that were believed to be suicides. The chosen character for the analysis unit in this paper is Detective Inspector Lestrade, who plays as a supporting character in the movie. As a Detective Inspector, he often helps Sherlock and Doctor Watson in solving cases and sometimes goes in action for handling crimes. The research will be done by analysing the illocutionary acts at each clauses from his utterances, then looking the participants that are involved, and finally understanding the context.

The title of this paper is *An Analysis of Illocutionary Acts in the Utterances of Detective Inspector Lestrade in SHERLOCK (BBC): A Study in Pink Movie*. According to the title and the background of the study above, this paper will limit the discussion on the types of illocutionary acts and what type of illocutionary acts are dominantly presented in the *SHERLOCK (BBC)* movie, spoken only by Lestrade and its script.

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics, a study of human language, covering meanings that appear in utterances, implicitly or explicitly (Chaer, 2007). Meanings also studied in semantics, but some aspects of meaning alone sometimes cannot be caught by this study, especially in the term of *meaning in context*, since semantics deals with meanings without references to the interlocutors (the users of the communication) and communicative functions (Aitchison, in Kusumo, 2015). Furthermore, Kortmann (2005) explained that "pragmatics is concerned with how factors such as time, place and the social relationship between speaker and hearer affect the ways in which language is used to perform different functions". Therefore, pragmatics deals with using language in contexts besides the meaning.

The study of pragmatics covers several subfields; deixis or referring expressions, presuppositions or assumptions, implicatures or the existence of context within language use, and speech acts or the use of utterance to perform an act are the example of domains in pragmatics (Griffiths, in Kusumo, 2015).

Speech act is developed in the first time by a philosopher named John L. Austin in his book "How to Do Things with Words" (1962), and he defined speech act as a concept of performing actions by saying something (Smith, 1991). Thus, we can say that speech act are actions that are performed through utterance, as has been also stated by Yule & Stalnaker, (1996).

In English, actions are commonly given more specific labels or naming, for instance: Apology, complaint, compliment, invitation, promise, and request (Yule & Stalnaker, 1996). Those distinctions are applied to the communicator's intention in producing sentences or utterances, and the utterances are usually helped by what is called as speech event or circumstance surrounding the utterances. The speech event is needed to determine the interpretation of the utterances. Take a look at the following utterance as an example:

"This book is so old!"

If taken without knowing the circumstances, the interpretation of the utterance might be various, start from complaint to praise. However, if the circumstances are understood, for example, the utterance was said by an antique literature lover, it is possible that the utterance might be considered as an excitement. However, if the circumstance was that the utterances was said by a person who looked for the most updated literary works, the sentence might be interpreted differently, such as a displeasure or disappointment. This means that there is no single sentence of action to one action correspondence will be possible, since there are more than one interpretation can be made from one utterance alone (Finegan, 2008).

Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs) are devices that are used for indicating the illocutionary act. One of the most obvious device is an expression which is using a performative verb. Below is the example of the use of performative verb (Vp) as IFIDs.

“I asked her that...”

Using “asked” in the utterance as the performative verb in that utterance clearly shows that the speaker explicitly states the illocutionary act (asking) that is being performed. Even so, speakers do not always explicitly ‘perform’ their speech acts, but sometimes they describe the act that is being performed.

Other example of IFIDs may be identified through word order, stress, and intonation. Below example is taken from Yule’s work, to show how the utterances formed by the same basic elements (Y-G) could mean different things.

There are five types of general functions performed by speech act, following the theory from Searle (1996): declarations, representatives, expressives, directives, and commissives.

Declarations or declarative speech acts are those which function to change the world through utterances. Representation or representative speech acts are those which function for the speaker believing their utterances as the case or not. Expressives or expression speech acts are those which are uttered to give image on the speaker’s feelings or emotion. This kind of speech act usually in line with the speaker’s psychological condition. Directives or direction speech acts are those which are uttered by the speaker to get others do what the speaker wants. Commissives or commission speech acts are uttered as the indication of the speaker intended some future actions. To summary, a table according to Searle has also been presented:

Table. 1. Types of Speech Act

| Speech Act Type | Direction of fit | S = speaker X = situation |
|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Declarations | Words change the world | S causes X |
| Representatives | Make words fit the world | S believes X |
| Expressives | | S feels X |
| Directives | Make the world fit words | S wants X |
| Commissives | | S intends X |

METHOD

A descriptive qualitative research design is preferred for this research. The data for this research was taken from the script of *SHERLOCK (BBC): A Study in Pink Movie*. To further enhance the writer’s understanding about the context, the whole episode of the movie was also watched.

Based on the script that has been provided, the writer chose dialogues (clause by clause) where illocutionary acts were found in them. After that, the dialogues are grouped in relation to the types of each illocutionary acts. Then, the data was analyzed by selecting and clarifying the suitable utterances with the method and relevant concept especially Searle's taxonomy on illocutionary acts. For short, the process of collecting data is done through the following steps: (1) searching the movie and its script; (2) watching the movie thoroughly; (3) reading entire dialogue on script; (4) dividing sentences of the specific character into clauses; (5) choosing the illocutionary acts from the clauses; (6) grouping the dialogue in relation to the types of illocutionary acts; (7) analyzing the data, and (8) writing the report of the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Based on the findings, four out of five types of illocutionary acts expressed by Lestrade are found in his utterances. They are representative, directive, commissive, and expressive. In his utterances, Lestrade presents more illocutionary acts of representative than other acts. The data is summarized in the table below:

Table.2.The Result of the Analysis

| No | Types of Illocutionary Acts | Indicator | Total |
|----|-----------------------------|---|------------|
| 1. | Representatives | Asserting (37), informing (28), predicting (2), reporting (1) | 68 (53%) |
| 2. | Directives | Advising (1), asking (21), begging (1), ensuring (1), inviting (1), ordering (13), permitting (3), requesting (5) | 46 (36.5%) |
| 3. | Commissives | Offering (3), Promising (6) | 9 (7.67%) |
| 4. | Expressives | Praising (1), thanking (2) | 3 (2.83%) |

Discussion

In this part, the writer compiles, classifies, and tabulates some sample of the collected data into the following table according to Searle's categories of illocutionary acts. The data are grouped based on the words in one clause of the sentence indicated as illocutionary acts. Those words are written in italic and bold to make them more noticeable in analyzing.

Table A: The list of Illocutionary Acts of Representatives

| No. | Indications | Data |
|-----|-----------------|---|
| 1. | Asserting (can) | <p>Context: Lestrade is being interviewed by press reporters, related to a case believed to be a serial suicide.</p> <p>Setting: Inside a conference building</p> <p>Participants: A reporter and Lestrade.</p> <p>REPORTER: But you can't have serial suicides.</p> <p>LESTRADE: Well, apparently you <i>can</i>.</p> <p>Lestrade and Donovan are in the police press conference and are ready to be interviewed by the reporters gathered in that place. The case at the moment is what is believed as a serial suicide, which the victims are found dead in illogical places.</p> |

Through the autopsy, apparently they are known to take the very same poisonous pills to kill themselves. However, a reporter disagree with the information and argues that you cannot have serial suicides, but then Lestrade says, “*Well, apparently you can.*”

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of representative (asserting). It commits the speaker to believe something is being the case, to the truth of the expressed propositions. He uses the word “can” to convey his belief that some propositions are true. He asserts the reporters that serial suicides have a possibility to happen.

2. Asserting (are clearly linked)

Context: *Lestrade is being interviewed by press reporters, related to a case believed to be a serial suicide. Lestrade said that there are some links between each suicide cases.*

Setting: *Inside a conference building*

Participants: *A reporter and Lestrade.*

REPORTER: But if they’re suicides, what are you investigating?

LESTRADE: As I say, these ... these suicides **are clearly linked**.

Lestrade asserts that the case is a suicide, but a reporter asks, what does Lestrade investigate if the cases are suicides, and Lestrade says, “*As I say, these... these suicides are clearly linked.*”

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of representative (asserting). It commits the speaker to believe something is being the case, to the truth of the expressed propositions. He uses the phrase “are clearly linked” to convey his belief that some propositions are true. He asserts the reporters that it is because the suicides have are linked so he investigate the case.

3. Informing (know)

Context: *Lestrade is being interviewed by press reporters, related to a case believed to be a serial suicide.*

Setting: *Inside a conference building*

Participants: *Reporter and Lestrade.*

REPORTER: Is there any chance that these are murders, and if they are, is this the work of a serial killer?

LESTRADE: ...but these do appear to be suicides. We **know** the difference.

After explaining and asserting that the case is suicides, a reporter asks if there is any chance that the suicides are actually murders, then Lestrade says, “*...but these do appear to be suicides. We know the difference.*”

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of representative (informing). It commits the speaker to believe something is being the case, to the truth of the expressed propositions. He uses the word “know” to convey his and his team’s knowledge to the reporters that they understand the difference between suicides and murders.

4. Reporting (did)

Context: *Lestrade comes to Sherlock, and Sherlock guessed that there is a new suicide case but it is unique compared to the old cases.*

Setting: *Inside Sherlock’s house*

Participants: *Sherlock and Lestrade.*

LESTRADE: You know how they never leave notes?

SHERLOCK: Yeah.

LESTRADE: This one *did*. Will you come?

Lestrade comes to Sherlock’s house to tell him a new ‘suicide’ case. After he reminds Sherlock how the first three victims never leave any notes or signs of dying messages, he tells Sherlock, “...*This one did. Will you come?*”

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of representative (reporting). It commits the speaker to believe something is being the case, to the truth of the expressed propositions. He uses the word “did” to report his findings to Sherlock, that the fourth ‘suicide’ victim left a note, more precisely, a dying message.

5. Asserting (is)

Context: *Lestrade and Sherlock are walking into the crime scene to investigate the victim.*

Setting: *Inside a house in Brixton*

Participants: *Sherlock and Lestrade.*

LESTRADE (to Sherlock): Her name **is** Jennifer Wilson according to her credit cards.

Lestrade leads Sherlock and John Watson upstairs to see the victim, then Lestrade says, “...*Her name is Jennifer Wilson according to her credit cards.*”

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of representative (informing). It commits the speaker to something is being the case, to the truth of the expressed propositions. He uses the word “is” to inform Sherlock about his knowledge and belief of the victim’s name.

6. Asserting (did not)

Context: *Sherlock is thinking about the corpse. Lestrade is staring in silence at the corpse.*

Setting: *Inside a house in Brixton*

Participants: *Sherlock and Lestrade.*

SHERLOCK: Shut up.

LESTRADE (*startled*): I *didn't* say anything.

Sherlock thinks about the victim and Lestrade is staring at the victim in silence. Sherlock feels annoyed because Lestrade is thinking and tells him to be quiet, but then Lestrade says, "*I didn't say anything.*"

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of representative (asserting). It commits the speaker to believe something is being the case, to the truth of the expressed propositions. He uses the phrase "did not" to convey his belief that some propositions are true. He asserts Sherlock that he did not say anything, because he keeps silent up to the moment Sherlock asked him to be quiet.

Table B: The list of Illocutionary Acts of Directives

| No. | Indications | Data |
|-----|-------------------|---|
| 1. | Advising (don't) | <p>Context: Lestrade is being interviewed by press reporters, related to a case believed to be a serial suicide.</p> <p>Setting: Inside a conference building</p> <p>Participants: A reporter and Lestrade.</p> <p>REPORTER: Yes, but if they <i>are</i> murders, how do people keep themselves safe?</p> <p>LESTRADE: Well, <i>don't</i> commit suicide.</p> <p>Lestrade and Donovan are in the police press conference and are ready to be interviewed by the reporters gathered in that place. The case at the moment is what is believed as a serial suicide, which the victims are found dead in illogical places. Through the autopsy, apparently they are known to take the very same poisonous pills to kill themselves. Then, a reporter asks, if the case is actually murders, how do people keep themselves safe, and Lestrade says, "<i>Well, don't commit suicide.</i>"</p> <p>Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of directive (advising). It is the act where the speaker wants the hearer to do something. He uses the phrase "do not" to advise the audience that if they want to keep themselves safe, do not commit suicide.</p> |
| 2. | Requesting (will) | <p>Context: Lestrade comes to Sherlock, and Sherlock guessed that there is a new suicide case but it is unique compared to the old cases.</p> <p>Setting: Inside Sherlock's house</p> <p>Participants: Sherlock and Lestrade.</p> |

LESTRADE: You know how they never leave notes?

SHERLOCK: Yeah.

LESTRADE: This one did. *Will* you come?

Lestrade comes to Sherlock's house to tell him a new 'suicide' case. After he reminds Sherlock how the first three victims never leave any notes or signs of dying messages, he tells Sherlock, "...*This one did. Will you come?*"

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of directive (requesting). It is the act where the speaker wants the hearer to do something. He uses the word "will" to request Sherlock to come along with him to solve the new case.

3. Begging (help)

Context: *Lestrade is disappointed because Sherlock does not want to rely on the team, and Lestrade tells him that he had to break the rules to let Sherlock in, but he cannot help it.*

Setting: *Inside a house in Brixton*

Participants: *Sherlock and Lestrade.*

SHERLOCK: Yes ... because you need me.

LESTRADE: Yes, I do. God *help* me.

Sherlock refuses to rely on the outsider team and Lestrade is disappointed. He tells Sherlock that he has broken every rules just for letting Sherlock to join the investigation, and Sherlock agreed by stating that Lestrade have to do that anyway because Lestrade needs his help. Then, Lestrade says, "*Yes, I do. God help me.*"

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of directive (begging). It is the act where the speaker wants the hearer to do something. He uses the word "help" to beg to the God to help him overcome Sherlock's attitude.

4. Ordering (keep)

Context: *Lestrade permitting John to help Sherlock, instead of relying on the medical team he has prepared.*

Setting: *Inside Sherlock's house*

Participants: *Anderson and Lestrade.*

LESTRADE: Anderson, *keep* everyone out for a couple of minutes.

After Lestrade permitted John to help Sherlock, he goes outside and tells Anderson, "*Anderson, keep everyone out for a couple of minutes.*"

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of directive (ordering). It is the act where the speaker wants the hearer to do something. He uses the word "keep" to order Anderson to have other personnels not to close the crime scene for a moment.

5. Ordering (two minutes, I said) **Context:** After Sherlock and Dr. Watson checking the victim for some time, Lestrade is back into the room to see if Sherlock has done his analysis because he has spent more than two minutes.

Setting: Inside a house in Brixton

Participants: Sherlock and Lestrade.

LESTRADE (to Sherlock): Sherlock – *two minutes, I said.*

Lestrade enters the room after some couple of minutes and sees Sherlock still doing his analysis on the victim, then he tells him, “*Sherlock – two minutes, I said.*”

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of directive (ordering). It is the act where the speaker wants the hearer to do something. He uses the phrase “two minutes, I said” to stop Sherlock doing his investigations on the victim because the time is up.

6. Requesting (need) **Context:** After Sherlock and Dr. Watson checking the victim for some time, Lestrade is back into the room to see if Sherlock has done his analysis because he has spent more than two minutes.

Setting: Inside a house in Brixton

Participants: Sherlock and Lestrade.

LESTRADE (to Sherlock): ...I **need** anything you’ve got.

After stopping Sherlock to investigate the victim, Lestrade asks, “...*I need anything you’ve got.*”

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of directive (ordering). It is the act where the speaker wants the hearer to do something. He uses the word “need” to order Sherlock to report everything he has got by investigating the victim.

Table C: The list of Illocutionary Acts of Commissives

| No. | Indications | Data |
|-----|-----------------------------|---|
| 1. | Promising (are looking for) | Context: Lestrade is being interviewed by press reporters, related to a case believed to be a serial suicide. Setting: Inside a conference building Participants: A reporter and Lestrade. |

REPORTER: These three people: there’s nothing that links them?

LESTRADE: There’s no link been found yet, but we’re **looking for** it.

Lestrade and Donovan are in the police press conference and are ready to be interviewed by the reporters gathered in that place. The case at the moment is what is believed as a serial suicide, which the victims are found dead in illogical places.

Through the autopsy, apparently they are known to take the very same poisonous pills to kill themselves. Then, a reporter asks, whether there are some links between each victims, and Lestrade says, *“There’s no link been found yet, but we’re looking for it.”*

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of commissive (promising). It is the act where the speaker is going to commit something in the future. He uses the phrase “are looking for” to promise people that he and his team will look for the links among the victims.

2. Promising (will not be)

Context: *Lestrade asks Sherlock to come with him for the new suicide case, and Lestrade informed him that Anderson is on forensics.*

Setting: *Inside Sherlock’s house*

Participants: *Sherlock and Lestrade.*

SHERLOCK (*grimacing*): Anderson won’t work with me.

LESTRADE: Well, he **won’t** be your assistant.

Lestrade reported that there is a new suicide case and he asks Sherlock to come with him to investigate it. Sherlock acknowledges that Anderson is on the forensics, and he starts to seem refusing Lestrade’s proposal, but then Lestrade says, *“Well, he won’t be your assisstant.”*

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of commissive (promising). It is the act where the speaker is going to commit something in the future. He uses the phrase “won’t” to promise Sherlock that even though Anderson is involved in the investigation, Lestrade promises that he will not assist Sherlock.

3. Promising (will stop)

Context: *Lestrade and Donovan received some messages from Sherlock that keep telling that their analysis is wrong during the conference.*

Setting: *Outside the conference building*

Participants: *Donovan and Lestrade.*

DONOVAN: You’ve got to stop him doing that. He’s making us look like idiots.

LESTRADE: Well, if you can tell me *how* he does it, I’ll **stop** him.

Sherlock keep texting the audience in the conference “Wrong!” everytime Lestrade gives his explanation about the case. After the conference is over, Donovan tells Lestrade that he has to stop Sherlock in doing that because it will not be good for him and herself. Then, Lestrade says. *“Well, if you can tell me how he does it, I’ll stop him”*.

4. Offering (give)

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of commissive (promising). It is the act where the speaker is going to commit something in the future. He uses the phrase “will stop” to promise to Donovan that he will stop Sherlock for texting them that way, only if she could tell him how Sherlock can text them like that.

Context: Lestrade leads Sherlock and Dr. Watson up a circular staircase to permit the boys investigate the victim.

Setting: Inside a house in Brixton

Participants: Sherlock and Lestrade.

LESTRADE: I can *give* you two minutes.

SHERLOCK (*casually*): May need longer.

Lestrade permitted Sherlock to investigate the victim by saying, “*I can give you two minutes*”, although Sherlock replies that he may need more time than that.

5. Promising (stops being pretend)

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of commissive (offering). It is the act where the speaker is going to commit something in the future. He uses the word “give” to offer the chance of how much time Sherlock will get to investigate the victim.

Context: Lestrade tells Sherlock to be cooperative in solving the case, then Sherlock realizes that the drugs bust is just a prank.

Setting: Inside Sherlock’s house

Participants: Sherlock and Lestrade.

SHERLOCK (*stopping and glaring at him*): Oh, what, so-so-so you set up a pretend drugs bust to bully me?

LESTRADE: It *stops being pretend* if they find anything.

Lestrade explained to Sherlock that the drugs bust is just an excuse, and Sherlock angrily asks him if the drugs bust is just a pretend to bully him, but then Lestrade says, “*It stops being pretend if they find anything.*”

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of commissive (promising). It is the act where the speaker is going to commit something in the future. He uses the phrase “stops being pretend” to indicate that he and his team will apparently stop pretending the bust if somehow they find drugs in Sherlock’s house.

Table D: The list of Illocutionary Acts of Expressives

| No. | Indications | Data |
|-----|-------------|------|
|-----|-------------|------|

-
1. Thanking (thank you) **Context:** *Lestrade ends the conference with the reporters about the serial suicides.*
Setting: *Inside a conference building*
Participants: *Lestrade and reporters.*

LESTRADE: *Thank you.*

Lestrade and Donovan are in the police press conference and are ready to be interviewed by the reporters gathered in that place. The case at the moment is what is believed as a serial suicide, which the victims are found dead in illogical places. Through the autopsy, apparently they are known to take the very same poisonous pills to kill themselves. After some questions are answered, Lestrade ends the session by saying, “Thank you.”

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of expressive (thanking). It states what the speaker feels. He uses the phrase “thank you” to thank the participants for having joined the conference.

2. Thanking (thank you) **Context:** *Lestrade asks Sherlock whether he will come with him to solve the new suicide case.*
Setting: *Inside Sherlock’s house*
Participants: *Sherlock and Lestrade.*

SHERLOCK: Not in a police car. I’ll be right behind.

LESTRADE: *Thank you.*

Lestrade asks Sherlock to join him to solve the case. After hearing Sherlock’s confirmation, he thanks Sherlock by saying, “Thank you.”

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of expressive (thanking). It states what the speaker feels. He uses the phrase “thank you” to thank Sherlock for wanting to help him in solving the case.

3. Praising (for God’s sake) **Context:** *Sherlock comes up with an analysis, but everyone including Lestrade feels that Sherlock’s findings is bizarre.*
Setting: *Inside a house in Brixton*
Participants: *Sherlock and Lestrade.*

SHERLOCK: Suitcase, yes. She’s been married at least ten years, but not happily. She’s had a string of lovers but none of them knew she was married.

LESTRADE: Oh, *for God’s sake*, if you’re just making this up ...

Lestrade and Sherlock are in the crime scene, and Sherlock begins his deduction on the victim, but since he stated that the

victim was possessing a suitcase, which did not make sense because none of the officers would expect that, Lestrade protested his analysis by saying “*Oh, for God’s sake, if you’re just making this up...*”

Based on the utterance, Lestrade uses illocutionary acts of expressive (sorrowing). It states what the speaker feels. He uses the phrase “for God’s sake” to show his annoyance against Sherlock’s bizarre explanation about the victim.

CONCLUSION

According to the results in the previous point, the illocutionary act of representative is often used by Detective Inspector Lestrade in his utterances. Representative potentially represents the factual, informative, and supportive nature of the speaker. Representative is the act that state what the speaker believes to be the case or not. In the representative, those utterances commonly occur between Lestrade and Sherlock, especially when discussing about the case, Lestrade will usually give Sherlock the information he might need about the case to be solved. Even though Lestrade’s representative utterances are spoken based on his belief, experience, or the fact, not every listener agree with those utterances.

The second most dominant act is directive, which represents power and the dominance of the speaker. Directive is the act that the speaker uses to get someone else to do something. In directive, those utterances commonly occur between Lestrade and his teammates, or with Sherlock. It is illustrated by the status of Lestrade as a Detective Inspector that has rights to command his subordinates to do something. However, directive act does not obligate the hearer to do something the speaker wants. It is proven by Sherlock that often, if not always, refuses Lestrade’s proposals.

Then, the illocutionary act of expressive is the least used by Lestrade in his utterances. This act states what the speaker feels, that can be psychological states or statements of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy, or sorrow. However, based on the result, it shows that Lestrade is apparently a less expressive or mostly serious character (at least throughout the series) in the story.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We sincerely appreciate the parties who had directly and indirectly support this paper in any aspects, especially to Mr. Yana, S.Pd., M.Hum. as the supervisor, also, to IT Team of IKIP Siliwangi, who has helped the authors with the prior revision, and to the whole reviewers of PROJECT who has helped publishing this work.

REFERENCES

- Aitchison, J. (2003). *Teach Yourself: Linguistics*. London: Hodder and Stroughton.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How To Do Things*, 1–173. Great Britain: Oxford University Press
- Chaer, A. (2007). *Linguistik Umum* (Indonesian). Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Finegan, E. (2008). *Language: Its Structure and Use*.
- Griffiths, P. (2006). *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.
- Kortmann, B. (2005). *English Linguistics: Essentials*. Cornelsen Verlag GmbH +C.
- Kusumo, D. W. (2015). *a Pragmatic Analysis of Illocutionary Acts*.

- Oishi, E. (2006). Austin's Speech Act Theory and the Speech Situation. *Esercizi Filosofici*, 1–14. Retrieved from <http://www2.units.it/eserfilo/art106/oishi106.pdf>
- Searle, J. R. (1996). What is a Speech Act? *Readings in Language and Mind*, 121–133.
- Smith, P. W. H. (1991). Speech Act Theory , Discourse Structure and Indirect Speech Acts
Peter Hesling Smith Submitted in Accordance with Doctor the Requirements of
Philosophy of Leeds Philosophy for the Degree of The University of September The
Candidate that the work submitted.
- Yule, G., & Stalnaker, R. (1996). Pragmatics. *Synthese*. Retrieved from
<http://philpapers.org/rec/STAP-7%5Cnhttp://www.amazon.com/Pragmatics-Oxford-Introductions-Language-Study/dp/0194372073>