

A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF RHETORICAL QUESTIONS IN SHAKESPEARE'S *TWELFTH NIGHT* AND *HAMLET*

Maha Mohammed Jameel

Prof. Riyadh Tariq Kadhim Al- Ameedi (Ph.D)

Prof. Salih Mahdi Hameed Al- Shukri (Ph.D)

Abstract

This paper is an attempt to study rhetorical questions (RQs) in Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night* and *Hamlet*. The study is hoped to achieve the following aims: (1) investigating the numbers, employments and the functions of RQs in the two plays; (2) showing the most common pragmatic functions of RQs from both Speech Act and Argumentation points of view; (3) examining the influence of context on the pragmatic interpretations of RQs; and (4) displaying how one function is used for different literary purposes in these plays.

To achieve these aims, it is hypothesized that: (1) RQs are used more often in *Hamlet* than in *Twelfth Night* for different employments and functions; (2) from Speech Acts point of view, rebuke is the most common function, whereas from the Argumentation point of view, fallacy of argument appeal to personal involvement is the most common one; (3) pragmatic functions of RQs in the plays vary according to their contexts; (4) one function is used for different literary purposes in the plays.

To test the validity of these hypotheses, certain procedures have been followed: (1) surveying the relevant literature on RQs from the pragmatic perspective; (2) finding out a model for the analysis of the selected texts; and (3) analyzing the RQs in the literary texts under investigation. The findings of this investigation have proved the validity of the above hypotheses.

The study falls into five sections. Section One introduces the problem, aims, hypotheses, procedures and limits of the study. Section Two is devoted to the theoretical framework of RQs from Speech Acts point of view, whereas Section Three is devoted to the theoretical framework of RQs from Argumentation point of view. Section Four presents the model of analysis followed by the practical analysis of RQs. Section Five sums up the conclusions arrived at.

SECTION ONE

INTRODUCTION

Rhetorical Questions (henceforth RQs) are examples of utterances whose form do not match their function. They have the structure of a question but the force of an assertion. RQs fulfill certain functions from the Speech Act point of view and from the Argumentation

point of view. As for the first type of functions, RQs can be used to fulfill certain functions such as: accusation, assertion, blame, boast, complain, criticism, lament, predicting, rebuke, reminding, suggestion, advice, command, plea, request, warning, refusal, invitation, protest, admonishing, contempt, desperation, displeasure, dissatisfaction and anger, helplessness, impatience, indignation, insult, powerlessness, uncertainty, surprise, irony and sarcasm . For example:

(1) What way would you have me react? (Criticism) (Frank, 1990: 732)

(2) Don't I work my fingers to the bone for you? (Reminding) (Pope, 1976: 37)

As for the second type, RQs can function as: standpoint, modus ponens types of syllogism, modus tollens types of syllogism, disjunctive syllogism, fallacy of denying the antecedent, either/ or fallacy, fallacy of hasty generalization, fallacy of the faculty of cause-effect, fallacy of argument appeal to group solidarity, fallacy of argument appeal to pity, fallacy of argument appeal to fear, fallacy of argument appeal to personal involvement and proposal for starting point. For example:

(3) How could they not have anything to do with your life? (Standpoint) (Jacobs, 1989: 65)

(4) Is it my fault that my looks are better than Ellen Van Langen's? (Proposal for starting point) (Henkemans, 2009: 16)

This study tackles the problem of how context influences the illocutionary forces of RQs in Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night* and *Hamlet*.

This study aims at investigating the number, employment and functions of RQs in the two plays; showing the most common pragmatic functions of RQs from the Speech Act point of view and from Argumentation point of view; investigating the influence of context on the illocutionary forces of RQs; and showing how the same function is used for different purposes in the literary texts.

It is hypothesized that RQs are used in *Hamlet* more than in *Twelfth Night* for different employment and functions; as a speech act, rebuke is the most common function, whereas as an argumentation, fallacy of argument appeal to personal involvement is the most common one; the pragmatic functions of RQs in the two plays vary according to their contexts; and the same function (e.g. sarcasm) is used for different purposes in the selected texts.

To achieve the aims of this work, the following procedures are adopted: surveying the relevant literature on RQs from the pragmatic perspective, in section two, RQs are studied from the speech act point of view, whereas in section three, RQs are studied from argumentation point of view; finding out a model for the analysis of RQs in the two plays; and analyzing RQs in the two plays under investigation.

This study is limited to the investigation of RQs from the pragmatic perspective in Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night* and *Hamlet*. *Twelfth Night* is a comedy, whereas *Hamlet* is a tragedy. The choice of these plays is due to their richness of this topic (i.e. RQs) and to see the differences in the use of these RQs in the tragedy (*Hamlet*) and in the comedy (*Twelfth Night*).

SECTION TWO

RHETORICAL QUESTIONS AS SPEECH ACTS

2.1 Definitions of RQs

RQs are as old as language itself, therefore, there has been considerable agreement and disagreement over exactly what they are or what they mean exactly (Cummings, 2010:206).

Dlugan (2012:1) claims that RQ is a common rhetorical device where a question is asked by a speaker, but no answer is expected from the hearer. Pope (1976: 47) points out that RQs are questions which exhibit opposite polarity: a positive RQ is like a strong negative assertion, while a negative RQ is like a strong positive assertion. Van Eemeren et al. (2007:95) show that RQs are used by speakers to get another party to accept a proposition, either what they term a common starting point, something which is agreed by the other party that they could use as part of their argument, or as a standpoint, a proposition which they are trying to show is true. The first definition deals with the idea of whether or not RQs have answers. The second definition is concerned with the polarity shift of RQs, whereas the third definition deals with the functions of RQs.

2.2 Contextual Factors Influencing the Use of RQs

Context is defined as the unity of discourse with considering the word at large, and it is influenced by the situation when the participants receive the message, cultural and social relationship within the participants, what the addresser knows and assumes the addressee knows (Cook, 1989:10).

Koshik (2005:36) argues that RQs gain their force as challenges, or assertions not from their linguistic forms, but from their interactional contexts. RQs depend on a number of pragmatic factors and these factors are commonly shared knowledge, the status of the addresser and the addressee, the addresser–addressee relation.

Cramton (2001:346) defines mutual knowledge as the knowledge that communicating parties share in common and know they share. It is an appropriation assumption based on various cultural, anthropological, historical and communicative studies, as well as on everybody experience that participants exchange information with others having in mind the situational background that helps them understand and interpret each other.

(5) S1: Is she all right?

S2: Is Chernobyl? (Liu, 2006: 14)

S1 and S2 are intimate female friends. They are talking about their best girlfriend, Amy. Amy has been dumped by her boyfriend. Chernobyl refers to a disastrous nuclear accident, which caused a great damage to the citizens and echo environment round Chernobyl, broke out in Chernobyl in the late 1990s. This is a well-known historical fact. The addresser believes that the addressee knows the Chernobyl accident and the addresser treats this accident as a mutual knowledge between him and his addressee.

The social status of the agents means that the status of the speaker is higher than or equal to the status of the hearer (Francesca et al. 2004:473).

It is argued that the pragmatic functions of RQs are affected by the relationship between the addresser and the addressee. Ilie (1994:172) clarifies the relationships between the participants and classifying them into: symmetrical, asymmetrical, adversarial, non-adversarial. Asymmetrical relations refer to the relations of power imbalance. This relation exists between participants who are in powerful position (i.e. controlling the situation, in a decision – making capacity) and participants who are in powerless positions (generally unable to control the situation , being expected to accept the decision marker rules of turn – taking and turn structuring) (ibid).

In contrast to asymmetrical, symmetrical relation applies to the relation of power balance (i.e. between participants who are both in either powerful or powerless positions) (ibid: 173).

Adversarial relations refer to relations between participants who pursue opposite goals and act at cross purposes, while non – adversarial relation point to relations between participants whose goals are complementary to and compatible with each other (ibid).

(6) Why would a mother poison her child? Angela Wilkes reports on a bizarre syndrome that can have fatal results for innocent victims [...] The woman, a psychiatrist later explains at her trial , suffers from the mental disorder known as “Munchausen by proxy” syndrome , which makes her need the child she cares for to be ill.

The relation between the addresser and the addressee is non – adversarial and the question is neutral, since a journalist’s standpoint is supposed to be objective (ibid.: 44).

2.3 RQs as Indirect Speech Acts

Within the framework of speech act theory, RQ is considered as a clear manifestation of indirect speech acts. Haverkate (1997:222) explains that in formulating RQ, the speaker communicates more than that which he actually states, because the literal performance of the interrogative act implies the performance of a non – literal assertive act. That is why the

RQ is qualified as an indirect speech act. It follows that RQs convey either assertive, directive, commissive or expressive speech acts and other functions.

2.3.1 Assertives

English verbs that function as explicit assertive include, *accuse, assert, blame, boast, complaint, criticize, lament, predict, rebuke, remind* and *suggest*. (Yarahmadi and Olfati, 2011: 2524). RQs can perform assertive speech acts like the following ones:

1. Accusation

(7) Do two wrongs make a right? (Hackstein, 2004:169)

2. Assertion

(8) How could you think I did it? (Abioye, 2009:4)

3. Blame

(9) How could you do that to her? (Chen, 2006:611)

4. Criticism

(10) Do you really think so? (Hackstein, 2004:167)

5. Predication

(11) Is this ungrateful boy, all I am to get for the pains I have taken in your education? (Sullivan, 2008:10)

6. Rebuke

(12) What are you doing? Just look at yourself. (Burton, 2004: 2)

7. Reminding

(13) Don't I work my fingers to the bone for you? (Pope, 1976: 37)

8. Suggestion

(14) Why don't you read ELD then? This is your paper? (Niazi and Gautam , 2010:263)

2.3.2 Directives

This class of speech acts includes advice, command, plea, request and warning (Yarahmadi and Olfati, 2011: 2526). RQs express these speech acts.

1. Advice

(15) Would you look at this big stain here? (Chen, 2006: 611)

2. Command

(16) Will you shut up? (just shut up) (Abioye, 2009:4)

3. Plea

(17) Can this system work? (Abioye, 2009:5)

4. Request

(18) Why can't you boys play well? (Chen, 2006:611)

5. Warning

(19) Do you think I am unaware of your goings-on? (Barnet and Cain, 2000: 406)

2.3.3 Commissives

This class involves: refusal and invitation. RQs present certain commissive speech acts.

1. Refusal

(20) Isn't there a chance that the former might feel abandoned or unloved?

(Sagaravasi, 2012:165)

2. Invitation

(21) Would you like to join us for dinner? (Atkinson and Drew, 1979: 48)

2.3.4 Expressives

This class includes: apology, thanking, protest, complain, etc (Yarahmadi and Olfati, 2011:2525). Some of these acts are performed by RQs.

1. Complain

(22) Why did you put so few vegetables? (Koshik, 2005: 53)

2. Lament

(23) Then what's the use of my money to me? (Goto, 2007:4)

3. Boast

(24) Do you see the old man who downed the Apache helicopter? (Daniel, 2003:1)

4. Protest

(25) A: Wasn't that a good idea?

B: Yea. I have an idea. How about if I bite your nose really hard? (Chen, 2006:611)

2.3.5 Other Functions

It is found out that in addition to the speech acts that RQs can perform, they serve other pragmatic functions as follows.

1. Admonishing

(26) Can't you do it in such – and – such a way? ...You haven't the time, of course?

(Sobelman, 2011: 3)

2. Contempt

(27) Have you ever taken a shower with a rain coat on? (Hackestein, 2004:167)

3. Desperation

(28) What will I tell my husband? (Balogun, 2011: 53)

4. Displeasure

(29) A: She didn't greet you?

B: Me? Who am I that she should greet me? (Abioye, 2009: 4)

5. Impatience

(30) S1: How do you like school?

S2: How do you like prison? (Schaffer, 2005: 423)

6. Indignation

(31) Where are your manners? (Bain, 1983:220)

7. Insult

(32)What does this whippersnapper think it's doing, bumping Apple's iPod off the must have gadgets list? (Lee-Goldman, 2006: 3)

8. Powerlessness

(33) Do I have a choice? (Balogun, 2011: 53)

9. Statements of Incertitude

(34)A: Can she work?

B: Is Batman a transvestite? (Schaffer, 2005:425)

10. Surprise

(35)Are his wits safe? Is he not light of brain? (*Othello*, IV, i, 276)

2.4 RQs and Politeness Theory

Grundy (2000:127) defines politeness as one manifestation of the wider concept of etiquette, or appropriate behaviour. Brown and Levinson (1987:61) start from the assumption that 'face' is a universal human property. It is defined as a public self – image that every member wants to claim for himself. According to Brown and Levinson's classification, there are two kinds of face: Positive and Negative. Positive face is 'the want of every member that he wants to be desirable to at least some others', namely the need to be accepted and liked by others, treated as a member of social group, and to know one's wants are shared by others. Negative face is 'the want of every competent adult member that his action be unimpeded by others', which means the need to be independent (ibid.: 62)

When interacting with other people, people need or want to do many things. Some of them are inherently 'face threatening acts' which have the potential to cause damage to the positive or negative face of the interlocutors. In order to mitigate threats to face and ensure that communications proceed, speakers adopt different linguistic strategies. Politeness is one of them, as theorized by Brown and Levinson who propose a taxonomy of possible politeness strategies and one of them is off-record politeness strategies. They (1987: 195) illustrate that by choosing to go off-record, the speaker indulges in being as indirect as possible. Thus a speaker can get credit for being tactful, non-coercive, furthermore, he can avoid responsibility for the potentially face – damaging interpretation.

Brown and Levinson extend Gricean theory to explain how RQ is used as a politeness strategy. They say 'to ask a question with no intention of obtaining an answer is to break a sincerity condition on questions – namely, that the speaker wants the hearer to provide him with the indicated information. This sincerity condition straightforwardly follows from the injunction 'Be sincere', i.e. the Quality Maxim'. RQs that leave their answers

hanging in the air, implicated, may be used to do face threatening acts (i.e. excuses, sarcasm and irony) (1987:223).

1. Excuses

(36) Robert: I don't know why I bought that. I don't even know what it was I just bought it. *Do you ever get in these moods sometimes where you just like want to buy something because the title sounds interesting?* (Frank, 1990: 728)

2. Irony

(37) Aren't they lovely? And you, my dear, where did you get it?
(Niazi and Gautam, 2010:271)

3. Sarcasm

(38) But who says I have to remember every movie I've seen? I mean, where is it written?
(Frank, 1990: 733)

2.5 RQs and Relevance Theory

Relevance Theory is a cognitive theory of human communication adopted by the two scholars Sperber and Wilson in the late 1970s and early 1980s as a cognitive – centered alternative to Grice's cooperative principle concerning human communication. Since then, it has been an influential theory in pragmatics producing a good number of studies supporting it, criticizing it or applying it to different pragmatic research areas. The main assumption of this theory is that human beings are endowed with a biological ability to maximize the relevance of incoming stimuli including the linguistic utterances and other communicative behaviour. Relevance theory is not a typical property of external stimuli, but of internal representations and thoughts which serve as an input for cognitive processing (Mey, 2009: 855).

It is suggested that, the key notions of relevance theory include: inference, mutual contextual beliefs, linguistic presumption and communicative presumption. The following examples will show how the mechanism of relevance works in the RQs.

(39) S1 and S2 are intimate female friends. They are talking about their best girlfriend, Amy. Amy has been dumped by her boyfriend.

S1: Is she all right?

S2: Is Chernobyl? (Schaffer, 2005: 442)

In (39) the addresser delivers an elliptical RQ "is Chernobyl". Its complete form should be "is Chernobyl all right?" which parallels the first question "is she all right?". The linguistic presumption of the RQ is an interrogative, while the communicative presumption of it is an answer to S1. A disastrous nuclear accident, which caused great damage to the citizens and echo environment round Chernobyl, broke out in Chernobyl in the 1990s. This is a well-known historical fact. The addresser believes that the addressee knows the Chernobyl

accident, so S2 delivers RQ with an intention of providing a negative answer to S1's question (Lui, 2006:14).

SECTION THREE

RHETORICAL QUESTIONS AS USED IN ARGUMENTATION

3.1 RQs as Standpoints

Standpoint is defined as an externalized attitude of language user in respect of an expressed opinion and it is analyzed as an assertive speech act (Van Eemern and Grootendorst, 1984: 5). This standpoint can be expressed explicitly and implicitly. An implicit way to perform the standpoint is via the use RQ.

(40) How should Hank know? He's never been there ... (Van Eemeren et al. 2008:25).

3.2 RQs as Modus Ponens Types of Syllogism

Modus ponens is a valid argument form taking a conditional statement as one premise, and the affirmation of its antecedent as another premise. So, if someone claims "if something, then another thing" and then affirm "something", s/he can logically deduce that "another thing". If the conditional statement and the affirmation of its antecedent are both true, the truth of the conclusion is guaranteed.

(Myers et al. 2013: 55)

(41) You want to grow up to be big and strong, *don't you?* Eat your vegetables.

(Walton, 2006:160)

3.3 RQs as Modus Tollens Types of Syllogism

Modus tollens is a valid argument form taking a conditional statement as one premise, and the denial of its consequent as another premise. So, if someone claims "if something, then another thing" and then deny "another thing", s/he can logically deduce that "not something". Here it is recognized that if the relation between "something" and "another thing" holds, and if "another thing" fails to happen, or is false (depending on what that thing is), then "something" must not have happened, or must not be true. (Myers et al. 2013: 56)

(42) *Was it to you and your master that my master sent me to speak these words? Why, it was to the men who are sitting on the wall, who will have to eat their dung and to drink their urine with you.* (Walton, 2006: 62)

3.4 RQs as Disjunctive Syllogisms

Disjunctive syllogism is a valid form of reasoning when there are only two options to choose from. (Van Vleet, 2011: 41).

(43) Britain today has more secrets than any other country in Europe. *Do you think the Government keep their secrets for our benefit –or for their own? Do they keep the secrets in the public interest – or in the Government's interest?* (Ilie, 1994:152)

3.5 RQs as a Fallacy of Denying the Antecedent

Denying the antecedent is a fallacy that occurs when someone argues from a conditional premise (if P then Q) together with the negation of its antecedent (not- P) for the conclusion that the cocequent is also negated (not- Q) (Bowell and Kemp, 2005: 35).

(44) How many years are left to me, that I should go up with the king to Jerusalem? (Moshavi, 2009:44)

3.6 RQs as the Either/ or Fallacy

When building an argument on a disjunctive syllogism, there is a danger of making evaluations by a two-valued system, even when the issue involves a multi-valued system. This may result in what is called the either/or fallacy or false dilemma (Van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 1992: 51).

(45) To every voter, I say this: pause before you vote ... pause at the door of the polling station ... and ask yourself this question: *What is this election really about? Is it a vote for myself? Or is it about our children's future? Is it a vote for selfishness and greed? Or is it about the whole of our community? Is it a vote just for here and now? Or is it about the future of this great country? [...]* But this election is about something more. It is about your children, your community, your country. (Ilie, 1994:158)

3.7 RQs as Fallacies of Hasty Generalization

Hurley (1997: 142) defines *secundum quid* (i.e. hasty generalization) as “an argument that draws a conclusion about all members of a group from evidence that pertains to a selected sample”.

(46) Take my son Martyn. He's been eating fish and chips his whole life, and he just had a cholesterol test, and his level is below the national average. *What better proof could there be than a frier's son?* (Copi and Cohen, 1994: 125)

3.8 RQs as Fallacies of the Faculty of Cause–Effect

Post hoc ergo propter (i.e. fallacy of cause– effect) is a fallacy of causation, the name of this fallacy translates from the Latin as “after this, therefore because of this.” This fallacy occurs when one presupposes that two consecutive but independently occurring events are causally related. In other words, one assumes that because one event happened after another event, the first event must have caused the second (Van Vleet, 2011: 34).

(47) Would they be privatising in Latin America today, if we had not first done it here? Would they be cutting high tax rates in India today, if we had not first done it here? Would they be planning to bring Eastern Europe into the community today, if we had not first suggested it here? (Ilie, 1994: 160)

3.9 RQsas Arguments Appeal to Group Solidarity

Ad populum (i.e. fallacy of argument appeal to group solidarity) is a fallacy in which one reasons from the popularity of a product or belief to a conclusion about its actual merits (Govier, 2010: 175).

(48) The British people no longer want such a Government. The British people want a country with a sense of community. They want a Britain that is whole and fair and free of fear. And to build that, they want a Government with a sense of duty towards all the people. [...] *Isn't that what we all want?* (Ilie, 1994:162)

3.10 RQs as Arguments Appeal to Pity

Ad misericordiam is a fallacy committed when premises express and evoke pity, with the implication that a conclusion should be accepted because someone is in a pitiful state (Govier, 2010: 175).

(49) The attorney for the defence may, for example bring into the courtroom the poorly-dressed wife of the defendant, surrounded by pathetic children in rags, and thus say in effect to the jury, "if you send my client to the electric chair, you make a widow of this poor woman and orphans of these innocent children. *What have they done to deserve this?*" (Walton,1992: 110)

3.11 RQs as Arguments Appeal to Fear

Ad baculum (i.e. fallacy of argument appeal to fear) is a fallacy committed when premises express or evoke fear, with the implication that a conclusion should be accepted because otherwise bad things are going to happen (Govier, 2010: 175).

(50) Must your glass be shattered? Must your flesh and blood be maimed? Must your livelihood be looted? Must all you've built be torn down? ... What will it take before you stand up with the one group that will stand for no more? (Walton, 2006:132)

3.12 RQs as Arguments Appeal to Personal Involvement

Ad hominem (i.e. fallacy of argument appeal to personal involvement) is a fallacy committed when an irrelevant premise about the background, personality, or character of a person is given in an attempt to show that the person's claims or arguments are false or unacceptable (Govier, 2010:175).

(51)A hunter accused of barbarity for his sacrifice of innocent animals for his own amusement or sport in hunting replies to his critic: "*Why do you feed on the flesh of harmless cattle?*" (Walton, 1992: 319)

3.13 RQs as Proposals for Starting Points

Van Eemeren et al. (2005:115) point out that it is unlikely that in practice parties will execute the opening move of the starting point dialogue by means of a fully explicit proposal to accept some proposition. Arguers can, however, implicitly make such a proposal, and one way of doing this is to ask or write RQ.

(52) Is it my fault that my looks are better than Ellen van Langen's?

(Van Eemeren et al.2008:477)

SECTION FOUR

APPLICATION

In this practical part, the functions of RQs have been used as a model of analysis of the dramatic texts (*Twelfth Night* and *Hamlet*). These functions are of two types: functions of RQs from the point of view of speech acts and functions of RQs from the point of view of argumentation. The first type of these functions includes: irony, rebuke, sarcasm, assertion, criticism, complain, surprise, protest, objection, inquiry, predication, uncertainty, helplessness, persuasion, desperation, insult, pleasure, displeasure, dissatisfaction and anger, self–deception, boast, reminding, lament, indignation, accusation, contempt, blame, warning, suggestion, advice, command, plea, invitation, admonishing, impatience, humor and making fun.

The second kind of these functions contains: standpoint, modus ponens types of syllogism, modus tollens types of syllogism, disjunctive syllogism, fallacy of denying the antecedent, either/ or fallacy, fallacy of hasty generalization, fallacy of cause– effect, fallacy of argument appeal to group solidarity, fallacy of argument appeal to pity, fallacy of argument appeal to fear, fallacy of argument appeal to personal involvement and proposal for starting point.

The procedure followed in this section is that the examples of RQs have been chosen according to their recurrence, significance to the theme(s) of the plays and the dramatic situations they explore. Each extract is presented, then followed by an explanation of the dramatic context and the functions of RQs are discussed at the end of each example. The texts, which are analyzed in these two plays, are thirty–eight. In *Hamlet*, there are twenty–five RQs and in *Twelfth Night*, there are thirteen RQs. Twelve texts are analyzed in some detail, six on each play. The others are all left to the appendix. The choice of these plays is due to their richness in this topic (i.e. RQs). It is also hoped to see the differences in the use of RQs in the tragedy (*Hamlet*) and in the comedy (*Twelfth Night*).

Situation (1) **Olivia**: Even so quickly may one catch the plague? (*Twelfth Night*, I, v, 285)*

Olivia delivers this soliloquy after her first encounter with Cesario (Viola in disguise) and she ironically expresses her emotions and love in the form of an RQ.

Pragmatically, the illocutionary force of Olivia's RQ is that of irony. Olivia says that a person is infected so quickly by the plague, while in reality she talks about her love. She says how the passion of love is caught as swiftly as one infected by the plague. Olivia falls in love at first sight with Cesario and she begins to describe his youth and beauty. Olivia's speech reflects the theme of love. The argumentative function of Olivia's RQ is that of a fallacy of argument appeal to pity in which Olivia declares her emotions in the form of an RQ.

Situation (2) **Olivia:** What's a drunken man like, fool? (I, v, 125)

Olivia says this speech when her cousin Sir Toby cannot recognize the man at the gate because of the effect of alcohol drinking. She angrily expresses her feelings by using an RQ.

The illocutionary force of Olivia's RQ is that of inquiry. When Sir Toby tells Olivia that there is a man at the gate and he cannot recognize him, she asks this RQ. Olivia inquires what a drunken man looks like. In this speech, Olivia plays on the tone of her speech. If Olivia makes a slight pause between the beginning of her question and the word 'fool', the meaning of her RQ is that Sir Toby is the fool and he is the one whom Olivia is talking about. If Olivia does not make any pause

* Shakespeare, William's *Twelfth Night* with an introduction by Wilson, J. D. (2009). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. All references to this play are taken from this edition and will be parenthetically cited with Act, Scene, Line number.

in her RQ, this means that she talks about the state of all the drunken men and one of them is Sir Toby. The argumentative function of Olivia's RQ is that of standpoint. Olivia expresses her opinion about the argument in which she says that a drunken man is just like a fool and no one can reject this opinion, so that the audience agree with her conclusion.

Situation (3) **Duke:** Still so cruel? (V, i, 115)

The Duke Orsino criticizes Olivia when she says that if the Duke is going to talk in the same old tune of love, this is as gross and distasteful to her ear as screaming after sweet music.

From the pragmatic perspective, the Duke's RQ has the illocutionary force of criticism. Orsino criticizes Olivia as being cruel. He asks her rhetorically if she is still cruel. He says that Olivia is merciless and pleased at causing pain and distress as she rejects Orsino's love. This speech is related to the theme of love. The argumentative function of this RQ is a fallacy of argument appeal to pity in which Orsino expresses his emotions and love to Olivia.

Situation (4) **Sir Toby:** Do not our lives consist of the four elements? (II, iii, 10)

Sir Toby is speaking with Sir Andrew about their life and the idea of sleeping early. Sir Toby expresses his disapproval about this idea by using an RQ.

From a pragmatic perspective, this RQ functions as an objection to Sir Andrew's opinion. Sir Andrew says that people sleep early and wake up early, but Sir Toby is unhappy with this opinion and this feeling is expressed in his RQ. Sir Toby states that it is a wrong idea when people sleep early and wake up early. He hates this idea as he hates an empty can of wine. The correct thing according to Sir Toby is to be awake after midnight and to go to bed in the morning. As for the argumentative function, this RQ functions as a standpoint in which Sir Toby presents his opinion about the argument and he thinks that Sir Andrew is going to accept it with no problem, since he talks about the four facts in the life: earth, air, fire and water. The four elements are thought to make up all matter. "our lives" has an obvious double meaning: it signifies either all living things, or life time before death. Sir Toby uses it in the former, but Sir Andrew, who cannot fathom his friend's subtleties, mistakes it for the latter, and remarks that life "rather consists of eating and drinking."

Situation (5) **Sebastian**: Are all the people mad? (IV, i, 2)

Amazed by the behaviour of Olivia, Sir Andrew, Sir Toby and Fabian in Illyria, so that Sebastian rhetorically asks: are all the people mad?

This RQ has the illocutionary force of surprise. Sebastian expresses his feeling of surprise because of the behaviour of the characters in the play. Olivia asks him to marry her (confuses him with Viola, Cesario) in spite of the fact that he does not know her. Sir Andrew, Sir Toby and Fabian are fighting Sebastian, because they think that he (Sebastian) is Cesario. The argumentative function of this RQ is a fallacy of hasty generalization. Sebastian generalizes his idea about the people in Illyria from the characteristics of few members in the society (i.e., Olivia, Sir Toby, Sir Andrew and Fabian).

Situation (6) **Olivia**: Hast thou forget thyself? Is it so long? (V, i, 135)

Olivia accuses Viola (Cesario) of being the cause of her suffering and she expresses her sad feeling by using an RQ.

Pragmatically speaking, Olivia's RQ has the illocutionary force of accusation. Olivia sends a ring to Cesario as a sign of her love and as a request to marry her, but he refuses to marry her. When Viola asks Olivia about the cause of her sadness, Olivia sadly reflects: "hast thou forget thyself?" Olivia has mistaken Cesario (Viola) for her twin brother, Sebastian who refuses to marry her. This speech refers to the theme of disguise (physical disguise). Olivia's RQ also functions as a fallacy of cause and effect. Olivia states that Cesario refuses the ring that she sends to him and refuses to marry her (cause), and the effect of Cesario's deeds is Olivia's sadness and suffering.

Situation (7) **Hamlet**: O, what a rogue and peasant slave am I!

Is it not monstrous that this player here,
 But in a fiction, in a dream of passion,
 Could force his soul so to his own conceit
 That from her working all his visage wan'd;
 Tears in his eyes, distraction in's aspect,
 A broken voice, and his whole function suiting
 With forms to his conceit? And all for nothing!
 For Hecuba?
 Am I a coward? (*Hamlet*, II, ii, 523–31; 545) *

Hamlet delivers this soliloquy after the end of the players' performance of the 'Murder of Gonzago' at Hamlet's request to see his uncle's reaction who murders his brother (Hamlet's father) in the same way as the players perform it. Hamlet uses RQs to rebuke himself as he cannot avenge his father's murder.

The pragmatic function of Hamlet's RQs is that of self – rebuke. He rebukes himself and calls himself a rogue and a peasant slave. Hamlet reprimands himself when he thinks of the situation of the players. Those players feign emotions and these thoughts effect their souls, causing physical transformations: a broken voice, tears and a face growing pale. He contrasts the players' motiveless activity with his lack of action despite his great motive (i.e., his father is killed by his uncle who is now the king of Denmark and his mother's husband). Hamlet goes on to describe his state by describing himself as a powerless avenger, henceforth, he feels foolish,

* Shakespeare, William's *Hamlet* with an introduction by Wilson, J. D. (2008). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. All references to this play are taken from this edition and will be parenthetically cited with Act, Scene and Line number.

having merely playacted the role, that's why he refers to himself as a coward person. Hamlet's RQs also have the function of a fallacy of argument appeal to personal involvement. Hamlet here attacks himself rather than the argument by saying that he is unable to avenge his father's murder. He attacks himself by saying that he is incompetent or unreliable to achieve his revenge, in spite of the fact that he has more than one chance to kill his uncle.

Situation (8) **Hamlet**: Must I remember? Why, she would hang on him

As if increase of appetite had grown
 By what it fed on: and yet, within a month,—
 Let me not think on't,—Frailty, thy name is woman!—
 A little month; or ere those shoes were old
 With which she followed my poor father's body

Like Niobe, all tears;—why she? (I, ii, 143– 9)

Hamlet soliloquizes after the conversation, when his mother and uncle not to return to Wittenberg, but remain in Denmark ask him. Hamlet uses RQs for sarcastically expressing the causes of his pain and suffering.

The illocutionary force of Hamlet's RQs is that of sarcasm. He expresses his suffering in a sarcastic way, specifically his intense disgust of his mother's remarriage. He thinks that Gertrude is just like a beast with no true emotional capacity. He says that his mother is clearly after sexual desires; henceforth, her grief for King's Hamlet death is a mere mask: with tears still in her eyes, he remarks, she rushed with wicked speed and such dexterity to incestuous sheets in Claudius's bed. Hamlet goes on to describe the haste of marriage bitterly through the image of shoes: the same shoes she follows his father's funeral at her marriage to Claudius. These RQs also have the function of a fallacy of argument appeal to personal involvement in which Hamlet attacks his mother when he talks about the inconsistency of Gertrude's grief on King Hamlet's death and her quick marriage from Claudius.

Situation (9) **Hamlet:** What may this mean,
That thou, dead corse, again in complete steel,
Revisit'st thus the glimpses of the moon,
Making night hideous, and we fools of nature
So horridly to shake our disposition
With thoughts beyond the reaches of our souls?
Say, why is this? wherefore? what should we do? (I, iv, 51–7)

Hamlet says these lines after the appearance of his father's ghost. Fearfully, Hamlet expresses his feeling of incertitude by using a series of RQs.

Pragmatically, Hamlet's RQs have the illocutionary force of uncertainty. Hamlet in this speech is unsure whether his father's apparition is truly the King's spirit or an evil demon. Through the use of these RQs, Hamlet asks the ghost in order to articulate the widespread unease in Denmark, while unsuccessfully attempting to quell the fear he is experiencing. These RQs also function as a fallacy of argument appeal to fear. Hamlet here tries to plant in the audience's mind the feeling of fear and uncertainty of what is going to happen in the afterlife that makes the soul of the dead people appears in the shape of a ghost.

Situation (10) **Hamlet:** who would these fardels bear,
To grunt and sweat under a weary life,
But that the dread of something after death,—
The undiscover'd country, from whose bourn

No traveller returns,—puzzles the will,
And makes us rather bear those ills we have
Than fly to others that we know not of? (III, i, 76– 82)

Hamlet delivers his famous soliloquy when he poses the problem of whether or not to commit suicide as a logical question. Hamlet uses an RQ to deceive himself by giving causes of delaying the idea of suicide.

Hamlet's RQ has the illocutionary force of self – deception in which he says that dreams that come in the sleep of death are daunting, that they must give us pause. He goes on in deceiving himself by being uncertain of the afterlife. According to Hamlet, the afterlife is essentially what prevents all of humanity from committing suicide to end the pain of life. After that, Hamlet inquires who chooses to bear the miseries of life if he can bring himself peace with a knife. Hamlet himself replies saying that no one chooses to live, except for "the dread of something after death" that makes people submit more to the suffering of their lives to another state of existence which may be even more miserable. Hamlet's RQ also functions as a fallacy of hasty generalization. Hamlet generalizes his situation on all the human beings when he says that all of them want to end their lives by committing suicide.

Situation (11) **Hamlet:** How all occasions do inform against me,
And spur my dull revenge? what is a man
If his chief good and market of his time
Be but to sleep and feed? (IV, iv, 32– 5)

Hamlet delivers this soliloquy after seeing Fortinbras marching with 20000 men to fight Poland over a small piece of land. Hamlet expresses his discomfort and dissatisfaction by using RQs.

Complain is the illocutionary force of Hamlet's RQs. Hamlet complains that everything he encounters prompts him to revenge, and points out how wrong his actions are. He declares that the world itself and all situations he finds are accusing him of apathy and remind him of his inability to complete his revenge. Then, Hamlet completes to describe his situation as being unable to find an answer to his question. He says that a man who exists but to eat and sleep is no more than a mere animal. This speech reflects the theme of revenge. The argumentative function of Hamlet's RQs is a fallacy of argument appeal to personal involvement, since there is an inconsistency between Hamlet's words and actions as he often decides what he is going to do and then decides against it.

Situation (12) **Hamlet:** What's Hecuba to him, or he to Hecuba,
That he should weep for her? What would he do,
Had he the motive and the cue for passion
That I have? (II, ii, 532– 5)

Hamlet soliloquizes after the performance of the 'Murder of Gonzago' Hamlet uses RQs to inquire about his situation.

Pragmatically speaking, Hamlet's RQs have the illocutionary force of inquiry. He asks rhetorically what is the relationship between the player and Hecuba or Hecuba and the player. Hamlet contrasts the player's motiveless activity with Hamlet's lack of action despite his great motive (i.e., his father is killed by his uncle who is now the king of Denmark and his mother's husband). Argument of disjunctive syllogism is the argumentative function of Hamlet's RQs. This type of syllogism is expressed by the use of 'either- or': what is **either** Hecuba to him, **or** he to Hecuba.

SECTION FIVE

CONCLUSIONS

- 1- The analyses of the selected texts have proved that RQs in *Hamlet* are different in number, employment and function from those in *Twelfth Night*. RQs are used in *Hamlet* more often than in *Twelfth Night*. It is found out that the advancement in the number and in the functions of RQs in the tragedy are due to their themes, since *Hamlet* deals with important and serious theme (i.e. revenge) whereas *Twelfth Night* deals with common theme (i.e. romantic love). There are twenty-five RQs in *Hamlet*, whereas there are thirteen RQs in *Twelfth Night*. It is found out that the employment of RQs is different in the selected texts. In the tragedy, RQs are used as a means that helps the audience to understand the dramatic characters and know how they think and feel about themselves and about other characters. In the comedy, RQs are used as a means for delight and amusement. It is also found out that, since *Hamlet* deals with tragic events, RQs fulfill sad functions as, lament, self- deception, self realization and regret; and since *Twelfth Night* deals with happy events, RQs fulfill functions just like, humour and making fun.
- 2- Rebuke is the most common function of RQs from the speech acts point of view and it occurs for six times in the plays, whereas fallacy of argument appeal to personal involvement is the most common function of RQs from the argumentation point of view and it does within twelve times in these plays.
- 3- It is proved that context is the most salient determiner of frequency and function of RQs. The two literary texts represent a rich environment in which RQs fulfill different functions. Context makes clear the functions of RQs by removing ambiguity surrounding these RQs.
- 4- The analyses of the selected texts have proved that RQs fulfill several functions which are used for different purposes. For example, the function of 'sarcasm' is used in the tragedy and in the comedy, but it is used for different purposes. In *Hamlet*, 'sarcasm' is used to make clear the way the character feels or thinks about herself/himself or about

other characters, whereas in *Twelfth Night*, it is used for the entertainment and delight of the audience.

References

- Abioye, O. T. (2009). 'Typology of Rhetorical Questions as a Stylistic Device in Writing.' *The International Journal of Language, Society and Culture*. 29. 1-7.
- Atkinson, J. M. and Drew, P. (1979). *The Organization of Verbal Interaction in Judicial Settings*. London: Methuen.
- Bain, A. (1983). *English Composition and Rhetoric*. London: Longman.
- Balogun, T. A. (2001). 'Interrogative Questions as Device for the Representation of Power in Selected Texts of Akachi Adimora-Ezeigbo.' *The Journal of PanAfrican Studies*. 4. 40-58.
- Barent, S. and Cain, W. E. (2000). *A Short Guide to Writing about Literature*. London: Longman.
- Bowell, T. and Kemp, G. (2005). *Critical Thinking: A Concise Guide*. New York: Routledge.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burton, G.O. (2004). "Rhetorical Question." URL: [http://humanities byu.edu/rhetoric/Figure/rhetorical question. htm](http://humanities.byu.edu/rhetoric/Figure/rhetorical%20question.htm).
- Chen, H.J. (2006). *A Study of Pragmatic Prototypical Categories of Rhetorical Questions*. Shiyang: Jinzhou, Liaoning.
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Copi, I. M. and Cohen, C. (1994). *Introduction to Logic*. New York: Macmillan.
- Cramton, C. D. (2001). 'The Mutual Knowledge Problem and Its Consequences for Dispressed Collaboration'. *Organization Science*,12, 346-371.
- Cummings, L. (2010). *The Pragmatic Encyclopedia*. New York: Routledge.
- Daniel, J. (2003). "Rhetorical Questions". URL: [http:// www. folk. uio. No/ elsness/ Danial/ 2003/ communicate speech. doc](http://www.folk.uio.no/elsness/Danial/2003/communicate%20speech.doc).
- Dulgan, A. (2012). 'How many ways can you use rhetorical questions in your speech?'. URL:[http://sixminutes.dlugan.com/rhetorical -questions](http://sixminutes.dlugan.com/rhetorical-questions).
- Francesca, M., Bucciarelli, M. and Bara, B.G. (2004). 'The fundamental context categories in understanding communicative intention'. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 36. 467-488.
- Frank, J. (1990). 'You call that rhetorical question? Forms and Functions of RQs

- in conversation'. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 14. 723–738.
- Goto, R. (2007). 'Relevance Theoretic Analysis of the Properties and Understanding of Rhetorical Questions'. *School of Comparative Culture*.
- Govier, T. (2010). *A Practical Study of Argument*. New York: Wadsworth, cengage Learning.
- Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hackstein, O. (2004). 'Rhetorical Questions and the Grammatization of Interrogative Pronouns as Conjunctions in Indo-European'. *Indo-European Journal*. 46.168–186.
- Haverkate, H. (1997). 'The Pragmalinguistic Characterization of rhetorical question'. In G. Vozdanovic, J. (ed.). *Language Change and Functional Explanations*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Henkmans, S. A.F. (2009). Maneuvering Strategically with Rhetorical Questions. In Van Eemeren, F. H. and Garssen, B.(eds.). *Pondering on Problems of Argumentation*. New York: Springer.
- Hurley, P. J. (1997). *A Concise Introduction to Logic*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Ilie, C. (1994). 'What else can I tell you? A pragmatic study of English rhetorical questions as discursive and argumentative acts. *Stockholm studies in English*, vol.72. Almqvist & Wiksell International, Stockholm.
- Koshik, I. (2005). *Beyond Rhetorical Question . Assertive Questions in Everyday Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lee-Goldman, R. (2006). 'A typology of rhetorical questions'. *Syntax and Semantics Circle*, 1–10.
- Liu, Z. C. (2006). 'A Pragmatic Account of Rhetorical Questions as Responses'. *Journal of Foreign Linguistics and Applied Linguistics*. 1–40.
- Mey, J. (2009). *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moshavi, A. (2009). 'Two Types of Argumentation Involving Rhetorical Questions in Biblical Hebrew Dialogue. ORL:<http://www.rhetoricalquestioninbiblicaldialogue.edu>.
- Myers. B., Elsby, C., Jaray, K. B. and Semczynsyn, N. (2013). *Clear and Present Thinking: A Handbook in Logic and Rationality*. London: Northwest Passage Books.
- Niazi, N. and Gautam, R. (2010). *How To Study Literature: Stylistic and Pragmatic Approaches*. New Delhi: Raj Press.
- Pope, E. N. (1976). *Questions and Answers in English*. Paris: Mouton Co, B.V.

- Sagaravasi, V. (2012). 'Intercultural Communication Strategies: Discursive Strategies between American and Thais in an English Language Asynchronous Argumentative Online Forum and their Impact for Language Education' URL: <http://www.speechactsoline.edu>.
- Schaffer, D. (2005). 'Can rhetorical questions function as retort?' *Journal of Pragmatics*. 37, 433-460.
- Sobelman, A. (2011). 'Kafka's Asking, Reading Rhetorical Questions in Letter to His Father'.
URL:<http://alanasobelman.files.wordpress.com/kaflaletterfather.jpg>
- Sullivan, A. (2008). 'On Pragmatic Regularities'. Memorial University of Newfoundland. 1-20.
- Van Eemeren, F.H. and Grootendorst, R. (1984). *Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussion. A Theoretical Model for the Analysis of Discussions Directed Towards Conflicts of Opinion*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- _____ (1992). *Argumentation, Communication and Fallacies. A Pragma-Dialectical Perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Van Eemeren, F. H., Houtlosser, P. and Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (2005). *Argumentative Indicators in Het Nederlands .Een Pragma-Dialectische Studie*. Amsterdam: Rozenberg Publishers.
- _____ (2007). *Argumentative Indicators in Discourse*. New York: Springer.
- _____ (2008). Identifying Indicators of Argumentative Moves. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 20, 475-493.
- Van Vleet, J. E. (2011). *Informal Logical Fallacies: A Brief Guide*. New York: University Press of America, Inc.
- Walton, D. N. (1992). *The Place of Emotion in Argument*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- _____ (2006). *Fundamentals of Critical Argumentation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, J. D. (2008). *Hamlet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____ (2009). *Twelfth Night*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yarahamdi, M. and Olfati, N. (2011). 'Speech Act Analysis of Anton Chekhov's The Seagull'. *Journal of Basic Applied Scientific Research*. 2522-2527.

Appendix

Examples of the Remaining Situations

Situation (1) **Antonio**: Will you deny me now?

Is't possible that my deserts to you

Can lack persuasion? (III, iv, 330– 2) (blame, fallacy of argument appeal to personal involvement)*

Situation (2) **Olivia**: What might you think?

Have you not set mine honour at the stake,

And baited it with all the unmuzzl'd thoughts

That tyrannous heart can think? (III, I, 117– 20) (indignation, fallacy of argument appeal to pity)

Situation (3) **Sir Andrew**: Fair lady, do you think you have fools in hand? (I, iii, 60) (protest, standpoint)

Situation (4) **Malvolio**: My masters, are you mad? or what are you? Have you no wit, manners, nor honesty, but to gabble like tinkers at this time of night? Do ye make an alehouse of my lady's house, that ye squeak out your coziers' catches without any mitigation or remorse of voice? Is there no respect of place, persons, nor time, in you? (II, iii, 83– 6) (contempt, fallacy of argument appeal to personal involvement)

Situation (5) **Sir Toby**: Art any more than a steward? Dost thou think, because thou art virtuous, there shall be no more cakes and ale? (II, iii, 107– 8)

(insult, fallacy of argument appeal to personal involvement)

* The remaining situations of the two plays (i.e. *Twelfth Night* and *Hamlet*) are presented with their pragmatic functions (i.e. from Speech Act and Argumentation point of view).

Situation (6) **Sir Toby**: Am not I consanguineous? Am not I of her blood? (*Twelfth Night*, II, iii, 74) (objection, standpoint).

Situation (7) **Viola**: Was not this love indeed? (*Twelfth Night*, II, iv, 115) (surprise, fallacy of argument appeal to pity).

Situation (8) **Hamlet**: Have you eyes?

Could you on this fair mountain leave to feed,

And batten on this moor? Ha! have you eyes? (III, iv, 66– 8) (criticism, fallacy of argument appeal to pity)

Situation (9) **King**: Why should we, in our peevish opposition,

Take it to heart? (I, ii, 100– 1) (persuasion, standpoint)

Situation (10) **Hamlet**: Where be your gibes now? your gambols? Your songs? your flashes of merriment, that were wont to set the table on a roar? Not one now, to mock your own grinning? quite chap-fallen? (V, i, 170– 3) (assertion, standpoint)

Situation (11) **Hamlet**: Have you a daughter? (II, ii, 182) (warning, fallacy of argument appeal to fear)

Situation (12) **King**: What if this cursed hand
Were thicker than itself with brother's blood,—
Is there not rain enough in the sweet heavens
To wash it white as snow? Whereto serves mercy
But to confront the visage of offence?
And what's in prayer but this twofold force,—
To be forestalled ere we come to fall,
Or pardon'd being down? Then I'll look up;
My fault is past. But, O, what form of prayer
Can serve my turn? Forgive me my foul murder!—
That cannot be; since I am still possess'd
Of those effects for which I did the murder,—
My crown, mine own ambition, and my Queen.
May one be pardon'd and retain the offence?

.....

What then? what rests?

Try what repentance can: what can it not?

Yet what can it when one cannot repent? (III, iii, 43– 56; 64– 6) (helplessness, fallacy of argument appeal to pity)

Situation (13) **King**: Alas, how shall this bloody deed be answered? (IV, i, 16)
(desperation, standpoint)

Situation (14) **Hamlet**: What is he whose grief

Bears such an emphasis? whose phrase of sorrow

Conjures the wandering stars, and makes them stand

Like wonder-wounded hearers? (V, i, 235– 8) (dissatisfaction and anger, fallacy of argument appeal to personal involvement)

Situation (15) **Laertes**: O heavens! is't possible a young maid's wits

Should be as mortal as an old man's life? (IV, v, 156– 7) (displeasure, fallacy of argument appeal to pity)

Situation (16) **Fortinbras**: O proud death,

What feast is toward in thine eternal cell,

That thou so many princes at a shot

So bloodily hast struck? (V, ii, 346– 9) (lament, fallacy of argument appeal to pity)

Situation (17) **Marcellus**: Does not divide the Sunday from the week? (*Hamlet*, I, i, 76) uncertainty, fallacy of argument appeal to pity.

Situation (18) **Hamlet**: Am I not i' th' right, old Jephthah? (*Hamlet*, II, ii, 388) sarcasm, proposal for starting point.

Situation (19) **Ophelia**: Could beauty, my lord, have better commerce than with honesty? (*Hamlet*, III, i, 110) rebuke, standpoint.

Situation (20) **Hamlet**: O God, your only jig-maker. What should a man do but be merry? (*Hamlet*, III, ii, 116-7) inquiry, standpoint.

Situation (21) **Hamlet**: Die two months ago, and not forgotten yet? (*Hamlet*, III, ii, 122) complain, fallacy of argument appeal to pity.

Situation (22) **Hamlet**: Sblood, do you think I am easier to be played on than a pipe? (*Hamlet*, III, ii, 345-6) rebuke, fallacy of argument appeal to personal involvement.

Situation (23) **Hamlet**: Would from a paddock, from a bat, a gib,
Such dear concernings hide? Who would do so? (*Hamlet*, III, iv, 191-2) rebuke, fallacy of argument appeal to personal involvement.

Situation (24) **Hamlet**: How stand I, then,
That have a father killed, a mother stained,
Excitements of my reason and my blood,
And let all sleep? (*Hamlet*, IV, v, 56-9) rebuke, fallacy of argument appeal to personal involvement.

Situation (25) **Hamlet**: Has this fellow no feeling of his business, that he sings at grave-making? (*Hamlet*, V, i, 60-1) inquiry, fallacy of argument appeal to personal involvement.

Situation (26) **Hamlet**: Why may not that be the skull of a lawyer?
Where be his quiddits now, his quillets, his cases, his
Tenures, and his tricks? Why does he suffer this rude knave
Now to knock him about the sconce with a dirty shovel, and
Will not tell him of his action of battery? (*Hamlet*, V, i, 89-93) sarcasm, standpoint.

Situation (27) **Hamlet**: Is't not perfect conscience
To quit him with this arm? And is't not to be damned
To let this canker of our nature come
In furer evil? (*Hamlet*, V, ii, 67-9) assertion, fallacy of argument appeal to personal involvement.