

Rhetorical Question Of Cultural Leaders Of Minangkabau

Aprili Yanti¹, Khairina Nasution², Oktavianus³, Muliadi⁴

^{1,2,4}Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia

³Universitas Andalas, Padang, Indonesia

Email : apriyanti@linguistics@gmail.com¹, khairina.nasution@usu.ac.id², oktavianus@hum.unand.ac.id³ & mulyadi@usu.ac.id⁴

Abstract

This study aims to identify the value and function of rhetorical questions that are widely used by Minangkabau traditional leaders. A rhetorical question is a language style inherent in Minangkabau culture, and it has a high aesthetic value as well as is rich in philosophical meaning. The language style of Minangkabau culture is closely related to metaphorical values that require a deep understanding of cognition to be understood by the interlocutors. Indigenous leaders are aware of their role as customary holders who control the ins and outs of Minangkabau tradition. They possess linguistic intelligence in a specific style that lets them have good verbal communication as well as acceptance in guiding their people. The results show that the speakers used a lot of multi-question patterns in a statement. These were not short answers and not counterclockwise patterns, but their meaning indicates affirmation, criticism, warning, advice, pride, and religion. Each question has metaphorical lexical in showing language politeness.

Keywords: Rhetorical question, speech act, cultural leaders, Minangkabau.

1. Introduction

The language style used by someone in a speech affects a positive response to his audience. The language style does not only consist of aesthetic values, but also linguistic potential. The speaker's ability in giving a lecture, such as in developing and enriching the choice of word (diction) can depend on someone's level of intellectuality in which someone is considered to have verbal abilities and a wide repertoire of knowledge and experience (Yahkah, 1994). Rhetoric is the art of speaking persuasively because it can hypnotize the audience by listening to the speaker's thoughts (speech). This is a very effective way of giving and defending an argument. Someone who is considered as an orator is someone who can give oration scientifically, elegantly, and systematically. The linguistic potential used is effective in exchanging intellectual experiences and it can comfort the audience. Larson (1998) states that questions that do not require an answer are called rhetorical questions.

A speaker has a lot of variations in delivering his speech. Sometimes, he even uses all types of speech acts, such as to convey the truth of information, to give an affirmation or instruction, to express a phenomenon, and to give hope in the form of a promise or commitment. The speech given by an orator plays the emotions of the audience. Speakers have various tricks and strategies in giving lectures so that it has a strong influence in stimulating the attention of their audience. A lecturer often throws a question to his interlocutor at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of his speech to achieve his goals or objectives. This is often called a rhetorical question, which is an interrogative sentence that does not require an answer. The question has a purpose as an affirmation. The rhetorical question shows a person's success in communicating because the question invites and involves a direct response from the audience. The speaker gives a very strong message implicitly so that it is often seen as an ambiguous sentence. Abioye (2008) states that a

rhetorical question is an utterance that aims to praise, to request, and to give a hidden message which is usually used to continue or end a communication, to give reasons and answers, to affirm, or to show a different opinion, and to conclude an important point from the content of the proposition of the utterance.

The rhetorical question motivates the speech partner to give a spontaneous answer, however, this is not needed by the speaker because the speaker has already known the answers to the question. The speaker's skill in asking questions is strengthened by figurative speech. The rhetorical question aims to strengthen assertive speech or to reject statements that are considered to be contradicted with the speaker's views or arguments. Thus, rhetorical questions can also function as tentative (temporary) statements that are paraphrased to strengthen the truth or to support the speech partner's answer (Baldick, 2004). Rhetorical questions syntactically and semantically can be formed in a positive or negative mode, and such questions can even be added by exclamation remarks and echo utterances (Qurk, 1985).

Abioye (2009) claims that rhetorical questions function as strong emotional affirmation to maintain commitment, confusion in a contradiction of the speaker's thought, as a permanent jolt, as a way to provoke the speaker's thoughts in getting a reaction from the interlocutor by the speaker's expectations.

The speaker's statement as a customary leader is in the form of a primordial claim of pride in his culture. The speaker's ability to share new inspiration or thoughts or to maintain cultural ideology for their people as a cultural honor is worthy and deserves to be inherited. This is to reprimand the behavior of their people who experience a metamorphosis that is far or contradicted from the values of morality, culture, and religiosity. The rhetorical question functions to give confirmation, to surprise, to confirm the truth, to give a suggestion, to encourage, to persuade or to invite, to show admiration or pride, to show doubt or uncertainty, to give instructions or orders, to express feelings of anger or confusion, to complain, to warn, and to conclude.

This study focuses on the speeches delivered by the Minangkabau traditional leaders in the context of Pitaruah Ayah that has been transcribed. This speech contains strong pragmatic linguistic intervention on language politeness and strategies in giving rhetorical questions. Pitaruah Ayah is a speech

delivered by a traditional leader in a formal context, such as in a wedding or Batagak Penghulu as a message to his people. The researcher provides an interpretation of the hidden message of the speaker's speech that consists of metaphorical speech. The researchers conduct a re-assessment to see the effectiveness of the speaker's strengths and weaknesses in understanding his interlocutor. The researchers identified the factors behind the speaker's rhetorical questions and their functions. This is closely related to the professionalism of a leader in transmitting his knowledge and experience.

2. Method

Then the data in the analysis of this descriptive method with a qualitative approach (Mulyani., 2018 and Putri, 2020). Based on problems in such research, the methodology used is the more precise analysis of culture studies tracing. As well as the descriptive method was selected as the way in solving the problem (Aprilia, 2020). The qualitative approach so that it is more in reference to the approach of the description or overview of the objects examined, based on the data that appear as is, and describe systematically will facts the situation factually and closely.

3. Result and Finding

In the Form of Questions

The questions asked by the speaker have a fairly broad meaning. Questions that stimulate the audience to think intelligently can provide an understanding of the purpose of the speaker's speech. The question is not something that the speaker does not know the answer to or something that the listener does not need to answer.

In a discussion, argumentation often occurs, and this can disturb the interlocutors if they are not ready and do not possess the cognitive capacity. One strategy to show the level of verbal intelligence of the speaker and to use the language politeness is by not giving face threats to the speech partner, and to do this, the speaker can use questions that can trigger the speech partner's repertoire in understanding a concept.

Data I

Apo caro kahebat lai? Kato teman amak di Bosnia ketiko amak memperkenalkan budayo Minangkabau dilimo nagari di Eropa Timur. Salah satu syarat agak rancak untuk dipahami adalah kalian harus baraja silek, baraja pidato adaik untuak menumbuhkan

percaya diri, kalian yang padusi baraja serak kuniang. Salagi dia balaja silat dia mampu berdiri didepan orang ramai, nilai rendah dirinya hilang, bisa tampil kedepan. Kini terabaikan sumbang dua baleh.diantaranyo sumbang kecek namonyo untuak pagaulan. Kareh pusek yang menentukan

These utterances are started by this statement "apa caro kahebat lagi" (what are the other great ways?). In this speech, the speaker is not throwing a question to the listener because the answer is not needed by the speaker. The question has an implicit meaning in that it is an affirmation responding to the speech of the previous speech partner by giving a competitive impression in speech situations that are prone to face threats the interlocutors. The speaker stimulates the interlocutors' insights into the Minangkabau culture by providing a comparison that someone who does not have a background as a Minangkabau himself knows and admires the Minangkabau culture. The speaker provides a metaphorical statement by saying "kareh pusek" (newborn baby) is someone who is educated from an early age, so it will be easier to shape his personality to be a better person.

The speaker shows a sense of love and pride for the Minangkabau culture that already exists in foreign countries by sharing his experiences and introducing the Minangkabau culture to foreign countries. The speaker's primordial attitude towards the Minangkabau culture is a form of self-awareness and responsibility for his role as a leader. This competitive attitude is shown by the speaker as the authority of a cultural leader in a Minangkabau community, and his interlocutor is younger than him, so the speaker needs to let him understand (the realization of Kato Manurun). The speaker also tries to criticize the thoughts of the interlocutor who only gives a negative view of the Minangkabau culture because someone is not well acquainted with the ins and outs of the Minangkabau culture in depth. The speaker limits the assumptions of the listeners that are too early to justify.

The speaker realizes the language politeness to provide a broad understanding of the Minangkabau culture to his interlocutors as a form of self-awareness as a leader who calls the community to have pride in the Minangkabau culture.

Data 2

Nan ma duluan, kilek jo patia?

The speaker provides an optional answer to the question. The speech partner's answer will provide the speaker's views and conclusions on the background knowledge of his interlocutor and his sharpness in understanding a problem and seeing the phenomena that occurred. The speaker gives a natural metaphorical lexical, namely "lightning" as a form of intelligence that does not judge (giving negative assessment) to his interlocutor. The question posed by the speaker is in the form of argumentation in providing understanding to the speech partners. This question was used to read the natural phenomena. The Minangkabau philosophy which always uses analogies of life problems to natural phenomena has a strong implicit meaning. There is a message of da'wah to be conveyed in that we should be wise in seeing two sides of life. The rhetorical question shows that God's power in creating nature as itibar (ibrah) that can be understood by humans to strengthen gratitude for all of God's creation.

Questioning in a speaker's speech is a language politeness strategy in a negative form that is used by the speaker to maintain his position as a leader (role model) for his people.

Data 3

A... cubo Ang pikia Ang ranuangkan nak, dek ingin babuek adil jujur nan luruih-luruih tabuang ang karek kayu samo panjang, rumah apo nan katagak? Ka baalah bantuak rumahnyo kalau tunggak jo paran samo panjang rasuak sapanjang itu pulo taruih kapado kusen pintu anak janjang kasau jo laeh hinggo ka pasak pintua dapua, ukurannyo ampek-ampek meter, lai ka jadi rumah?(to confirm)

The speaker gives a rhetorical question that does not require a short "yes" or "no" answer, but a long answer because there is a strong explanation and reason given by the speech partner. The speaker invites the speech partner to think sharply by illustrating and it is in a rhetorical question whether the speech partner can imagine the illustration described by the speaker. The house used as an illustration given by the speaker is in the form of a metaphorical utterance that has a very deep meaning and does not label bad characters to the speech partner. The illustration has an implicit message on the assessment of a human character. The speaker wants to confirm the meaning of his speech. Honesty in the speaker's view is like "a house" that will be strong if it has a strong support pole. A house that is

designed without proper architecture will not become a dream house and livable for us. Honesty is a basic trait that must be possessed by humans in social interaction because this trait is the foundation for a person in the success of his social and private life.

Data 4

Dunsanak pandangan, Ambo ingin mangatokan bahwa sabananya Minangkabau punyo sumber sejarah nan bisa dipertanggung jawabkan. Sumber nan tak kalah nilainyo dari satumpuak candi-candi, prasasti, atau tulisan-tulisan purbakala, Apo sajo itu? Iyolah Tambo dan Kaba (to inform and to claim).

The speaker uses a rhetorical question to convey true information or fact that every Minangkabau person must know to show pride in his own culture. Culture cannot be separated from the role of history in revealing the existence of the culture. The extent to which history can carve authentic evidence of the existence of a culture will be a legacy to the next generations. There are issues against the lack of historical evidence about Minangkabau culture, and these can be traced to manifest a sense of love for Minangkabau cultures, such as artifacts, ancient buildings, temples, and inscriptions or intangible culture of legends related to Minangkabau culture. The speaker opens the repertoire of the interlocutor about the richness of Minangkabau culture. One of which is the story of Tambo and Kaba. The story of Tambo and Kaba is not very popular among the younger generation of Minangkabau people. The speaker reintroduces the story to the interlocutors because the story provides valuable life lessons and also explains the background of the origins of the Minangkabau ancestors as well as the true personality traits of the Minangkabau people.

The explanation given by the speaker in providing the facts is a form of his anxiety as a leader to the generation that lacks interest in studying the Minangkabau culture. The speaker uses a rhetorical question as a form of language politeness, and this does not give the impression of being authoritarian in giving instruction or messages to the interlocutors.

Data 5

Pengertiannyo bisa ganda, a... kama ka dibaok? Ka soal asmara, buliah "hanyuiklah buyuang jo angangan sabab si dia alah bapunyo", a...sajo iko aratinyo tu? Ha... ka masalah ekonomi, bisa juo "manggagaulah dulu di kaki limo salamo toko alun

tagagai". O... ka dibaok ka soal pandidikan cocok, "nyampang ndak luluih sipenmaru menganggurlah agak satahun, kamasuak ka swasta bajuta pith dimintaknyo", a... kamaa lai? Ka politik, a... itu nan jaleh bana "tanguangkanlah dek Markos tingga di pangasiangan salamo si Qori bakuaso di Filipina", a... putalah kini kama kadibaok lai. Jadi pantun cako punyo sasaran nan banyak dan luas, tapi isinyo bisa disimpulkan dalam satu kato, yaitu prihatin (to explain and to conclude).

The speaker gives parallel questions as an affirmation of the meaning of the statement that he wants to strengthen. The question provides many choices for the interlocutor as a form of seriousness in presenting information that is important for the interlocutors. The speaker shows a concern over a fact that occurs in the phenomenon of life within the younger generation of Minangkabau people who do not have the character of toughness in overcoming life. The speaker wants to strengthen the Minangkabau work ethic which starts from the original Minang character who likes to wander. This is a sign that Minangkabau people are adaptive and can be accepted well by their new environment. The speaker shows primordialism to the interlocutors to restore a sense of pride and to return the true identity as Minangkabau people.

The speaker uses politeness strategy by asking a rhetorical question to defend his argument by keeping the face of the interlocutor. The question asked is not in a short yes or no answer, but it requires answers in the form of descriptions, elaborated answers, and not answers that contradict the question. The question pattern is symmetrical with the statement of the speech partner although it is not needed by the speaker.

Data 6

Akan tetapi, dari pihak lain kami manampak bahwa adoh samacam kerinduan bagi sekelompok pemuda untuk mengetahui adat. Apo dan baa bana itu adat? Unsur apo nan mampatamukan pandang antaro moral Islam dan moral adat? Aponyo nan unik dan kanapo mangko popular sampai ditaliti urang lua? Inyo mancari, mancari dan mancari (pride).

The speaker asked a question about a concept or definition of "adat" (tradition). The question asked by the speaker is a form of admiration for the speech partner who wants to learn the Minangkabau culture in depth and pride in the Minangkabau culture itself.

The speaker responds to the positive attitude made by the speech partners for his curiosity about the Minangkabau culture. The speaker stimulates the speech partners to understand the position of Islam in the Minangkabau customs so that the interlocutors as the younger generations of the Minangkabau culture not only have pride in their culture but also apply Islamic values that are integrated into the Minangkabau culture, such as marriage that involves Islamic concepts, the culture of donating Duo Baleh, the social ethics in the Minangkabau cultural norms that are relevant to Islamic Sharia values. Thus, if the Minangkabau community does not have the status of a Muslim, they might not be considered as a Minang.

The rhetorical question was posed as an application of language politeness in Islamic concepts. The concept of Islam is in line with the conventional theory in that it avoids the threat of other people's faces as well as perfecting or wisely saying something true. As a leader, the speaker realizes his role in acting, speaking, and dressing that can make him be a role model for his community.

Data 7

Akan tetapi sampai kini alun ado berita sejarah nan terperinci mengenai kerajaan Minangkabau kuno. Banyak pertanyaan nan alun terjawab. Pabilo masonyo Minangkabau muncul di Sumatera? Sia pendirinyo? Siapo rajo-rajonyo? Sampai dimana wilayah taklukannyo? Baa bantuak pemerintahannyo? Dan lain-lain sebagainya. Ndak surang pun ahli sejarah nan bukak suaro, apo buliah buat (kekhawatiran). Kalaulah kito batanyo kapado tuan-tuan para ahli, apo sabab katarangan tantang nagari kami kalam tuan? Seakan-akan kami ko ndak pernah ado dahulunyo? Mako spontan mereka akan menjawab, "karena nagari angku indak maninggakan bukti-bukti ilmiah sabagai bahan penyelidikan sejarah" (Worries).

The speaker gives multiple questions about the history of the Minangkabau people and their origin. The younger generation of Minangkabau people receives little explanation of the Minangkabau history because of the lack of authentic evidence of the Minangkabau history. The history of Minangkabau is revealed a lot from the story of Tambo and Kaba. Meanwhile, Tambo and Kaba are not very familiar to the younger generation because they are mostly told orally rather than in the form of transcription or inscriptions. The rhetorical question

posed by the speaker functions as an acknowledgment of the lack of information that can be obtained by generation in seeking knowledge about the intricacies of the Minangkabau culture. The acknowledgment spoken by the speaker is a concern for the younger generation of the Minangkabau people who lack a sense of pride in their culture. The speaker has a sense of responsibility to provide a repertoire of the Minangkabau culture from the sources that can help introduce the culture more deeply.

A rhetorical question is a form of wisdom in the speech that does not judge the speech partner who does not have an interest in studying the Minangkabau culture. A rhetorical question is an inducement given by the speaker in stimulating the curiosity of the interlocutors in studying the Minangkabau culture. This question cannot be answered spontaneously by a "yes" or a "no" answer, but it requires time for someone to find the right answer.

Data 9

Apokah tungkek estafet itu akan ditaruihkan atau akan dilipek sampai disiko? Apo kito basadio manjadi angkatan pengkhianat nan menggelapkan amanah? Apo kito ala siap manarimo caci maki sumpah sarapah dibelakang hari? Apo kito relakan adat dikubua samantaro kito melestarikan kehidupan gajah, harimau sampai biawak sekalipun jawabannyo ado dalam dado kito surang-surang (to criticize) ?

Rhetorical question conveyed by the speaker is in the form of criticism and concerns made by the speaker as a leader who sees a phenomenon of reduced interest in the younger generation to be proud of the Minangkabau culture and to pass it on to the next generation so that the culture will not disappear in the era of globalization. Globalization mixes various cultures so that there are many choices for the younger generation in filtering or even adopting cultures that are not relevant to their original culture (their real identity). Ironically, many Minangkabau youths are no longer paying attention and applying the values of local wisdom of the Minangkabau culture. The speaker assumes that leadership will regenerate and a traditional leader is needed. The leaders should be someone who understands the Minangkabau culture, who can generate a sense of pride in Minangkabau culture, and who can provide protection for problems that arise in the Minangkabau community.

The rhetorical question posed is a hope made by the speaker so that it can raise the listeners' awareness or as contemplation for the young generation of Minangkabau. The speaker uses language politeness by using lexical metaphorical relay sticks in analogy to leadership transition (leadership regeneration), and he uses the pronoun "we" as a form of self-inclusiveness that does give the impression of judging the interlocutors because the warning is not only addressed to the speech partners but also himself. Therefore, this does not pose a threat to the face of the interlocutors.

Data 10

O . . . buyuang, kok ang nak tahu, itulah anak manusia nan lahia ka bumi Allah nangko lahia sarato jo untuangnyo. Adopun tujuan jo mukasuiknyo, mangko jo darah samo tibo, sirah hati pakek panganan lambang barani, lahia batin indak manaruah gamang-takuik. Manga tangan suok kida mandongkak, manyipak-nyipak? itu ma'ana urang bagak, medan galanggang nan nyo hadang cakak nan tidak kunjuang damai. Pakiak bukan sumbarang pakiak, sorak kumando dilewatkan ibaraik badia jo mariam, tando nagari dalam parang.

The speaker asks a rhetorical question which indicates a criticism and a warning, instilling the values of local wisdom that characterizes his culture. The question inserted in a statement is an affirmation of growing a sense of love for culture in the form of sacrifices to defend his culture. The sense of primordialism is the propriety of the speaker as a cultural agent. The speaker uses the question "why" to require serious thought in giving the right answer that to the question posed by the speaker, not in the form of a short answer or giving an answer in the agreement code.

The realization of language politeness conveyed does not reduce the sense of firmness in speaking in the form of metaphorical speech, a subtle criticism that does not bring down the dignity of the interlocutor. Humans in the creation of God as perfect beings are expected to be the caliphs on earth. The analogy of blood and heart as vital human organs that have an important role in human life indicates the extent to which Minangkabau society contributes to the existence of the Minangkabau culture.

Data 11

Nan partamo, tujuan hiduik, motivasi jo nawaitu. Dari mano datangnyo awak, sadang di ma kito kini, kamano arah ka dituju? Batanyo ka diri, untuak apo waang ko iduik? Ka manga datang ka dunia-ko? Kok indak tau jawabannyo, Tuhan manolong manjawabkan. "Wama akhlaktul jinni wal insa illa liyak buduni". Tidaklah aku jadikan jin dan manusia kato Allah, kecuali untuak mengabdikan kepada-Ku saja. Untuak itu Rasulullah pun batitah, iduiklah sasuko hati, tapi ingek salamo iduik musti ka mati, karajokan apo nan taragak, tapi ingek satiok karajo akan ditanyo, cintoilah apo nan dihati, tapi ingek satiok pertemuan ado perpisahan, itu nan partamo.

The speaker gives several forms of wh-question to encourage the interlocutors to think about these questions. The question also has the implicit meaning of self-awareness of a human's role as a leader on the earth. The speaker gives multiple questions that assume an urgency that it is not enough to jolt a person's consciousness with just one statement or question because the statement does not give the impression of affirmation. There is an impression of criticism of today's conditions which is seen by the speaker that it does not involve the role of religion in life.

The question asked does not require a short answer, but it requires an argument that is contested and invites agreement on something absolute truth. The speaker applies Minangkabau cultural values that are attached to the concept of Islam so that the speaker strives for every speech to contain religious values.

Data 12

Nah dek anak baradiak kakak, nan adiak sadang di TK nan kakak nyato SMA diagiah jajan samo banyak dibari saribu surang, mako kejamlah waang ke nan gadang, indak sampai samanguak bakso. Lobo namonyo ke nan ketek, jajan pemen tigo ratuih, minum mambaok dari rumah. A... baa makonyo adil, dimaa talatak kajujuran? Agiah nan ketek limo ratuih bari nan gadang tigo ribu, itu baru nyo sadang elok.(to explain)

The speaker poses a rhetorical question in the middle of his statement to explain a concept, namely justice. The justice that the speaker wants to describe is not a balanced portion with the same weight, but the concept of justice is carried out according to the level of one's needs by providing examples to make it easier for the speech partner to understand what the

speaker wants to convey. Comparison in an example is also a realization of the speaker's language politeness which does not give the impression of judging someone. The speaker uses one question in his statement because the illustration is enough to strengthen the understanding of the listeners. However, it needs to be thought of as material for contemplation, not in the form of a short answer.

Conclusion

Some considerations of using rhetorical question function to win the heart and attention of the interlocutors allowing different arguments among the participants to strengthen their statements, to accept or reject an opinion. The rhetorical question is also a speaker's trick in mitigating the threats faced by the interlocutor. The rhetorical question functions as a barrier to the firmness of the conclusion of the propositional content of the speech because the rhetorical question can be an utterance in the form of criticism, an order by persuasion leading to adjustment or agreement in a statement, and the firmness of a provision that exists in the speaker's principle. The rhetorical question asked by the Minangkabau traditional leader requires sharp thinking in analyzing it because it is not a question that merely requires a short yes or no answer, and it is not an answer in the form of an inverse pattern, the positive question with a negative answer or vice versa, or negative question which are answered with a positive pattern. The uniqueness of the pattern of retrieval questions asked by the Minangkabau leader as a speaker is that it provides multiple questions from a rhetorical question which indicates that the speaker involves the seriousness of the speech partner towards understanding his speech.

The rhetorical question stimulates the listeners' insight into the information that the speaker wants to convey and emphasizes. The message to be conveyed is simple, and it is not easy for the speaker to intervene or address something to the subject and evaluate the information objectively. This question requires background knowledge and insight from the speaker and there is an emotional involvement of the speaker in the tone. This shows that the speaker is not only conveying something that gives a theoretical and patronizing impression but also invites the interlocutor as inclusiveness to understand his intentions and goals. The speaker gives a hidden message of a high sense of primordialism to the Minangkabau culture because of his role as a

connecting agent for cultural transformation for his generation and has a religious personality because the foundations of the Minangkabau customs are in line with Islamic concepts and values. The speaker's pride is a manifestation of his concern about the phenomenon of globalization and the influence of modernization so that the values of local wisdom have begun to decline and even be forgotten by the Minangkabau generation. The Minangkabau traditional leader knocked back the awareness of the generation to return to national identity, but the speaker realized that it was not easy to invite something that had been influenced by the currents of cultural assimilation which became a human need in this era. Therefore, the speaker persuasively invites to re-engraving history in the gold ink of the Minangkabau culture to foster a sense of pride and love for Minangkabau culture itself. The pattern of questions that are only in the form of short answers does not involve the seriousness and concentration of the speech partner to understand the contents of the speaker's proportion or only to provide answers of agreeing or disagreeing.

References

1. Abioye, T. (2007). Resourcefulness of Rhetorical Questions in Ehusani's "A New Year Prayer for Peace." *Ibadan Journal of English Studies*, 4, 296-309.
2. Abioye, T. (2009). Typology of rhetorical questions as a stylistic device in writing. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture*, 1-8.
3. Abioye, T. (2011). Preference for rhetorical questions as an index of textual message effectiveness. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(11), 290-299.
4. Ahmad, N. (2021). Presidential rhetoric in the COVID-19 pandemic era: Jokowi's Aristotelian rhetorical leadership models before and after implementation of semi-lock down policy. *Jurnal Komunikasi Ikatan Sarjana Komunikasi Indonesia*, 6(1), 72-85.
5. Ahmed et al (2022): Rhetorical Tropes of Nationhood in Nigeria's Presidential Campaign Speeches, in
6. Al-Jumaily, A. A., & Al-Azzawi, J. N. (2009). Identification, description and interpretation of English rhetorical questions

- in political speeches. *Ahl Al-Bait Journal*, 1(9). 40-62.
7. Aprilia, D, & Safiera, S, (2020). The Cultural Relativism (A Pattern of Symbolic Discourse or Language). *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*. 11(4). 910-915.
<https://tojqi.net/index.php/journal/article/view/8201>
 8. Baldick, Chris (2004). *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Literary Terms*, New York: Oxford University
 9. Basra, S., & Thoyyibah, L. (2017). A speech act analysis of teacher talk in an EFL classroom. *International Journal of Education*, 10(1), 73-81.
 10. Garba, S. (2022). Pragma-Stylistic Analysis of Rhetorical Questions in some Selected Poems of Akilu Aliyu. *International Journal of Arts, Languages, Linguistics and Literary Studies*, 11(2).
 11. Hauk, E., & Mueller, H. (2015). Cultural leaders and the clash of civilizations. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 59(3), 367-400.
 12. Haverkate, H. (1990). A speech act analysis of irony. *Journal of pragmatics*, 14(1), 77-109.
 13. Humanities, Imo State University. <https://jolls.com.ng/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/52-62.pdf>
 14. Kurzon, D. (1998). The speech act status of incitement: Perlocutionary acts revisited. *Journal of pragmatics*, 29(5), 571-596.
 15. Lane, B. A. (1992). Cultural leaders in effective schools: The builders and brokers of excellence. *NASSP Bulletin*, 76(541), 85-90.
 16. Louis, K. S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2011). Principals as cultural leaders. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(5), 52-56.
 17. Miring'u, P. W. (2020). *The Persuasive Devices in William Ruto's Political Speeches a Relevance Theoretic Approach* (Doctoral dissertation).
 18. Mulyani, R, Barus, A (2018). Local Wisdom of Merisik in Melayu Langkat Society : Oral Tradition Study. *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology (IJCIET)*. 9(11), 2714–2720.
<http://iaeme.com/Home/issue/IJCIET?Volume=9&Issue=11>
 19. Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1990). The learning of complex speech act behaviour. *TESL Canada journal*, 45-65.
 20. Owolabi, D. (2012). Rhyme, rhythm and rhetoric in religious discourse in Nigeria's ESL environment. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(5), 1.
 21. Perrault, C. R. (1980). A plan-based analysis of indirect speech act. *American Journal of Computational Linguistics*, 6(3-4), 167-182.
 22. Prummer, A. (2019). Religious and cultural leaders. *Advances in the Economics of Religion*, 103-117.
 23. Putri, N.I, Fransisca, M, (2020). Linguistic Relativism in Accounting. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*. 11(4). 928-934.
<https://tojqi.net/index.php/journal/article/view/8204>
 24. QUIRK Randolph 1985. *The English Language in a Global Context*. In R Quirk and H G Widdowson eds. 1985. pp 1-6.
 25. QUIRK Randolph 1988. *The Question of Standards in the International Use of English*. In Peter Lowenberg ed 1988. pp 229-241.
 26. QUIRK, Randolph 1989. *Language Varieties and Standard Language*. *JALT Journal* 11.1. 14-25.
 27. Searle, J. R., Kiefer, F., & Bierwisch, M. (Eds.). (1980). *Speech act theory and pragmatics* (Vol. 10). Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
 28. Tariq, M. (2018). Style, stylistics and stylistic analysis: A re-evaluation of the modern-day rhetorics of literary discourse. *International Journal of English Research*, 4(2), 46-50.
 29. Verdier, T., & Zenou, Y. (2015). The role of cultural leaders in the transmission of preferences. *Economics Letters*, 136, 158-161.

-
30. Yankah, K. (1994). Rhetoric: Anthropological Perspectives. The encyclopedia of language and linguistics, 3, 3568-3571.