



An Analysis of Speech Acts Performed by Ten Characters in The Last Supper Movie

Uli Arta Pangaribuan^{1*}, I Wayan Swandana², Dewa Putu Ramendra³

Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Bali, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: uliarta0607@gmail.com

Received: 05/06/2026 Revised: 03/07/2026 Accepted: 05/08/2026

ABSTRACT

Purpose – This study examines the forms and functions of speech acts performed by ten characters in The Last Supper movie.

Methodology – This research employed a descriptive qualitative method to systematically describe and interpret meanings within the data. The subjects were ten characters: Jesus, Judas, Caiaphas, Peter, John the Apostle, Caiaphas' Servant, a Roman Soldier, Mark, Rachel, and the devil. The researcher served as the main instrument, supported by the movie subtitle script, devices, and data sheets. Data were collected through observation and documentation, analyzed using content analysis, and validated through source and technique triangulation.

Findings – Declarative utterance forms were predominantly used to make statements, express opinions, present arguments, deliver judgments, represent public opinion, emphasize authority, defend personal perspectives, and influence others' decisions. Representative acts were the most dominant illocutionary acts, while declarative acts occurred least frequently.

Novelty – This study offers originality by analyzing a movie that has not been examined by previous researchers.

Significance – The findings benefit future pragmatics researchers, society, and educational institutions. They may also help teachers become more aware of strategies conveyed through utterances and use language effectively to enhance students' motivation in learning English, particularly in classroom communication and instructional contexts.

Keywords: Austin and searle's theory; Last supper movie; Pragmatic; Speech acts

How to cite: Pangaribuan, U.A., Swandana, I.W., and Ramendra, D.P. (2026). An Analysis Of Speech Acts Performed By Ten Characters in The Last Supper Movie. *Journal of Literature Language and Academic Studies*, 05(3), pp, 117-130, doi: <https://doi.org/10.56855/j-llans.v5i3.2351>



This is an open-access article under the [CC BY](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license

1. Introduction

Language is a human instrument of communication. Language comprehension can be viewed as important in communication because communication is a key skill in almost every aspect right now. Language can be considered successful when both participants achieve their purpose of communication. Kalra & Danis (2024), stated that language becoming so crucial because the role and function of language are closely connected with linguistics. The speaker plays a big role; they are trying to make the listener understand clearly (Budasi & Suadnyani, 2021). Moreover, the listener's inferences are also needed to achieve the goal of communication. Rees et al., (2026), argued that rational reasoning can help the listener's inferences. One way to connect their inference is by giving all necessary information stated by an utterance. In this case, a rational speaker's utterance should be as relevant, informative, and simple as possible. The information also should be well understood to avoid communication errors (Santosa & Tantra, 2021; Rismayani, 2022). This argument also supported by Bergey & Yurovsky (2022), who believed that all of the decisions conveyed through the speaker's utterance should be appropriate and not redundant and overload, so it can help the listener's comprehension as a signal that allows them to make a constative/reasonable inference as a reflection for the speaker. In short, all of those aspects are needed in the conversation for both participants, the listener and the speaker. In short, the conversation between the speaker and the listener is the act of transferring necessary information.

People use language through utterances in communication to express their thoughts and feelings in a verbal way. Spoken language, in which the utterances are uttered by the speaker themselves, not from writing or the sign form Putra & Suarnajaya (2020). Communication through spoken language and face-to-face interactions allows the listener to understand the speaker's utterance more deeply than written form (Suryana & Agus Permana, 2025). Pragmatic and linguistic aspects could not be separated (Lubis et al., 2025). If pragmatic cues cannot be fully understood by the speaker and the listener, that makes communication fail, and the purpose of the communication cannot be achieved. Moreover, both participants have to consider the mind reasoning/cognitive mechanism that enables pragmatic competence in daily communication (Kosinski, 2024; Chen et al., 2024). Pragmatic competence covered about five aspects: meaning disambiguation, complete meaning transfer, differentiating utterance meaning from what the speaker says, how the hearer interpret utterance, and figuring out why people communicate (Yu et al., 2026; Raditiyanto et al., 2026). Pragmatic competence becomes crucial for ensuring the communication is not only linguistically correct but also contextually appropriate and understood by both participants in the interaction (Tantra & Ramendra, 2020).

One of the pragmatic studies is speech acts. Speech acts have many functions in our social life. In the linguistic study, speech acts can be observed through the speaker's utterance whether its functions to express their idea, command other, and respond to others. Speech acts are one study that belongs to intellectual activities that require the human brain to process language and the things that speakers function of utterance simultaneously, the activity such as questioning, commanding, forming beliefs, making a declaration, etc (Weston et al., 2024).

Hence, the speaker/the interlocutors need to understand pragmatics, especially speech acts so their utterance can function communicatively (Zhenguang G., 2022). The study of speech acts helps the speakers use language appropriately in communication. (Swandana et al., 2026; Merdeka, 2023) argued that the purpose of speaker utterances is not only about transferring information, but the speaker also provide/ give knowledge that contributes to the enhancement of the listener's cognitive process. Based on (Austin, 1962) framework, there

are three level of speech acts, locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts. These three level work together in daily communication. The form of speech acts (locutionary acts) are divided into four form (Austin, 1962) includes declarative, imperative, interrogative and exclamation form. According to Yule (1996) locutionary acts focuses on the explicit way, such as delivering information, stating a fact, expressing surprise through exclamation form by the speaker. In addition, Villalba (2025), argued that exclamations form reflect the speaker's expectation when a situation differs from what is normally expected so this form combine three basic form such as declaratives, interrogatives, and imperatives with adding the intensity for an emotive predicate. Next, it is illocutionary acts that focus on the functions of the speech acts like representative, directive, expressive, commissive, and declarative (Searle, 1979). The illocutionary acts focuses on what the speaker is trying to accomplish with their utterance rather than the literal meaning of the words they use (Anisa et al., 2025). And the last one is perlocutionary acts, this type carried out the effect of speech acts, such as the response from the listener, in which the speaker can recognized through the facial expression from the listeners (Saputra et al., 2026).

However, there are still a lot of misunderstanding and misinterpretation in our society because of communication gap. The first phenomenon is from the speaker's side. The speaker are not aware of the functions of their utterance; their capability in uttered/conveyed the appropriate utterance in their brain still limited/ lack of pragmatic competence (Yu et al., 2026). The second problem from the speaker, they do not understand what they are saying, or they may have multiple meanings for what they are thinking (Sari, 2025). The second phenomenon is from the listener's side, in which they faced ambiguous utterance. This problem appeared because of two things consideration: the difficult word/sentences stated by the speaker and the listener has poor language comprehension in processing the utterance produced by the speaker (Felser, 2026; Patria, 2023). In short, all of that case, was appeared when the speaker's stated something through their own speech acts. The consequence of poor language comprehension from the listener would leads to different act because their perspective was still limited.

In many cases, the function of speech act looks similar (Handayani & Arfani, 2026); in addition the speaker have to understand about the context of utterance so it can achieved by the listener's inference, like the writer already said previously, is needed in the speech act study. Based on the brief observation from the writer, those problems are not only found in real life, but also found in movies. As a medium of entertainment, a movie consists of many dialogues about human experience and activities. The dialogue occurs between its characters that can be analysed using the speech act theory. The utterances from the movie can be useful as an object of the study to identify and analyse the form of locutionary acts, and the function of illocutionary acts. Moreover, movies help the writer to think critically after being served in many situations. It is worth analysing more and more regarding the language use of speech acts, such as in the conversation in a particular movie. Furthermore, the Last Supper movie has not been analysed by previous researchers, making this study a novel contribution to the existing body of research. The previous study had analyzed speech acts in movies using Searle's speech act theory. Khodijah et al., (2025) found the dominant form was imperative form and representative acts was the most dominant act in the Gorge Movie, while Diffani & Kholis (2023) only analyzed the function of speech acts, they found expressive acts was the most dominant type in Turning Red movie. Other studies focused on specific speech act types, such as directive (Trihanto, 2022), commissive (Devi & Degaf, 2021), and representative (Izar et al., 2020). However, the previous studies mainly focused on the functions of speech acts and limited characters. In addition, this study filled the gap by

examined the forms of speech acts (locutionary acts) using (Austin, 1962) theory and also the functions of speech acts (illocutionary acts) using (Searle, 1979) theory to provide a more comprehensive analysis of the pragmatic study. This present research is important to conduct in order to confirm that the study of speech acts is urgent, so that the gap can be filled. It seeks to examine the forms of speech acts and the functions of speech acts performed by ten characters in the movie. This makes the research highly relevant. The writer analysed the utterance that appeared in the movie entitled “The Last Supper Movie” directed by Mauro Borelli, which was released in 2025.

2. Methods

In this research, the writer used a descriptive qualitative method. This study practiced a qualitative descriptive approach because it aimed to describe the data obtained. Descriptive qualitative research was an approach that aimed to systematically and objectively describe data with an emphasis on interpreted the meanings contained within the data. In this approach, the researcher not only described the data but also interpreted its deeper meaning within the context in which they occurred, allowed the findings to provide a deeper understanding of the phenomenon, particularly in linguistic studies. In addition, the writer compared the most dominant and the least frequent occurrences to provided a more comprehensive and analytical interpretation of the study of speech acts.

3. Findings and Discussion

3.1. Findings

3.1.1. Form of Speech Acts

Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage of the four speech act forms identified in the utterances of the ten characters in The Last Supper movie based on Austin’s (1962) framework.

Form of Speech Acts	Frequency	Precentages
Declarative Form	214	55 %
Imperative Form	81	20 %
Interrogative Form	76	19 %
Exclamation Form	23	6 %
Total	394	100 %

From the table above, there are 394 data found in which they were divided into four form of speech act based on theory of (Austin, 1962). From the data above, it was found that the most dominant form of speech acts identified in the Last Supper movie was the declarative form, with a total of 214 utterances. This finding indicated that declarative form of utterance were predominantly used by ten characters to make statements, express opinions, present arguments, and deliver judgements. In additions, these utterances were used to represent public opinion and emphasize authority. Moreover, the declarative forms were uttered by the character to defend personal point of view/ perspective, and influence the decision of others. The frequent use of declarative forms also reflected the intense conflicts, disagreements, and opposing perspectives among the characters throughout the movie. While exclamatory form was identified as the least frequently occurring form in The Last Supper movie. This form was used to express the character’s spontaneous emotional responses to various situations. Exclamatory utterances were produced during highly emotional scenes, especially those leading to Jesus’ crucifixion, when intense anger, shock, fear, and frustration were uttered by the characters. In short, the feelings of the people, especially Caiaphas, were conveyed

through exclamatory utterances. The limited use of the exclamatory utterance indicated that emotional expressions appeared only in specific situations requiring an intense response.

3.1.1.1 **Declarative Form**

Data 1

JA/Ut111/00:23:46

John the Apostle: *"Master choose this man, Peter"*.

The context theory from (Yule, 1996), Peter did not believe that the person had been chosen by his master; therefore, John provided him with clear information. Based on the structural form, this utterance was categorized as a declarative form because it was used to inform a listener or hearer about something. This utterance followed the pattern Subject + verb + object. In this pattern "Master" functioned as the subject, "choose" functioned as the verb and the last one "this man" functioned as the object of the utterance.

Master chooses (this man)

(S) (V) (O)

Data 2

J/Ut64/00:17:46

Jesus: *"This is a place of worship"*.

The context theory from (Yule, 1996), that Jesus inform the hearer about the functions of that place. The form of the utterance performed by Jesus would like to inform the hearer. This aligns with the form of utterance of declarative form. This utterance has a pattern subject + linking verb + complement. Where "This" as the subject, "is" as the linking verb, "a place of worship" as the subject complement. In short, declarative sentences were generally used to give information or make statements.

This is (a place of worship)

(S) (Linking Verb) (Subject Complement)

3.1.1.2 **Imperative Form**

Data 1

D/Ut210/00:44:55

Devil: *"Save yourself, Judas, before it is too late."*

The context from (Yule, 1996), Judas was instructed by the devil to run away from the last meeting with the other disciples. Based on the structural form, this utterance was produced in the form of an imperative form because it followed the pattern: main verb + reflective object + vocative + adverbial clause of time. The word "save" functions as the main verb in the imperative sentence, while "yourself" functions as the reflective object of the verb. The noun "Judas" serves as a vocative, identifying the person being addressed rather than functioning as the subject. The phrase "before it is too late" functions as an adverbial clause of time limit within which the action should be performed.

Save yourself, Judas, before it is too late

(Main verb) (Reflective Object) (Vocative) (Adverbial Clause of time)

Data 2

RS/Ut61/00:17:21

Roman Soldier: *"Stop, No, You have no authority"*

The context theory from (Yule, 1996), that Roman Soldier saw Jesus made a chaos in the marketplace, so the Roman soldier gave a command to Jesus to stop his activity. In this situation, the utterances belong to imperative form because the Roman Soldier wants to stop the hearer from destroyed the marketplace. Based on its structural form, the utterance was

categorized as an imperative form because it had a pattern: “stop no” stand as imperative verb, “you” as a subject and “have no authority” as the subject complement”.

Stop, No,	You	(have no authority)
Imperative part	S	complement

3.1.1.3 Interrogative Form

Data 1

J/Ut63/00:17:37

Jesus: “*Do you think God is Blind?*”

The context theory from (Yule, 1996), Jesus whereas, the people had turned the house of prayer into a market in Jerusalem. The question was functioned to warn the people about the original function of that place. Based on the structural form, this utterance was categorized as an interrogative form because it followed the pattern “auxiliary + subject + verb + object + a sign of question (?)”. Where “do” as auxiliary, “you” as subject, “think” as the verb, “God is blind” as the object and “?” as the sign of question.

Do	you	think	(God is Blind)	?
(Aux)	(S)	(V)	(O)	(A question sign)

Data 2

P/Ut261/00:59:23

Peter: “*To whom do you speak, Judas?*”

The context theory from (Yule, 1996), Peter asked to whom Judas was speaking. In this context, Peter saw Judas talking to someone, even though there is no one else in the room. From those utterances, Peter asked this question to clarify the situation. Based on structural form, this utterance was categorized as an interrogative form because of it has a pattern object + auxiliary + subject + verb + ?. Where “to whom” was the object, “do” was an auxiliary verb”, “speak” is a verb, and (?) was the sign of the question

(To whom)	do	you	speak	Judas	?
(O)	(Aux)	(S)	(V)		(A Question sign)

3.1.1.4 Declarative Form

Data 1

C/360/01:29:44

Caiaphas: “*What a blasphemy!!!!*”

The context theory from(Yule, 1996), Caiaphas expresses a strong emotion to the soldiers to carry out the crucifixion of him. In this situation, the utterance presented an exclamation utterance because it was spontaneously produced by the Roman Governor, reflecting their anger and the serious consequences for him. Based on its structural form, the utterance is categorized as an exclamation form because it has a pattern 5W1H (What) + article a + noun + exclamation sign (!). Where “what” is the exclamatory determiner, “a” as an indefinite article, “blasphemy” is the noun, and a sign of spontaneous anger by (!).

What	a	blasphemy	(!)
(Exclamatory determiner)	(article)	(N)	(Exclamatory sign)

Data 2

J/Ut66/00:18:02

Jesus: “*How disrespectful you are to my father’s house !!!!!*”

The context theory from (Yule, 1996), Jesus was angry because he saw his father’s house change into the marketplace that makes his angry in full action. The utterance presented an exclamation utterance because it was spontaneously anger produced by Jesus in the marketplace. Based on its structural form, the utterance is categorized as an

exclamation form because it has a pattern 5W1H (How) + adjective + subject + verb + exclamation sign (!). Where “how” is the exclamatory determiner, “disrespectful” is the adjective, “you” as the subject, “are” as the verb, “to my father’s house” as the prepositional phrase and “(!)” as the sign of spontaneous anger.

How disrespectful you are (to my father’s house) !!!!
 (Exclamatory determiner) (a) (S) (V) (prepositional phrase) (exclamatory sign).

3.1.2. *Functions of Speech Acts*

Table 2 shows the frequency and percentage of the five speech act functions identified in the movie based on Searle’s (1979) classification of illocutionary acts.

Functions of Speech Acts	Frequency	Percentages
Representative Acts	160	40 %
Directive Acts	149	38 %
Expressive Acts	33	8 %
Commissive Acts	25	6 %
Declarative Acts	27	7 %
Total	394	100 %

From the table above shows 394 utterances produced by ten characters in the movie entitled Last Supper by Mauro Borelli were classified based on (Searle, 1979) theory of speech acts. Based on the data and chart above, the representative act was identified as the most dominant type of illocutionary act, while the declarative acts was the least type occurred in the Last Supper movie.

The dominance of representative acts indicated that the utterance produced by the ten characters used to express opinions, conveys their beliefs, communicate presuppositions that were regarded as true, and present various arguments from different points of view among characters. Through those utterances, resulting in the high frequency of representative acts in the movie. Meanwhile, declarative acts occurred in only a limited number of utterances because they could only be performed by characters who possessed institutional/ formal occasion that appeared in the Last scene of the Last Supper movie. In the movie, declarative acts were mainly produced during official judgements, particularly when Jesus was carried to death by crucifixion after he had been regarded as a threat to the religious and social order.

3.1.2.1. *Representative Act*

Data 1 (Stating)

Jl/Ut286/01:08:16

Judas Iscariot: *“Something easy for you to understand, money.”*

Based on those utterances, the speaker performed an utterance that belonged to a representative act. The writer can indicate that from the utterance “something easy for you”, which meant the speaker already knows the perspective of the hearer, especially for humans, which is “money”. Those utterances were one example of representative acts that were based on the speaker’s belief and presupposition (Vanderveken, 1990). In this case, Peter believed the hearer understood what the speaker needed in the negotiation. Peter’s presupposition was that humans always used money as a transaction during negotiations.

Data 2 (Predicting)

J/Ut274/01:06:18

Jesus: *“Truly I said to you tonight before the rooster crows, you, yourself will demand me three times.”*

Based on (Yule, 1996) theory, the context of the utterance was analysed as follows. A prediction about a future event was expressed by the speaker. The speaker conveyed his presupposition because it was strongly believed that the hearer would deny him three times before the rooster crowed. Through this utterance, the speaker's belief and warning regarding the hearer's future action were conveyed. Therefore, the utterance was categorized as a representative act with the function of predicting, as it expressed by the speaker's belief about an event that had not yet occurred.

3.1.2.2. Directive Act

Data 1 (Commanding)

C/Ut360/01:29:44

C: "*Crucify him now*"

Based on those utterances, the speaker performed an utterance that belonged to directive types. The writer indicated that from the utterance "crucify....now", the word "now" highlighted the speaker wanted the hearer to perform an action immediately after being commanded. The speaker had the authority to command the hearer in this case. Those utterances were one example of directive types for directing someone/to get the hearer perform an action immediately (Dewi & Jannah, 2022). From those utterance, the speaker urged the hearer to take immediate action due to the urgency of the situation.

Data 2 (Entreating)

P/Ut319/01:15:34

Peter: "Master, we ask for your forgiveness."

Based on Yule (1996) theory, the context of the utterance was analysed as follows. The participants involved in the conversation were Peter and the other disciples. During the previous event, the disciples had failed to keep watch throughout the night because they had fallen asleep and forgot about the instruction previously given by their master. In short, forgiveness was sought from their Master through the utterance, "We ask for your forgiveness.". Therefore, the utterance was categorized as a directive act with the function of entreating because forgiveness was requested from a person with higher position (Fraser, 1998). Compared with begging, entreating was characterized by a higher level of politeness.

3.1.2.3. Expressive Act

Data 1 (Deploring)

P/ Ut.366/01:34:48

Peter: "*I failed you, my brother. I failed myself.*"

Based on the context of Yule (1996) theory, the analysis was presented as follows: The participants during the conversation were Peter, who was looking at Judas, who had already died after hanging himself with a rope that he tied himself. The setting of the place was a corner of Jerusalem. The goal of the conversation was that the speaker, namely Peter, was deploring because he had failed as a loyal disciple and a good brother to Judas. Based on the context, the function of the speaker's utterance was to express his strong regret of losing his friend and losing his teacher. This was indicated by his words "I failed you" and "failed myself" that express a strong regret. (Paramartha & Chandra, 2024) argued this act was conveyed a strong regret toward a situation.

Data 2 (Complimenting)

C/Ut302/01:11:48

Caiaphas: "*How well you have done your job as a good traitor, Judas*"

Based on the context of Yule (1996) theory, the analysis was presented as follows: The participants during the conversation involve Caiaphas and Judas. The setting was in Caiaphas house. The goal of the conversation was to give a compliment to Judas because Judas finally

gave the information about his teacher's location to Caiaphas. The function of utterance was to compliment Judas. The compliment was given as praise for their action or performance. In this context, Caiaphas successfully showed a compliment, in which as an expression of admiration for something they feel, and responded to Judas' information (Tursunovich, 2022).

3.1.2.4. Commissive Act

Data 1 (committing)

P/Ut280/01:06:20

Peter: *"I will not leave you, I will not assault you."*

Based on the context of Yule (1996) theory, the analysis was presented as follows: The participants during the conversation include Peter, Jesus, and the disciples. The setting of this conversation was set in Mark's house. The functions of the utterance was as an committing act. Peter stated something that committed himself to a future action. By saying "I will," he expressed the action that would be performed in the future. This indicated that the utterances presented a commissive act, in which the speaker committed himself to carrying out the action in the future (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985). This was related to the speaker's commitment to a future action. In short, this utterance represented commissive act.

Data 2 (Threatening)

C/Ut80/00:19:45

Caiaphas: *"Are you prepare for the highest pay for him?"*

Based on the context of Yule (1996) theory, the analysis was presented as follows: The participants during the conversation include Caiaphas and Judas. The setting of the place was set in Judas' house. The goal of the conversation was to threaten Judas so that he would be more careful about his future's action. The function of the speaker's utterance was identified as a threatening act directed toward the listener, with the intention of making him feel guilty and persuading him to change the situation after being threatened (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985). The threatening act was indicated by the utterance "are you prepare?" which meant the speaker wanted the hearer to think twice before made a decision.

3.1.2.5. Declarative Act

Data 1 (Declaring)

C/Ut354/01:28:49

Caiaphas: *"The verdict is he must die"*

Based on those utterances, the speaker performed an utterance that belonged to the declarative act. The writer indicated that from the utterance "the verdict", those word only used by someone who had high authority in one place. The position of Caiaphas of that region was the highest among all of them, that made those utterance performed functionally as a declared statement. In this case, the speaker uttered those utterances as official information that immediately changed the situation of the suspect, and no one could disturb the verdict. Those utterance also were also used only in formal places and occasions. Those utterance were examples of declarative acts to declared the statement and changed a person's situation immediately through someone who had high authority (Putra et al., 2021).

Data 2 (Appointing)

J/Ut386/01:43:37

Jesus: *"Peter, I hereby appoint you as a fisher of humans in this world."*

Based on the context of Yule (1996) theory, the analysis was presented as follows: the participants during the conversation were Jesus and Peter, with the setting of the place in the shore of Galilee. The goal of the conversation was to appoint Peter as a Leader of Christian followers in this world. The function of the utterance to perform an appointing act as one functions from a declarative act. This was indicated by the utterance "I hereby appoint you", from this utterance, the appointing act was clearly highlighted by the speaker. From those

utterance, an appointing act was performed as declarative act. It was used to made something official through the speaker's statement and to appointed Peter, based on careful consideration, to assume the responsibility (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985; Yunus et al., 2024).

3.2. Discussions

The discussion of this research showed that the theories of speech acts from Austin (1962) and (Searle, 1979) were relevant and appropriate to answer the research questions of the research. Based on the findings, the writer found that the form and the functions of speech acts, appeared clearly in the movie and could be analysed effectively through the theories used in this study. The first one was the form of speech acts, The finding from the writer could strongly support the (Austin, 1962) theory during the research process. The analysis showed that the utterances produced by the characters in the Last Supper movie can be clearly classified based on Austin's theory. In previous studies by Khodijah et al., (2025), the researchers had already discussed locution. However, from their studies, the writer found that there are some differences in the dominant form of utterances from the research between the writer's findings and (Khodijah et al., 2025; Septiaji et al., 2025) findings. In their findings, the dominant form of locutionary act was located in the imperative form; in the present study, the most dominant form was located in the declarative form. The previous study found imperative form dominant because the numerous instruction, and commands were delivered by main characters. Their finding was depicted a role of Levi, which was reflecting a leader and soldier, that took so many responsibilities in the movie. In the present study, the most dominant form was the declarative form from ten characters in the Last Supper movie to give clarification and expressed different points of view that represented their own beliefs.

Throughout the Last Supper movie, several conflicts and disagreements were depicted, causing declarative form of utterance to be conveyed more frequently rather than other forms. Additional tension was showed by the disclosure information by Judas, through which Jesus were revealed to the Caiaphas, leading to his dead. Moreover, a major conflict among the twelve disciples was created by Judas and was added by the denial of Jesus by Peter. The confrontations between Jesus and Caiaphas were also depicted. In short, the dominance of declarative form was considered to reflect selfishness, clarifications, sorrow, and dramatic conflicts conveyed through the declarative form of utterances. The second one was the functions of speech acts. The findings from the writer also highly support Searle's theory (1979) about the functions of speech acts study. The result indicated representative act became the most dominant type with 160 data, the theory from Searle was considered suitable for this research clear in analysis of classifying the utterance. The findings was not significantly different from the previous studies from Khodijah et al., (2025). However, this research could give a contribution for the future research because there was still a gap. In the previous studies, the researcher did not find any declarative acts data, the reason behind it because as a soldier, their job was the execution of orders by higher authorities, such as following instructions and ensuring that commands were emphasized through the movie. In the present study, the writer found declarative acts data that showed higher authority; the declarative acts from the Last Supper movie were conveyed by Jesus and Caiaphas. Declarative acts were able to be performed because the institutional authority was held by Caiaphas, who occupied the highest position in Jerusalem. Caiaphas could give verdict to crucify Jesus, and the decision could not be opposed by those under his authority. On the other hand, spiritual of Christian authority was held by Jesus. Therefore, only these who leader depicted as possessing the authority to made an official decision throughout The Last Supper movie.

4. Conclusions

This study investigated the speech acts study of 394 utterances spoken by ten characters in the Last Supper Movie, classified by the forms of speech acts and the functions of speech

acts. The analysis highlights two core findings central to understanding ten characters communication style and character; first, Declarative forms with a total of 214 utterances, reflected the intense conflicts, disagreements, and opposing perspectives among the characters throughout the movie. In contrast, the exclamatory form was identified as the least frequently occurring form in The Last Supper movie. This form was used to express the character's spontaneous emotional responses to various situations. Exclamatory utterances reflecting the intense anger, shock, fear, and frustration were uttered by the characters especially in the emotional scenes; in which in the scene crucifixion of Jesus. Regarding the functions of speech acts, the dominant act was representative acts with a total 160 utterances, demonstrating several arguments, different point of view, and defending their own beliefs, arguing, and intense conflict. The last one is declarative acts, reflected official judgements, particularly when Jesus was carried to death by crucifixion after he had been regarded as a threat to the religious and social order.

In short, the value of this analysis lies on application of speech act theory that reflected the pragmatic communication of each characters, beliefs, and arguments. This study proved how linguistic forms and its function of utterance to the interaction among characters in the Last Supper movie. Further studies were encouraged to extend the present research by investigating speech acts in an educational setting, particularly an analysis of speech acts produced by English teachers during classroom management. Such investigations were expected to provide deeper insights into how speech acts were employed to explain the learning material, give instructions, ask questions, give feedback, and facilitate students' learning. In addition, future research was encouraged to be strengthened through the use of different perspectives, broader analytical approaches, and more diverse data sources, thereby expanding the understanding of speech acts in the school area.

Acknowledgements

This research presents the lessons, struggles and achievements I encountered during the process of completing my study. However, this research was also the result of support, guidance, and encouragement from many remarkable beloved people whom I sincerely wish to acknowledge. First and foremost, the writer wish to thank the advisors, Dr. I Wayan Swandana and Dr. Dewa Putu Ramendra, for their continuous support, guidance, patience, and encouragement throughout the process of completing this research. They have supported me academically and emotionally through the difficult journey of finishing this research. In addition, the sincere gratitude from the writer also goes to Prof. I Gede Budasi and Ms. Adnania Nugra Heni for their valuable suggestions, inspiration and support during completing this research. Their guidance and knowledge have truly inspired me in many ways.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- Anisa, S. K., Lailiyah, N., & Sujarwoko, S. (2025). Forms and Functions of Illocutionary Acts in the Indonesian Presidential Candidate Debate 2024. *Journal of Educational Study*, 5(1), 70–88. <https://doi.org/10.36663/joes.v5i1.977>
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford University Press.
- Bergey, C., & Yurovsky, D. (2022). *Using Contrastive Inferences to Learn About New Words and Categories*. ELSEVIER. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2023.105597>
- Budasi, I., & Suadnyani, P. (2021). An Analysis of Directive Speech Act Produced by Teachers in EFL Classrooms. *Journal of English Language and Culture Versi Online*, 12(1), 36–45. <http://journal.ubm.ac.id/>

- Chen, Z., Wu, J., Zhou, J., Wen, B., Bi, G., Jiang, G., Cao, Y., Hu, M., Lai, Y., Xiong, Z., & Huang, M. (2024). T MBENCH: Benchmarking Theory of Mind in Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 1, 15959–15983. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.847>
- Devi, M. F., & Degaf, A. (2021). AN ANALYSIS OF COMMISSIVE SPEECH ACT USED BY THE MAIN CHARACTER OF “KNIVES OUT.” PARADIGM: *Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 4(1), 43–52. <https://doi.org/10.18860/prdg.v4i1.10932>
- Dewi, E., & Jannah, R. (2022). Illocutionary acts analysis of the main character in “brave” movie. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literacy*.
- Diffani, H., & Kholis, A. (2023). An Analysis of Speech Act in the Movie “Turning Red.” *Journal of Linguistics, Culture and Communication*, 01(02), 100–115. <https://jolcc.org/index.php/jolcc/index>
- Felser, C. (2026). How language production shapes language form and comprehension. *Journal of Historical Linguistics*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00226>
- Fraser, B. (1998). Threatening revisited. *International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law*, 159–173.
- Handayani, W., & Arfani, S. (2026). Prohibition Speech Acts and Politeness Strategies in LRT-English Train Signage: A Pragmatic Analysis. *ELIF: Jurnal UMJ.Ac.Id*. <https://doi.org/10.24853/elif.8.2.81-92>
- Izar, J., Muslim Nasution, M., & Ratnasari, M. (2020). Available online at. Lexeme : *Journal of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics*, 2(1). <http://openjournal.unpam.ac.id/index.php/LJLAL>
- Kalra, K., & Danis, W. (2024). Language and identity: The dynamics of linguistic clustering in multinational enterprises. *Journal of World Business*, 59(4). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2024.101541>
- Khodijah, F. U., Norahmi, M., Farid, R. N., Rahman, E., & Hayati, S. (2025). Levi Kane’s Utterances: Speech Acts in The Gorge Movie (2025). *Journal of English Language and Education*, 10(6), 202–211. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v10i6.1477>
- Kosinski, M. (2024). Evaluating large language models in theory of mind tasks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 121(45). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2405460121>
- Lubis Rodiatul, Siregar Deasy, Husni, Rizky, & Thomaroh. (2025). Pragmatics in Everyday Life: Understanding Unspoken Rules of Interaction. *Sintaksis: Publikasi Para Ahli Bahasa Dan Sastra Inggris*, 3(1), 199–211. <https://doi.org/10.61132/sintaksis.v3i1.1359>
- Merdeka, P. H. (2023). Representation of feminism in Disney Brave film. *Journal of Literature Language and Academic Studies*, 2(01), 10-14.
- Paramartha, S., & Chandra, K. (2024). An Analysis of Expressive Illocutionary Act Found in Night School Movie. *Elysian Journal: English Literature, Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 4.
- Patria, R. (2023). Educate Children's Character With Finding Nemo Film Media. *Journal of Literature Language and Academic Studies*, 2(01), 19-22.
- Putra, A., & Suarnajaya I. (2020). An Analysis of Speech Acts Used by the Seventh-Grade Teacher of SMPN 2 Bangli in EFL Classroom Interaction. *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation*, 4(1), 49–58. <https://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/JERE>
- Putra, J., Aditya, G., & Ramendra, D. P. (2021). Speech Act and Politeness Strategy Used by Pre-service Teacher in Online Learning in SMA LAB UNDIKSHA. *Yavana Bhasha: Journal of English Language Education*. UHN I Gusti Bagus Sugriwa Denpasar, 4(2).
- Raditiyanto, S., Amina, A., & Purwadi, P. (2026). “Beauty, Blood, and Boundaries: Interrogating Genre and Morality in ‘Haunting Adeline’ Novel written by H.D. Carlton Using Sigmund Freud’s Psychoanalytic Theory”. *Journal of Literature Language and*

- Academic Studies*, 5(2), 52-59. <https://doi.org/10.56855/jllans.v5i2.1869>
- Rees, A. , Reksnes, V. , & Rohde, H. (2026). Why are you telling me this? The availability and timing of relevance inferences. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 148.
- Rismayani, R. (2022). Item Analysis of Reading Comprehension Test of Wattpad Readers and Writers Community. *Journal of Literature Language and Academic Studies*, 1(01).
- Santosa, M., & Tantra, D. (2021). An Analysis of Speech Acts in the Student's Textbook at the Senior Vocational High School. *International Journal of Language and Literature*, 5(2), 2549–4287.
- Saputra, R., Wijayawati, D., Bivit, :, & Nugroho, A. P. (2026). Jurnalistrendi: Jurnal Linguistik, sastra, dan pendidikan |Volume. *Jurnalistrendi: Jurnal Linguistik, Sastra, Dan Pendidikan*, 11(1), 2026. <https://doi.org/10.51673/jur>
- Sari, K. (2025). An Analysis of Assertive Speech Acts in the Press Release "The General Attorney Affirms Pertamina Quality Meets Pertamina's Specifications". *Lingue : Jurnal Bahasa, Budaya, Dan Sastra*, 7(1), 40–51. <https://doi.org/10.33477/lingue.v7i1.9331>
- Searle, J. (1979). *Expression and Meaning*. Cambridge University Press. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/200052681>
- Searle, J., & Vanderveken, D. (1985). *Foundation of Illocutionary Logic*. Cambridge University Press.
- Septiaji, A., Kusmana, S., & Syarifah, E. F. (2025). Character Heroism in the Mecha Mobile Suit Gundam Anime Series: Iron-Blooded Orphans: A Psychoanalytic Study. *Journal of Literature Language and Academic Studies*, 4(2), 104-114. <https://doi.org/10.56855/jllans.v4i2.1499>
- Suryana, M. A., & Agus Permana, L. (n.d.). *Role of Interpersonal Communication in Enhancing Student's Academic Success and Social Skill at Vocational College*, Universitas Diponegoro. Retrieved <http://journal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/commedies/>
- Swandana, W., Ramendra, D., & Made, I. (2026). *An Analysis of Communication Strategies Used by Local Guide at Tegenungan Waterfall* (Vol. 7, Number 1).
- Tantra, D., & Ramendra, D. (2020). An Analysis of Speech Act Used in Matilda Wormwood (1996) movie. *E-Journal of Linguistics*, 14(1), 97. <https://doi.org/10.24843/e-jl.2020.v14.i01.p10>
- Trihanto, A. (2022). An Analysis on Directive Speech Act Found in Jumanji: The Next Level Movie Directed by Jake Kashan. *International Journal of English Linguistics, Literature, and Education (IJELLE)*, 4(1), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.32585/ijelle.v4i1.2175>
- Tursunovich, S. (2022). Classification of compliments as speech acts and their basic characteristics in Uzbek and English Language. *Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching*, 77–79.
- Vanderveken, D. (1990). *Meaning and Speech Acts: Principles of Language Use*. In Manuscript-Rev. Int. Fil (Number 2). Cambridge University Press.
- Villalba, X. (2025). *Exclamatives, try to be a bit more assertive!* *De Gruyter Brill Theoretical Linguistics*, 51(1–2), 131–142. <https://doi.org/10.1515/tl-2025-2005>
- Weston, J., Wang, T., Kulikov, I., Golovneva, O., Yu, P., Yuan, W., Dwivedi-Yu, J., Pang, R. Y., Fazel-Zarandi, M., & Li, X. (2024). *Self-Taught Evaluators*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2408.02666>
- Yu, K., Zeng, Q., Xuan, W., Li, W., Wu, J., & Voigt, R. (2026). The Pragmatic Mind of Machines: Tracing the Emergence of Pragmatic Competence in Large Language Models. *The Association for Computational Linguistics*, 1, 192–213.
- Yule, George. (1996). *Pragmatics: Introductions to Language Study*. Oxford University Press.
- Yunus, M., Hakim, K., & Syakir, A. (2024). Language Politeness in the Comedy Show" Main Hakim Sendiri". *Journal of Literature Language and Academic Studies*, 3(3), 98-104.
- Zhenguang G. (2022). *Interlocutor modelling in comprehending speech from interleaved interlocutors of different dialectic backgrounds*. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*,

29(3), 1026–1034. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-022-02055-7>