

# **CHAPTER ONE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **1.0 Background**

In human interaction, people need to communicate with others for very vital purposes. As humans communicate, they practice their languages based on their daily language. In this case, the language has an important role as a means of communication. Communication is usually known as a conversational process that consists of, at least, three main components; a speaker sends the message, a message carries interpretable meaning and a hearer interprets the sending message, by which people interact properly with others.

Using language as a means of communication, people can express their ideas, desires, thoughts, knowledge and feelings. Language can be used to perform social attitudes. For instance, people use it to greet each other, to make compliment, to assess, to assert, to commit themselves to a future course of actions.

In communicating, the speaker usually performs an action in uttering specific words. A speaker might commit him/herself to a future course of action; for instance, a speaker might promise, threaten, vow, refuse, guarantee, invite, pledge or oath. In other words, the speaker might commit him/herself to a future appointment, by using the appropriate commissive speech act.

Based on the earlier mentioned notes, the researcher is interested in analyzing the expressions of direct commissive speech acts employed by the characters; in the novel entitled “The Wedding of Zein” written by the Sudanese novelist Tayeb Saleh (may his soul rest in peace). The targeted novel is one of the masterpieces written by this awesome Sudanese novelist. It is about a simple-minded villager a young man who unexpectedly got married to the best young woman in the entire village. The novel contains various direct commissive expressions employed in convivial forms. Hence; it seems that the strategy of commitment used by the characters is also various.

### **1.1 Statement of the Study Problem/s**

The researcher thinks that speech acts in general and particularly the commissive speech acts, as linguistic elements, are quite neglected area of linguistic inquiry that no much of research is done on it. This pragmatic aspect is used in an intensive way in our daily life by both well-lightend and laymen.

### **1.2 Significance of the Study**

It is not in the researcher’s intention that this study is novel in the field. Consequently, this study is an attempt to shed light on commissive speech acts as an essential element of linguistics. The researcher seeks through this study to analyze the direct commissive speech acts and their employment by the characters in the novel entitled “The Wedding of Zein”. This study is expected to be an extension to those too little efforts that have been held earlier in this field of research by other researchers.

### **1.3 Objectives of the Study**

The general objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To describe the kinds of direct commissive expressions employed by characters in the novel “The Wedding of Zein”.
2. To describe reasons behind using the direct commissive expressions by the characters in Tayeb Salih's novel “The Wedding of Zein”.
3. To demonstrate the role of context in conveying meaning in the novel “The Wedding of Zein”.

### **1.4 Questions of the Study**

This study addresses the following questions:

1. How a direct commissive stands as a commissive speech act?
2. How is each type of direct commissive speech act employed by a character in the novel “The Wedding of Zein.”
3. What is the role of context in using commissives?

### **1.5 Hypotheses of the Study**

The following hypotheses are the hypotheses upon which this study will be conducted:

1. The novel contains several types of direct commissive speech acts.
2. The characters of the novel employ commissive speech act to satisfy specific needs.
3. The context plays a core role in conveying meanings.

## **1.6 Limitations of the Study**

There are many kinds of commissive speech acts contained in the novel “The Wedding of Zein”. The research is limited to the expressions functioning as direct commissive speech acts employed by the characters of the novel. The analysis will be based on the extracts exclusively drawn from the novel “The Wedding of Zein”.

## **1.7 Methodology of the Study**

This research is a qualitative research that employs the descriptive analytic method. A research is considered as descriptive analytic one if the research just collects the data; analyze the data and draws conclusion without making general conclusions. Meanwhile, qualitative research is a type of research concerning data reduction or collecting, classifying, and concluding.

The data source of the research is exclusively drawn from Tayeb Salih's novel “The Wedding of Zeint”, in which the extracts are the dialogues containing direct commissive expressions used by the characters. The sampling technique applied is purposive. In other words, the data which is analyzed is chosen purposively. Further details of the research methodology will be explained in Chapter Three.

# **CHAPTER TWO**

## **LITERATURE REVIEW AND PREVIOUS STUDIES**

### **2.0 Introduction**

In order to present the commissive expressions in the novel entitled (The Wedding of Zein), review of literature is needed as basic requirements. Therefore, this chapter discusses literature related to this research which covers pragmatics, context, speech acts, classification of speech acts, direct and indirect speech acts, the commissive speech acts, sociolinguistics, the ethnography of communication, address, previous studies, summary of the novel and a note about the author.

### **2.1 About the Pragmatics**

The modern usage of the term “Pragmatics” is attributable to the philosopher Charles Morris (1938). According to him, pragmatics is a part of semiotics. Morris distinguishes three branches of semiotics, namely Syntactics; the study of the relation of signs to one another, Semantics: the study of the relation of sign to the object to which the sign is applicable and Pragmatics; the study of relation of sign to interpreter (science of language usage).

Anglo-American Linguists and Philosophers claim that, pragmatics deals with the study of language usage, including sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics (Levinson, 1983: 1). Anglo-American pragmatics is closely associated with the work of Austin and Searle on Speech Act. Thus, the term of pragmatics, basically, is concentrated on general condition of the communicative use of language.

In addition, Levinson (1983:1) also argues that pragmatics is the study of the relation between language and context that are basic to account to language understanding. Here, the term of language understanding is used in the way favored by workers in the artificial intelligence to draw attention to the fact that understanding an utterance involves a great deal, more than knowing the meaning of the words uttered and the grammatical relation between them. Understanding an utterance involves the making of references that will connect what is said to what is mutually assumed or what has been said before.

Yule(1996:3) defines pragmatics as the study of contextual meaning .This type of study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in the particular context and how the context influences what is said. It also requires a consideration of how speakers organize what they want to say in accordance with who they are talking to, where, when, and under what circumstances. According to Yule, pragmatics also explores how listeners can make inference about what is said/written in order to be understandable and interpretation of message intended by the speaker, and explores how a great deal of what is unsaid is recognized as part of what is communicated. (ibid)

Thus, based on the definition above it can be concluded that pragmatics is the study of language or utterance meaning in which the meaning is influenced by the context. In short, pragmatics emphasizes on the inseparable relation between language and the context. (The researcher's own paraphrasing.)

## **2.2 Context**

In understanding and interpreting the meaning of an utterance, one must not ignore the context or situation in surroundings, but he/she must closely pay attention to them. If one takes no notice of context and situation, the intended meaning of an utterance may be different from their interpretation. Levinson points out the importance of context. Here, the language user must pair the sentences with the context, which they would be appropriate (1983:24). Therefore, the sentences should be appropriate to the context.

Leech (1983:13) considers context as the relevant aspect of the physical or social setting of utterance. It is a background of knowledge assumed to be shared by speaker and hearer. Context also contributes to the hearer's interpretation of what the speaker's means by a given utterance.

Linguists suggest two kinds of contexts. First, is the context of situation and second the context of culture. The context of situation is the context in which the speech is uttered. It is an environment of text, which includes participants or people involved in speech, time, place, social environment, etc. Mean while, the context of culture is the context background or history behind the participants (Halliday and Hasan, 1985: 13)

In accordance with context of situation, Firth in (ibid) suggests four important factors involved in context of situation; the participants including their status and social relationships; the action of participant; other relevant features referring to surrounding object and event and the effect of the verbal action.

## **2. 3 Speech Acts**

People do not only produce utterance containing grammatical structures and words when they attempt to express themselves, but they also perform action through utterance. Actions performed through utterances are generally called as speech acts (Yule, 1996:47). Meanwhile, Mey considers speech acts as words that do things (1993:110). It means that act in theory refers to the actions that are performed in making utterance.

In addition, Austin (in Allan, 1986:164) states that sentences are not only used to say, but they rather actively do things. In every utterance, the speaker performs an act such as stating a fact or opinion, confirming or denying something, greeting, thinking, giving advice, and so forth. He also isolates three basic senses, that when one is saying something, one is doing something, and hence, three kinds of acts are simultaneously performed. The three kinds of acts are Locutionary act, Illocutionary and Perlocutionary.

### **a. Locutionary Act**

It means the utterance of sentence which determines sense and reference. It is the simple act and interprets the things the speaker says.

### **b. Illocutionary Act**

This act is which kind of making the statement, offer, request, promise and etc. in uttering a sentence by virtue of the conventional force associated with it (or with explicit performance paraphrase). It is more or less what is done in the act saying something.



### **c. Perlocutionary Act**

It is bringing about the effects from audience by means of uttering the sentence, such as effect being special to the circumstances of utterance. In short, it is the effect that the speaker produces by saying something Example:

A: “Would you open the window?”

B: “Oh yes”

The example above describes that the act of saying “would you open the window?” is the Locutionary act. A who requests B to open the window is the illocutionary act, while the act of opening the window by B is Perlocutionary act. For the information, the illocutionary act as Austin focuses on is a basic theory which is known as speech acts.

According to Searle (in Levinson, 1983:240), speech acts are divided into five types of utterances based on their purposes; they are:

1. Representatives, which commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition (paradigm cases: asserting, concluding, etc).
2. Directives, which are attempted by the speaker to get the addressee to do something (paradigm cases: requesting, advising and commanding).
3. Commisives, which commits the speaker to some future course of action (paradigm case: promising, threatening, offering).
4. Expressive, which expresses a psychological state (paradigm cases: thanking, apologizing, welcoming and congratulating).

5. Declaration, which effects immediate changes in the institutional state of affairs and tends to rely on elaborate extra-linguistic institutions (paradigm cases: excommunicating, declaring war, christening, firing from employment).

The following explanation may help to clarify the above five points:

### **1. Representatives**

Are kinds of speech acts in which the speaker expresses belief that the propositional content is true. The term proposition content will be used to refer to what a sentence is all about, acts of describing, concluding, asserting, are all examples of the speaker's intention in expressing his belief.

### **2. Directives**

Are kinds of speech acts in which the speaker expresses an attitude toward a prospective action by the hearer. Act of commanding, ordering, requesting, inviting are examples of directives.

### **3. Commisives**

Are kinds of speech acts in which the speaker expresses his intention concerning some future action. Act of promising, threatening, refusing are examples of commissives.

### **4. Expressives**

Are kinds of speech acts in which the speaker expresses his psychological attitude toward a state of affairs specified in the

propositional content. Act of thinking, apologizing, congratulating are examples of what the speaker feels.

## **5. Declarations**

They are kinds of speech acts that declare something. Searle (1969:239) says that declarations function to change the status of the person or object by performing the act successfully. The speaker of those acts is someone who is especially authorized by an extralinguistic institution which provides rules for their use, such as court, committee, and church and so on.

## **2.4 Socio-Pragmatics**

Socio-pragmatics is concerned with the analysis of significant patterns of interaction in particular social situations and in a particular social system. It emphasizes the interactive aspect and the acknowledgement of the social context in which a speech act occurs forms the basis of socio-pragmatics research. Socio-pragmatics is the study of communication in its socio-culture context. It can be said that social and cultural factors influence how people communicate with others. When a person issues a speech act, for instance, the social context of the conversation plays a role in the case of how the speech act is delivered to the hearer. Tronsborg,(1995:37-38).

## **2.5 Direct and Indirect Speech Acts**

To be able to distinguish types of speech acts, we should consider the relationship between the three structure forms (declarative, interrogative, imperative) and the three general communicative functions (statement, question, command or request). Whenever there is a direct relationship

between a structure and a function, the direct speech act is got. Searle (1985:68).

Examples:

- a. You wear a seat belt (Declarative).
- b. Do you wear a seat belt? (Interrogative).
- c. Wear a seat belt! (Imperative).

Thus, a declarative is used to make statement of direct speech act. Besides, if it is used to make a request, it is an indirect speech act.

Other examples:

- a. Move out of the TV! (Imperative).
- b. Do you have to stand in front of the TV? (Interrogative).
- c. You are standing in front of the TV. (Declarative).

The sentences above have different structures (imperative, interrogative and declarative), but the different structures can be used to accomplish the same basic functions. Thus, the basic functions of all utterances above are command or request, where the speaker wants the hearer not to stand in front of the TV. Based on the example, we can see a direct speech act forms on the imperative structure in (a) Move out of the TV! The interrogative structure in (b) is not being used only as a question; hence, it is an indirect speech act. The declarative structure in (c) is also an indirect request. (ibid)

One of the most common types of indirect speech act in English has the form of interrogative, but it is not typically used to ask a question. Someone

who asks a question not only expects an answer, but also an action (Yule, 1996: 54-55).

## **2.6 Commissive Speech Acts**

The term commissive is widely used in at least three major areas of linguistics inquiry: studies on illocutionary acts, studies on modality and evidentiality and the formal modeling of dialogue / argumentation. In spite of its frequent use, the notion has rarely been theorized and has never been the subject of a monograph or a specialized reader. In keeping with this is the fact that none of the many dictionaries and encyclopedias of linguistics or philosophy devotes a separate entry to it. William (1995).

In speech act theory, the term has been used, informally at least, since the very first days of the discipline. In his William James lectures of 1955, Austin talks of speech acts “committing [one] to certain future conduct” (1975: 89).

In this context, the term is used first and foremost in connection with. ‘commissives’ (acts of promising, pledging oneself, guaranteeing, swearing to do), and several theorists have no further use for it (e.g. Searle 1969: chapter 3; Leech 1983). In a way, this is unsurprising as one of the core meanings of commitment is “promise”; promises are the core type of commissive speech acts, and early speech act theorists tend to use the term in a nontechnical sense. Note in this respect that dictionaries or encyclopedias that have an entry for commissive usually define the notion in terms of commitment.

Thus, Bussmann (1996: 83) states that, “commissive speech act meant to commit a speaker to some course of action ...” (a similar definition occurs in

Crystal 1997: 71). In these sorts of uses, the locutions to commit someone to or to make a commitment to are barely more than synonyms of to undertake an obligation or to assume responsibility for.

However, Toulmin (1958:50) uses the verb to commit NP (to) in his characterization not only of promises but also of predictions and, more generally, statements. Interestingly, Toulmin in (ibid)s applies it to different 'targets': in most cases promises commit the speaker tout court (in all but one instance, the object of the commitment is left implicit), whereas statements about the future commit the speaker to - it seems - the very content (or consequences) of the act itself. Performatives also commit their launchers to performing other acts. In Searle's early work on speech acts, the term only comes up in connection with commissives, but in *Expression and Meaning*, it is used in definitions of the illocutionary point (the core component) of both commissive and assertive.

Some authors (Lyons 1977: 734; Green 2007) assume that the performance of a speech act of any sort commits the speaker to certain beliefs and/or intentions. But there is another sense of commitment in speech act theory, a technical one, which was introduced in Searle and Vanderveken (1985):

Formal semanticists and argumentation theorists are keen to insist that a commitment is not a mental state (though there will be relations with mental states): a commitment is not necessarily a belief of the participant who has it. We do not believe everything we say; but our saying it commits us whether we believe it or not. The purpose of postulating a commitment store is not psychological (Hamblin 1970: 264).

Similar claims can be found in Gunlogson (2001); she often resorts to the odd collocation 'public beliefs', or in Beyssade & Marandin (forthcoming). There is an obvious parallel with this statement.

*"Anyone who states a certain proposition is committed to it, not in the sense that they must in fact know it or believe it to be true, but in the sense that their subsequent statements and anything that can be legitimately inferred from their accompanying and subsequent behavior must be consistent with the belief that it is true" Lyons, (1995: 254).*

The view here is that (a) commitment is not a mental state; it is the expression (sincere or not) of a mental state. Yet, perhaps this view requires some qualification. The famed argumentation theorist Walton (1993: 97; also 1995: 102) suggests that,

*"at least for the sake of modeling everyday argumentation, commitment stores ought to be divided into ``two subsets a light side of overt, expressed, explicit commitments, and a dark side of commitments that are only partially apparent or plausibly surmised by one or more of the participants in the dialogue"*

## **2.7 Sociolinguistics**

This research employs Socio-Pragmatic approach to analyze direct commissive speech acts employed by the characters in the novel (The Wedding of Zein). Socio- Pragmatic approach is about the realization of Ethnography of communication. It combines pragmatics and sociolinguistics. Here, the researcher gives more definitions about sociolinguistics.

### **2.7.0 Definition of Sociolinguistics**

Language and society cannot be separated from one another. Wardaugh (1992) defines a language as what the members of particular society speak.

If there is language, there must be a society. Language and society are related to each other. Sociolinguistics cannot be understood without both of them. Chaika (1994: 3) says that language and society are so intertwined that it is impossible to understand one without the other. There is no human society that does not depend upon, is not shaped by and does not itself shape language. Every social institution is maintained by language. Law, religion, government, education, and the family are all set in place and carried out with language. It means that language is very important for the society. Besides, society needs language to interact with others.

One of the applications of language is a conversation. In a conversation, people use language to talk with each other. Through language, people do not only inform the news and express the feelings, but also manipulate the others. It means that language becomes an essential means to communicate and to inform something. Besides, language also has a great influence on maintaining and even establishing relationship. This is in line with the statement argued by Trudgill (1974:2) that language behavior is seen from a social point of view. Obviously there are two important aspects, which is the function of language in establishing social relationship and the role played by language in conveying information about the speaker.

The existence of language in the society is undeniable. On the other hand, society is stratified into many social groups leading to the variety of speech community. Consequently, it possibly creates a phenomenon in which each social group and each speech community have their own language. The language is understandable among members in their society. That is why, when a member moves from one speech community to another community, the language that he/she usually uses to communicate among the members of



the community may become incommunicable unless it is translated into the language of another community with different language. It means that language can be used as the indication of membership among different social groups and different speech communities. Concerning language and society, Biber and Finegan (1994) state that there is a branch of linguistics which studies all aspects of language and society. This branch is called Sociolinguistics.

Sociolinguistics refers to how people use language when they interact with each other, for instance how they talk with their friends, families and teachers. In accordance with sociolinguistics, actually some sociologists give definitions about it. Wardaugh (1986) says that sociolinguistics is the study of the relationship between the language and the society in which certain people use an appropriate language in order to carry out their daily activities. It means that sociolinguistics is intended to take the appropriate language in daily activities.

According to Holmes, (1992:1) sociolinguistics is the study of the relationship between language and society. Sociolinguistics is interested in explaining why people speak differently in different social contexts. Besides, it is also concerned with identifying the social functions of language and the ways it is used to convey social meaning. It means that sociolinguistics does not only describe the relationship between the language and society, but also the social function of the language and the picture of how people use language in different social contexts and different speech communities.

Based on the definition above, it can be pointed out that there are some important aspects related to sociolinguistics. First, sociolinguistics is the

study of the relationship between language and society; second, sociolinguistics is concerned with how people use an appropriate language in different social contexts; third, sociolinguistics is concerned with how language is used to identify social function and to convey social meaning.

### **2.7.1 The Scope/s of Sociolinguistics**

Sociolinguistics can be divided into two studies. The studies consist of Macro-sociolinguistics and Micro-sociolinguistics. Trudgill states that the term of Macro-sociolinguistics refers to sociolinguistics area that involves the study of a relatively large group of speech. One of the examples of Macro sociolinguistics research is genealogy of language. This research emphasizes on the history of language (1992: 21). On the other hand, he also defines Micro-sociolinguistics as the study on social that emphasizes the study of face-to-face interaction, discourse analysis, and other areas of sociolinguistics involving the study of relatively small group of people (1992: 31).

Thus, based on the two definitions above, this research belongs to Micro sociolinguistics, since it is concerned with the discussion of speech acts, especially commissive speech acts employed by characters in Tayeb Salih's novel "The Wedding of Zein".

### **2.7.2 The Ethnography of Communication**

In relation to this case, Fasold argues that Ethnography of Speaking, or more generally called as the ethnography of communication, is the approach to the sociolinguistics of language in which the use of language in general is related to society and culture (1996:39). It implies that the study of Ethnography of Communication is required to study and to know how a

speaker of a particular language in a particular community organizes his/her social relationship. It possibly creates a different function of language in a different situation. It is more or less about knowing how people react and behave toward others by making use of language in his social life. This is in line with Hymes who states that Ethnography of Speaking is concerned with the situations, which use pattern and function of speaking as an activity in its own right (Fasold, 1996: 39).

### **2.7.3 Speech Community**

To understand what ethnography of communication is all about, it is necessary to understand some fundamental concepts, such as speech community and organization of speaking which are studied further as follows:

Hymes in Fasold argues that all members of a speech community share not only the same rules for speaking, but at least one linguistic variety as well (1996: 41). Savile-Troike in Fasold also says that a speech community needs not share a language. A speech community must at least share role for speaking.

According to her, it is not necessary for each speaker to belong to only one speech community or even to two or more completely separate communities. People can be members of several speech communities at the same time, but they should change their speech behavior by adding, subtracting, and substituting rules of communicative behavior (ibid).

Thus, from those definitions above, it can be underlined that a speech community is a group of people who shares at least a single speech variety and has the same rules for conducting and interpreting speech. Within a

speech community, there is communicative behavior. To study the communicative behavior, it is necessary to know the units of interaction. Hymes suggests about a nested hierarchy of units called speech situation, speech event and speech act. The nested hierarchy shows that speech acts are parts of a speech event, whereas speech events are parts of speech situation. Thus, the hierarchy points out the speech situation on the first level, speech event is on the second level and finally speech act on the third level. Meanwhile, a speech situation is not purely communicative. They are composed of communicative and other kinds of events. Speech events are composed of communicative activities and governed by rules for using a speech. A speech event takes place within a speech situation and may consist of one or more speech acts; for example, a joke might be a speech act that is a part of conversation (a speech event), which takes place at a party (a speech situation). It is also possible for a speech act to be, in itself, the entire speech event that might be the only event in a speech situation (Fasold, 1996:42).

On the other hand, according to Hymes, speech act is the simplest and most troublesome level at the same time. It is the simplest, because it is the minimal term of the set. It is troublesome, because it has a slightly different meaning in the study of ethnography of communication from the meaning given to the terms in linguistics, pragmatics and philosophy (in Fasold, 1992:42).

#### **2.7.4 Organization of Speaking**

Speech situation, speech event or speech act cannot get rid of communication. To look at the communication, Hymes has suggested the

components of speech, which are labeled with the letters arranged by the word “SPEAKING”. They are as follows:

### **1. Situation (S)**

Situation covers the setting and the scene. The setting here means the time and the place of physical circumstances of communicative event, while the scene is about the psychological setting, and what kind of speech event is taking place according to cultural definition (Hymes, 1986:55).

### **2. Participant (P)**

Participants include combination of the speaker/addresser and the listener/addressee engaged in the speech event. The speaker/addresser is the person delivering a message, while the listener/addressee is the person to whom the message is transmitted. Their presence in communicative event may influence what is said and how it is said. Each of them has his own behavior toward language and language choice according to the social and cultural factor (ibid).

### **3. End (E)**

Ends of speech can be divided into outcomes (the purpose of the event from a culture point of view) and the goals (the purpose of the individual participants). For example, in the bargaining events, the outcome is to exchange something of a value from one person to the others. (Hymes, 1986:57).

#### **4. Act Sequence (A)**

Act sequence is classified into two, namely message form (how something is said) and message content (what is said). Message content is related to question of the topic and charge of the topic (what is being talked about when a topic changes, and how to manage the change of the topic). Message form is related to the form of individual utterance either in the starting or in the finishing of speech event (Hymes in Couldhard, 1985:50). In addition, Hyme's observation says that how something is said is a part of what is said. It implies that understanding the meaning of how something is said requires the knowledge of the topic or the whole meaning of the conversation.

#### **5. Key (K)**

Key is introduced to provide for the tone, manner, or spirit in which an act is done (Hymes, 1986:57). It refers to the feeling atmosphere and attitude in which a conversation occurs. Manner, feeling and attitude are used in reference to participants, while tone and atmosphere are used in inference to situation. For better understanding about those terms, the definition of the key in details is explained as follow:

- a. Tone, it refers to general spirit of the scene, such as brave, fierce, fearful.
- b. Manner, it refers to the participants' way of behavior toward others whether it is polite, impolite, intimate, distant, formal, informal, serious, or respectful.

- c. Feeling, it refers to the emotions indicating happiness, terror, anxiety, shock, desperation, anger, irony, frustration, uncertainly, etc.
- d. Atmosphere refers to the feeling that affects the mind in a place or condition such as good, evil, solemn, and likeness.
- e. Attitude, it refers to the participants' way of thinking and behavior toward a situation, whether it is sympathy, optimism, seriousness or bitterness.

The signaling of key may be non-verbal like with a wink, smile, and gesture, and posture, style of stress or musical accompaniment. It also commonly involves conventional unit of speech tools that are often regarded in ordinary linguistics analysis, such as English aspiration and vowel length to signal emphasis.

## **6. Instrumentalities (I)**

Instrumentalities include both channel and the form of speech. Hymes defines channel as the way a message travels from one person to another. The most commonly used channel is oral or written, but channels can also be telegraph, semaphore, smoke signal or drumming. Meanwhile, form of speech, as defined by Hymes, deals with languages and their subdivisions, including dialects, codes varieties, and register. The speaker should know how to formulate both channel and form of speech appropriately in accordance with the participants, purposes, and situations of the communicative event (Hymes, 1986:59).

## **7. Norms (N)**

Norms include both the norm of interaction and the norm of interpretation. The norm of interaction refers to an underlying set of nonlinguistic ruler which governs when, how and how often speech occurs (Coulhard, 1985:55). All communities commonly have norm of interaction, but it is different from one culture to another. For example, Americans typically follow that there is no gap and overlap norm of conversation turn-taking and this norm is not followed in every other culture. The norm of interpretation implicates the belief system of a community. It involves trying to understand what is being conveyed beyond what is in the actual words used. (Hymes in Fasold, 1996:45).

According to Hymes, interpretation in the context is what is meant by the expression of “reading between the lines”. It involves an effort to understand what is being conveyed beyond what is in the actual word used. Thus, it is possible to make mistakes in interpreting communicative acts among other members of the culture, which is more common to occur in cross culture. Therefore, following the norm of interpretation in a certain culture is the main point to be competent in communicating.

## **8. Genre (G)**

Genres refer to categories like poems, myths, lectures, proverbs, and communal messages. Genres often coincide with speech events. Nevertheless, genres and speech events need to be kept apart since a genre can occur in more than one speech event. For example, a lecture



as a genre typically identified with a certain place in a course, but its properties may be invoked, for serious or humorous effect, in other situations. Genres are performed for specific purposes in specified places with particular participants. Meanwhile, speech events have concentrated on participants and situations, as well as on stylistic modes (Hymens, 1986:61).

## **2.8 Address**

Addressing is the way to maintain social relationship between people in a society. In addressing people, we should concern terms of address. One person to address another, whom he talks to (Trudgill, 1974: 105), terms of expression uses terms of address.

The use of address term depends on the relationship between the addresser and addressee, the social status of individual involved in conversation, where the conversation happens, what the purpose of the conversation is and what the situation is. According to Spolky (1988: 21), there are many kinds of address terms, namely Title alone, Title with Last Name (TLN), Last Name (LN), First Name (FN), and Multiple Name (MN). Each of the terms has a certain intention and meaning implied in addressing. For a clearer description, it is explained as follows:

### **Title alone (T)**

Title alone indicates the relationship between the addresser and addressee is least intimate. It shows respect as well as designates one's rank or occupation, such as colonel, doctor, and etc. Example: Sir, Your Majesty, Madam and Constable.

**Title with last name (TLN)**

It indicates that the addressee has a higher status than the addresser. It also indicates inequality between the interlocutors. Example, Mr. Jones for Mr. Tom Jones, Mr. Smith for Mr. John Smith.

**Last Name (LN)**

Addressing one's last name usually represents degree of intimacy that is greater than TLN, but lesser than FN. Example: Jones for Tom Jones, Smith for John Smith.

**First Name (FN)**

It indicates equality between the addresser and the addressee. Example: Libby for Libby Ellison, Ben for Ben Stafford.

**Multiple Names (MN)**

It is the case in which two or more versions of the proper names are used by turns, including nickname. It is usually used for those who know well the addressee as the expression of a close relation and a familiarity. Example: Huny bunny, Son, Buddy, Dear, Young man, etc.

Meanwhile, Brown and Gilman state that there are two major dimensions, which condition the choice of terms of address, namely power and solidarity. Power is realized in the form of social status, whereas solidarity is in terms of social distance. Someone who has higher status in society says "informal term" non-reciprocally to his interlocutor, but he will receive "formal terms" nonreciprocal from him. Thus, he may call someone of lower status by using

FN only, while someone of a lower status should call someone of higher status by using TLN or formal term. The use of “formal term” non-reciprocally in addressing someone indicates that the relationship is distant. The use of “informal term” non-reciprocally in addressing someone indicates that the participants have close relationship, although they have different status (Fasold, 1996).

## **2.9. Previous Studies**

The study has a close relationship with the study entitled “An Analysis of Commissive Speech Acts Employed by The Characters in The Movie “A BUG’S LIFE”. The study is conducted by Kurnia Dwi Puspitasari. It was a kind of qualitative research that employs a pragmatic approach as the method of analysis.

The purposes of the research were to figure out the types of commissive speech acts in the movie entitled A Bug’s Life. The reasons of the speakers in uttering such type, and the way of how the speakers exploit those types.

It uses the Pragmatics approach with speech act as the field of study. It was a descriptive qualitative research and it employed purposive sampling as the sampling technique. The data in this research were data that had important relationship with the problems being observed. Only the types of commissive speech acts were analyzed, i.e. the expressions which express the speaker’s intention toward the future action.

From the result of the data analysis, there are six types of commissive speech acts employed by the characters in the movie A Bug’s Life. They are promises, guarantees, refusals, threats, volunteers, and offers. The result of this research

shows that there are some functions of commissives. Promises, offers, and volunteers are expressed to maintain and repair the relationship. Promises are also used by the speakers when they try to show loyalty, love and care to the hearers.

Guarantees are expressed to get sympathy from the hearers and to express the belief and conviction of the speakers about something. Refusals are expressed to show the dislike and distrust of the speakers to the hearers and to save the speakers from the bad effects made by the hearers or to avoid conflicts with the hearers.

Threats are uttered to express the negative feeling and anger of the speakers to the hearers and to intimidate the hearers as a form of the speakers' intention to show the higher power and status. The other finding of this research is that the speakers use verbal and non-verbal expression in uttering commissives.

The verbal expression means that the speakers utter a direct or indirect speech act, an explicit or implicit statement, in high, normal, or low intonation. The non-verbal expression is commonly done through body language to emphasize the speech acts which is performed via eyes gaze, facial expression (happy, sad, annoyed, angry, and disappointed), and body movement (nodding the head, shaking the hands, and pushing the hearer).

The analysis also shows that the six types of commissives found in the movie *A Bug's Life* are shaped based on the theme and the sub themes establishing the context of situation to make the characters perform those six types of commissives, although some of the speech acts are shaped as the development of the story.

Based on the findings, it is suggested that the students who are interested in

Speech Acts Study are expected to explore the speech acts especially about commissives to find out that commissive speech acts are not only classified into promise, threat, guarantee, offer, volunteer, and refusal.

There are still many other types of commissives which can be found in the interactions, while for the other researchers, there are still many other classifications of speech act that can be taken into the similar field of research.

The researcher expects that the other researchers will be interested in conducting a research about speech acts as a further and a more detailed analysis in the same field by taking the other classifications of speech acts such as directives, representatives, expressives, or declarations in the movie *A Bug's Life*. It is also possible to the other researchers to conduct the same research in the different sources of data such as the other movie, novel, or drama.

## **2.10 A Note about the Author**

Tayeb Salih, the Sudanese writer was born on 12<sup>th</sup> July 1929 in Al Dabbah in the Northern Province of Sudan. He studied at the University of Khartoum before leaving for the University of London in England. For more than ten years, Salih wrote a weekly column for the London-based Arabic language newspaper *al Majalla*. He worked for the BBC's Arabic Service and later became director general of the Ministry of Information in Doha, Qatar. He spent the last 10 years of his working career with UNESCO in Paris. Tayeb Saleh's writing is drawn from his experience of communal village life that is centered on people and their complex relationships. "At various levels and with varying degrees of psychoanalytic emphasis, he deals with themes of reality and illusion, the cultural dissonance between the West and the exotic orient, the harmony and conflict of brotherhood, and the individual's

responsibility to find a fusion between his or her contradictions". It can be said that the motifs of his books are derived from his Islamic background and his experience of modern Africa, both pre- and post-colonial. Salih achieved immediate acclaim when *Season of Migration to the North* was first published in Beirut. In 2001, the book was declared "the most important Arabic novel of the 20th century" by the Arab Literary Academy. Tayeb Salih's most interesting writing are: *Doumat wad Hamid* (1960), *'Urs al-Zayn*(1964), or *The Wedding of Zein*, *A Handful of Dates* (short story 1964), *Mawsim al-Hijra ila al-Shamal* (1967), or *Season of Migration to the North*, *Daw al-Bayt (Bandarshah I)* (1971) and *Maryud (Bandarshah II)* (1976). He died on 18<sup>th</sup> February 2009. (Wikipedia)

- 1.
- 2.

## **2. 11 Summary of (The Wedding of Zein)**

The story opens with the village hearing the news of Zein's upcoming nuptials. Because Zein is regarded as the village idiot, the people as a whole are greatly surprised that any family agreed to give their daughter to him.

The rest of the story unfolds non-linearly. The first section is an account of Zein's childhood and young adulthood, focusing on his strange ability to draw attention to village girls by falling in love with them. After he sings their praises, other people notice the girls, resulting in their advantageous marriages. Because of this, the other villagers invite him over in hope of his falling in love with their daughters. Zein is also distinguished by his friendship with Haneen, a Sufi holy man who did not associate closely with anyone else in the village. He is also close to many of the socially shunned, such as Mousa the Lamé, a disabled former slave.

The turning point of the story is an encounter between Zein and Seif ad-Din, a local man of bad character. Seif ad-Din attacks Zein while he is standing talking to Mahjoub's gang, a group of local men who run the village. Zein retaliates with unexpected strength, but before he can actually kill Seif ad-Din, he is stopped by Haneen, who blesses both men and the village as a whole. In the following year, which is referred to as Haneen's year, the village experiences multiple miracles, which they attribute to Haneen's blessing. The story climaxes with one of these miracles, the wedding of the fool Zein to the most handsome, intelligent, religious girl in the village, Ni'ma.

The main characters are:

**Zein:** Zein is an unconventional man from the moment of his birth, when he entered the world laughing rather than crying. He also has a non-traditional physical appearance, which Salih describes at length: he has a long face with prominent bones, with only one tooth on his bottom jaw and one on the top, a long neck and long arms, which are described as resembling those of a monkey, broad shoulders, and prodigious, unsuspected strength, which becomes dangerous when he gets in fights. Notably, Zein is completely hairless, lacking even eyebrows and eyelashes. He has an enormous appetite that leads him to attend as many social events as he can, where he inevitably irritates his hosts by eating too much. Kenneth Harrow argues that Zein's outsized appetites are "signs or metaphors for other, higher appetites," because he is meant to represent the perfect Sufi saint.

**Haneen:** Haneen is a holy man who spends half his year in the village and the other half living ascetically. No one in the village knows exactly where

he goes for the second half of the year. Zein is the only person with whom Haneen is friendly. Haneen's blessing affects numerous miracles in the village, including turning the criminal Seif ad-Din into a model citizen, helping with harvest and prosperity, and causing Zein's marriage to Ni'ma.

**Ni'ma:** Ni'ma is the most beautiful girl in the village. She is unusually serious and studious. As a child, she was the only girl in the elementary school. However, although she was devoted to learning the Quran at the elementary school, she rejects her brother's suggestion that she continue her schooling, because she claims that non-religious education is nonsense. Although she is approached by a number of respectable suitors, she rejects them all, until she decides that her destiny is to marry Zein.

**Mahjoub's gang:** Mahjoub's gang is comprised of men between the ages of thirty-five and forty-five who rule the village. They are farmers by vocation. They are not particularly religious, but they do understand the importance of religion to the community, so they collect the Imam's salary from the other villagers every month and see to repairs in the mosque. They organize all important social functions in the community, including weddings, burials, and funerals. They also manage irrigation of the Nile and other important practical matters in the village.

**The Imam:** the Imam is the officially designated spiritual leader of the village; however, he does not connect well with the other villagers, because of his lack of concern with their daily lives and his fixation on fire and brimstone preaching in his sermons. He is the only person in the village hated by Zein.



**Seif ad-Din:** Seif ad-Din, at the beginning of the story, is an unrepentant sinner who gets drunk frequently, visits prostitutes, disobeys and disrespects his parents and uncles, and is suspected of living a life of crime in the city when he isn't in the village. Ahmad Nasr claims that Seif ad-Din represents all the negative values associated with modern city life. Harrow argues that Seif ad-Din is a foil for Zein, because, unlike Zein, his outward appearance, with his beard and ever present traveler's bag, resembles that of a traditional Sufi saint, yet his interior is perfectly rotten at the start of the story. Additionally, both men are ruled by love: Seif ad-Din's final break with his father is caused by his desire to marry a prostitute, while Zein is defined by his ability to draw attention to the village girls through his love of them. After his encounter with Zein and Haneen, Seif ad-Din turns his life around. He treats his father's former slaves kindly, where before he had neglected them. He abstains from drinking. He settles down and marries his cousin. He even calls the Athan at the mosque. (ibid)

# **CHAPTER THREE**

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **3.0 Introduction**

This chapter is concerned with describing the methodology adopted by the researcher to analyze the data. It employs the descriptive analytic method. The aim of the research is to reveal the phenomena of commitment existing in the novel “The Wedding of Zein”.

### **3.1 The Source of Data**

The source of data of this research is a literary work. It is a novel entitled “The Wedding of Zein” written by the Sudanese novelist Tayeb Salih. The novel consists of eighty-nine pages. The data of this research are taken from the dialogues by the characters containing direct commissive expressions.

### **3.2 Sample and Sampling Technique**

The researcher adopts the purposive technique in this study. Sample is taken based on certain consideration. The sample of this research was taken in consideration of:

1. What are in the form of words, or sentences containing direct commissive expression.
2. The act of committing must be performed after a real speech event.

### **3.3 Technique of Collecting Data**

The technique of collecting data applied in this research is the analysis of content. The steps of collecting data in this research are as follows:

1. Reading the novel several times in order to understand the story.
2. Marking each sentence containing direct commissive expression/s.
3. Analyzing the data.

### **3.4 Technique of Classifying Data**

In order to make it easier for the reader, the classification and the analysis of the data was sorted under a certain commissive form. The sorting of the data in this research is as follows:

1. The type of committing employed by the characters.
2. The number of each type.
3. The number of each datum.

### **3.5 Data Analysis**

The analysis of data in this research was built on the basis of subjecting each item of data to the features of pragmatics. Those pragmatic features included: Felicity conditions, Implicatures, Presupposition and Deixis.

# CHAPTER FOUR

## DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

### 4.0. Introduction

This chapter meant for the analysis of the data collected from Tayeb salih's novel entitled (The Wedding of Zein). The sample texts are analyzed qualitatively. The data for this chapter composed of texts exclusively drawn from the novel (The Wedding of Zein)

### 4.1 Results of Data Analysis

The following analysis shows the results of data analysis:

#### 4.1.1. Invitations

##### 4.1.1.1 Sheikh Ali Invites Abdul Samad:

The setting of this speech event is in the morning, in the market place, particularly in the front of Sheikh Ali's shop. There are two participants who take part in this speech event, Abdul Samad, and Sheikh Ali. There is an unsettled debt from Sheikh Ali to Abdul Samad. The former has put off for a whole month. He is badly annoyed.

##### An extraction from (Salih, W. O. Z. P: 31)

*Abdul Samad: "Ali, do you really think you'll do me out of my money, or what is it you've got in mind?"*

*Sheikh Ali: "Hajj Abdul Samad, just put your trust in God and sit down and have a cup of coffee with us."*

#### Datum analysis

Based on an extract above, Sheikh Ali commits himself to a near future course of action by saying: "*Hajj Abdul Samad, just put your trust in God and sit down and have a cup of coffee with us.*" This is an invitation.

As hypothesized by the researcher, it is clear that, Sheikh Ali calls a direct commissive speech act. It is direct because of the performatives (*sit* and *have*). Most of the pragmatic features are there in this utterance. Conditions of felicity – conditions that necessary to the success of any speech act – are properly contained in the utterance. For instance, Sheikh Ali's status, as a host in this exchange, allows him to perform this commissive act as a preparatory condition. The condition of execution is also overt, in the sense of Sheikh Ali's capability to perform the invitation that he offers.

Regarding sincerity condition, the researcher argues that it depends on the extent to which Abdul Samad would respond positively to that invitation. Employment of this commissive act shows Sheikh Ali's high pragmatic competency. Inference depends on conversational implicatures imbedded in Abdul Samad's utterance, the maxims of conversation, and to what extent Abdul Samad's contribution is related to the purpose of the exchange.

Concerning the analysis of utterance context, the researcher thinks that Sheikh Ali's utterance contains primary and secondary deixis personal (*us*) by Sheikh Ali.

On the other hand, there is a social norm, calming down annoyed people by inviting them to something indicates Sheikh Ali's success to infer Abdul Samad's message (perlocution). In doing commitment, Sheikh Ali uses a direct commissive speech act. Commissive verbs "*sit and have*" contained in Sheikh Ali's utterances, indicate that this commitment belongs to the direct form of the act of committing. Usage of direct commissive speech act shows Sheikh Ali's explicit commitment. In doing this, Sheikh Ali seems to employ a simple strategy of commitment.

Sheikh Ali is correct in applying this strategy. Sheikh Ali's applying this strategy he and Abdul Samad have a close relationship, by virtue of that

unsettled debt. Therefore, Sheikh Ali just employs a simple strategy. Besides, he really relaxes Abdul Samad rather than inviting him in the literal meaning of invitation (...*just put your trust in God*). In this way, Sheikh Ali intends to repair the relationship between him and Abdul Samad. Based on the datum above, Sheikh Ali is successful in his act of committing.

#### **4.1.1.2 Mahjoub Invites Sheikh Haneen**

This speech event takes place at evening and in the front of Sa'eed's shop, the place where Zein and his people are use to spending their evenings. Participants of this speech event are Mahjoub and Skeikh Haneen. There are also Zein's freinds as well as Seif ad Din.

#### **An extraction from (Salih, W.O.Z. p: 65)**

"You must dine with us." Mahjoub quickly invited him. Haneen thought and gently refused. Claspig Zein's shoulder with the other hand, he said, "Dinner's to be in the home of the blessed one". Then the two of them made off into the darkness.

#### **Datum analysis**

(*You must dine with us tonight*). It is clear that Mahjoub employs a commissive speech act as he invites Sheikh Haneen to have dinner with them. It is a direct commissive act as he uses simple strategy (*you must*) directing his speech to Sheikh Haneen. Therefore, it is a matter of invitation. This commissive which is employed by Mahjoub is correct since Mahjoub is qualified to call whoever he wishes to have a meal with him. The researcher considers this feature as preparatory condition. Not only this, but also the researcher argues that Mahjoub is able to fulfill his word and offer them the meal that is called by him – locutionary force. The sincerity condition is the

most overt felicity condition in this datum. Regarding the event, participants and the sensitivity of the event, all these prove his real desire that Sheikh Haneen is to dine with them having in mind that Haneen is not the person who is treated just like any other person as the writer portrays him in this novel as a man of highly respect position among the villagers.

The researcher thinks that some of the pragmatic features are contained in Mahjoub's utterance in a good way. For instance, if we go a little bit further, we find that the indirect refusal employed by Sheikh Haneen indicates his good inference, which indicates that conversational maxims are properly contained in this datum. Mahjoub's words coincide with what is going on as a maxim of quality; his words are neither too much nor too little quantity maxim, and he is closely related to the topic as a social norm as well as relevance principle.

Concerning the utterance context, the researcher thinks that some deixis are contained in Mahjoub's utterance. There are (*you*) which refers back to the person being spoken to – Sheikh Haneen – and (*us*) which refers back to the speaker as a personal deixis. In addition, the researcher counts the temporal deixis (*tonight*) referring to the night of the speech event. The researcher thinks that Majoub properly employs the act of this invitation in this datum and he is successful in using it.

#### **4.1.1.3 Abdul Hafeez Invites Zein**

This event takes place in the evening at Sa'eed's shop. Mahjoub, Abdul Hafeez, Ahmed Isma'il, Taher Rawwasi, Hamad Wad Rayyis, Sa'eed the owner of the shop and Zein represent the participants of this part of the novel. They are having their usual evening talk.

### **An extraction from (Salih, W.O.Z. P:102)**

*"What are you looming over us like that for? Said Taher Rawwasi  
"either sit down or push off."*

*"Zein must be drunk this night." Said Ahmed Isma'il.*

*"Sit down and have a smoke." Said Abdul Hafeez.*

### **Datum analysis**

Abdul Hafeez in this extract invites Zein to a smoke. By uttering this utterance, it is clear that he calls a direct commissive speech act. Therefore, he commits himself to a future course of action that is, no doubt, an overt invitation. This commissive act is direct because Abdul Hafeez's utterance contains the performative (have) which strongly indicates the act of invitation.

The conversation goes on smoothly between Abdul Hafeez and Zein because they both share the same contexts. Another more fact about this utterance is that the conversational maxims are convivially contained in Abdul Hafeez's utterance; for instance, he tells no false and this is considered as a maxim of quality. His utterance is neither too much nor too little as a maxim of quantity. Abdul Hafeez's utterance is in the purpose of the exchange, which is figuring out what annoys Zein. Concerning the maxim of manner, the researcher argues that Abdul Hafeez via his utterance is clear, direct and very free of ambiguity. All this, in fact, leads to a very expressive way at conveying messages and enables the interlocutor to grasp the meaning. It also facilitates inferring the intended meaning.



Regarding indexicality, the researcher thinks that Abdul Hafeez's utterance contains a spatial deictic marker, “*down*” that refers to the place appointed to the interlocutor to have a seat. Also the researcher considers the lexicon “smoke”, as a deictic marker since it refers back to a particular entity and specified sort of smoke - cigarette.

No doubt, the above-discussed utterance is direct commissive speech act. The conditions of felicity are well contained in it. Abdul Hafeez is smoking when he triggers his smoking invitation and this is why the preparatory condition is said to be contained in this utterance. The execution is hundred percent there since Abdul Hafeez enjoys high reliability among his people. Sincerity condition is proved, as we follow up the sequence of this speech event.

The researcher thinks that Abdul Hafeez is not only successful in employing this commissive speech act, but also correct in employing it. The strategy he uses coincides with the presupposition that is based on a quite comprehensive knowledge about the context. He employs this direct commissive speech act to figure out what annoys Zein. It is mentioned in this thesis earlier that commissive speech acts are usually employed to maintain social harmony.

#### **4.1.2. Promises:**

##### **4.1.2.1 Sheikh Ali Promises Abdul Samad:**

The setting of this event is the in the market at Sheikh Ali's shop. There are two participants who take part in this conversation: Abdul Samad, and Sheikh Ali. Refusing Sheikh Ali's invitation, Abdul Samad, who remains upset, meets Sheikh Ali's explicit invitation by: “*To hell with your coffee*”

...”The message is clear enough to make Sheikh Ali work out its illocution force. As a perlocution, Sheikh Ali’s reaction is not but the same invitation underpinned by a promise this time.

***An extraction from (Salih WOZ. p:32)***

*Abdul Samad: “To hell with your coffee. Get up and open this safe of yours and give me my money. If you are determined not to pay, just say so?”*

*Sheikh Ali: “Come along and sit down and I’ll tell you a bit of news.”*

***Data analysis***

Based on the datum above and bearing the social context in mind, it is clear that Sheikh Ali calls another commissive expression when he adds, *“I’ll tell you a bit of news.”* By using (*will*), Sheikh Ali commits himself to another future course of action which is promising this time, a direct commissive act as an inevitable result of (*I’ll*). Sheikh Ali commits himself to tell Abdul Samad (*a bit of news*). When he invites Abdul Samad to sit down, then he would tell him that bit of news, he presupposes – relying on context – this commitment would make sense. Not only this, it is also a very strong sign of cooperativity of conversation, availability of conversational maxims, relevance, adequate inference and the most important feature to the correctness of any speech act, the felicity conditions. The researcher argues that Sheikh Ali is qualified to direct this promise as a preparatory condition. Shiekh Ali is able to fulfill his promise that the researcher argues he actually did a condition of execution. The third condition is also there, the sincerity condition, which is proved by Sheikh Ali when he released that promised bit of news.

Regarding deixis, both primary and secondary are sensible. The researcher counts these; (*your*) possessive adjective, (*this*) a demonstrative adjective, (*yours* and *my*) possessive pronouns, personal (*me*). He avoids repeating the same phrase by using the adverb (*so*). Sheikh Ali's only deictic marker is the personal pronoun (*you*).

On the other hand, a socio-cultural phenomenon, which is to wish those who annoy you bad things, is employed. Due to this, Abdul Samad wishes Sheikh Ali (*the Hell*). Abdul Samad's utterances are unacceptable, but pragmatically, his words are not but insistence on refusal and a concentration on the issue he is after. As commitment, Sheikh Ali said "...*I'll tell you a bit of news*". In doing commitment, Sheikh Ali has used a direct commissive speech act. The first person (*I*) plus "*will*" contained in Sheikh Ali's utterance indicates that this promise belongs to the direct form of the act of committing. The use of direct commissive speech act at least shows Sheikh Ali's explicit commitment. Sheikh Ali seems to employ simple strategy of commitment.

Here, Sheikh Ali uses a semantic formula. He employs a commissive expression by saying "...*I'll tell you a bit of news*." In this way, Sheikh Ali is correct in applying this strategy. The factor behind Sheikh Ali to apply this strategy is that because they have a close relationship, by virtue of that unsettled debt. Therefore, Sheikh Ali just employs a simple strategy. Besides, he really relaxes Abdul Samad. Socially, Sheikh Ali intends to maintain the relationship between him and Abdul Samad, as well as gaining believability. Based on the datum above, Sheikh Ali is successful in his act of committing.

#### 4.1.2.2 Sheikh Ali Promises Abdul Samad:

Sheikh Ali is doing his to distract Abdul Samad away from the purpose that Abdul Samad makes this visit for. Sheikh Ali is going further and commits himself to a one more promise.

#### An extracion from (Salih, WOZ. p: 32)

**Sheikh Ali:**“I swear your money’s here safe and sound. Come along and sit down and I’ll tell you the story of Zein’s marriage.”

#### Data analysis:

*“I’ll tell you the story of Zein’s marriage.”* Again, Sheikh Ali employs a direct commissive speech act. The usage of (*will*) makes it direct commissive act. Furthermore, it is correct in terms of felicity conditions. Sheikh Ali is qualified to perform promises and fulfill them since he identifies the issue he promises to tell “the story of Zein’s marriage”. He released that bit of news he promised earlier, which represents the condition of sincerity. Getting use of the entire context, Sheikh Ali, tries to distract Abdul Samad out of his money. The shared world between them helps him to expect Abdul Samad’s reaction to that bit of news.

Conveying meaning facilitators are well used by Sheikh Ali, personal deixis (*I*) denotes the person who speaks, (*your*) personal possessive adjective denotes the possessiveness of that person being spoken to, (*you*) refers to the addressee. Since deixis are closely related to the speaker’s context, the researcher classifies demonstrative (*here*) as a proximal deictic, regarding the place where this speech event takes place. The question they are about is known for both of the participants, so the article (*the*) as deictic marker is in its place, the researcher thinks. It seems that Sheikh Ali has used a simple strategy here because of the earlier mentioned factors.

#### 4.1.2.3 Mahjoub Promises Zein:

The setting is in the front of Sa'eed's shop. Participants are Zein, Mahjoub and Abdul Hafeez. Zein is narrating how he attacked one bride and bit her on mouth. Suddenly, he asks Mahjoub to marry him his daughter.

#### **An extraction from (Salih, WOZ. P: 37)**

*Suddenly Zein sat upright, the expression on his face wholly serious and directing his words at Mahjoub, said: “listen, are you going to marry your daughter Alawiyya to me or aren't you?” “I promise the girl to you – right now before all these people here” Mahjoub answered.*

#### **Datum analysis:**

Based on what has gone above between the two participants, a direct commissive act of promising is employed by Mahjoub. Performative (promise) makes it a direct act. Indexicality in this datum is heavily used which is considered as a strong sign of the role of context in conveying meaning. In other words, both participants share the same world. This helps them to build perfect conversation (cooperative principle), infer each other's utterances as (conversational implicature), the relevance is the backbone of the interpretation without which the whole communication would abort. Personal (*I*) refers to the speaker. Personal (*you*) refers to the addressee “Zein”. The article (*the*) identifies Alawiyya. The spatial markers (*before and here*) refer to the listeners who attend this speech event. From a felicitous view, the researcher thinks that a preparatory condition is exists. Mahjoub's status as a father permits him to determine who marries his daughter (a sociological perspective). The condition of execution is also

there similarly. The question is in the condition of sincerity, does Mahjoub seriously intend to do that? The researcher argues that the condition of sincerity is contained in this promise since here promised Zein before reliable group.

Socially, comforting simpleminded people by telling them lies is permissible in some communities. Based on this phenomenon, Mahjoub has used simple strategy in employing this commissive act. Another thing is that his relation with Zein makes him to behave that way. The researcher thinks Mahjoub is correct in employing this commissive act socio-pragmatically.

#### **4.1.2.4 The Omda Promises Zein:**

This speech event takes place in the fields, where the Omda for the cultivation of his field, one morning, brought a considerable gathering of peasants together. Zein, regardless the Omda's presence and before all that gathering, raises his voice and mentions the name of the daughter of the Omda (Azza). He says "Hear, ye. O people of the village, O kinsfolk, Azza the Omda's daughter has slain herself a man. Zein is slain in the courtyard of the Omda". Participants are Zein and the Omda.

#### **An extraction from (Salih, WOZ. p: 40)**

*The anger died in the breast of the Omda, who was seated on a chair in the shade of a palm tree, red of eye and dusty of moustache, as he spurred the people on to work. He was a serious, owe-inspiring man who seldom laughed; however, on this occasion he gave a harsh explosive laugh at Zein's words. "Zein" he shouted out at him, "If you go on working hard till evening, we'll give you Azza in marriage".*

## **Data analysis**

Another promise is made, and this time by the Omda . The Omda in this speech event promises Zein. The Omda's promise to Zein is tied down to a condition. If Zein objects his job, he will be given Azza - the Omda's daughter herself - in marriage. The Omda's utterance meets the three conditions of felicity, the thing that qualifies his promise to be considered as a correct commissive act. The Omda is the Omda as well as he is Azza's father. As an Omda and a father, the researcher argues the Omda is able to execute his promise to Zein if he wishes. Pragmatically talking, it is a correct commissive act. It is correct because the Omda infers Zen's utterance and responses in this way. The Omda knows Zein well (presupposition). The maxims of conversation are quite achieved in the sense that the Omda's utterance is directly related to the issue of that exchange as a maxim of relevance. The Omda's speech is neither too much nor too little as a maxim of quantity. The Omda is not ambiguous, a maxim of manner. The question that arises is that it is clear the Omda does not tell the truth. The researcher argues that the absence of quality maxim does not affect the flow of the conversation, especially in such a case like the one of Zein.

The researcher counts the personal deictic (you) which refers to the person being spoken to – Zein – and (we) refers to the person who speaks – the Omda – the temporal (till) referring to the time appointed to the end of the working hours.

It is clear that, the Omda commits himself to a future course of action, which is, no doubt, a promise. If it happens and Zein comes and asks the Omda to

marry him his daughter, the Omda will fulfill his promise as a matter of respecting his word.

#### **4.1.2.5 Saadiyya Promises Amna:**

The setting of this speech event is in Hajj Ibrahim's house. Amna visits Saadiyya for asking Ni'ma's hand for her son Ahmed as a wife.

#### ***An extraction from (Salih, WOZ. p: 49)***

*In her calm voice, which neither trembled nor was raised, she said:  
"God's will be done. Naturally, the decision lies with the girl's  
father. When he comes, we'll speak to him".*

#### ***Data analysis***

Saadiyya is the character who promises in this datum. She employs this commissive act correctly. Felicity conditions are achievable in this datum. What she commits herself is as simple as conveying infinitive information.

Saadiyya tells no false as a maxim of quality. She is neither too much nor too little and this is the maxim of quantity. She is very much related to the issue they discuss, a maxim of relevance and the last maxim is the maxim of manner, which congruent with Saadiyya's character so much. She is clear, brief and direct.

The deixis employed by the speaker are the personal pronouns (*he*) which refers anaphorically to the girl's father who is known to the hearer (presupposition) as well as, the personal pronoun (*we*), which refers to the speaker herself.

According to the above talk, the researcher thinks Saadiyya is correct in launching the commissive she commits. She uses a simple strategy based on



social assumptions that help her convey her message and keep herself out of blaming.

### **4.1.3 Oaths**

#### **4.1.3.1 Sheikh Ali Swears:**

This speech event is between Abdul Samad and Sheikh Ali. It is in the front of Sheikh Ali's shop at the market place in the afternoon. Abdul Samad is after this money.

#### **An extraction from (Salih, WOZ. p: 32)**

**Abdul Samad:** “I’ve not got the time, neither for you nor for your bit of news. I know well enough that you’re trying to fool me and take me out of my money.”

**Sheikh Ali:** “I swear your money is here safe and sound. Come along and sit down and I’ll tell you the story of Zein’s marriage.” **Abdul Samad:** “Whose marriage did you say?”

#### **Datum analysis**

As a commissive doer, Sheikh Ali commits to Abdul Samad by saying “*I swear*”. Felicity conditions in this utterance are there. However, sincerity condition is not sure for now, unless Sheikh Ali fulfills the oath he did. Contextually, Sheikh Ali presupposes Abdul Samad’s full knowledge of Zein’s mental situation that disqualifies Zein to marriage. The reaction made by Abdul Samad shows successful inference of Sheikh Ali’s utterance. Here the researcher thinks it is worth to highlight the role of context in conveying meaning as earlier hypothesized. Most of deixis used by both participants are personal possessive pronouns/adjectives, spatial (here) and articles (the). In doing the act committing, Sheikh Ali uses direct commitment because the performative “*swear*” belongs to direct form. The use of direct commitment,

at least shows Sheikh Ali's explicit committing to fulfill his oath and repay that money. He employed a simple strategy of committing, (*I swear*). Here, there is a kind of semantic formula that is used by Sheikh Ali. Socially, the participants share the same world. So, Sheikh Ali is quite sure about the reaction expressed by Abdul Samad "*Whose marriage did you say?*" a taunting question. This way, Sheikh Ali achieves his purpose and distracts him off his money.

#### **4.1.4. Pledges**

##### **4.1.4.1 Zein's Friends Pledge**

The setting is in the front of Sa'eed's shop this time, the place where the participants use to spend their evenings. There are Ahmed Isma'il, Taher Rawwasi, Abdul Hafeez, Hamad Wad Rayyes, Sa'eed the shopkeeper, Mahjoub and Zein. All these stated that they were witnesses to the promise made by Mahjoub.

#### **An extraction from (Salih, WOZ. p 38)**

**Zein:** "that is it then" he said "Bear witness brothers – this man has given his word and he can't come along denying it tomorrow or the day after." All those present Ahmed Isma'il, Taher Rawwasi, Abdul Hafeez, Hamad Wad Rayyes and Sa'eed the shopkeeper stated that they were witnesses to the promise made by Mahjoub and that the marriage would, God permitting, take place.

#### **Datum analysis**

As a response to Zein's request, "Bear witness", all those present stated that they were witnesses to the promise made by Mahjoub. According to this statement, the researcher argues that those people who attend Mahjoub's

promise admit a clear commissive act. They commit themselves to witness that is considered as (pledge).

All those who present Mahjoub's promise are qualified to witness and nothing militates this feature. Therefore, preparatory condition is satisfied. All of them are able to witness as execution condition, concerning sincerity condition; the researcher thinks that all the witnesses will do it having in mind the social context.

This datum, unlike the rest of the data analyzed so far, is brought in a reported form, the thing that leads the researcher to approach it with reference to its indexicality. Concerning this point, the researcher counts some personal deictic markers such as (his) possessive pronoun refers to person who utters the (word) – Mahjoub's utterance – and (he) which stands for the person being referring to his word. In addition, we find the personal (it) refers to the word – the promise – being made. The rest of the personal pronouns are production of the use of the reported form. For instance, we find the personals (they) and (were), referring to those who witness. He also counts a number of demonstrative pronouns as spatial markers.

Besides the above highlighted personal deixis, the data also contains spatial deixis. Deictic marker (that) that refers to the whole Mahjoub's utterance. Deictic marker (this) refers to the entity being spoken about who is (Mahjoub) in this incident. Temporal markers used in this datum are (tomorrow) and (the day after tomorrow) as reference to the near future course of time.

Conversational maxims presence is quite weak in this datum. The datum is presented in a reported speech. Reported speech masks quality and quantity

maxims. Relevance and manner maxims can be tested out of the reported speech. The cooperative principle in this datum is convivially held. The reason this in no doubt is the reported nature of this exchange. Inference is correctly taken.

It is clear that the earlier mentioned people employ a commissive speech act in this part of the novel. It is a reported commissive act and it correct since they do not reject what is reported about them. The locution force is Zein's request. The perlocution is the commissive (pledging).

#### **4.1.4.2 Seif ad Din Pledges**

This speech event takes place in the front of Sa'eed's shop. The participants are Zein's friends, Seif ad Din and Haneen. It is in the evening.

#### **An extraction from (Salih,WOZ. p: 66)**

... when Zein's grip had tightened on Seif ad Din and he had all but throttled him. In fact, some of them insist that Seif ad Din had actually died, had breathed his last, and had fallen to the ground a lifeless corpse. Seif ad Din himself affirms his version and says that he did actually die he says that the moment Zein's grip on his throat had tightened he completely departed this world. He saw a vast crocodile's jaws closed upon him, then came a wave so large it seemed like a mountain, which bore off the crocodile with Seif ad Din between its jaws into the valley that was the trough of the wave, and the crocodile plunged down into a vast bottomless pit. It was then, Seif ad Din says, that he saw Death face to face, and Abdul Hafeez, the person closest to Seif ad Din when he recovered conciosness, is adamant that the first words he uttered on breath coming anew to his lungs, the first thing he said on opening his eyes, was " I bear witness that there is no god butGod, and I bear witness thar Mohammed is the massenger of God"

## **Datum analysis**

Seif ad Din "I bear witness ... " in this extract Seif ad Din is pledging to witness that there is no God but Allah and Mohammed is the messenger of Allah pledging is commissive speech act it is directly used by Seif ad Din in this datum to serve social function. But before elaborating this function the researcher thinks it is a must to analyze how is it considered as direct commissive speech act. This pledging of Seif ad Din is a correct commissive speech act in the sense that Seif ad Din is qualified to witness there is nothing militates this felicity condition, in this case concerning him. The execution condition is also presented because he is mature and free and knows well what he does again no militating factors. The third condition is there because of the accident he encountered and how he faced the death, this entire situational context proves Seif ad Din's sincerity when he uttered his words.

Conversational maxims are contained in Seif ad Din's utterance. His utterance is neither too much nor too little as a maxim of quantity, his utterance coincides to the speech event, which is considered as a maxim of quality, and the relevance maxim is achieved compares the utterance to the context at which it is uttered. The researcher thinks that Seif ad Din's utterance contained deixis of different kinds. Personal deixis are the first person (I) which refers to the person the speaker who is Seif ad Din in this datum spatial deixis marker(there) which refers to the entire universe. Religiously, this utterance is said when a person declares being a Muslim. But in this case it cannot be classified as a declarative speech act first because Seif ad Din is already a Muslim so the evidence comes from that social norm when a Muslim faces some horrible danger and gets out of it

safe he or she may utter such words to express gratitude as well as his astonishment as being safe of that very close danger. Seif ad Din in this datum employs a correct direct commissive speech act. It is correct because of the above-mentioned details. Seif ad Din uses simple strategy in employing this commissive speech act.

#### **4.1.4.3 Tureifi Pledges**

It is in the school and particularly in the classroom in the morning. Participants are Tureifi and his classmate.

#### ***An extraction from (Salih, WOZ. p: 79)***

Looking around him with cunning eyes, he whispered in the ear of his right hand neighbor, "We've got out of tonight's geography. I bet you the headmaster won't finish the lesson."

( ..... I bet you the headmaster will not finish the lesson) Tureifi is betting his classmate. By this betting, it is clear that he commits himself a future penalty if his prophecy is not correct. Therefore, this datum will be approached under the consideration that Tureifi's expectation is incorrect. At such a condition Tureifi is employing direct commissive speech act, the act of betting since Tureifi's utterance meets the basic conditions that allow it to be classified as so. Preparatory condition is contained in this utterance since Tureifi, in spite of his young age is mentally legal to perform such an act with regard to what they fix as reward. The condition of execution is also contained in this datum, and Tureifi is sincere and would not deny his classmate's right if the headmaster finishes the lesson.

Regarding the maxims of conversation, the research thinks that Tureifi's utterance contained these maxims. Tureifi tells no false and this is the

maxim of quality, Tureifi's utterance neither too little nor too much, his utterance is clearly related to the purpose of the exchange that considered, as a maxim of relevance besides, Tureifi is clear, orderly and avoids ambiguity which is the maxim of manner.

The researcher accounts the following deixis, the pronoun (I) which refers back to the person the speaker who is Tureifi in this utterance, pronoun (you) refers to the person being spoken to, the classmate. The word (The headmaster) is used as a proper noun rather than its normal usage as a common noun because of social norms, (the lesson) refers to the geography lesson.

Tureifi is successful in employing this commissive speech act – betting – the reason is his presupposition, the adequate inference. The strategy he uses is a simple strategy as he addresses a classmate the one who sits by him.

#### **4.1 .5. Offers**

##### **4.1.5.1. Amna Offers**

The setting of this speech event is late in the morning in Haj Ibrahim's house. Participants are Haj Ibrahim's wife Saadiyya, Ni'ma's mother and Amna Ahmed's mother. Ahmed ignoring the tensions between his mother and Saadiyya, insists that his mother is to go and ask on his behalf for Ni'ma's hand in marriage. His mother agrees. Unenviable position.

#### **An extraction from (Salih, WOZ. p: 48)**

Calming down, she had swallowed hard and said in a quavering voice, while inwardly cursing her son who had exposed her to all this humiliation  
**“Saadiyya, sister mine, I swore that not even a matter of life and**

**death would ever bring again to you, because you of all people had refused to come and offer me condolences on my mother's death. Yet even so the true Muslim is indulgent, and thus, sister, I forgive you.**

### **Datum analysis**

In this datum Amna correctly employs the commissive act (I forgive). She commits herself forget about the past and implies a new start with Saadiyya her counterpart in this tension. This is her commitment, felicitously; her utterance is purely commissive act. She is qualified to launch such an expression as indication of preparatory condition, she can forgive Saadiyya, not only this, the researcher thinks that sincerity condition regarding this datum, is deeply rooted in Amna's utterance by virtue of the following offer she intends tell.

Conversational implicatures are held in this datum via conversational maxims and cooperative principles. Amna's utterance contains the necessary maxims for carrying out meaningful message, which the researcher argues she does. Concerning quality, Amna tells no false, quantity wise, she is neither too much nor too little, her speech is very much related to the purpose of the exchange and the maxim of manner is present in Amna's utterance. She is clear, brief and her participation is of no ambiguity.

Amna's utterance is a clear forgiveness, as assertion. Both participants know each another very well, as presupposition. It entails a new start. Inference appears clearly in saadiyya's response.

Not too many deixis usage in this datum. Deictical makers used in the above datum are only personal. In Amna's utterance personal (I) refers to the



person being speaking, it is Amna here. In addition, the researcher counts (you) that refers to the person being spoken to, Saadiyya in this course.

The researcher thinks that Amna's main purpose of employing this commissive act is to maintain her relation with Saadiyya. She uses simple strategy (I forgive). He also thinks she correct because of the social context.

#### **4.1.5.2 Amna's Family Offers**

The setting of this datum is the same speech event of the previous datum. Amna goes on persuading Saadiyya.

*An extraction from (Salih, WOZ. ps: 48-49)*

Amna going on talking to Saadiyya: **"... the point of my coming to you now – the thing that's brought me along – it's my son Ahmed – Ahmed's father and I would like to have Ni'ma for Ahmed."**

#### **Data analysis**

Here Amna offers her family's desire in having Ni'ma as wife for Ahmed to Hajj Ibramem's family. She employs a direct commissive act. She uses (to have). It is an offer because it accepts both acceptance and refusal. It is commissive because Amna by uttering this commissive, comits herself to continue the process of having Ni'ma for Ahmed. Pragmatically speaking, the researcher thinks that Amana is Ahmed's mother (preparatory condition). She is able to complete the process of having Ni'ma for Ahmed (execution condition). Socially, Amna cannot come and deny what she says (sincerity condition).

Conversational implicatures are represented via conversational maxims and cooperative principle. Regarding conversational maxims, the researcher argues Amna's utterance contains the four maxims of conversation. She tells no false (quality maxim), closely related to the whole context (relevance), she is clear, brief and direct, her speech is ambiguity free (manner maxim). Concerning the maxim of quantity, the researcher thinks that the tension between her and Saadiyya as well as the sensitivity of the thing that brings her to Saadiyya, all this lead to the result of weakening the quality maxim and make Amna's speech quite much.

Saadiyya's well inference indicates the achievement of the cooperative principle. Amna's utterance is relevant, it contains a clear offer (Assertion), both participants share the same world (presupposition), her utterance entails she likes Ni'ma (entailment) and Saddiyya's well response indicates (inference).

The sensitivity of the issue demands a real need for using personal deixis. She employs (my) the possessive pronoun shows the speaker's possessing of something, (you) refers to the addressee who is Saddiyya in this situation, ( I ) leads back to the speaker, the subject who is Amna in this case, (me) the object pronoun referring to (Amna) the speaker, (it) the impersonal pronoun here refers a person this person is Ahmed, (my) referring to what belongs to the speaker (Amna's son), (so) here stands for (also) because of the whole beginning tone that Amna adapts. The researcher also accounts (that) as a relative pronoun refers to the significant of her visit that day. Temporal (now) is a time marker that indicates the time of speech event.

The researcher thinks that Amna in her offer uses a simple strategy. Moreover, she is correct in doing so because of the nature of the issue they discuss.

#### **4.1.6. Threatening:**

##### **4.1.6.1 Zein Threatens**

Sa'eed's shop is the scene of this speech event and it is in the evening as usual. Participants are Zein the utterance launcher and Seif ad Din. Zein's friends are all there.

**An extraction from (Salih, WOZ. P: 62)**

The all knew that this emaciated body concealed an extraordinary super human strength and Seif ad Din \_ the prey upon whom Zein swooped \_ was doomed. For a while, their voices were intertwined.  
"The he donkey, I'll kill him," Zein was repeating angrily.

#### **Datum analysis:**

(The he donkey I will kill him) Zein is threatening in the above-mentioned utterance. Consequently, he is committing himself to a future action – killing – pragmatically speaking, he threatens Seif ad Din. He employs a direct commissive speech act (threatening). It is direct because Zein is using the form (I will). The use of this form (first person plus will) indicates threatening. From contextual point, the researcher argues that when we go back we find that Seif ad Din is repaying what he did some time ago when he struck Zein on the head using an axe.

From felicity point of view, the researcher thinks that all that needed conditions of felicity are available. From preparatory point, Zein is qualified

to perform such an act, as he – at that time – is well motivated to hold out what he utters because of those hard feelings he feels against Seif ad Din, besides his physical position that allows him to do what threatens. This analysis leads to approve the existence of the second felicity condition, the condition of executing the act of killing. For the same two reasons, the physical situation of Zein and his strong motivation. Concerning the third felicity condition, the researcher argues that Zein's words to Sheikh Haneen indicate his serious intention to kill Seif ad Din. Zein talking to Sheikh Haneen, he says, "If you hadn't come, reverend Sheikh, I'd have killed him. The he donkey – when he struck me on the head with an axe did he think I'd let him get away with it." Based on this illustration the researcher asserts that this commissive act is correctly employed by Zein. Regarding Utterance context, the researcher counts the following personal deixis.

The third persons singular (He), (the he donkey) and (him), refer back to Seif ad Din. First person (I) directly refers to the person being speaking (Zein). The context in this datum plays the core role in conveying the meaning and clarifying the whole situation. Zein as well as all those who attend that speech event, shares the same world. The factor that facilitates interpreting and understanding, the question between Zein and Seif ad Din and then solving it.

Conversation maxims in Zein's utterance are also included in a good way. Zein's utterance goes with the nature of the issue – quarreling -, his utterance is neither too much nor too little and his words suit his emotional situation that time.

#### 4.1.7. Vowing

##### 4.1.7.1 Mahjoub Vows

It is in the evening in the front of Sa'eed's shop. There are Ahmed Isma'il, Taher Rawwasi, Abdul Hafeez, Hamad Wad Rayyes, Sa'eed the shopkeeper, Mahjoub and Zein. All these stated that they were witnesses to the promise made by Mahjoub.

##### **An extraction from (Salih, WOZ, p: 103)**

*"She is certainly a woman to fill the eye all right," said Mahjoub with boundless admission, his voice raised in enthusiasm "I'll divorce if there's another girl like that." Sa'eed came along with the tea and Mahjoub said to him "Did you hear that? The girl went off herself and told him."*

##### **Datum analysis**

It is clear that Mahjoub in this speech event commits himself to a conditioned situation, which is divorcing, his wife. It is a vow. It is direct commissive speech act since it meets the three necessary conditions of felicity. From preparatory point, the researcher thinks Mahjoub tells no false. From execution hand, the researcher thinks Mahjoub is qualified to hold divorce out. Mahjoub is sincere by virtue of that enthusiasm.

Mahjoub's utterance implies his full support of Zein's marriage to Ni'ma. His utterance contains the maxims of conversation he talks about what the whole village is talking about which is considered as a maxim of quality, his utterance is neither too much nor too little, also Mahjoub is so much related to

the purpose of the exchange besides he is clear direct and almost free of ambiguity.

Mahjoub's utterance contains some deictic markers for instance he begins by the personal deictic marker (I) referring to himself the speaker, temporal (will) referring to a near future, spatial (there) referring to the village, and the demonstrative (that) referring the person being spoken about and in this case it is Ni'ma bit Hajj Ibrahim.

A social norm here arises and it is vowing to divorce your own wife is employed to show your seriousness and gain believability. The researcher argues that Mahjoub is quite sure about the fact that there is no a girl like Ni'ma. This commissive is direct because Mahjoub employs the phrase (I'll divorce). In this case, he uses simple strategy because he addresses his own people. The researcher thinks that Mahjoub is successful in employing this commissive speech act.

#### **4.1.7.2 Sheikh Ali Vows**

The setting of this speech event is in the wedding house in the afternoon. Sheikh Ali and his friend Hajj Abdul Samad are exchanging talk.

#### **An extraction from (Salih, WOZ. p: 110)**

“In all my born days I've never seen such a wedding as this”  
Said Sheikh Ali to Hajj Abdul Samad. Hajj Abdul Samad said,  
"I'll divorce my wife if Zein hasn't got himself married and a  
real proper marriage it is too"

## **Datum analysis**

Hajj Abdul Samad is vowing. He would divorce his wife. He employs a direct commissive speech act. His utterance contained the felicity conditions. He tells no false, he can divorce whenever he wishes.

Hajj Abdul Samad's utterance meets the needed maxims of conversation quality wise he talk about Zein's marriage so he is on the subject of the exchange. Quantity wise the researcher thinks his utterance is quite suitable. He is closely related to the subject of exchange as relevance maxim. Regarding the maxim of manner Abdul Samad utterance is clear and ambiguity free.

Hajj Abdul Samad's utterance contained some deixis. the personal (i) which refers to the person being speaking, the temporal (will) which refers to a near future, the possessive (my) which refers back to that what the speaker owns. The personal (wife) here is Abdul Samad's, the reflexive (himself) points to the person being spoken about and it is Zein in this case, the pronoun (it) refers to the marriage of Zein.

The researcher argues that Hajj Abdul Samad is correct in employing this commissive and successful in it also. The strategy he uses is simple one because of that social context and the shared world between them both.

## **4.2 Summery of Analysis**

This chapter contains 17 data. These data are sorted into seven kinds of direct commissive speech acts where the speakers commit themselves to future courses of actions. The researcher has counted five promises, three

invitations, three pledging, two offers, two vowing, a threatening and an oath.

As hypothesized by the researcher, the results shows the social reasons behind employing a certain direct commissive speech act, the pragmatic approach by which it is expressed, the strategy and the role of context in conveying each datum. The researcher postulated three hypotheses in this study. These three hypotheses were confirmed.

In the final chapter, the researcher will present the conclusions, recommendations of the study as well as suggestions for further studies.



# CHAPTER FIVE

## MAIN FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

### 5.0 Introduction

This chapter provides main findings conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further studies. The conclusion is drawn on the bases of the results of the analysis which is held out with full regard of the statement of the problem of this thesis.

### 5.1 Conclusions

Based on the results of data analysis, the researcher has arrived to the following conclusions:

#### 5.1.1 The kinds of Direct Commissive Expressions

The commitment is called since there are social and psychological tendencies to be satisfied as natural features of human personality. Characters of the novel (The Wedding of Zein) mostly used the direct form of the act of committing marked by the existence of the performative verbs such as; *come along ... have coffee ... I'll ... I promise ... I bear ... I pet ... etc.* The use of the direct form of the committing explicitly shows that most of the characters of the novel (The Wedding of Zein) are sincere about their commitment. They aim to convince their interlocutors that they really mean what they say.

### **5.1.2 The Choice of the Strategy of Commitment**

Regarding the strategy of the act of committing used by the characters the novel (The Wedding of Zein), direct commissive expressions are more often employed by the characters of the novel; for instance, promise expression (*I'll*) is the most used expression used for promising, the most overt expressions employed for directing invitations are (*come along*) and (*have a ...*), the form (*I swear*) is the expression used for expressing oath ... etc. Most of direct commissives mentioned earlier in this thesis are pinpointed with explanations. These explanations are for showing speaker's sincerity. Most of these direct commissives employed in the novel, are employed not for nothing, they are employed for more far intended purposes.

### **5.1.3 Pragmatic Faculty**

Most of the data are brought from artificial source which is the novel (The Wedding of Zein) which represents a simple language community. In spite of the low educational standards of the most if not all of the characters of the novel, it is so clear that they have managed not only to communicate convivially, but also to change realities and do things via their own day-to-day language.

### **5.1.4 Conveying Meaning is a Context Dependent Process**

Characters of the novel (The Wedding of Zein) have functionalized the communicative feature of language via that simple discourse of a peasant. It is because they share the same social and cultural context.

## **5.2 Recommendations**

In the light of the findings of the study, some recommendations are formulated below:

1. Direct forms of any commissive speech act must contain a performative verb.
2. Simple strategy must be the first strategy via which direct forms are always used.
3. Context must be well considered as it is the backbone of conveying meanings.

## **5.3 Suggestions**

The researcher proposes the following suggestions:

1. Other researchers may analyze about indirect commissive speech acts, expressives, directives, representatives or declaratives. Besides, they can also use other sources of data, such as film and drama with other approaches.
2. The students are suggested to use this research as reference to have a deeper understanding in pragmatics study. Hence, students will be inspired to have further knowledge about it.
3. Lecturers are required to give more practice regarding pragmatics study so that students will understand the subject better. Moreover, they will do research in Pragmatics better.

## References

- A. C. Henry Yule (1996) The Anglo-Indian Dictionary. London: Words Worth Reference
- Charles w. Morris (1938) Logical Positivism Pragmatism and Scientific Empiricism. Paris: Hermann et cie
- Coulhard (1985) An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. UK: Longman
- D. Walton (1993) Slippery Slope Arguments. Oxford: Clarendon
- David Crystal (1997) English as a Global Language. Cambridge: CUP
- Dell Hymes (1986) Ethnography of Communication. New York: Journal of Language in Society
- E. Chaika (1994) Language, The Social Mirror. London: Heinle ELT
- Fasold Ralph (1992) The Sociolinguistics of Society. Oxford: Blackwell
- G. N. Leech (1983) Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman
- H. Bussmann (1996) Dictionary of Language and Linguistics. London: Routledge LTD
- [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Wedding\\_of\\_Zein#Plot\\_Summary](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Wedding_of_Zein#Plot_Summary)
- <https://www.wikipedia.org/>
- J. Holmes (1992) An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. London: Longman
- J. L. Austin (1960) Speech Theory .Oxford:OUP
- J. L. Austin (1975) Speech Acts Theory .Oxford: OUP
- J. Lyons (1977) Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- John R. Searle (1969) Speech Acts .Cambridge: CUP
- M. A. K. et al (1985) Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social Semiotic Perspective.Oxford : OUP
- Mey (1993) Speech Acts Theory and Communication. Cambridge: CUP

- S. Toulmin (1958) The Uses of Arguments. US: California University Press
- Searle et al (1985) Speech Acts in Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: CUP
- Stephen C. Levinson (1983) Pragmatics. UK: Cambridge University Press
- Tayeb Salih (1962) The Wedding of Zein. UK: African Writers series.
- Trudgill (1974) Language Myths. Cambridge: CUP
- Wardaugh (1992) An Introduction to Sociolinguistics . UK : Penguin
- William (1995) Commissive Speech Acts {Lecture to HU} University of Harvard
- Biber et al (1994) Studies in Sociolinguistics. Oxford: OUP - C. L.
- Hamblin (1970) Standard Treatment of Fallacies. UK: Vale Press