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ABSTRACT


William Congreve’s The Way of The World (1894) is one of the best examples of Comedy of Manners in Restoration Period. It is a play which satirizes the customs, attitudes and manners of upper class people in that period. This thesis focuses on the use of impoliteness in the language of upper class people of the play. Impoliteness seen in the pragmatic perspective occurs in the speech acts of the characters during the conversation. Since there are various kinds of speech acts the writer only discusses blaming and accusing speech acts in the play.

The objectives of this study are to identify all impolite blaming and accusing speech act and to find out what are the politeness strategies violated in the impolite blaming and accusing speech act.

There are four steps as guidance for the analysis. Firstly, Searle’s categories of illocutionary acts are used to identify all of the blaming and accusing speech acts. Secondly, Gofman’s Face theory is applied to determine whether a blaming or accusing speech act is impolite or not. Thirdly, the writer analyzes the strategies which are applied in all of the blaming and accusing speech acts. Lastly, the writer summarizes all of the findings in the study into a comprehensive table and makes a brief and clear explanation of it.

As the result of the analysis, there are some important facts to answer the problems of the study. Firstly, there seventeen out of twenty seven blaming and accusing speech acts identified in act I until act V of the play are impolite. Nine of them are the impolite blaming speech acts and there are eight impolite accusing speech acts. Secondly, most of the blaming and accusing speech acts in the play use the bald on record strategy, which performs Face Threatening Act (FTA) in the most direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way. Thirdly, most of the blaming and accusing speech acts violate the negative politeness strategy. It means the impolite blaming and accusing speech acts are used to reply speech acts which contain FTA.
ABSTRAK


Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengidentifikasi semua tindak tutur menyalahkan dan menuduh yang tidak sopan dan untuk mengetahui strategi-strategi kesopanan apa saja yang dilanggar di dalam tindak tutur menyalahkan dan menuduh yang tidak sopan.


Sebagai hasil dari analisis, ada beberapa fakta penting untuk menjawab masalah-masalah dari penelitian ini. Pertama, ada tujuan belas dari dua puluh tujuh tindak tutur menyalahkan dan menuduh yang teridentifikasi di babak I sampai babak V yang termasuk tidak sopan. Sembilan diantaranya adalah tindak tutur menyalahkan yang tidak sopan dan ada delapan tindak tutur menuduh yang tidak sopan. Kedua, sebagian besar tindak tutur menyalahkan dan menuduh yang tidak sopan menggunakan strategi mengatakan sesuatu yang mengandung Face Threatening Act (FTA) dengan cara yang langsung, jelas, tidak ambigu, dan ringkas. Ketiga, sebagian besar dari tindak tutur menyalahkan dan menuduh yang tidak sopan melanggar negative politeness strategy. Hal ini berarti tindak tutur menyalahkan dan menuduh yang tidak sopan digunakan untuk membalas tindak tutur yang mengandung FTA.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

This thesis analyzes William Congreve’s play, *The Way of the World* (1894) from a pragmatic perspective, with special reference to the unwritten conventions of impoliteness. The idea of impoliteness in our daily life is simply inspired by a universal phenomenon which is called politeness. It is an important aspect of human social interaction since we all want other people to be polite to us, and in turn we are polite to others because we recognize the same need in them, we want to be accepted emotionally, and because if we do not pay attention to the politeness needs of others we are unlikely to be very efficient in getting things done. Violating politeness needs of others means we are impolite. As the result, it will destruct our social relationship.

Talking about impoliteness and politeness in the pragmatic perspective perhaps, the most well-known account of them was developed by Brown and Levinson (1978). It is true that they make significant accounts in politeness strategies using the concept of face. However, their concentration on strategies which stipulate how to be polite rather than impolite leads to the area of linguistic strategy of impoliteness being overlooked. Therefore, it is challenging for the writer to deal with impoliteness in a literary work.

There are several reasons why the writer chooses *The Way of the World* (1894) as the object of analysis. Basically, as a play, Congreve’s *The Way of the*
World (1894) is a literary work in which face-to-face interactions happen. During
the face-to-face interaction, the impoliteness implications of this play are
understood through the interactions and speech acts of the fictional characters in
the play. The study of impoliteness also can be applied in this play since
Congreve compares the society of the Earl, a British nobleman ranking below a
marquis and, and the lower class people. These people often undergo the state of
disequilibrium since the Earl in that Restoration Period often deceives others who
have lower status than them. There are also various intrigues talking about love
and money which make them deceive each other and create conflictive situations
(Berkowitz, 2004).

Impoliteness is important in the study of drama or play because it is a type
of aggression, meaning to say, the practice of making assaults or attacks on the
rights or territory of others as a method or policy that has been a source of
entertainment for thousand of years (Culpeper, 1998: 86). In our daily life we can
find a socially respectable and legitimate form of verbal aggression in the
courtroom. A prosecutor or a lawyer usually chooses different discourse strategies
in exerting pressure on the witnesses and defendants, condescendingly casting
doubt on their testimony, or frightening them. In this play, the writer found that
there were a lot of conversations showing impolite behaviour. Such aggression
often happens in the dialogue between upper class people and lower class people.

Since there are a lot of speech acts showing impolite behaviour, the writer
will limit the analysis to expressive speech act in the play. Expressive speech act
is a part of Searle’s illocutionary acts. The main reason why the writer confines
this research to expressive speech act is because it makes known a speaker's psychological attitude towards a state of affair which can be conflictive in certain conditions. However, expressive speech act also has several categories. Therefore, to make it restricted the writer will only focus on expressive speech acts which show blaming and accusing acts.

*The Way of the World*, one of Comedy of Manners in its era, is also characterized by a condition where characters clash with each other in situations of conflicting love entanglements and intrigues. Having enjoyed studying politeness and the play previously within the writer's degree, combining these two interests appeared both an interesting idea and a feasible area of analysis.

**B. Problem Formulation**

Writing this thesis, the writer wants to answer the two questions as follow:

1. What are the blaming and accusing speech acts in William Congreve's *The Way of the World* which show impoliteness?

2. What are the politeness strategies violated in the impolite blaming and accusing speech acts?

**C. Objectives of the Study**

Based on problem formulation above, this study has two aims. Firstly, it is to find out blaming and accusing speech acts that in William Congreve's *The Way of the World* which show impoliteness. Secondly, it aims to find out the politeness strategies violated in the impolite blaming and accusing speech acts.
D. Definition of Terms

According to Culpeper impoliteness is conceptualized as "a complex notion which comprises a whole spectrum of linguistic phenomena ranging from single lexical items or phrases through various complex types of Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) (Culpeper, 1996: 350)." It means impoliteness makes someone becomes offended. In pragmatics it is also called threatening the addressee's *face*. As the result the addressee may redress negative speech act to the speaker who performs impoliteness.

The ways the speaker performs impoliteness are vary. They include the use of inappropriate or condescending forms of address, epithets and taboo words. Other strategies could be instantiated by ridiculing the addressee with banter, and irony (Culpeper, 1996: 351).
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL REVIEW

A. Review of Related Studies

The writer finds out that some studies related to impoliteness have been done by some scholars. Nevertheless, most of them only discuss a little bit about impoliteness since they focused more on the politeness. In fact, there are a lot of theories discussing more about politeness than impoliteness because impoliteness itself is derived from politeness. Simply said, if a speaker is not polite, he or she will be called impolite. In the following paragraphs the writer gives the examples of related studies and elucidates what makes this thesis different from other theses.

An example of the research on politeness is a paper written by Abdelaziz Bouchara which is entitled The Application of Brown + Levinsons’ Universal Theory of Politeness to Much Ado about Nothing, Measure for Measure, The Taming of the Shrew, and Twelfth Night. The aim of his research was to see treatment of the variables power, rank, and distance in the speakers as the way to classify their genres (Bouchara, 2002). Doing a closer look in this paper the writer found how Bouchara could prove systematically the applicability of Brown and Levinsons theory of politeness as modified by Brown and Gilman in the study of drama. It is a good reference for the writer to do this thesis by having particular attention in the treatment of the variables power, rank, and distance.
Another example of the previous related research is a thesis entitled *Naguib Mahfouz's The Thief and the Dogs: A Pragmalinguistic Analysis*, written by Ayid Sharyan (1992), graduated from Department of English, Faculty of Education, University of Sana’a. In this thesis, he tried to reveal insights a universal phenomenon (i.e. politeness strategies, and their unwritten conventions) so as to promote tolerance and a better understanding of cross-cultural settings (Sharyan, 1992). Having read this thesis the writer believes that the study of impoliteness is essential for a better understanding of language and cultural parameters influencing the literary consciousness and also the means and methods of literary interpretation. The writer assumes that language can be better understood and analyzed in terms of its relationship with a number of situational (themes and characters) and socio-cultural factors. In fact, *The Way of The World* (1894) presents several situational themes and socio cultural elements in the Restoration Period.

A sample research on analyzing impoliteness in dramatic dialogue can be seen briefly in Culpeper’s *(Im) politeness in dramatic dialogue*, taken from *The Exploring Language of Drama* (1998). In his writing, he tried to apply impoliteness strategies in the film *Scent of a Woman* (Culpeper, John, Mick Short, and Peter Verdonk, 1998: 88-89). This is the closer related studies that the writer found in the field of impoliteness though it is only a brief look on how analyzing dramatic dialogue in a certain context.

The writer is assured that this thesis is distinctive from researches mentioned above. Firstly, the writer worked on a work from different culture and
time. Congreve’s *The Way of the World* was written in 1894, far ahead from Shakespeare’s plays mentioned before (1595-1604) (Berkowitz, 2005) and before the novel Naguib Mahfouz’s *The Thief and the Dogs* (1961), and the film *Scent of a Woman* (1974). This play was set on English Restoration period, unlike others which was written in other period, for example Naguib Mahfouz’s *The Thief and the Dogs* of which the culture is Arabian culture. Kasper says that politeness varies between Western cultures (Kasper, 1990: 193). It means that this thesis has chance to discuss impoliteness in Restoration period as other theses have not done yet. Secondly, the writer’s aim to conduct this analysis is to find out the impolite expressive acts which show blaming and accusing speech acts used in the play and what are the politeness strategies violated in the speech acts.

**B. Review of Related Theories**

In this part the writer explains all theories needed in this thesis and why they are important to the analysis of impoliteness in the play. Basically, there are four theories that shall be used within this thesis. Firstly is the idea of discourse analysis and its significant elements in the play. The writer must have understood discourse analysis since the writer deals with a language used in certain context of a literary work. Secondly, this chapter will look at Austin’s definition of speech act and Searle’s categories in one of its levels. This theory is useful as the indication of the blaming and accusing speech acts in the discourse. Thirdly, Goffman’s Face theory is used to determine whether each of the blaming and accusing speech acts is impolite or not. Fourthly, the writer will use Stephen
Levinson and Penelope Brown's Super Strategies. This theory is applicable to find out what kind of politeness strategy violated in the impolite blaming and accusing speech acts. However, before the writer elaborates all these theories, it is necessary to acknowledge the idea of impoliteness in Comedy of Manners. The writer should explain how impoliteness can be a possible study in a Comedy of Manners.

1. The Application of Impoliteness in Comedy of Manners

The study of impoliteness can be applied in Comedy of Manners since both have the same purpose that is to evaluate the manner of a certain group of people. According to Gaudet (2001) “a manner is the method in which everyday duties are performed, conditions of society, and a way of speaking” (Gaudet, 2001). The certain group of people that the writer is going to talk about is the upper class people in the Restoration Period. However, since this study uses pragmatic perspective, the writer refers the term of impoliteness to the impolite speech acts that are made by the characters. The playwright of Comedy of Manners can violate various strategies of politeness to the characters' impolite speech acts. As the result, it becomes a mean to maximize confrontation in the discourse and a source of entertainment to the people who watch the play or read the scripted dialogue.

Some studies conducted by Neil Simon, Edward Albee, and other analysts which tried to analyze the conventions that governed Comedy of Manners found some facts
1. “Constancy in love (especially in marriage) was boring”. It means if tiresome exists in love there might be a state when conversation goes inharmoniously or even harshly. Emotional level tends to lead to the state of unpleasant feeling. Anger, sadness, and disgust are the level of emotions that mostly appear in the characters (Plutchick, 2005).

2. “Sex should be tempting”. In the state when sex seriously attracts people, lust can control human behavior. People can do everything to fulfill it. This condition happens among the upper class people in the play. Once again their level of emotions can guide them to do something wrong or to speak inappropriately.

3. “Love thrived on variety”. When love succeeds usually it ends in weeding in a comedy. Variety makes it has a process of achieving. Undergoing this process could be the strife one or the easy one. The strife one can make someone has to deal with threats. Talking about threats, impoliteness in communication could happen any time between the characters.

4. “Genuine sexual feelings had no place on stage”. This characteristic shows that characters in Comedy of Manners often deceive others or themselves if they deal with love matters. In the context of politeness this manner is wrong.

5. “Characters clashed with each other in situations of conflicting love entanglements and intrigues”. It is obvious that whenever clash happens in the
society people tend to act roughly and speak harshly. People will scorn, insult, and mock others. What they say often appears impolite. In this case, the playwright has the freedom to violate politeness strategies in the speech acts of the characters.

6. “Country life was considered boring”. When life turns into something which is not interesting, the characters of the play tends to be stressful. Thus, their emotion will be easily affected. The way they speak might enter the state of impoliteness.

7. “Clergy and professional men were treated with indifference or condescension”. These groups of people usually have significant roles in the upper class people in the play. Clergy is often considered to be holy since they teach good moral values coming from God. Professional men should also be appreciated since they have the skills which are useful to help human being. If these men were not appreciated well they would not care about moral values and would live individually. Arrogance and selfish might lead them to speak improperly. Impoliteness could happen any time.

All of these conventions will be analyzed further in the conversation between the characters related to impoliteness. They function as social context how far impoliteness happens in the way of life of people in Restoration period.

*The Way of The World* (1894) as one of the greatest Comedy of Manners also shows some of these ideas through the conversation among the Earl and between the Earl and the lower class people. Impoliteness exists as the characteristics of the conversation in upper class society and it can function as the
material to criticize them. Impoliteness is observable because when a speaker says
impolitely, though it can be done consciously or unconsciously, the result can
change the atmosphere of conversation.

Talking about the language of Comedy of Manners, it has its own
characteristic:

Comedy of Manners is also known as high comedy because it involves a
sophisticated wit and talent in the writing of the script. In this sense it is both
intellectual and very much the opposite of slapstick, which requires little skill
with the script and is largely a physical form of comedy
(http://www.bartleby.com/218/0606.html)

It means the writer of Comedy of Manners has sophisticated writing ability in
diction. Therefore, it needs careful understanding of the words to follow the story.

2. Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis, in dealing with pragmatic perspective, tends to focus
particularly on aspects of what is unsaid or unwritten, but they are communicated,
within the discourse being analyzed. When a discourse is mutually constructed
and negotiated in time between speakers and usually informal and unplanned, it is
called a conversation. Discourse analysis itself goes beyond the primarily social
corns of interactions and conversation analysis. In the pragmatic of discourse,
any analysis conducted unavoidably explores what the speaker or writer has in
mind (Yule, 1996: 84).

According to Yule the discourse of a play is very likely to be divided in a
series of speech events. "Speech event is an activity in which participant interact
via language in some conventional way to arrive at some outcome (Yule, 1996:
67).” An obvious central speech act, such as “You, have caused a trouble for me,” as in a speech event of ‘blaming’ may be included in a speech event with other utterances leading up to and subsequently making a reaction to that central of action.

Furthermore, according to Hymes a speech event should have at least three important characteristics. They are setting, participants, and purpose. The setting means a specific time or a place of an event. Participants mean people who get involved in an event. There are at least a speaker who transmits a message and a listener who receives the message. Focusing on the message, the writer should pay attention to the adjacency pairs. A conversation contains frequently occurring patterns, in pairs of utterances, known as adjacency pairs. It is said that “utterance of one speaker makes a certain response of the next speaker very likely” (Cutting, 2003: 30). The acts are arranged with a first part and a second part, and categorized as question-answer, offer-accept, blame-deny, and so on, with each part creating an expectation of a particular second part. This is known as preference structure (Cutting, 2003: 30). The last characteristic, purpose, is the topic of being discussed which leads to a certain problem. All of these characteristics are needed because sometimes several events, even speech act may share the same style and are distinguished only by purpose, participants, and setting.
3. Austin’s Speech Acts and Searle’s Categories of Illocutionary Acts

According to Austin, speech act is “the actions performed in saying something”. It is said in the Speech Act Theory that speech act can be analyzed in three different levels. They are locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. Illocutionary act means “performing the act in saying something”. It is different from locutionary act which means “performing the act of saying something” and perlocutionary act which means “performing an act by saying something” (Leech, 1983:199). To make it easy to understand the writer will give a brief overview of how illocutionary act differs with locutionary act through social goal point of view and a test for distinguishing illocutionary from perlocutionary verbs by placing the verb in the context.

The illocutionary act can be identified with the transmission of discourse (interpersonal communication). On the other hand, locutionary act can be identified with the transmission of the message (ideational communication). As the result, the social goal between illocutionary act and locutionary is different. The social goal of illocutionary act is to maintain cooperation and politeness since it deals with others or the hearers. The locutionary act only reaches the idea of its message transmitted by the speaker.

The following test will be useful for distinguishing illocutionary from perlocutionary. The writer will place the word try in this context (Leech, 1983:204):

i. “She tried to persuade me to accompany him” (perlocutionary verb)

ii. “She tried to ask me to accompany him”. (illocutionary verb)
In the perlocutionary verb the word *try* implicates that the illocution failed to achieve its intended perlocutionary effect. In the case of the illocutionary verb, this interpretation does not exist. It allows the interpretation that the hearer was not listening, could not be found, or could not understands the speaker’s use of language. Thereby, the writer uses illocutionary speech act since its social goal involves both the speaker and hearer, and the illocution does not fail to achieve its intention.

Furthermore, there are some categories of illocutionary acts made by Searle that need to be acknowledged to limit the discussion of illocutionary acts in the play. However, before going to Searle’s categories of illocutionary acts, it is important to know its function because it is closely related.

According to Austin “illocutionary functions chiefly may be classified into the following four types, according to how they recount to the social goal of establishing and maintaining comity (Leech, 1983:104).”

a. Competitive

The goal of this illocutionary competes with the social goal; e.g. ordering, asking, demanding, and begging. Broadly speaking, the goals of competitive are those which are essentially discourteous. One of the simple acts of competitive is when you are getting someone to lend you money.

b. Convivial

The goal of this illocutionary coincides with the social goal; e.g. offering greeting, thanking, and congratulating. As the second type, convivial is, on the contrary to competitive, intrinsically courteous. It is meant to take a more
positive form of seeking opportunities for comity. When you have an opportunity to congratulate someone (the hearer) on his 50th birthday, it is convivial.

c. Collaborative

The goal of this illocutionary is indifferent to the social goal. It is unconcerned to the social goal; e.g. asserting, reporting, announcing, and instructing. Politeness is largely irrelevant in this type.

d. Conflictive

The goal of this illocutionary conflicts with the social goal; e.g. threatening, accusing, cursing, and reprimanding. Politeness is out of question in this type since it is designed to cause offence. It creates threat to the addressee. In this research the writer fully deals with the conflictive aspects of speech act. The writer focuses on the aspect of how impoliteness strategy appears in the conflictive speech act. It is not how the speaker threatens or curses the hearer politely, but impolitely.

The above classification is based on functions. According to Searle another classification of speech acts can be made based on varied criteria. There are three major ways of the variation. Firstly, “they can differ in the way in which they fit the words to the world”. Assertion is the former category of this criterion. Secondly, they also can differ in terms of the psychological state they express. Lastly, “they can differ in terms of point or purpose (Coulthard, 1985: 24).” The writer finds that it is helpful to relate the two classifications to show how politeness affects Searle’s categories. What is polite or impolite will be clear by
relating both classifications. Searle’s categories are defined as follows (Cutting, 2003: 17)

1. Assertives

Assertives or also called as representative are illocutionary acts in which the words state what the speaker believes to be the case such as ‘stating’, ‘suggesting’, ‘boasting’, ‘complaining’, ‘claiming’, ‘reporting’, ‘insisting’, and ‘predicting’. For example:

a. The fact that girls have been outstripping boys academically has been acknowledged for the past years or so (Glasgow Herald, 28 November 2000)

b. I came, I saw, I conquered (Julius Caesar)

(Cutting, 2003: 17)

Such illocutions tend to be neutral as regards politeness and they belong to collaborative category above. However, there are some exceptions, for example, boasting, complaining, and claiming is generally considered to be impolite.

2. Directives

This category covers illocutionary acts in which the words are aimed at making the hearer do something, such as ‘ordering’, ‘commanding’, ‘requesting’, ‘advising’, and ‘recommending’. For example:

a. Better remain silent and be thought a fool than open your mouth and remove all possible doubt (Ancient Chinese proverb)

b. Do not do unto others as you would they should do unto you. Their tastes may not be the same (Shawl)

(Cutting, 2003: 17)
They frequently belong to competitive category although some directives (such as invitations) are intrinsically polite.

3. Commissives

This includes illocutionary acts in which the words commit the speaker to future action, such as ‘promising’, ‘vowing’, and ‘offering’. For example

a. *I'll love you dear. I'll love you/ Till China and Africa meet/ And the river jumps over the mountain/ And the Salmon sing in the street* (Auden)

(Cutting, 2003: 17)

These acts tend to be convivial rather than competitive, and therefore intrinsically polite.

4. Expressives

This group includes illocutionary acts in which the words state what the speaker feels, such as ‘thanking’, ‘congratulating’, ‘pardoning’, ‘blaming’, ‘praising’, ‘accusing’, ‘condoling’, etc. For example:

a. *A woman without a man is like a fish without a bicycle* (Steinem)

b. *If I'd known I was gonna live this long, I'd have taken better care of myself* (Blake)

(Cutting, 2003: 17)

Like the commissive, they have the sense to be convivial, and it makes them intrinsically polite. However, blaming and accusing are the reverse of other speech acts (Leech, 1990: 106). Blaming means “to say or think that someone is responsible for something bad (Frederick: 1996),” for example “It is not fair to blame Christie. He didn’t know anything.” On the other hand accusing means “to say that someone has done something wrong or illegal (Frederick: 1996),” for example “Are you accusing me of stealing?” The difference
between blaming and accusing is that blaming indicates that speaker who expresses this has been convinced that the addressee is the one who did the mistake. Compared to accusing the speaker is less convinced that the addressee is the one who did the mistake. Furthermore, blaming speech acts tend to demand the addressee’s responsibility for doing the mistake rather than accusing speech acts. The writer will prove in this thesis whether both speech acts are really impolite.

5. Declarations

This category includes illocutionary acts which are performed by someone who is specially authorized to do something within some institutional framework, for example, judges sentencing offenders, minister of religion christening babies, etc. Broadly speaking, it is about resigning, dismissing, christening, naming, excommunicating, appointing, sentencing, and so on. They can scarcely be said to involve politeness. For example, sentencing a person is an unpleasant thing, but because a judge has a complete authority in doing so, it can scarcely be said impolite.

As mentioned in the chapter I the writer will focus on the expressive speech act and it is limited to blaming and accusing speech acts. Therefore, the writer will only limit the discussion and the analysis to blaming and accusing speech acts. Further analysis is suggested to give a better understanding of impolite speech acts in the play.
4. Face and Politeness

Erving Goffman’s notion of ‘face’ is an integral concept within the field of politeness in particular, and impoliteness. It was Goffman who first used the term ‘face’ within the field of politeness. Subsequently many theorists, for example Stephen Levinson and Penelope Brown (1978), have used it within politeness theories. The writer employs the term ‘face’ in this chapter because it is very difficult to make judgments concerning politeness or impoliteness without referring to it. According to Goffman, “The term face may be defined as the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact (Goffman, 1967:5).” It will determine how far the speaker being polite or impolite in making utterances. This is, of course, related to emotional control of the speaker which a playwright can apply in a character. Thereby, certain strategy of impoliteness can be variedly applied.

Yule also comments on the term ‘face’ and its usage within the concept of politeness,

Face means the public self image. It refers to that emotional and social sense of sense of self that everyone has and expects everyone to recognize... Politeness, in an interaction, can be defined as the means employed to show awareness of another persons face (Yule, 1996:60)

On the other hand Yule says, “If a person says something that represents a threat to another individual’s expectations regarding self-image, it is regarded as a ‘face-threatening act (Yule, 1996:61).’ This makes politeness turning into impoliteness because the state of equilibrium has moved through to a state of disequilibrium.
The strategies that can be applied depend on the writing ability of the writer of dramatic dialogue itself.

Furthermore Goffman says, "Each person, subculture and society seems to have its own characteristic repertoire of face-saving practices (Goffman, 1967:13)." It means both concepts of politeness and impoliteness depends on the characteristic of people at particular time. It is similar to what Culpeper said in his book. Culpeper criticized Brown and Levinson's use of the term 'face' within their book Politeness: Some universals in language usage (1978). Culpeper says, "They underestimate the impact of context: positive and negative face cannot be assumed to apply in quite the same way across cultures, individuals, situations, acts, time and so on (Culpeper, 2001:239)." Culpeper also suggests that, "Face varies from person to person." In brief "Face" is something that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and varies from one person to another (Culpeper, 2001:239)."

Related to the expressive illocutionary acts, blaming and accusing speech acts can be said creating offence or social disruption. It creates what so-called as Face Threatening Act (FTA) because what is said by the speaker or the response from the addressee threatens face. However, though it tends to threaten the addressee's face it can only be said impolite if the reaction from the addressee showing disagreement, anger or using scornful words. The writer will focus the analysis more on the concept of impolite expressive illocutionary acts, blaming and accusing speech acts.
5. The Five Super Strategies

According to Culpeper (Culpeper, 2001:243), Brown and Levinson proposed Five Super-Strategies that are systematically related to the degree of face threat. By taking each of the different statements from the selected dialogue, it will be possible to divide them into each of the different ‘super-strategies’. This theory will enable a thorough examination of the characters dialogue and allow a detailed analysis of how the characters use politeness and impoliteness. Culpeper says “the five super-strategies ... are systematically related to the degree of face threat (Culpeper, 2001:243).” The list of super-strategies appears thus:

1) ‘Bald on record’ (Culpeper, 2001:243) “The face threatening act is performed “in the most direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way possible” (Brown and Levinson, 1987:69). In other words, in accordance with Grice’s Maxims (1975), no attempt is made to acknowledge hearers wants.

2) ‘Positive politeness’ (Culpeper, 2001:43) “The use of strategies designed to redress the addressees’ positive face wants.” The speaker indicates that in general they want some of the hearers’ positive face wants, for example paying attention to the hearer, expressing interest, approval or sympathy. It is what so-called polite. The reverse will produce impoliteness.

3) ‘Negative politeness’ (Culpeper, 2001:244) “The use of strategies designed to redress the addressees’ negative face wants. The speaker indicates respect for the hearers’ face wants and the wish not to interfere with the hearer’s freedom of action.” Negative politeness attempts to soften the blow.” For example, apologizing, “I’m sorry but could I...,” questions and hedges, “Actually, I
wondered if you could help...” etc. The opposite of this will be claimed impolite.

4) ‘Off-record’ (Culpeper, 2001:244) “The face threatening act is performed in such a way that “there is more than one unambiguously attributable intention so that the actor cannot be held top have committed himself to one particular intent (Brown and Levinson, 1978:69).” In other words it is performed by means of an implicature (Grice 1975)... For example, “I’m thirsty” said with the goal of getting a cup of tea.

5) ‘Withhold the face threatening act’ (Culpeper, 2001:245) “The speaker actively refrains from performing the face threatening act.” As Craig et al point out, “an option every speaker has is not to talk”. Keeping silent can be the strategy in conversation to avoid creating an FTA.

All these strategies will be very useful to know how the impolite speech act is uttered by the speaker. In the study of politeness the application of this theory will be on how a speaker readdresses the other speaker’s positive or negative face wants and how it is performed (off record or on record).

C. Theoretical Framework

This part will explain the contributions of all theories and reviews mentioned above in solving the problems of the study. It includes the importance of each theory and how they are applied in this study. As written in the problem formulation, there are two problems arise in this study. In the following
explanations the writer will explicate the application of theories and reviews in answering the problems one by one.

To answer the first problem the writer will apply Goffman’s face theory and Searle’s expressive illocutionary speech act theory to identify which dialogue showing Face Threatening Act and which can be categorized as expressive illocutionary acts, particularly in the form of blaming and accusing. The writer will try to understand the speaker’s intended meaning and the context of certain conversation using discourse analysis. Having known the intention and the context the writer will classify which speech acts can be included in the blaming and accusing speech act to make a specific boundary of analysis. Answering the second problem, the writer will apply The Brown and Levinsons’ theory of Five Super Strategies to find out what politeness strategies violated in the impolite blaming and accusing speech acts. All of the findings will be arranged in a brief and comprehensive table of data according to the speech act in the play. The findings will be useful to answer all problems of this study.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Through this chapter, the writer will explain thoroughly the ways this thesis is going to be analyzed. It will cover three major parts, namely object of the study, approach of study and method of study. In the first part, the object of the study, the writer will describe Congreve’s *The Way of The World* (1894) as a work of literature. As the second part, the approach of study, the writer will explain all approaches that will be used in this work and why they are chosen. Finally, the last part concerning the method of study, the writer will describe the procedure taken in analyzing the work, including its systematical steps.

A. Object of the Study

This thesis tries to analyze impoliteness used in Congreve’s work, *The Way of the World* (1894). This play is written by British playwright, William Congreve. It was premiered in 1700 in the theatre in Lincoln’s-Inn-Fields, England. That the play was a failure on the stage is not remarkable. It was written to please its author’s fastidious taste, not to be in harmony with the humour of the age. However, it is widely considered as being one of the best Restoration comedies written and it was still performed sporadically to this day. Congreve said, “That it succeeded on the stage was almost beyond my expectation” (http://www.bartleby.com/218/0606.html).
The story tells about the courtship between Mirabell and Millamant which is almost sabotaged by a gallery of brilliantly conceived characters: Lady Wishfort, a fifty-five year-old widow who desperately wants another husband, her country bumpkin nephew, Sir Wilfull Witwoud, the mismatched Fainall, and the pert servants, Waitwell and Foible. All of the characters reflect Congreve’s special view of the "the world" of Restoration society. “For Congreve "the world" means the polite eighteenth-century society of the city with its artificiality, rigidity, and formality (www.sparknotes.com/thewayoftheworld).” Thus, the play aims to satirize upper class manner, and this is what so-called the main idea of Comedy of Manners.

Since the analysis deals with the violation of politeness strategies, the writer will focus on the conversation of characters which imply impolite blaming and accusing speech acts. The way the writer identifies all the violation of politeness strategies is by applying all the related theories mentioned in chapter II.

B. Approach of the Study

Working on this thesis the writer uses pragmatics as a lens to examine. The writer believes that using pragmatic perspective provides a novel point of entry for investigating the relationships between characters' language behavior driven by psychological motives. Brown (1978) also says that politeness theory is a psychological theory. It deals with the individual, rather than the society as a whole. Applying this approach is also justified by the fact that study of politeness and impoliteness is done by scholars who are interested in the question of
meaning, rather than in other levels of language, e.g. phonetics, phonology, or syntax. Pragmatics is context-dependent unlike other levels of language in the organization of a text, which Carter et al (Carter, 1990: 9) summarizes, as phonology (sounds), vocabulary (words), grammar (phrases, and clauses), discourse (relations between sentences and paragraphs; speaking turns) and context (relations between participants in a context). Pragmatics (the relations of signs to meaning) differs from syntax (the relations of signs to one another), and semantics (the relations of signs to objects). Pragmatics is concerned with meaning that comes from the contextual and interpersonal situation which includes speaker and listener. It does not ask about “What does X mean?” but “What do you mean by X?” It is interested in the functions, intentions, goals and effects of language use in specific social situations, (Wales, 1989: 36).

To study the organization of a literary from the pragmatic viewpoint, there is a need to observe the contextual factors, rather than the structural layers. Pragmatics concerns with the meaning of utterances rather than sentences or propositions which lie within the area of semantics. Related to impoliteness, meaning of utterances is important to acknowledge whether it can be said as polite or impolite in particular context.

All theories mentioned in chapter II also support pragmatic perspective in the field of impoliteness. Therefore, its application will be done by revealing the attitudes of the speaker and listener through their use of language, showing whether relations are smooth or tense.
C. Method of the Study

Though the analysis will be done by conducting a close reading on the conversation text of the play, the writer believes that it is a necessity to apply library research (including the electronic one from World Book 2005 and Microsoft Encarta Encyclopedia Standard 2005) and internet research. The library research will use reliable books and journal of pragmatics that chiefly deal with impoliteness. To complete it, an internet research of text related to the play itself, and pragmatic perspective are necessary as the main part of analysis.


The writer carried some steps to accomplish this thesis. Firstly, the writer the writer finds out all of the blaming and accusing speech acts in the play. This was important since the writer only focuses the analysis on the blaming and accusing speech act. Secondly, the writer identified all the blaming and accusing speech act whether they can be categorized impolite. The writer used Goffman’s Face Theory to identify which dialogues showing Face Threatening Act (FTA). If the reaction from the addressee towards the speaker who produces blaming and
accusing speech acts creates negative face and the conversation becomes tense, it means it is impolite. This would answer the first problem of this research. Thirdly, the writer applied Culpeper’s five super strategies of politeness. The writer analyzed what are the strategies violated in each impolite blaming and accusing speech act. Doing this step would answer the second problem of this thesis. Lastly, the writer included all the data of blaming and accusing speech act in a comprehensive table of data. It would make the reader easy to understand the result of analysis.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

In this chapter, the writer analyzes impoliteness that appears in the dialogue of characters in Congreve’s *The Way of the World* (1894). This play consists of five acts in which impolite blaming and accusing speech acts likely happen in certain dialogues among the characters. The writer then analyzes them to find out all of the violation of politeness strategies used in the speech acts.

The first analysis is identifying all of the blaming and accusing speech acts. The second analysis is to find out whether each of the blaming or accusing speech acts is polite or impolite. The writer uses all the indications of impoliteness by paying attention to the speech of the speaker and the reaction of the addressee which show the idea of Face Threatening Act (FTA) and by understanding why the speaker says it or what are the intentions of saying it. All of the findings will answer the first problem of this study.

To answer the second problem the writer finds out what kind of politeness strategies violated in each impolite blaming and accusing acts. The Five Super Strategies is applicable here as the way the writer categorizes the impolite blaming and accusing speech acts. Finally, to sum up the findings, the writer draws a list of table of the violation of politeness strategies in blaming and accusing speech acts in Congreve’s *The Way of the World* (1894).
A. Blaming and Accusing Speech Acts

In this part, the writer finds out all of the blaming and accusing speech acts starting from act I until act V of the play. The writer has identified twenty seven (27) blaming and accusing speech acts from act I to act V. They consist of seventeen (17) blaming speech acts and ten (10) accusing speech acts. The writer uses three important characteristics of speech event namely setting, participant, and the purpose of the speech to make the speech act if they have significant roles in the speech act. The writer applies these characteristics since each speech act has its own characteristics in the level of setting, participants, and purpose and they are also a part of speech event in the play. The writer elaborates them in each act of the play below.

1. Blaming and Accusing Speech Acts in Act I

This act introduces the characters and tells complexity of problems in the play. There are problems of love which show who is the true lover between the men. Intrigues also appear to win someone’s heart. Men criticize one another expressively using clever wit and deceive others for the sake of their own favours. Of all the problems the writer identified that blaming and accusing speech acts occur in the discourse.

Speech Act 1

Participants : Mirabell and Mr. Fainall

Purpose : Mr. Fainall blames Mirabell for being indifferent in a chess game.
You are a fortunate man, Mr. Fainall.

Have we done?

What you please. I’ll play on to entertain you.

No, I’ll give you your revenge another time, when you are not so indifferent; you are thinking of something else now, and play too negligently; the coldness of a loosing gamester lessens the pleasure of the winner. I’d no more play with a man that slighted his ill fortune, than I’d make love to a woman who undervalued the loss of her reputation.

You have a taste extremely delicate, and are for refining on your pleasures.

Prithee, why so reserved? Something has put you out of humour?

(1894: lines 1-6)

As the opening of the play, speech act I tells about the unpleasant victory of Mr. Fainall who has just beaten Mirabell in a chess game. The cause of the unpleasant feeling is because of Mirabell’s indifference. As the result, Mr. Fainall blames Mirabell because his attitude lessens his winning by saying, “No, I’ll give you your revenge another time, when you are not so indifferent; you are thinking of something else now, and play too negligently; the coldness of a loosing gamester lessens the pleasure of the winner.” (line 4) The last sentence shows the blaming speech act since Mirabell is responsible for lessening Mr. Fainall’s pleasure of the winner.

Hearing the complain Mirabell replies it in indirect way; “You have a taste extremely delicate, and are for refining on your pleasures.” (line5) The phrase “extremely delicate” actually has the reverse meaning. It is not mild, but rough and striking. It is what so-called ironic. Mirabell also knows that the purpose of Mr. Fainall says it is actually to refine his winning. The effect makes the conversation becomes tense. That is why Mr. Fainall then said “Something has put you out of humour?” (line 6) to mitigate Mirabell’s negative face want.
Speech Act 2

Participants: Mirabell and Mr. Fainall

Purpose: Mr. Fainall blames Mirabell for resenting what Millamant spoke in the previous night.

13 Mira. For which reason I resolved not to stir. At last the good old lady broke through her painful taciturnity, with an invective against long visits. I would not have understood her, but Millamant joining in the argument, I rose an with constrained smile told her I thought nothing was so easy as to know when a visit began to be troublesome; she reddened, and I withdrew, without expecting her reply.

14 Fain. You were to blame to resent what she spoke only in compliance with her aunt.

15 Mira. She is more mistress of herself, than to be the under the necessity of such a resignation

(1894: lines 13-15)

In this speech act, Mirabell and Mr. Fainall get involved in a serious talk about the event last night. That night Mirabell felt that he was not welcomed by the guests and the worse thing was that Millamant, the woman he loves, defended her aunt, Lady Wishfort. Mr. Fainall blames Mirabell for resenting what Millamant said since she was only complying with her aunt, “You were to blame to resent what she spoke only in compliance with her aunt.” (line 14) Mirabell’s reply,” She is more mistress of herself, than to be the under the necessity of such a resignation” (line 15) intends to tell that she should be more mistress of herself and she should not cave in to outside pressures.
Speech Act 3

Participants: Mirabell and Mr. Fainall

Purpose: Mr. Fainall blames Mirabell because he has not returned Mrs. Marwood's overtures.

24 Fain. You are a gallant man, Mirabell; and though you may have cruelty enough, not to satisfy a lady's longing, you have too much generosity, not to be tender of her honour. Yet you speak with an indifference which seems to be affected; and confesses you are conscious of negligence.

25 Mira. You pursue the argument with a distrust that seems to be unaffected, and confesses you are conscious of a concern for which the lady is more indebted to you, than is your wife.

26 Fain. Fie, fie, friend, if you grow censorious I must leave you; - I'll look upon the gamesters in the next room.

(1894: lines 24-26)

During the conversation Mr. Fainall also blames Mirabell wounds Mr. Marwood because he has not returned her overtures, "You are a gallant man, Mirabell; and though you may have cruelty enough, not to satisfy a lady's longing, you have too much generosity, not to be tender of her honour... (line 24). He also vexes a statement related to "negligence" at the end of his speech, "Yet you speak with an indifference which seems to be affected; and confesses you are conscious of negligence (line 24). The reply spoken by Mirabell about "concern", "You pursue the argument with a distrust that seems to be unaffected, and confesses you are conscious of a concern for which the lady is more indebted to you, than is your wife," (line 25) in other way teases Mr. Fainall because he criticizes him having affair with Mr. Marwood.
Speech Act 4

Participants : Mirabell and Betty

Purpose : Mr. Fainall asks about the time to Betty.

Betty, what says your clock? (line 29) Betty then answers “Turned of the last canonical hour, sir” (line 30) The answer makes him angry since it does not directly answers the question. He blames it by saying “How pertinently the jade answer me! ... (line 31).” This is one of the evidence of how Congreve criticizes upper class people who often insult lower people.

Speech Act 5

Participants : Witwoud, Mirabell, and Mr. Fainall

Purpose : Mirabell and Mr. Fainall accuse Witwoud monopolizing the wit.

He’s reckoning his money; my money it was- I have no-luck today. (96) You may allow him to win of you at play, for you are sure to be too hard for him at repartee; since you monopolize the wit that is between you, the fortune must be his of course. (97) I don’t find that Petulant confesses the superiority of wit to be your talent, Witwoud. (98) Come, you are malicious now, and would breed debates. Petulant’s my friend, and a very honest fellow, and a very pretty fellow, and has a smattering, faith and troth a pretty deal of an odd sort of small wit. Nay, I’ll do him justice. I’m his friend, I won’t wrong him. And if he had any judgment in the world, he would not be altogether contemptible. (99)
Come, come, don’t detract from the merits of my friend.
(1894: lines 96-99)

Witwoud, being distressed by the letter from his half-brother, Sir Wilful Witwoud, criticizes Petulant who has just beaten him in a card game (line 96). However, when Mirabell and Mr. Fainall accuse Witwoud monopolizing all the wit between them, “You may allow him to win of you at play, for you are sure to be too hard for him at repartee; since you monopolize the wit that is between you, the fortune must be his of course and “I don’t find that Petulant confesses the superiority of wit to be your talent, Witwoud (lines 97-98).” He defends himself by asserting that Petulant also possesses “an odd of sort of small wit (line 99).”

Speech Act 6
Participants : Petulant and Mirabell
Purpose : Mirabell blames Petulant because his severe humour hurts other people.

200 Mira. But hast not thou then sense enough to know that thou ought’s to be most ashamed of thyself, when thou hast put another out of countenance?
201 Pet. Not I, by this hand- I always take blushing either for a sign of guilt, or ill breeding.
202 Mira. I confess you ought to think so. You are in the right, that you may plead the error of your judgment in defence of your practice. Where modesty’s ill manners, ‘tis but fit That impudence and malice pass for wit
(1894: 200-202)

At the end of the conversation, before Mirabell and Mr. Fainall go to the Mall to meet the ladies, Mirabell blames Petulant because he has put another out of countenance by his severe humour, “But hast not thou then sense enough to
know that thou ought’s to be most ashamed of thyself, when thou hast put another out of countenance? (line 200)” However, Petulant reacts calmly by negating and arguing it. The last sentence, which is like a poem verse, “Where modesty’s ill manners, ‘tis but fit-That impudence and malice pass for wit” (line 202) also indirectly blames him. Nevertheless Petulant does not say anything.

2. Blaming and Accusing Speech Acts in Act II

Act II is decisive because it unfolds the complication of Mirabell’s plot. Mirabell’s scheme involving Waitwell is revealed. It also reveals strained relationship between the characters. Blaming and accusing speech acts appear in the conversation between women, wife and husband, persons who actually love each other, and a man who tries to persuade a woman for the sake of love. The following sub chapters will elaborate the occurrence of blaming and accusing speech acts in act II.

Speech Act 7

Setting : St. James’ Park

Participants : Mrs. Fainall and Mrs. Marwood

Purpose : Mrs. Fainall and Mrs. Marwood talks about their aversions to mankind.

Mrs. Fain. Then it seems you dissemble an aversion to mankind, only in compliance to my mother’s humour.

Mrs. Mar. Certainly. To be free; I have no taste of those insipid dry discourses, with which our sex of force must entertain themselves, apart from men. We may affect endearments to each other, profess eternal friendships, and seems to dote like lovers;
but 'tis not in our natures long to persevere. Love will resume his empire in our breasts, and every heart or soon or late, receive and readmit him as its lawful tyrant.

(1894: lines 205-206)

Mrs. Fainall and Mrs. Marwood open act II with a conversation about an aversion to mankind in St. James Park. The setting is important here since in this park people are free to talk without being afraid of someone overhearing the conversation. It makes the two ladies are free to talk about their aversions to men. In the conversation Mrs. Fainall accuses Mrs. Marwood of pretending to have an antipathy to men only to humour Lady Wishfort, "Then it seems you dissemble an aversion to mankind, only in compliance to my mother's humour." (line 205)

Speech Act 8

Participants : Mrs. Fainall and Mrs. Marwood

Purpose : Mrs. Fainall accuses Mrs. Marwood in love with Mirabell.

227 Mrs. Fain. Ingenious mischief! Would thou wert married to Mirabell.
228 Mrs. Mar. Would I were.
229 Mrs. Fain. You change colour.
231 Mrs. Fain. So do I; but I can hear him named. But what reason have you to hate him in particular?
232 Mrs. Mar. I never loved him; he is, and always was, insufferably proud.
233 Mrs. Fain. By the reason you give your aversion, one would think it dissembled; for you have laid a fault to his charge of which his enemies must acqutt him.
234 Mrs. Mar. Oh, then it seems you are one of his favourable enemies.
Methinks you look a little pale, and now you flush again.
235 Mrs. Fain. Do I? I think I am little sick o' the sudden.

(1894: lines 227-305)

Mrs. Fainall asks a question whether she might marry Mirabell. She says this to provoke Mrs. Marwood, whom she suspects is in love with Mirabell:
“Ingenious mischief! Would thou wer't married to Mirabell.” (line 227) Being accused, Mrs. Marwood reacts violently and asserts that she hates him in particular because he is insufferably proud. Mrs. Fainall replies that this seems to be an invalid reason, for most people do not judge him as proud. Mrs. Marwood then retorts that Mrs. Fainall must be one of Mirabell’s favorable enemies (line 234).

**Speech Act 9**

**Participants**: Mr. Fainall and Mrs. Marwood

**Purpose**: Mr. Fainall accuses Mrs. Marwood and his wife love Mirabell.

> 263 Mrs. Mar. It may be you are deceived.
> 264 Fain. It may be so. I do not now begin to apprehend it.
> 265 Mrs. Mar. What?
> 266 Fain. That I have been deceived, madam, and you are false.
> 267 Mrs. Mar. That I am false! What mean you?
> 268 Fain. To let you know I see through all your little arts. Come, you both love him; and both have equally dissembled your aversion. Your mutual jealousies of one another have made you clash till you have both struck fire. I have seen the warm confession reddening on your cheeks, and sparkling from your eyes.

> 269 Mrs. Mar. You do me wrong.
> 270 Fain. I do not -'twas for my ease to oversee and willfully neglect the gross advances made him by my wife; that by permitting her to be engaged, I might continue unsuspected in my pleasures; and take you oftener to my arms in full security. But could you think, because the nodding husband would not wake, that e'er the watchful lover slept?

(1894: lines 263-270)

Being left together with Mrs. Marwood, Mr. Fainall accuses Mrs. Marwood and his wife love Mirabell, “Come, you both love him; and both have equally dissembled your aversion.” (line 268) He can see the signs from the reddening cheeks and her sparkling eyes when she met Mirabell before.
Speech Act 10

Participants : Mr. Fainall and Mrs. Marwood

Purpose : Mrs. Marwood accuses Mr. Fainall of ruining her reputation and spending her fortune.

287 Mrs. Mar. By all my wrongs I'll do it - I'll publish to the world the injuries you have done me, both in my fame and fortune. With both I trusted you, you bankrupt in humour, as indigent of wealth.

288 Fain. Your fame I have preserved. Your fortune has been bestowed as the prodigality of your love would have it, in pleasures which we both have shared. Yet, had not you been false, I had ere this repaid it. 'Tis true, had you permitted Mirabell with Millamant to have stolen their marriage, my lady had been incensed beyond all means of reconciliation: Millamant had forfeited the moiety of her fortune; which then would have descended to my wife. And wherefore did I marry, but to make lawful prize of a rich widow's wealth, and squander it on love and you?


Mrs. Marwood accuses Mr. Fainall of ruining her reputation and spending her fortune, ”By all my wrongs I’ll do it - I’ll publish to the world the injuries you have done me, both in my fame and fortune...” (line 287) However Mr. Fainall denies that he has injured Mrs. Marwood by marrying his wife. He did it to get the fortune which he will give to her (line 288).

Speech Act 11

Participants : Mirabell and Mrs. Fainall

Purpose : Mrs. Fainall blames Mirabell who has made her marry Mr. Fainall.

313 Mrs. Fain. You have been the cause that I have loved without bounds, and would you set limits to that aversion, of which you have been occasion? Why did you make me marry this man?
Mira. Why do we daily commit disagreeable and dangerous actions? To save that idol reputation. If the familiarities of our loves had produced that consequence, of which you were apprehensive, where could you have fixed a father’s name with credit, but on a husband? I knew Fainall to be a man lavish of his morals, an interested and professing friend, a false and designing lover; yet one whose wit and outward fair behaviour have gained a reputation with the town, enough to make that woman stand excused, who has suffered herself to be won by his addresses. A better man ought not to have been sacrificed to the occasion; a worse had not answered to the purpose. When you are weary of him, you know your remedy.

(1894: lines 313-314)

The play then shifts to Mirabell and Mrs. Fainall’s conversation. In this conversation Mrs. Fainall claims that she is married with a man whom she despises and blames Mirabell who has made her marry Mr. Fainall by saying “You have been the cause that I have loved without bounds, and would you set limits to that aversion, of which you have been occasion? Why did you make me marry this man?” (line 313)

Speech Act 12

Participants : Mirabell and Millamant

Purpose : Mirabell blames Millamant in their previous meeting.

Milla. Mirabell, did you take exceptions last night? Oh, aye, and went away - Now I think on’t I’m angry - no, now I think on’t I’m pleased - for I believe I gave you some pain.

Mira. Does that please you?

Milla. Infinitely; I love to give pain.

Mira. You would affect a cruelty which is not in your nature; your true vanity is in the power of pleasing.

Milla. Oh, I ask your pardon for that - one’s cruelty is one’s power, and when one parts with one’s cruelty, one parts with one’s power; and when one has parted with that, I fancy one’s cold and ugly.

(1894: lines 358-362)
In the conversation Mirabell blames Millamant for affecting a cruelty which is not in her nature, “You would affect a cruelty which is not in your nature; your true vanity is in the power of pleasing (line 361).” Instead of giving pain and cruelty, Mirabell thinks that Millamant has the power of pleasing, “your true vanity is in the power of pleasing” (line 361).

**Speech Act 13**

**Setting**: St. James’ Park

**Participants**: Mirabell and Millamant

**Purpose**: Millamant and Mirabell shares their feeling each other.

384 Mira. I would give something that you did not know, I could not help it.

385 Milla. Come, don’t look grave then. Well, what do you say to me?

386 Mira. I say that a man may as soon make a friend by his wit or a fortune by his honesty, as win a woman with plain-dealing and sincerity.

387 Milla. Sententious Mirabell! Prithee don’t look with that violent and inflexible wise face, like Salomon at the dividing of the child in an old tapestry hanging.

388 Mira. You are merry, madam, but I would persuade you for a moment to be serious.

(1894: lines 384-388)

A park is usually the perfect place for lovers who want to share their feelings. It happens between Mirabell and Millamant. They are involved in profound conversation. As the conversation goes on, Millamant blames Mirabell for being more serious and looking at her with his “violent and inflexible wise face”. She refuses to be more serious by saying “Sententious Mirabell! Prithee don’t look with that violent and inflexible wise face, like Salomon at the dividing of the child in an old tapestry hanging” (line 387).
3. Blaming and Accusing Speech Acts in Act III

This act shows how Mirabell’s plan is in action. Unfortunately, the antagonists, Mrs. Marwood and Mrs. Fainall find it out. The characterization of Lady Wishfort, the upper class lady, the most significant character of Mirabell’s plan is also introduced. Having done an overview of the discourse in this act the writer found out five blaming and accusing speech acts.

Speech Act 14

Participants : Lady Wishfort and Peg

Purpose : Lady Wishfort blames Peg for bringing her the wrong thing.

417 Lady. I have no more patience-- if I have not fretted myself till I am pale again, there’s no veracity in me. Fetch me the red—the red. do you hear, sweetheart? An arrant ash colour, as I’m a person. Look you how this wench stirs! Why dost thou not fetch me a little red? Didst thou not hear me, mopus?

418 Peg. The red ratafia does your ladyship mean, or the cherry-brandy?
419 Lady. Ratafia, fool. No, fool. Not the ratafia, fool. Grant me patience! I mean the Spanish paper, idiot, complexion, darling. Paint, paint, paint! dost thou understand that, changeling, dangling thy hands like bobbins before thee? Why dost thou not stir; puppet? Thou wooden thing upon wires,

420 Peg. Lord, madam, your ladyship is so impatient-- I cannot come at the paint, madam, Mr. Foible has looked it up, and carried the key with her.

421 Lady. A pox take you both—fetch me the cherry-brandy then. (Exit Peg)

422 Lady. I’m as pale and as faint, I look like Mrs. Qualm-sick the curate’s wife, that’s always breeding. Wench, come, come, wench, what art thou doing, sipping? tasting? Save thee, dost thou not know the bottle?

Re-enter Peg with a bottle and a china cup

423 Peg. Madam, I was looking for a cup.
424 Lady. A cup, save thee, and what a cup hast thou brought! Dost thou take me for a fairy, to drink out of an acorn? Why didst thou not bring thy thimble clinking in thy pocket with a bit of nutmeg? I
warrant thee. Come, fill, fill. So. Again. See who that is.-- (One knocks) Set down the bottle first. Here, here, under the table-- What, wouldst thou go with the bottle in thy hand like tapster! As I'm a person, this wench has lived in an inn upon the road, before she comes to me, like Maritornes the Asturian in Don Quixote. No Foible yet?

Peg.

No, madam, Mrs. Marwood.

(1894: lines 416-425)

Lady Wishfort's preparations to receive Sir Rowland opens act III. Congreve at the same time tries to introduce Lady Wishfort, the upper class lady who desperately tries to appear young and hides her advancing age using cosmetics and criticize how the language of upper class people used towards lower class people who tend not to react negatively. During her extreme effort, Lady Wishfort gets exasperated with Peg and reproves her for bringing the wrong thing and too small a cup for the brandy. Therefore, she blames her for her fault by saying "Ratafia, fool. No, fool. Not the ratafia, fool. Grant me patience! I mean the Spanish paper, idiot, complexion, darling. Paint, paint, paint! dost thou understand that, changeling, dangling thy hands like bobbins before thee? Why dost thou not stir, puppet? Thou wooden thing upon wires" (line 319) and "A cup, save thee, and what a cup hast thou brought! Dost thou take me for a fairy, to drink out of an acorn? Why didst thou not bring thy thimble clinking in thy pocket with a bit of nutmeg?" (line 424)

Speech Act 15

Participants : Lady Wishfort and Foible

Purpose : Lady Wishfort accuses Foible that he has betrayed her.
Lady. O Foible, where hast thou been? what hast thou been doing?
Foib. Madam, I have seen the party.
Lady. But what hast thou done?
Foib. Nay’ tis your ladyship has done, and are to do; I have only promised. But a man so enamoured—so transported. Well, if worshipping of pictures be a sin—poor, Sir Rowland, I say.
Lady. The miniature has been counted like—But hast thou not betrayed me, Foible? Hast thou not detected me to that faithless Mirabell? What hadst thou to do with him in the Park? Answer me, has he got nothing out of thee? Foib. So, the devil has been beforehand with me, what shall I say?—Alas madam, could I help it, if I met that confidant thing? Was I in fault? If you had heard how he used me, and all upon your ladyship’s account, I’m sure you would not suspect my fidelity. Nay, if that had been the worst I could have borne: but he had a fling at your ladyship too; and then I could not hold: but I’ faith I gave him his own.

(1894: lines 433-437)

In this speech event Lady Wishfort accuses Foible as a “traitor” in the form of question. She suspects his fidelity: “But hast thou not betrayed me, Foible?” Hast thou not detected me to that faithless Mirabell? What hadst thou to do with him in the Park? Answer me, has he got nothing out of thee?” (line 437).

Speech Act 16

Participants : Millamant and Mrs. Marwood

Purpose : Millamant blames Mrs. Marwood to tell about her love with


Mrs. Mar. ‘Twere better so indeed. Or what think you of the play house? A fine gay glossy fool should be given there, like a new masking habit, after the masquerade is over, and we have done with the disguise. For a fool’s visit is always a disguise; and never admitted by a woman of wit, but to blind her affair with a lover of sense. If you would but appear barefaced now, and own Mirabell; you might as easily put off Petulant and Witwoud, as your hood and scarf. And indeed ‘tis time, for the town has found it: the secret is grown too big for the pretence: ‘tis like Mrs. Primly’s great belly; she may lace it down before, but it
burnishes on her hips. Indeed, Millamant, you can no more conceal it, than my Lady Stramme! can her face, that goodly face, which in defiance of her Jewish-wine tea, will not be comprehended in a mask.

490 Milla.  I'll take my death, Marwood, you are more censorious than a decayed beauty, or a discarded toast; Mincing, tell the men they may come up. My aunt is not dressing here; their folly is less provoking than your malice.

      (Exit Mincing)

      The town has found it. What has it found? That Mirabell loves me is no more a secret, than it is a secret that you discovered it to my aunt, or than the reason why you discovered it is a secret.

491 Mrs. Mar.  You are nettled.
492 Milla.  You are mistaken. Ridiculous!
493 Mrs. Mar.  Indeed, my dear, you'll tear another fan, if you don't mitigate those violent airs.

      (1894: lines 489-493)

Millamant firstly appears in this act to be irritated by Petulant's meaningless contradiction of everything that Witwoud says. She becomes more exasperated when Mrs. Marwood tells that her love to Mirabell is no longer a secret for everybody in the town (line 489). She blames Mrs. Marwood because of this and because she tells it to her aunt, "I'll take my death, Marwood, you are more censorious than a decayed beauty, or a discarded toast ... The town has found it. What has it found? That Mirabell loves me is no more a secret, than it is a secret that you discovered it to my aunt, or than the reason why you discovered it is a secret. (line 490).

Speech Act 17

Participants : Witwoud and Millamant

Purpose : Millamant accuses Petulant and Witwoud of having animosity to meet her.
Milla. Is you animosity composed, gentlemen?

Wit. Raillery, raillery, madam, we have no animosity - we hit off a little wit now and then, but no animosity. The failing out of wits is like the falling out of lovers. We agree in the main, like treble and bass. Ha, Petulant?

Pet. Aye, in the main, but when I have a humour to contradict.

(1894: lines 505-507)

The accusing speech act happens when Petulant and Witwoud have just arrived. Millamant accuses them having animosity to meet her, “Is you animosity composed, gentlemen?” (line 505) She has the motif of saying it because their previous meeting had made her condition aggravated.

Speech Act 18

Participants : Sir Wilfull and a Footman

Purpose : Sir Wilfull Witwoud blames a footman because the footman does not know that he is Lady Wishfort’s nephew.

Foot. Sir, my lady’s dressing. Here’s company; if you please to walk in, in the meantime.

Sir Will. Dressing! What, it’s but morning here I warrant with you in London; we should count it towards afternoon in our parts, down in Shropshire. Why, then, belike my aunt han’t dined yet - ha, friend?

Foot. Your aunt, sir?

Sir Will. My aunt, sir, yes, my aunt, sir, and your lady, sir; your lady is my aunt, sir. Why, what dost thou not know me, friend? Why, then send somebody hither that does. How long hast thou lived with thy lady, fellow, ha?

Foot. A week, sir; longer than anybody in the house except my lady’s woman.

Sir Will. Why, then, belike thou dost not know thy lady, if thou seest her, ha, friend?

Foot. Why truly, sir, I cannot safely swear to her face in a morning, before she is dressed. ‘Tis like I may give a shrewd guess at her by this time.

(1894: lines 527-533)
This speech act is the moment when Sir Wilfull Witwoud encounters his brother, Witwoud. The blaming speech act occurs when Sir Wilfull meets a footman before he can see Lady Wishfort. He asks several questions to the footman, but then blames him because the man does not know that he is Lady Wishfort’s nephew, “My aunt, sir, yes, my aunt, sir, and your lady, sir; your lady is my aunt, sir. Why, what dost thou not know me, friend? Why, then send somebody hither that does. How long hast thou lived with thy lady, fellow, ha?” (line 530)

Speech Act 19

Participants : Sir Wilfull and Witwoud

Purpose : Sir Wilfull Witwoud blames his brother for the unpleasant welcome.

564 Sir Will. ‘Sheart, sir, but there is, and much offence - A pox, is this your Inns o’Court breeding, not to know your friends and your relations, your elders, and your betters?

565 Wit. Why, brother Wilfull of Salop, you may be as short as a Shrewsbury cake, if you please. But I tell you ‘tis not modish to know relations in town. You think you are in the country, where great lubberly brothers slabber and kiss one another when they meet, like a call of serjeants - ‘Tis not the fashion here; ‘tis not indeed, dear brother.

566 Sir Wil. The fashion’s a fool; and you are a fop, dear brother. ‘Sheart, I’ve suspected this - By our Lady, I conjectured you were a fop, since you began to change the style of your letters, and write in a scrap of paper gilt round the edges, no bigger than a subpoena. I might expect this when you left off Honoured Brother; and hoping you are in good health, and so forth - to begin with a Rat me, knight, I’m so sick of a last night’s debauch. Ods heart, and then tell a familiar tale of a cock and a bull, and a whore and a bottle, and so conclude. You could write news before you were out of your time, when you lived with honest Pumple-nose, the attorney of Furnival’s inn. You could intreat to be remembered
then to your friends round the Wrekin. We could have Gazettes then, and Dawks's Letter, and the Weekly Bill, till of late days. (1894: lines 564-566)

When Sir Wilfull meets Mrs. Marwood, Petulant, and his brother, Witwoud he finds out that he is offended by the way they treat him. He blames them for the offence and for the way his brother welcomes him, "'Sheart, sir, but there is, and much offence - A pox, is this your Inns o'Court breeding, not to know your friends and your relations, your elders, and your betters? (line 564) and "The fashion's a fool; and you are a fop, dear brother. 'Sheart, I've suspected this-..." (line 566)

4. Blaming and Accusing Speech Acts in Act IV

This act shows the progressive action of Mirabell's plan. The appearance of Sir Rowland (Waitwell in disguise), as a part of Mirabell's plan, makes Lady Wishfort gets busy to prepare the welcome. Meanwhile the agreement to get married also happens between the two lovers, Mirabell and Millamant. The existence of the drinkers (Petulant, Witwoud, and Sir Wilfull) also gives a comic interlude within act IV. The following explanation of the occurrence of blaming and accusing acts in act IV show how all these things happen.

Speech Act 20

Participants : Millamant, Petulant and Witwoud.

Purpose : Petulant accuses Millamant as the cause of the quarrel.

706 Wit. Thou dost bite, my dear mustard-seed; kiss me for that.
Pet.

Stand-off I 'll kiss no more males.-I have kissed your twin yonder in a humour of reconciliation, till he (hiccup) rises upon my stomach like a radish.

Mill.

Eh! Filthy creature-what was the quarrel?

Pet.

There was no quarrel - there might have been a quarrel.

Wit.

If there had been words enow between 'em to have expressed provocation, they had gone together by the ears like a pair of castanets.

Pet.

You were the quarrel.

Milla.

Me!

(1894: lines 706-712)

Witwound and Petulant enter the stage in drunken condition. They continue quarreling and insulting each other. When Witwound ask Petulant the cause of the quarrel, Petulant directly accuses Millamant who is watching them with Mrs. Fainall by saying "You were the quarrel." (line 711)

Speech Act 21

Participants : Sir Wilfull and Lady Wishfort

Purpose : Lady Wishfort blames Sir Wilfull Witwound for drinking too much.

Lady.

Out upon't, out upon't, at years of discretion, and comfort yourself at this rantepole rate.

Sir Wil.

No offence, aunt.

Lady.

Offence! As I'm a person, I'm ashamed of you-Foh! how you stink of wine! D'ye think my niece will ever endure such a borachio! you're an absolute borachio.

Sir Wil.

Borachio!

Lady.

At a time when you should commence an amour, and put you best foot foremost.

Sir Wil.

'Sheart, an you grudge me your liquor, make a bill-give me more drink, and take my purse. (Sings) But if you would have me marry my cousin, say the word, and I'll do it. Wilfull will do't, that's the word. Wilfull will do't, that's my crest-my motto I have forgot.

(1894: lines 718-723)
Sir Willful is brought by Lady Wishfort to meet Millamant. However, he is very drunk at the moment. Knowing this condition Lady Wishfort blames him for drinking too much since it will give bad effect in the meeting between him and Millamant. She says, "Offence! As I'm a person, I'm ashamed of you—Foh! how you stink of wine! D'ye think my niece will ever endure such a borachio! you're an absolute borachio." (line 720) He actually has to woo Millamant, but Millamant will unlikely endure him, a borachio.

Speech Act 22

Participants : Lady Wishfort and Waitwell (disguises as for Sir Rowland)

Purpose : Lady Wishfort talks with Waitwell (disguises himself as Sir Rowland) about their plan to get married.

749 Lady. If you do, I protest I must recede. Or think that I have made a prostitution of decorums, but in the vehemence of compassion, and to save the life of a person of so much importance.-
750 Wait. i esteem it so-
751 Lady. Or else you wrong my condescension-
752 Wait. I do not, I do not-
753 Lady. Indeed you do-
754 Wait. I do not, fair shrine of virtue.
755 Lady. If you think the least scruple of carnality was an ingredient-
756 Wait. Dear madam, no. You are all champor and frankincense, all chastity and odour.

(1894: lines 749-756)

During the effort of wooing Lady Wishfort, Sir Rowland (Waitwell in disguise) pretends to be offended knowing that Mirabell is his rival. He threatens to kill him. Lady Wishfort agrees with it and has more severe plan to suffer Mirabell. However, she accuses him not being serious to his intention, "Or else you wrong my condescension-.” (line 751)
5. Blaming and Accusing Speech Acts in Act V

This last act of the play is full of surprising events. The efforts of Mr. Fainall and Mrs. Marwood to get all the estate of Mrs. Fainall seems to be succeed since they finally reveal Mirabell’s plot. Furthermore, Millamant agrees to get married with Sir Wilfull. However, Mirabell turns it out by calling all the witnesses and an important document of the estate to counter Mr. Fainall’s plot. Several blaming and accusing acts occur within the plot and the counter plot.

Speech Act 23

Participants : Lady Wishfort and Foible

Purpose : Lady Wishfort blames Foible for being ingratitude.

790 Lady. Out of my house, out of my house, thou viper, thou serpent, that I have fostered; thou bosom traitress, that I raised from nothing - begone, begone, go, go - that I took from washing of old gauze and weaving of dead hair, with a bleak blue nose, over a chaving dish of starved embers, and dining behind a traverse rag in a shop no bigger than a bird-cage - go, go, starve again, do, do.

791 Foib. Dear madam, I’ll beg pardon on my kness.

792 Lady. Away, out, out, go set up for yourself again - do drive a trade, do with your threepenny - worth of small ware, flaunting upon a packthread, under a brandy-seller’s bulk, or against a dead wall by a ballad monger. Go, hang out an old frisoneer-gorget with a yard of yellow colber ofteen again; do; an old gnawed mask, two rows of pins and a child’s fiddle; a glass necklace with the beads broken, and a quilted nightcap with one ear. Go, go, drive a trade. These were your commodities, you treacherous trull, this was the merchandize you dealt in, when I took you into my house, placed you next myself, and made you governante of my whole family. You have forgot this, have you, now you have feathered your nest?

793 Foib. No, no, dear madam. Do but hear me, have but a moment’s patience. I’ll confess all. Mr. Mirabell seduced me; I am not the first that he has wheedled with his dissembling tongue’ your ladyship’s own wisdom has been delude by him, then how should I, a poor ignorant, defend myself? Oh, madam if you knew what he promised me, and how he assured me your ladyship should come to no damage—or else the wealth of the Indies should have
not bribed me to conspire against so good, so sweet, so kind a lady as you have been to me.

(1894: Act V: lines 790-793)

At this moment Lady Wishfort is very angry with Foible for being Mirabell's accessory. She blames her for being ingratitude (line 790 and 793), "Out of my house, out of my house, thou viper, thou serpent, that I have fostered; thou bossmess traitress, that I raised from nothing..." (line 790) and "These were your commodities, you treacherous trull, this was the merchandize you dealt in, when I took you into my house, placed you next myself, and made you governante of my whole family. You have forgot this, have you, now you have feathered your nest?" (line 793) She also uses a lot of scornful words (bossmess, traitress, an old gnawed mask, and treacherous trull) to express her anger. She reminds her that she saved her from the streets. Foible then pleads for mercy. She claims that Mirabell seduced her.

Speech Act 24
Participants : Lady Wishfort and Foible
Purpose : Lady Wishfort blames Foible for being a betrayer.

794 Lady. No damage? What, to betray me, to marry me to a cast-serving man; to make me a receptacle, an hospital for a decayed pimp? No damage? O thou frontless impudence, more than a big-bellied actress.

795 Foib. Pray do but hear me, madam, he could not marry me your ladyship, madam-no indeed, his marriage was to have been void in law; for he was married to me first, to secure your ladyship, he must have run the risk of the law, and been put upon his clergy. Yes, indeed, I enquired pf the law in that case before I would meddle or make.

796 Lady. What, then I have been your property, have I? I have been convenient to you, it seems, while you were catering for
Mirabell? I have been broker for you? What, have you made a passive bawd of me?—This exceeds all precedent; I am brought to fine uses, to become a botcher of second-hand marriages between Abigails and Andrews! I'll couple you. Yes, I'll haste you together, you and your Philander. I'll Duke's Place you, as I'm a person. Your turtle is in custody already: you shall coo in the same age, if there be constable or warrant in the parish.

(Exit)

(1894: lines 794-796)

Lady Wishfort also accuses Foible to betray her, "No damage? What, to betray me, to marry me to a cast-serving man; to make me a receptacle, an hospital for a decayed pimp? No damage? O thou frontless impudence, more than a big-bellied actress." (line 794) Foible then states that the marriage with Lady Wishfort unlikely happens since it would have been illegal; he was already married to her (Foible). This explanation serves only to aggravate Lady Wishfort further. She threatens to have Foible arrested by saying "...you shall coo in the same age, if there be constable or warrant in the parish." (line 796)

Speech Act 25

Participants : Lady Wishfort, Mrs. Marwood, and Mrs. Fainall

Purpose : Lady Wishfort accuses Mrs. Fainall, her own daughter, has damaged her family reputation.

816 Mrs. Mar. Let us first dispatch the affair in hand, madam. We shall have leisure to think of retirement afterwards. Here is one who is concerned in the treaty.

817 Lady. Oh, daughter, daughter, is it possible thou shouldst be my child, bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh, and as I may say, another me, and yet transgress the most minute particle of severe virtue? Is it possible you should lean aside to iniquity, who have been cast in the direct mould of virtue? I have not only been a mould but a pattern for you, and a model for you, after you were brought into the world.
Mrs. Fain. I don’t understand your ladyship.
Lady. Not understand? Why, have you not been naught? Have you not been sophisticated? Not understand? Here I am ruined to compound for your caprices and your cuckoldoms. I must pawn my plate and my jewels, and ruin my niece, and all little enough—

(1894: lines 816-819)

Being told about Mirabeli’s plot Lady Wishfort blames her daughter to be a part of the plan by saying “Oh, daughter, daughter, is it possible thou shouldst be my child, bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh, and as I may say, another me, and yet transgress the most minute particle of severe virtue? Is it possible you should lean aside to iniquity, who have been cast in the direct mould of virtue? I have not only been a mould but a pattern for you, and a model for you, after you were brought into the world.” (line 817) She is disappointed to know that her daughter has ruined her own family reputation.

Speech Act 26

Participants : Mrs. Marwood, and Mrs. Fainall

Purpose : Mrs. Fainall accuses Mrs. Marwood of being a false friend of Lady Wishfort.

Mrs. Fain. I am wronged and abused, and so are you. ‘Tis a false accusation, as false as hell, as false as your friend there, aye, or your friend’s friend, my false husband.

Mrs. Mar. My friend, Mrs. Fainall? Your husband my friend, what do you mean?

Mrs. Fain. I know what I mean, madam, and so do you; and so shall the world at a time convenient.

(1894: lines 820-822)

Mrs. Fainall indeed does not accept to be blamed as a part of Mirabell’s plot. She protests that she has been falsely accused. In return, she accuses Mrs.
Marwood of being a false friend of Lady Wishfort by saying “I am wronged and abused, and so are you. ‘Tis a false accusation, as false as hell, as false as your friend there, aye, or your friend’s friend, my false husband.” (line 820)

**Speech Act 27**

Participants : Lady Wishfort and Mincing

Purpose : Mrs. Marwood blames Mincing for daring to reveal her affair with Mirabell.

670 Mrs. Mar. Have you so much ingratitude and injustice, to give credit against your mena. to the aspersions of two such mercenary trulls?

677 Min. Mercenary, mem? I scorn your words. ‘Tis true we found you and Mr. Fainall in the true garrer; by the same token, you swore us to secrecy upon Messalina’s poems. Mercenary? No, if we would have been mercenary, we should have held our tongues; you would have bribed us sufficiently.

(1894: Act V: lines 898-899)

Mrs. Marwood is aggravated by the willingness of Foible and Mincing to tell the affair between her and Mr. Fainall. She blames them for daring to reveal it to Lady Wishfort, “Have you so much ingratitude and injustice, to give credit against your friend, to the aspersions of two such mercenary trulls?” (line 898)

**B. Face Threatening Act Analysis**

Having identified blaming and accusing speech acts in all of the speech events in act I the writer analyzes whether they can be categorized as impolite using the Face Threatening Act theory. The main indication to determine the
impolite speech act is the reaction from the addressee. This analysis is applied in act I, II, III, IV, and V.

Speech Act 1

The reaction from Mirabell, "You have a taste extremely delicate, and are for refining on your pleasures," (line 5) shows that he is offended because he thinks that Mr. Fainall only wants to glorify his victory. This ironic statement, as explained before, has created unpleasant feeling since Mr. Fainall compares him with a woman who loses her reputation. That is why then Mr. Fainall teases him by asking whether he does not have any sense of humour. If it is offended it means that the speech act from Mr. Fainall contains an FTA. Based on the reaction the writer concludes that Mr. Fainall's speech act is impolite because it threatens Mirabell's face and makes him addressing unpleasant reaction.

Speech Act 2

Mirabell's reaction, "She is more mistress of herself, than to be the under the necessity of such a resignation," (line 15) states what he thinks Millamant should have been. She should have not been easily pressured. Therefore, it is not a denial of what Mr. Fainall has blamed to him. It is a kind of explaining an opinion. In conclusion, it does not threaten Mirabell's face.
Speech Act 3

It is clear that both of them involve in frantic conversation. They try to blame and criticize one another. Mirabell's reaction, "You pursue the argument with a distrust that seems to be unaffected, and confesses you are conscious of a concern for which the lady is more indebted to you, than is your wife" (line 25) criticizes Mr. Fainall's blaming speech act. It shows his denial since he does not accept to be blamed. Thereby, the writer derives a conclusion that the blaming speech act spoken by Mr. Fainall is impolite.

Speech Act 4

Betty answers, "Turned of the last canonical hour, sir," (line 30) creates an unpleasant reaction towards Mirabell. It is obvious that it threatens him. As the result he is angry and calls Betty "jade" (line 31).

Speech Act 5

The denial from Witwoud to defend his friend, Petulant: "Come, you are malicious now, and would breed debates. Petulant's my friend, and a very honest fellow, and a very pretty fellow, and has a smattering, faith and troth a pretty deal of an odd sort of small wit..." (line 99) shows a disagreement of what Mirabell and Mr. Fainall blame to his friend. It creates an FTA towards Witwoud.
Speech Act 6

Responding the blaming speech act (line 200), Petulant replies “Not I, by this hand- I always take blushing either for a sign of guilt, or ill breeding.” (line 201) Though his words do not really confront the blaming speech act the blaming speech act is impolite because the reaction showing negation. As explained in chapter II, a form of negation, denial, disagreement, or any expressions showing contradiction is regarded impolite since the FTA creates a negative face. In this case, the blaming speech act is impolite.

Speech Act 7

The reaction from Mrs. Marwood by saying, “Certainly. To be free; I have no taste of those insipid dry discourses, with which our sex of force must entertain themselves, apart from men.” (line 206) means that she confesses that she actually has a strong dislike to men, but she hides it only to show her conformity to Lady Wishfort’s humour. It does not create a tense situation in their conversation since the reaction of the blaming speech act is not readdressed with positive face. Therefore, the blaming speech act is polite.

Speech Act 8

Talking about the aversion of men finally leads Mrs. Fainall accuses Mrs. Marwood in love with Mirabell. As the result, Mrs. Marwood reacts violently and asserts, “I never loved him; he is, and always was, insufferably proud” (line 232).
It means she hates him. She denies the accusation. It shows negative face in her speak. It means the accusing speech act is impolite.

Speech Act 9

Mrs. Marwood absolutely disagrees and denies Mrs. Fainall’s accusation by saying “You do me wrong.” (line 269) It is clear that the speech act threatens her face. It is obvious that the accusing speech act is impolite.

Speech Act 10

Mr. Fainali says, “Your fame I have preserved. Your fortune has been bestowed as the prodigality of your love would have it, in pleasures which we both have shared. Yet, had not you been false, I had ere this repaid it.” (line 288) His reaction indeed denies the accusation that he has injured her. He then tries to assure Mrs. Marwood that he did it for her. It is actually the way he approaches her. Thereby, the accusing speech act does not threaten his face.

Speech Act 11

The reaction comes from Mirabell, “Why do we daily commit disagreeable and dangerous actions? To save that idol reputation. If the familiarities of our loves had produced that consequence, of which you were apprehensive, where could you have fixed a father’s name with credit, but on a husband?” (line 314), only tries to convince Mrs. Fainall that she married Mr. Fainall to safeguard her good reputation in case her affair with Mirabell had resulted in a child. This
shows that The FTA spoken by Mrs. Marwood does not make a furious reaction. The explanation tries to mitigate the negative face in the blaming speech act.

Speech Act 12

Millamant argues that “one’s cruelty is one’s power.” (362) It means she maintains herself doing what she wants to do. It is clear that the blaming speech act makes a confrontation between them. Mirabell wants her to be a nice girl, while Millamant asserts that it is her right to behave in certain way. It shows the blaming act is impolite.

Speech Act 13

Mirabell’s reaction towards Millamant, “You are merry, madam, but I would persuade you for a moment to be serious” (line 388) shows that he really wants to talk seriously. He does not comply with Millamant’s want. The word “sententious’ also adds a significant effect to the FTA since it is a judging expression to Mirabell. In conclusion, the FTA is impolite.

Speech Act 14

As a maid Peg does not dare to react harshly. However, as the reaction of being offended she dares to say that the Lady “is so impatient” (line 420). This is an evidence of the unpleasant feeling. This is an expression of a maid who cannot stand anymore being treated decently. It means the accusing speech acts indeed creates an FTA, and the FTA is spoken using negative face
Speech Act 15

Being accused as a traitor Foible reacts quickly by defending herself. She denies it using clever wit. She protests that she is not at fault, since she accidentally met Mirabell, who began accusing her of hatching some plot, "Humph (says he), what, you are hatching some plot (says he), you are so early abroad, or catering..." (line 450) But when he abused Lady Wishfort, calling her "superannuated" (old), she could not bear it any longer and gave him a piece of her mind, "...I'll have him murdered." The defense and the denial show that the accusing speech act has been spoken out with an FTA though she uses clever wit in her reply to defend herself.

Speech Act 16

It is clear said by Millamant that she accuses Mrs. Marwood has hidden secret why she discovered the love between Millamant and Mirabell to Lady Wishfort. The reaction from Mrs. Marwood by saying "you are nettled" (line 491) obviously shows that she is irritated. The accusing speech act creates an FTA and makes her expressing unpleasant feeling using negative face. Thereby, the accusing speech act is categorized impolite.

Speech Act 17

The reaction from Witwoud shows that he considers the accusing act as a joke. He says "...The falling out of wits is like the falling out of lovers (line 506)
We agree in the main, like treble and bass. Ha, Petulant?" Petulant also agrees with him, "Aye, in the main, but when I have a humour to contradict," (line 507) he replies. Since they consider it as a joke it means it is still polite for Witwoud and Petulant.

Speech Act 18

Being blamed for unrecognizing Sir Wilfull Witwoud, his Lady's nephew, the footman only tells the reason why he cannot directly meet his Lady. "Why truly, sir, I cannot safely swear to her face in a morning, before she is dressed. 'Tis like I may give a shrewd guess at her by this time" (line 533). It can be concluded that the accusing speech act does not create an FTA for him since the reply only showing explanation instead of negative face. It means the blaming speech act is polite.

Speech Act 19

The blaming speech act is replied by Witwoud with a critic, "Why, brother Wilfull of Salop, you may be as short as a Shrewsbury cake, if you please. But I tell you 'tis not modish to know relations in town. You think you are in the country, where great lubberly brothers slabber and kiss one another when they meet, like a call of serjeants - 'Tis not the fashion here; 'tis not indeed, dear brother" (line 565). This speech act shows his disagreement of his brother's behaviour. Based on this reason, the blaming speech act has formed an FTA and
has made negative face. Therefore, the blaming speech act can be categorized impolite.

Speech Act 20

Based on a brief reply from Millamant, “me!” (line 712) it shows how Millamant is surprised knowing that she is the one who causes the quarrel. She does not expect it. The accusing act makes Millamant’s negative face. It means the FTA is impolite.

Speech Act 21

Lady Wishfort realizes that Sir Wilfull’s condition absolutely does not match the purpose of his coming. Sir Willful will be absolutely failed to woo Millamant if he is still drunk. Therefore, she blames him for being a borachio. Sir Willful then replies that she is the one who has made him drunk with her liquor, “Sheart, an you grudge me your Equor, make a bill-give me more drink, and take my purse” (line 723). It is indeed a form of denial. When the FTA is replied with a denial, it means it creates a negative face. It is said impolite.

Speech act 22

Waitwell who disguises himself as Sir Rowland negates the accusation made by Lady Wishfort, saying “I do not, I do not-“. (line 752) and “I do not, fair shrine of virtue” (line 754). However, he tries to make tact and replies the negative face with positive face. He says “Dear madam, no. You are all champor
and frankincense, all chastity and odour” (line 756). The FTA is mitigated. It means impoliteness does not exist.

**Speech Act 23**

To be blamed as someone who shows ingratitude Foible tries to explain that it is not true. She asks her patience first and then confesses all the things. “No, no, dear madam. Do but hear me, have but a moment’s patience. I’ll confess all…” she begs (line 792). She wants to know that she does not have any intentions to damage her ladyship. She tries to make a positive face. It means the Face Threatening Act (FTA) is polite.

**Speech Act 24**

Being accused as a betrayer Foible tries to explain that the marriage between her husband and the Lady is unlikely happen. She asserts, “Pray do but hear me, madam, he could not marry me your ladyship, madam—no indeed, his marriage was to have been void in law...” (line 795). Instead of it, she wants to secure her ladyship, “for he was married to me first, to secure your ladyship, he must have run the risk of the law, and been put upon his clergy…” (line 795). By giving the explanation she tries to mitigate Lady Wishfort’s face negative wants. Thereby, it is polite.
Speech Act 25

It is obvious that Mrs. Fainall denies that she has ruined her family reputation. She says, “Tis a false accusation...” (line 820). Then she thinks that she and Lady Wishfort who are both wronged and abused. The accusing act creates a negative face. It means it is impolite.

Speech Act 26

In turn, Mrs. Fainall accuses Mrs. Marwood and Mr. Fainall as her false friends, saying “‘Tis a false accusation, as false as hell, as false as your friend there, aye, or your friend’s friend, my false husband” (line 820). However, Mrs. Marwood pretends to ask what she means, “My friend, Mrs. Fainall? Your husband my friend, what do you mean?” (line 821). By pretending do not understand she does not show her negative face. The accusing speech act is still polite.

Speech Act 27

By saying “I scorn your words” (line 899), in reply to the accusation, Mincing shows that she does not like to be blamed for daring to say the truth. The blaming act is clearly creates a negative face to Mincing. Her response shows that the FTA threatens her face. It means the blaming speech act is impolite.
Based on the data, there are seventeen impolite speech acts. They are speech acts number 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 25, and 27. Nine of them are blaming speech acts, and the rests are accusing speech act. In the following analysis the writer finds out all kind of violation of politeness strategies applied in the speech acts mentioned above. This analysis answers the second problem of this thesis.

C. Five Super Strategies Analysis

All of the seventeen impolite speech acts are classified into Five Super Strategies in the table below. Each of the speech acts is analyzed in brief, clear, and justified explanations.

Speech Act 1

The impolite blaming speech act is indirectly spoken. Mr. Fainall uses the word “a man” which actually refers to Mirabell (line 4). Though Mirabell wants to play again Mr. Fainall thinks that it will not be a pleasure since he is being indifferent. He replies Mirabell’s positive face wants with negative face. In conclusion he violates the positive politeness strategy and performs it in an off-record strategy.

Speech Act 3

It is directly spoken. Both of them try to offend and blame each other. “You are a gallant man, Mirabell; and though you may have cruelty enough, not
to satisfy a lady’s longing, you have too much generosity, not to be tender of her honour,” Fainall blames Mirabell (line 24). On the other side Mirabell should have not redressed the negative face wants with offending speech act, and blames, “You pursue the argument with a distrust that seems to be unaffected, and confesses you are conscious of a concern for which the lady is more indebted to you, than is your wife” (line 25). It violates the negative politeness strategy and uses the bald on-record strategy.

Speech Act 4

It is directly spoken to redress Betty’s answer. Mirabell responds the negative face by blaming her answer, “How pertinently the jade answer me! Ha! Almost one a clock!” (line 31) It means he violates the negative politeness strategy since he replies the negative face wants with negative face too. Using scolding word ‘jade’ directly means the blaming speech act uses the bald on-record strategy.

Speech Act 5

“You may allow him to win of you at play, for you are sure to be too hard for him at repartee; since you monopolize the wit that is between you, the fortune must be his of course,” (line 97) the blaming speech act is directly performed to accuse Witwoud having a monopoly of wit in the game. Mr. Fainall and Mirabell should have redressed it with sympathy since he is the one who loses the game.
Thereby it violates the **positive politeness strategy** and uses the **bald on-record strategy**.

**Speech Act 6**

The blaming speech act is directly spoken by Mirabell using question, “But hast not thou then sense enough to know that thou ought’s to be most ashamed of thyself, when thou hast put another out of countenance?” (line 200) Mirabell should have not redressed the negative face wants spoken by Petulant. However, he is really fed up of it and cannot hold to blame him. It means it violates the **negative politeness strategy** and uses the **bald on record strategy**.

**Speech Act 8**

“Ingenious mischief! Would thou wert married to Mirabell,” (line 227) this impolite accusing speech act, is directly spoken. Mrs. Fainall addressed it since he noticed that behind her aversion to men, Mrs. Marwood loves Mirabell. She says the accusation clearly to Mrs. Marwood. On the other side Mrs. Marwood wants her plan to carry the aversion would be good and Mrs. Fainall would agree with her. However, the result is not the positive face. Based on this indication the writer concludes that the **positive politeness strategy** is violated and it is performed using the **bald on-record strategy**.
Speech Act 9

The accusing speech act is spoken directly by Mr. Fainall. Mr. Fainall is irritated since he was offended being told that he has been deceived by his own wife. As the result they are involved in frantic conversation. Mr. Fainall then accuses her and his wife having secret love to Mirabell by saying, “To let you know I see through all your little arts. Come, you both love him; and both have equally dispersed your aversion” (line 268) In conclusion, Mr. Fainall’s reaction is in respond to Mrs. Marwood’s negative face and it is spoken due to Mrs. Marwood. It violates the negative politeness strategy and uses the bald on-record strategy.

Speech Act 12

“You would affect a cruelty which is not in your nature; your true vanity is in the power of pleasing,” (line 361) the blaming speech act is directly performed to blame Millamant of being cruel in the event the night before. Millamant’s words that she loves to give pain deliberately to show her power upon Mirabell (line 360) makes Mirabell saying it as a critic. It means he readdresses Millamant’s negative face wants with negative face. Thereby it violates the negative politeness strategy and uses the bald on-record strategy.

Speech Act 13

It is directly spoken by Millamant using offending word, “sententious”, and metaphor (“like Salomon at the dividing......an old tapestry hanging.”) (line
387) because of the way Mirabell looks at her, not because of what he said. What he said actually wanted positive face since he talks about sincerity to win a woman. Instead of it the negative face appears. In conclusion, it violates the positive politeness strategy and uses the bald-on record strategy.

Speech Act 14

The impolite blaming speech act is directly spoken towards Peg. Lady Wishfort really feels exasperated since Peg does not understand what she wants, “Ratafia, fool. No, fool. Not the ratafia, fool. Grant me patience! I mean the Spanish paper, idiot, complexion, darling. Paint, paint, paint! dost thou understand that, changeling, dangling thy hands like bobbins before thee? Why dost thou not stir, puppet? Thou wooden thing upon wires” (line 419). Moreover, she blames her for bringing too small cup for her (line 424). It also clear that she uses scornful words such as idiot, mopus, puppet, and bobbins (lines 419 and 424). She cannot stand to hold her negative’s face to readdress Peg’s fault. Based on these indications the writer concludes that the negative politeness strategy is violated and it is performed using the bald on-record strategy.

Speech Act 15

The accusing speech act is spoken directly in the form of questions. Lady Wishfort was told before by Mrs. Marwood that she had seen Foible in conference with Mirabell in the park. Therefore, she accuses him committing betrayal to her, “The miniature has been counted like-- But hast thou not betrayed me, Foible?”
(line 437) She expresses the accusation to readdress the negative’s face she has got from Mrs. Marwood’s story before. It means the accusing speech act performed by the Lady violates the **negative politeness strategy** and uses the **bald on-record strategy**.

**Speech Act 16**

The impolite blaming speech act performed by Millamant happens because Mrs. Marwood provokes her into talking about Mirabell. She forces Millamant to conceal her love with Mirabell and says that it is not a secret anymore. Being forced makes Millamant readdresses the negative face directly. She says, “I’ll take my death, Marwood, you are more censorious than a decayed beauty, or a discarded toast...” (line 490). Mrs. Marwood then responds, “You are nettled” (line 491), and Millamant replies it by saying, “You are mistaken. Ridiculous!” (line 492) It means she replies the negative face want. Thereby it violates the **negative politeness strategy** and uses the **bold on-record strategy**.

**Speech Act 19**

Since the very beginning he comes to Lady Wishfort house, Sir Wilful Witwoud feels that he has been offended by all people in the house, even his own brother. Though he is Lady Wishfort’s nephew he is not welcomed well. Finally, he could not hold his hatred and speaks it out to his brother, Witwoud. He says, “Sheart, sir, but there is, and much offence - A pox. is this your Inns o’ Court breeding, not to know your friends and your relations, your elders, and your
betrays?” (line 564) and “The fashion’s a fool; and you are a fop, dear brother.
‘Sheart, I’ve suspected this - By our Lady, I conjectured you were a fop, since you
began to change the style of your letters, and write in a scrap of paper gilt round
the edges, no bigger than a subpoena....” (line 566) He readdresses the negative
face wants by blaming the way they welcome him. In conclusion, it violates the
negative politeness strategy and uses the bald-on record strategy.

Speech Act 20

The impolite accusing speech act is directly spoken to Millamant. The
FTA comes out suddenly without any obvious cause. Petulant blames her by
firmly saying, “You were the quarrel” (line 711). It is a pure statement to express
his feeling to what Millamant has done. Millamant does not make any speech
before. Keeping silent should be better done than to reveal the accusation.
Petulant violates this politeness. Based on these indications the writer concludes
that the Withhold the Face Threatening Act strategy is violated and it is
performed using the bald on-record strategy.

Speech Act 21

The blaming act is spoken directly in respond to Sir Willful’s drunken
condition. Lady Wishfort is angry to him since he does not feel guilty of his
condition. Sir Willful indeed only says “No offence, aunt” (719). As the result, it
makes a negative face. The impolite blaming act then spoken out to him. The old
Lady angrily says, “Offence! As I’m a person, I’m ashamed of you-Foh! How you
stink of wine! D'ye think my niece will ever endure such a borachio! You're an absolute borachio" (line 720). She expresses this since it is not the condition she wants to be. The FTA threatens her face and makes her produce negative face as the reaction. It means that the blaming speech act is the violation of negative politeness strategy and in a use of the bald on-record strategy.

Speech Act 25

The impolite accusing speech act is directly spoken because Mrs. Marwood encourages her to do so. Lady Wishfort replies Mrs. Marwood's negative face wants with FTA to her own daughter, Mrs. Fainall by saying "...Here I am ruined to compound for your caprices and your cuckoldoms. I must prawn my plate and my jewels, and ruin my niece, and all little enough" (line 819). In the theory of Five Super Strategy it means she violates the negative politeness strategy and uses the bald on record strategy.

Speech Act 27

Mincing and Foible intention to disclose all they know about Mr. Fainall's plot has made Mrs. Marwood's negative face emerges. As the result, she responds the negative face by using blaming speech act. "Have you so much ingratitude and in justice, to give credit against your friend, to the aspersions of two such mercenary trulls? (line 898) she says furiously She speaks it directly to blame them having so much ingratitude and injustice to her and Mr. Fainall. Responding
the negative face, she violates the **negative politeness strategy** and since it is spoken directly, it means she uses the **bald on record strategy**.

Based on the result of analysis there are various kinds of strategies used or applied in the blaming and accusing speech acts which appears in Congreve’s The Way of The World (1894). To summarize the findings the writer put all of them in the following part.

**D. The Result of the Analysis**

In this part, the writer summarizes all the findings of impolite blaming and accusing speech acts and their impoliteness strategy in the tables below. There are various kinds of strategies can be used in the speech act. All of the data started from the blaming and accusing speech act in the play, the analysis of Face Threatening Act (FTA), and the violation of Five Super Strategies are shown to answer all the problems in this thesis. The check (✓) shows the occurrence of certain violation of politeness strategies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTS</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>B/A</th>
<th>P/I</th>
<th>VNPS</th>
<th>VPPS</th>
<th>VWFTA</th>
<th>ON-RECORD</th>
<th>OFF-RECORD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ONE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREE</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>B/A</td>
<td>P/I</td>
<td>VNPS</td>
<td>VPPS</td>
<td>VWFTA</td>
<td>ON-RECORD</td>
<td>OFF-RECORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIVE</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SA: Speech Act  
B: Blaming  
A: Accusing  
P: Polite  
I: Impolite  
VNPS: Violating the Negative Politeness Strategy  
VPPS: Violating the Positive Politeness Strategy  
VWFTA: Violating the Withhold the FTA Strategy  

Table 1. The Result of Analysis

First of all, to answer the first problem, using the Face Threatening Act Analysis there are seventeen (17) impolite blaming and accusing speech acts. Being divided, there are nine (9) impolite blaming speech acts and eight (8) accusing speech acts in the play. They appear in all of the acts of the play though the frequency is slowly down from act I to act V. It means that at the end of the
play the problem tends to be clearer. Everything is covered so that there are only few blaming and accusing acts.

Looking at the violation of politeness strategies in the data, there are 4 (four) different kinds of violation of politeness strategies applied in the impolite blaming and accusing speech acts. Firstly, the impolite speech act violates the positive politeness strategy and performs off-record strategy. It only occurs once in the play (speech act 1). Secondly, the impolite speech act violates the positive politeness strategy and performs the bald on-record strategy. There are three (3) data uses this kind of strategy (speech acts 13, 8 and 5). Thirdly, the impolite speech act violates withhold the Face Threatening Act and performs the bald on-record strategy. There is also only one data applying this strategy (speech act 20). Last but not least, the most often strategy appears in the play, the impolite speech act violates the negative politeness strategy and performs the bald on-record strategy. There are twelve blaming and accusing speech act that violates this kind of politeness strategy. All of these facts have answered the second problem of this study.

Profound analysis of the findings by comparing the findings of blaming and accusing speech acts finds some interesting facts to know. Firstly, eleven of seventeen blaming speech acts in the play are impolite. It means about 60% of blaming speech acts in the play is impolite. Compared to the accusing speech act, there are 6 impolite accusing speech acts. They make exactly 60% of accusing speech acts in the play is impolite. In conclusion, the blaming and accusing speech acts tend to be impolite. This fact is in accordance to what Geoffrey Leech (1990)
said in his book, *Principles of Pragmatics*, that blaming and accusing speech acts are the reverse of polite speech acts in the expressive illocutionary speech acts. Secondly, there are nine (9) impolite blaming speech acts that violate the negative politeness strategy. The other three violates the positive politeness strategy. It means 75% of impolite blaming speech acts violates negative politeness strategy and 25% of them violates positive politeness strategy. On the other hand, there are only three (3) impolite accusing speech acts that violate the negative politeness strategy while three (3) accusing speech acts violates the positive politeness strategy and an accusing speech act violates the withhold the FTA strategy. It means about 40% of the accusing speech acts violates the negative politeness strategy. The similar amount, 40% of them, occurs violating the positive politeness strategy and almost 20% violates the withhold the FTA strategy. In conclusion, the violation of negative politeness strategy in this play tends to be higher in the impolite blaming speech acts than impolite accusing speech acts. On the other violation of politeness, namely the positive politeness strategy, impolite accusing speech acts have higher number than the impolite blaming speech acts and it happens too in the violation of withhold the FTA. Thirdly, it can be concluded that all the blaming and accusing speech acts are delivered on-record. It means that the characters of the play, or we can say the upper class people (the object of the play), have the characteristic to tell and express their negative face directly.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

In this chapter the writer presents the answers for all the problems as formulated in the problem formulation. There are two problems related to impoliteness in Congreve's The Way of The World (1894). They are about the use of impolite blaming and accusing speech act and the politeness strategies violated in that impolite blaming and accusing speech act. In general, the play, as one of the Comedy of Manners in Restoration Period uses the concept of impoliteness creatively in some wit conversations to satirize upper class language.

To answer the first question of this study, the writer has used Searle's categories of illocutionary acts to identify the blaming and accusing speech acts. As the result, the writer finds out twenty seven blaming and accusing speech acts. Seventeen of them are blaming speech acts and the ten left are accusing speech acts. The number of blaming and accusing speech act in fact tends to decrease from act I until act V. It shows how problems that create conflicting situation tend to go down from act I to act V.

It is said above that seventeen blaming and accusing speech acts out of twenty seven are categorized impolite using the Face Threatening Act Theory. The main indications are the reply of the addressee and the language used (scorn words, metaphor, etc.) in the speech act. As the result, there are nine impolite blaming speech acts and eight accusing speech acts. Each of the speech acts has its own reason why it is impolite. The first and highly occurred reason that the
writer finds is that the speaker creates a Face Threatening Act (FTA) which makes the addressee produces negative face. As Leech said in his book, Principles of Pragmatics (1990), the FTA makes politeness turns into impoliteness. The reaction that shows negative face can be in form of disagreement, anger, and denial, and it makes the conversation becomes tense. The second reason occurs in the analysis is that when the speaker wants positive face from the addressee but instead of positive face the speaker receives negative face from the addressee. The expected outcome is objectionable. Both reasons appear as major reasons to categorize whether the speech act is impolite. Minor reason that exists is the use of scornful words. However, it happens only between master and servant. This is one of the evidence how the upper class people, a class of people who should have been good in language, in fact lack of control in their speeches. Lady Wishfort is the obvious example of this.

Progressing on the second problem of the analysis, the writer uses Five Super Strategies of politeness to find out what are the strategies violated in the impolite blaming and accusing speech acts. This theory emphasizes the strategies of how the speaker performs the impolite speech act and what violation the speaker does concerning the term face.

The way the speaker performs the impolite speech act can be the bald on-record or off-record. The violation of politeness can occur if the speaker breaks the rules of positive politeness, negative politeness, and withhold the FTA strategies. As the result the writer finds that most of the impolite blaming and accusing speech acts are performed using the bald on-record strategy and most of
them violates the negative politeness strategy. It means the upper class people, as the main object of the play, tend to say their unpleasant feeling directly and they tend to be easily offended.

Comparing the analysis of impoliteness in the blaming and accusing speech acts of the play the writer also finds some interesting facts. Firstly, blaming and accusing speech act show equal percentage, namely 60% of all the blaming and accusing speech acts in the play can be categorized impolite. It justifies Leech (Leech, 1990: 106) that the content of blaming and accusing speech act indeed tends to be impolite rather than other expressive illocutionary acts such as pardoning, thanking, and congratulating. Secondly, impolite blaming speech act has higher number of violation of negative politeness strategy than the impolite accusing speech act. Thirdly, the impolite accusing speech act in turn has higher number of violation of positive politeness than the impolite blaming speech act. Fourthly, the impolite accusing speech act is the impolite speech act that violates the withhold FTA strategy. Lastly, the way the upper class people express their blaming and accusing speech acts to show their negative faces tends to be direct since the findings show that on-record strategy is the main way to express their negative faces.
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APPENDIX

A Brief Overview of The Way of the World

Written by English playwright William Congreve, The Way of The World (1894) is widely regarded as being one of the best Restoration comedies and is still performed sporadically to this day. One of its successful performances was held by Oxford Playhouse production on 13 to 17 April, 2004 since it was premiered in 1700. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Way_of_the_World).

The play is based around the two lovers Mirabell and Millamant. In order for the two to get married and receive Millamant's full dowry, Mirabell must receive Millamant's aunt, Lady Wishfort's blessing. Unfortunately, she is a bitter lady who hates Mirabell and wants her own nephew, Sir Witwoud to marry Millamant. Knowing this, Mirabell tries to arrange a secret plan with Mrs. Fainall, Mirabell's past mistress, and Waitwell, Mrs. Fainall's servant. Waitwell then marries Foible, lady Wishfort's maid and pretends to be Sir Rowland and on Mirabell's command. They try to trick Lady Wishfort into a false engagement.

Other characters include Fainall who is having a secret affair with Mrs. Marwood, a friend of Mrs. Fainall's, who in turn once had an affair with Mirabell. Fainall and Mrs. Marwood perform the roles of the antagonists and villains in the play. They are directly opposed to Mirabeli and Millamant. Both of them have clearly defined objectives for seeking revenge. Fainall needs money. Furthermore, he learns that both his wife and mistress love Mirabell, and so he tries to ruin Mirabell's chance for success. Mrs. Marwood wants revenge on Mirabell because
he has not responded to her advances. Together, Fainall and Mrs. Marwood devise a counter plot to foil Mirabell’s plans. In the end they are not succeeded.