Summary of the Paper

The study of literature through linguistic is one of the way to make that progress. Wahab (2002:2) has a thought that half-hearted process of teaching-learning linguistics and literature, will not produce outputs with adequate knowledge, skills, and creativity in linguistics and/or literature, that is why a bridge between the two disciplines must be built. Based on that Wahab’s statements, the study between the two disciplines is important to improve the knowledge, skills, and creativity of students who study linguistics and/or literature and that is why the bridge between these two disciplines must be built. Schiffrin (1994:39) claims that discourse consists of utterances. It means that discourse arises not as a collection of decontextualized unit of language structure but as a collection of inherently contextualized units of language use. Therefore, language has many different functions because in using the language it depends on some certain occasions, and that is why the writer wants to find out the kinds of utterances that are produced by the speakers. Sometimes from the language that is uttered, it is difficult to understand the inference, but this problem can be solved through illocutionary acts analysis. This research will try to find out the result of the illocutionary act from the discourse, while the illocutionary act itself will be found from the utterances of the speaker. So it can be claimed that language seems to have as many different functions as there are occasions for using language, but for all the apparent diversity the basic uses of language are rather limited. So in this research, the researcher wants to know the kinds of utterances, or illocutionary acts which are produced by the speaker.

Halliday (1973:41) states that all use of language express social and personal relation, including all forms of the speaker’s intrusion into the speech situation and the speaker act. It is obvious that language use relates to a context in communication including situation of participant. The context is social and physical words which interact with text to create a discourse, and situation of participants creates a speaker’s intrusion. And the context relates to
contextual features which exist in communication especially participant, topic, setting, and purpose. All of them are used to produce the act of behavior. It usually happens when speaker conveys his utterances. The action which is performed by the speaker to influence the hearer via utterance is called speech act.

Yule has five types general function classification of speech acts, they are declarations, representatives, expressive, directives, and commisives. For Illocutionary Acts, Searle classifies illocutionary act into 5 types. They are (Leech, 1998:105-107) assertive, directives, commisives, expressives, and declaration.

Positive politeness strategies
a. Positive politeness strategy 2 is also called Exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with H
b. Positive politeness strategy 4 or Use in-group identity markers
c. Positive politeness strategy 6 or avoid disagreement
d. Positive politeness strategy 8 or Joke
e. Positive politeness strategy 13 or give (ask for) reasons

2. Negative politeness strategies
This set of negative-politeness strategies consists of 5 rule/criteria which will then be elaborated or developed to become 10 strategies, as follows (see chart next page):
a. Be direct (be conventionally indirect)
b. Don’t presume/assume
c. Don’t coerce H
d. Communicate S’s want to not impinge on H
e. Redress other wants of H’s, derivative from negative face
The result of the finding can also be described in a graphic of illocutionary acts finding, so that it is obvious which illocutionary acts that are often used by the main character, that finding is visualized as follows:
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**Figure 10**
Graphic Of Illocutionary Acts Findings In Each Fragment

**Interpretation of tables of illocutionary acts findings in each fragment**

First of all, illocutionary acts of main character that have been found are: **warning**, **mocking**, **forbidding**, **threatening**, **asserting**, **deploring**, **asking**, **commiting**, **stating sorrow**, **convincing**, **commanding**, **blaming**, **getting angry**, **attacking**, **sentencing**, **regretting**, and **forgiving**.

The other finding that can be obtained from table 38: Illocutionary acts findings in each fragments is when we can see some the illocutionary that are uttered by the main character may
reflect the main character’s personality. Those illocutionary acts that appear most are *warning* (7), *mocking* (4), and *blaming* (5). Most of the time, the main character always utters utterances which have the meaning of illocutionary acts as warning, mocking, and blaming. Actually there are the other meaning of illocutionary acts that are used by the main character but they have only small quantity such as: *asserting* (3), *deploring* (3), *convincing* (2), *getting angry* (2), *attacking* (1), *sentencing* (1), *regretting* (1), *forgiving* (1), *forbidding* (1), *threatening* (1), *asking* (1), *committing* (1), *stating sorrow* (1), and *commanding* (1). Those illocutionary acts that do not appear most cannot reflect the main character’s personality, but the illocutionary acts that appear most can reflect the main character’s personality. Since the illocutionary acts that appear most are *warning, mocking, and blaming*, we may conclude that the main character is a kind of person who has an anger in his heart because he likes to warn, to mock, and to blame to his addresser (hearer). It could be predicted that his personality is so frustrated because what he can do most are warning, mocking, and blaming. Since this study has used all of the main character’s illocutionary acts in the novel, we may conclude that the illocutionary acts meaning of the main character in this novel reflect his personality, and of course this finding can be applied for the other character in fictions and also in reality whenever they used illocutionary acts in their utterances.

In the analysis of each fragment, the writer has made a table for each fragment and explained what, how, and why the illocutionary acts are used by the main character. Besides, in the table of analysis in each fragment, the writer has found that the meaning of each utterances of main character has a politeness strategy. Then, the result of each politeness strategy analysis related to the finding of meaning, they have the same meaning as the previous analysis about the meaning of illocutionary acts. We can also say that the relation between illocutionary and politeness strategy is, when we try to find the meaning beyond each utterances, we will find the same idea, the same topic, and of course the same meaning of the utterances as long as we make a good comprehension about the speech event, speech situation, and also the feature of the context.