

## Speech Acts of Genuine Invitations in Iraqi Arabic: A Socio-Pragmatic Study

Khalid Wahaab Jabber

University of Misan/College of Basic Education/Department of English

### Abstract

This study tries to investigate the speech acts of genuine invitations that Iraqi speakers are characterized with. The study will examine the linguistic and social context on which a genuine invitations are appeared. Personal observation way by a researcher is used to collect the data which is regarded as a short social daily live conversation. Speech acts theory developed by Searle's thoughts is adopted to analyze the selected data. Felicity conditions, as rules developed by Searle, are used to show a speaker observance of these conditions as a proof to show the sincerity of Iraqi genuine invitations. The study concluded that an Iraqi speakers use declarative and interrogative sentences to perform indirect illocutionary acts of genuine invitations. The study also found out that the invitations of Iraqi speakers were shown genuine (sincere) through the

observing of felicity conditions proposed by Searle.

Key words: invitation, genuine, speech acts, felicity conditions

### المخلص

تحاول هذه الدراسة البحث في افعال الكلام للدعوات الحقيقية التي يتميز بها المتكلمين العراقيين. ستبحث الدراسة في السياق اللغوي والاجتماعي التي ظهرت فيه الدعوات الحقيقية. استخدمت الملاحظة الشخصية من قبل الباحث لجمع العينات والتي تعتبر كمحادثة اجتماعية يومية حية. استخدمت نظرية افعال الكلام التي طورت من قبل سيرل لتحليل العينات. استخدمت Felicity Conditions ، كقواعد وضعها سيرل، لإظهار التزام المتكلم بهذه الشروط كدليل لأثبات صدق الدعوات العراقية الحقيقية. وخلصت الدراسة ان المتكلمين العراقيين يستخدمون الجمل الاخبارية والاستفهامية للقيام بأفعال كلام غير مباشرة للدعوات الحقيقية. استنتجت الدراسة ايضا صدق دعوات المتكلمين العراقيين من خلال الالتزام بقواعد Felicity Conditions التي وضعها سيرل.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الدعوة ، حقيقي ، افعال الكلام، felicity Conditions

## 1.Introduction

Sociolinguistics is the study of language in relation to the social context. It studies the functions of language in society (Wardhaugh, 1986:1). Sociopragmatics, according to Leech (1983: 10) is the sociological interference of pragmatics, by other means, it studies how the social context affects the language use conditions. When people speak, they do more than their expressed propositions; they suggest, promise, invite, request, threaten...etc., they perform speech or illocutionary acts (Allan & Jaszczolt, 2012: 169).

Sentence meaning and utterance meaning are two distinction terms, sentence meaning is a conventional meaning. In other words, it is a semantic meaning. Utterance meaning, on the other hand, is a pragmatic meaning or implied meaning. Utterance meaning (speaker meaning) is performed under certain circumstances to produce various functions in different social contexts. Therefore, an utterance may achieve different meanings with different situations (Kaburise, 2011: 87-88). The study of the speaker meaning or implied meaning is fallen under the term of pragmatics. Pragmatics can be defined as the study of language use in context (Allan, 2016:205). Pragmatics, according to Leech

(1983 cited in Abbood, 2016), is made up of two components, the first is pragma-linguistics which refers to the appropriateness of the form while the second is called socio-pragmatic which refers to appropriateness of meaning of social context. Speech act is an activity of the speaker to encode a formal speech to perform an intending meaning with relation to social cultural context. Therefore, request, promise, invite, order...etc. are examples of speech acts.

Invitation, as an act is performed by an addresser, is a communicative cultural and social act. It is a social behavior that a speaker may intend to produce in which it affects the hearer to do something. Genuine speech act of invitation is produced for propositional content as opposed to the ostensible which deal with tacit content.

Salmani-Nodoushan (1995:45) defined genuine invitation as “a speaker A invites a hearer B to receive something or to perform some task, the primary aim of which is to benefit the hearer himself/herself.”

In genuine invitations, as mentioned by Bach & Harnish (1979: 51 cited in Hady, 2015: 8), a speaker S invites a hearer H to perform an event A, if S requests H's

presence and promises acceptance of his/her presence. An invitation is sincere if S wants H's presence and intends to accept it. Three important factors affect the most of invitations exchanges, the context, the shared knowledge of the interlocutors, and the question intonation (Salmani-Nodoushan, 1995:35).

In this study, the researcher will examine the linguistic environment (cotext) and social context that Iraqi community participants follow to perform what is called a 'Sincere Invitation.' The study also shows the way when an invitee responds to the inviter, acceptance or declining. The direct observation of the speech is used to collect the data from a variety of speech situations. The gathered data will be analyzed according to the speech act theory developed by John Searle (1969). Speech acts of genuine invitations are fulfilled by observing the felicity conditions as developed by Searle (preparatory condition, propositional condition, sincerity condition and essential condition). Therefore, to prove that the invitations are genuine, the data will be examined according to the Searle's felicity conditions.

## 2. Literature review

### 2.1 Previous studies on invitation

A study by Al-Asadi (2015) explored the similarities and differences across the insincere speech act of invitation as a comparative study between American English and Iraqi Arabic. The study concluded that there are similarities in defining the insincere invitation for both American English and Iraqi speakers.

Another study is adopted by Al-Darraji et al (2013), their study was an attempt to describe and analyze the realization patterns of speech act of invitation. The study attempted to detect causes for potential differences of the speech act realization strategies during conversation whether they are linguistic or pragmatic aspects and whether they are cultural values or social parameters. The study concluded that the Arabic and English differ in the way they make invitation, due to the cultural difference between them. Also, cultural aspects and Islamic tradition play an important role in making invitations among Iraqi EFL speakers.

A study by Abbood (2016) was aimed to investigate the ability of Iraqi EFL learners to recognize and produce utterances related to the two speech acts of invitation and offer the strategies followed when adopt the two speech acts. Also, the study aimed at examining whether the significance

differences exist between gender and year of study in their relationship with a student's ability to produce the two speech acts.

Many Asian, European researchers have studied the style of invitation; like Salmani-Nodoushan, (2006); Dastpak & Mollaei, (2001); Hady, (2015); Bella, (2009); Issacs & Clark, (1990); Link & Kreuz, (2005); Al-Marrani & Suraih, (2018); Eslami, (2005); and Al-Khatib, (2006) but most of them have dealt with ostensible invitation, therefore, the present study tries to study the genuine invitation which the Iraqi speaker characterized with in opposed to the ostensible (insincere) invitation.

## 2.2 Speech acts theory

An invitation, as a polite type of behavior, can be seen as speech acts. According to the Searle (1969: 22 cited in Al-Khatib, 2006: 272) speech acts theory is based on the assumption that language is a form of behavior and conditioned by a set of rules. Each culture has its own of social norm of politeness principle and different from other cultures norms. It means that an invitation in one community can be seen socially acceptable behavior whereas in other community unacceptable.

Invitations, as a class of directive acts, can also be measured by fulfilling the felicity conditions proposed by Searle. To differentiate genuine from ostensible invitations, a speaker must observe those conditions. If one condition is violated by an inviter, this allow an invitee to believe that an invitation is ostensible (insincere). Austin distinguished three main categories in order the conditions or circumstances on which the performative must meet. Austin called these conditions as 'felicity conditions', they are:

- a. There must be a conventional procedures to perform a particular acts.
- b. The persons must be appropriate and exist and adopted by participants correctly.
- c. Thought, feelings, and intentions are personal psychological state must be taking part.

(Levinson, 1983; Chapman, 2011:59-60)

Austin axiomatic felicity has been systematized by Searle in the idea that each type of speech act has four kinds of conditions. Searle proposed that all should be necessary and sufficient, and specified (Verschueren, 1999:23). Searle, in his speech acts, argues that the felicity conditions should also be seen positively as rules, not only just be negatively as way

in which an utterance may go wrong. In order an utterance to be true it must meet those conditions, so an utterance cannot be said as true unless measured by a felicity conditions or rules as pointed out by Searle.

The four types of conditions are as follow in which a speaker of an utterance should be followed in order the speech act of invitation be genuine (sincere):

1. Propositional condition: S predicates a future act (A) of S and S expresses the proposition of suggestion in his utterance.
2. Preparatory condition: S believes B would like to do act A and S be able to provide what he/she offers.
3. Sincerity condition: S truly intends to do act A with B
4. Essential condition: Speaker undertakes an obligation to do act A. S intends to make H recognize that his/her utterance counts as a desire A to be done

### 2.3 Speech act of invitation

According to Searle's (1979 cited in Al-Marrani & Suraih, 2019: 2) classification of speech acts, an invitation is a directive speech act in which a speaker directs a hearer to do something.

Searle (1996) classified speech acts into direct and indirect speech acts. When a declarative, imperative, and interrogative

sentences are used for performative speech acts different from their default kind, these sentences are called indirect speech acts. Furthermore, indirect speech acts mean that there is no direct correlation between form and function of an utterance (Verschueren, 1999:25 cited in Griffiths, 2006: 149), for example:

*Could you put the lid on that one to your light?*

This utterance was said to someone, when she was cooking, by someone working a couple of meters away, talking to another saucepan on the cooker she was working at. The hearer said "Ok" and put the lid on the pan. The sentence is interrogative as a question of default type of speech act, but if the question is verified then the hearer should say "Yes I could (my arm's long enough and I'm strong enough)," but the hearer treated the question as an indirect speech act of request. Her idea appears to be asking whether the hearer is capable to put a lid on the pan. Previously a speaker knows that the hearer is capable to do so. The incapacity offers the hearer a polite way to accede such a request, therefore, *could you...?* is an idiomatic expression to make a polite request. The politeness, then, is one reason that pay a speaker intention to behave or manage things more than the

sentence meaning. In reverse, direct speech act is realized literary what a speaker says, it means that there is a relationship between form and function of an utterance, for example, “*Close the door.*” The sentence is imperative, it is said when a speaker utters this utterance and there are no circumstances that make a hearer believes that a speaker may be intended more than the words mean, then the utterance is said directly which mean that a speaker want a hearer to close the door no more no less.

The context of politeness goes along with the indirect invitation acts rather than direct. Searle (1979 cited in Salmani-Nodoushan, 1995: 31) pointed out that there are cases in which one illocutionary force is performed indirectly, by way of others. Brown & Levinson (1987) consider politeness as an underline motivation for indirectness.

The illocutionary act of invitations has an effect on invitee as proposed by Issacs and Clark (1990:502), these effects are called perlocutionary acts. Genuine invitations, not ostensible, have two perlocutionary acts:

P1.B comes to believe that A wants B to attend event E.

P2.B comes to feel that A likes or approves of B to an extent consistent with P1.

If the speaker fails to fulfill these perlocutionary acts, the speaker will violate these expectations of perlocutionary acts.

The following example shows how an illocutionary act of addresser’s utterance effects on the addressee to produce a perlocutionary act of invitation:

A. We haven’t seen you for two weeks.

B. Please, come to me now.

Because A told that he hasn’t seen B, in genuine invitations, this leads B to belief that A wants to meet him and to feel that A likes or approves of B enough that A want to meet B.

Different from ostensible invitations, in genuine invitations the situation makes B believe that A misses B and he really wants to meet him. Because the utterance is extended directly to the B and no other things have been mentioned that change the situation, this leads B to feel or believe that A is honestly wants to meet B.

#### 2.4 Genuine invitation in Iraqi Arabic

Iraqi Arabic speaker tends to use utterances that give an implicit meaning different from that of explicit meaning. This case is related to the culture and social dimensions of Iraqi community and the life style. Most of Iraqi speakers are recognized such

utterances they exposed during their daily interaction and these become familiar to the most of people in Iraq. This kind of implicit meaning is associated with many of the aspects of life places; in families, schools, colleges, and markets...etc.

The Iraqi community is different from other communities, like in Europe, America, or some Asian countries. Iraqi families are interferences between each other due to the tribal nature, religious, cultural and natural situations of the country. Because Iraqi Arabic is spoken by majority of people, this made the implied meaning, in case, is recognized by all parts of the country, except some northern cities. Iraqi people are familiar to use different short; declarative, imperative, and interrogative sentences to convey invisible meaning. The speaker aims to utter like these utterances to perform different illocutionary acts; to avoid embarrassment, to be polite with the listener, and to show the desire to do something with the others...etc.

According to the observation of the genuine invitations in Iraqi community, it has been found that they are issued by some specific arrangements; 1. reference to time or/and place implicitly showing by the circumstances of the a situation.2. a request

for reponse.3. a response by an invitee is expected directly or indirectly.

It is the illocutionary act that an Iraqi speaker intends to perform in order to achieve different performative speech acts. Iraqi speaker uses some utterances that have a strong effect on the addressees. Sincere invitation is one of functions that is characterized in Iraqi community and most people as friends, relatives, and families accomplish such kind of invitations. For example, an Iraqi speaker is always using the expression /ra:h ?nswi.../ ‘we will...’ to bring the addressees to the issue he/she is talking about, bringing him/her unconsciously performs what he/she would like to do. And he/she sometimes uses an interrogative expression /šano r?jk b?.../ “*What’s your opinion....?*” as if apparently he wants to inquire the hearer’s opinion of the case he/she is talking about, but actually he/she produces a speech act of invitation. These expressions, that an Iraqi speaker uses, are more polite with a hearer. How does a speaker convey, and a hearer understand the illocutionary force of an utterance? There is a distinction between explicit and implicit illocutionary force as stated by Levinson (1983:231). In the explicit illocutionary force there is a linguistic signal to encode illocutionary

force. In this respect, we can distinguish between two types; lexical and grammatical. For example:

/ma šajfk šarli ʔsbu:ʕan/

/man faʕlak taal jami hasa/

a. We haven't seen you for two weeks.

b. Please, come to me now.

The verb 'seen' is called a performative verb which encodes the illocutionary force and functions as inviting. The grammatical type of a declarative sentence encodes the statement force. It functions as inviting a friend. An Iraqi addresser, in uttering this utterance, wants to bring the addressee's attention to visit him. This is a conventional procedure in which Iraqi speakers are used to deal with it as a desire of a speaker to invite another to do something. The hearer unconsciously asks himself why a friend told me about this? He/She soon believes that a speaker intends and likes to meet him. The meaning of the sentence (a) is not just a statement. The situation tells us that the locutionary act functions as inviting to meet others because the performative verb 'seen' bring the hearer's attention to do meeting. Invitation is not merely uttering words, but it is the desire of the speaker to do something with the hearer.

Speech act of genuine invitations can be distinguished from ostensible speech act of invitations by following the five properties that is somehow different or similar to the properties suggested by Isaacs and Clark (1990:496-497). As opposite to the techniques proposed by Issacs and Clark (1990) to fulfill ostensible invitation, the researcher suggests some techniques that a speaker use in fulfilling the genuine invitation.

1.Sincerity: the inviter is sincere to invite an invitee to do something honestly. It is opposite to ostensible invitation on which an inviter is only inviting to extend a sincere invitation.

2.Genuine mutual recognition: an invitee is expected to recognize the extended invitation positively. Context and the friendship relationship between an inviter and invitee play an important role for the invitee to believe that an extended invitation is sincere. An invitee does not believe that such invitation is insincere. As soon as an inviter extends his invitation, an invitee without hesitation will accept or refuse it with reasons.

3.Cooperation: invitee is expected to cooperate with inviter positively, after he/she recognizes the sincere invitation of



the inviter, accepting or refusing with reasons.

4. Absence of constraints: to avoid embarrassment or sometimes to achieve some propositional contents, an inviter might give choice to the invitee to respond. For example, an Iraqi speaker is always used /šano rʔjk bʔ.../ “What is your opinion....?” or /wanta/ “How about you?”

5. On-record purpose: on-record purpose means that an inviter who produces a speech act of genuine invitations is accountable of certain interpretation of that utterance avoiding of what an addressee may sometimes feel manipulating. It is different from ostensible invitations in which a speaker who produces an utterance is not accountable of the interpretation of that utterance.

Returning to above example, we can demonstrate the five properties through this example:

/ma šajfk šarli ʔsbu:ʕan/

/man faʕlak taal jami hasa/

A. We haven't seen you for two weeks.

B. Please, come to me now.

One of the social habits in Iraqi community is that the people, whether friends, relatives, and neighbors are used to visit each other constantly not to mention the formal events. A and B are two friends,

they live in different districts. They always visit each other.

Both of the speakers are honest to produce such utterances. An inviter, when he said /ma šajfk šarli ʔsbu:ʕan/ “We haven't seen you,” he was sincere because there is no other alternative meaning can be concluded rather than wishing to see him, so he expects to see him as soon as the addressee knows that. Because the interlocutors are friends, an invitee soon accepted the invitation by saying / taal jami hasa/ “come to me now,” therefore, both of the interlocutors are sincere in producing such utterances. There is no expecting by the inviter that the invitee will decline the invitation due to the friendship relationship. Furthermore, if the invitee says ‘yes’, he releases that he will soon come to see him and he has an ability and desire to do that. And if he refuses that, then he will present reasons and these reasons will be appreciated by the inviter. When an invitee says /ma šajfk šarli ʔsbu:ʕan/ “We haven't seen you,” he gives the inviter choice to accept invitation or to apologies. There is no belief, that the invitee intends to manipulate or deceive him because an invitee believes that an inviter's intention is only to see him no more no less.

### 3. Analysis and discussion

In this part, the researcher will adopt the speech act theory developed by Searle's (1969) concepts of performative and felicity conditions to analyze the selected data. The data are transcribed into Arabic phonetic transcription in order to be understood by the readers. The hereunder analysis tries to show how an Iraqi speaker uses a common speech to perform an invitation.

**Situation (1):** A and B are close friends. They are in the same social class. They always meet together to achieve different purposes; visit friends, shopping, for tourism, etc. in this situation, A suggests his friend B to go in journey.

/a:lǧʔw ɧʔlw ʔlyo:m/

/ʔi: ʔni: ʔhab ʔro:ɧ balsafra/

**A. The weather is nice today.**

**B. Yes, I would love to go for a walk.**

The first sentence is declarative. It shows a state of a day weather. The word 'nice' gives comfort and contentment in the soul. Therefore, the addresser uses this utterance to indicate an indirect speech act of invitation. In the ordinary speech, the addressee should respond the addresser by 'yes' or 'I see', etc., but the addressee's respond was opposed. He responded by "yes, I love to go for walk" as an indicator

that the addressee recognized the performative act of the addresser, that is the desire of the addressee to go for a walk with him. The interlocutors' saying can be constructed as follow:

A. The weather is nice today, I invite you to go for a walk.

B. Yes, I would love to go for a walk.

The propositional condition is fulfilled through the context of uttering an utterance because the circumstances show that the speaker intends to go for a walk with the hearer, if an addresser doesn't intend to do that in the future, then the performative act of invitation cannot be performed as genuine norm and this will interpret by a hearer as an ostensible invitation. For preparatory condition, a speaker would prefer the invitation to be published. Therefore, an inviter would consider that the invitee would accept his invitation to go in journey. This mutual recognition gives an indication for both that such invitation is sincere. If an inviter wouldn't consider that, an invitee would be unable to go for a walk for certain circumstances. The invitation, then, was violated and would be insincere. Sincerity condition shows that, in this utterance, a speaker actually intends to go for a walk with the hearer. When a hearer accepts an

invitation, a speaker does not hesitate to perform that. Therefore, a speaker proved that he serious to go with the hearer and he is sincere. In this utterance, a speaker obligated himself to perform a speech act of going for a walk. He knows implicitly that he cannot give up from his invitation if the speaker implicitly realizes the intended meaning. Therefore, a speaker here presents his intention to do an act and as a result, he fulfills the essential condition.

**Situation (2):** A and B are two close friends. They are university students. They love sports especially playing football. The following situation is fallen when a speaker A tries to invite B to go for playing football.

/baʕar raḥ naru:ḥ nalʕb ʔo:ba/ Tomorrow we will go for playing football.

/ʔʕtaðar ʕndi: daras/

**A. Tomorrow we will go for playing football.**

**B. I'm sorry, I have a class.**

The first utterance indicates an indirect speech act of invitation. In the first utterance, an addresser tries to share his intention with an addressee's mind as a member of a group that he wants to go for playing football by using the pronoun 'we'. He, as if intends to say to the addressee "we want you to go with us." The second

utterance implied an indirect speech act of refusal of invitation realized through a declarative sentence "I have a class." The noun phrase 'I'm sorry' gives an indication that the addressee recognizes the illocutionary meaning of the first utterance. Therefore, an addressee refuses that, which means he cannot go with them. This saying can be reconstructed into:

A. We want you to go with us for playing football tomorrow.

B. I'm sorry, I cannot because I have a class.

Propositional condition shows that the speaker, in this utterance, decided to go for playing football in the future. An addresser proposed a time and place to perform such act, with this, he fulfilled the propositional condition. For a preparatory condition, when a speaker decided to go for playing football, he actually knows that an addressee has willing to go to this place due to the store knowledge of them which states that a speaker will do what he wants to do, although the addressee sometimes refuses to accept such invitation for reason beyond his will. Because a speaker wants a hearer to go with him for playing football, he really observes the sincerity condition. When a hearer responds by saying 'I'm sorry...', he indicates that he recognized

that the speech act of invitation is genuine. The essential condition of this utterance shows that a speaker has an ability to perform a speech act and he intends to do that, if he doesn't intend to perform such invitation, he could say '*I try*' or '*I think to*'...etc. In this case, the invitation will be insincere.

**Situation (3):** The Iraqi people used to visit the sick people whether they are friends, relatives, and neighbors. It is a social and cultural behavior that Iraqi people always behave. In this situation, one friend is sick, therefore their friend try to invite others indirectly to visit him.

/ʃadi:qna '....' mari:d/

/ha ʔna rajh wjak/

**A. Our friend '....' is sick.**

**B. Oh, I'm coming with you.**

The first utterance shows that something is happened to one friend. The speech act of invitation is realized here through a declarative sentence. Because the situation refers to an intended person is a friend for both of interlocutors by using the personal pronoun 'our', the illocutionary act of the first utterance can be interpreted by an addressee as an invitation, therefore, the addressee's response is to accept the invitation by saying "*I'm coming with you.*" Why does the addressee say that?

Because when an Iraqi friend is sick, another friend should visit and help him. The conversation lines can be recognized by saying:

A. Our friend '....' is sick, why don't we go to visit him?

Propositional condition, in this utterance, shows a situation of a speaker's friend A illness. So, this circumstance, according to the social context, forces a speaker to visit him and to invite his friends to do that. If a speaker invites a friend after he/she has already visited him, this allows an invitee to believe that the invitation is insincere.

Because A is a friend of two interlocutors and because he/she is sick, this situation, according to the Iraqi social context, they have to visit him. By other means, they have willing to perform such invitation. The hearer's utterance "*Oh, I'm coming with you.*" is approval that an invitee has also willing to perform the invitation. In this case, a speaker is fulfilling the preparatory condition. Because an invitation is still coming at time of inviter speaking, an inviter then is sincere to invite B. Essential condition required a speaker's intention to perform a speech act of invitation. Here, a sick friend is a friend of B also. Therefore, an addresser, in order to avoid embarrassment if a friend B doesn't

know the friend's case, a speaker A here obligated himself to visit the friend A with his friend B.

**Situation (4):** A and B are friends stay in the same place. They always go shopping together. A needs to buy things, so he/she told his friend to go with him.

/maḥtağ maswak/

/albaḥa ʔštarat bađ a:lašaʔ/

**A. I need to go shopping.**

**B. Yesterday, I bought some things, but don't worry.**

The declarative sentence indicates that the addressee invites the hearer to go shopping whereas the perlocutionary speech act shows indirect speech act of acceptance of invitation by an addressee by saying 'don't worry'. The verb phrase 'go shopping' can be interpreted as asking help, but the addressee's inference specifies the illocutionary act of the addresser's intention as an intended invitation. The conversation can be rewritten as: A. I invite you to go shopping.

Because a speaker needs of shopping, the circumstance of an utterance, in which a speaker produced, was not achieved until a hearer's response. Therefore, in this utterance, the inviter observes the propositional condition.

People in Iraqi community especially women have a habit to go shopping together. It is a social circumstance which allow them to behave like this. Therefore, a speaker A in producing such utterance, he/she believes that a hearer B has also willing to accept what a speaker wants to do. When a speaker performs a speech act, he/she actually fulfills a preparatory condition. For the sincere condition, in the context of conversation, a speaker A really wants his/her friend B to go shopping, therefore he/she gives a genuine fact about his need to go shopping with him/her. An essential condition is shown by intention of the speaker. In uttering such utterance, the speaker has a desire and really wants B to go shopping with him. This context is realized by the invitee that the invitation is sincere through his/her utterance 'don't worry.'

**Situation (5):** An Iraqi speaker always invites himself to visit his friends. A and B are friends. A interrogates whether his friend in his apartment or not.

/ʔnta balbi:t/

/hala bi:k/

**A. Are you in your apartment?**

**B. You're welcome.**

An Iraqi speaker always uses interrogative sentences to indicate multiple uses, one of

them is to invite himself to visit the other. The first utterance apparently shows that an addresser inquires the addressee whether he is in the apartment or not. But this utterance implies a different meaning. It indicates an indirect speech act of invitation realized through an interrogative sentence. The norm of interrogative sentence does not wait an answer from the hearer whether he is indoor or outdoor rather it serves to point the hearer's opinion of accepting or refusing an invitation. To prove that is the response of the addressee when he says "You're welcome", it is an indication that he recognizes the addressee's intention. The first utterance can be reconstructed as; I want to visit you.

Felicity propositional condition can be seen from the circumstances in which an utterance is produced. When a speaker interrogates about the existence or not of the hearer in the apartment, he actually knows his existence in the apartment implied beyond an interrogative statement. Preparatory condition shows that a speaker is able and free to present an invitation and an addressee utterance shows that he would like to meet a speaker, the mutual recognition of the utterance proves the fulfilling of preparatory condition. The

sincerity condition is shown from the fact that a speaker is sincere in producing such utterance due to the time of the speaker misses seeing the hearer. If he early saw the hearer, the invitation will give a hearer insincerity belief. The Essential condition is understood as an attempt by a speaker to the undertaking the obligation of doing a speech act of invitation. It expresses a great desire of the speaker A to meet a hearer B. An addressee's utterance is also proven that the speaker's intention to meet a hearer B when a hearer soon accepts and welcomes him. It can be inferred from the utterances' context that the felicity conditions are fulfilled.

**Situation (6):** A and B are students. They are friends who study abroad like many other of Iraqi students. Iraqi students who live together are regarded as a small group represents the Iraqi community.

/ʔlba:rħa ʔǧʔ ʔalab ǧadi:d mʔn ʔalʔraq/

/ħa ʔi: xali: naru:ħ su:ʔ ʔnzwrəħ/

**A. Yesterday a new student came from Iraq.**

**B. Yes, OK, let's go together to visit him.**

When one new student comes from Iraq, the group of Iraqi students go to visit him. Socially, it is enough to hear that someone arrived from his country, other soon realized that they have to visit him/her. The

noun phrase ‘a new student’ socially inspires the other students that they have to visit that new student. Therefore, the first utterance indicates an indirect speech act of invitation through the declarative sentence. The second utterance shows that the perlocutionary act recognizes by the addressee as an invitation, so he soon accepts and is ready to visit him. This is an indication that both of interlocutors share the same feeling towards this situation. The saying can be interpreted as “*I invite you to visit a new student.*”

The circumstances of the utterance show a future visit that a speaker suggests to the new friend. Because a friend, who came from Iraq, is new to the study, social circumstances require the interlocutors to meet him. It is a social and cultural habit that the Iraqi people are used to doing. This context shows a propositional condition is fulfilled. Preparatory condition is fulfilled through the belief of a speaker A that a hearer B shares the same feeling towards a new friend. So, his utterance “*let’s go together.*” is an intention that he would like to go with a speaker A to visit a new friend. Because a new friend is a friend of all, a speaker shows his sincerity to participate with his colleague to do such social activity. In other words, this context

is an inference to observe the sincerity condition. This utterance meets the requirements of the essential condition. A speaker cannot abandon his claim. He shows his compliment of the invitation to visiting his friend. His declarative sentence states the desire of a speaker A to a hearer B to be going together. Hearer’s response shows the social relationship when he soon responded “*let’s go together.*” It is a mutual obligation in which Iraqi speakers always deal and interact with

**Situation (7):** A and B are friends. Both are always met together. This situation is happened when one friend is eager to see another.

/we:n ?nta/

/?nta we:n hala bi:k/

**A. Where are you?**

**B. Where are you, too? You’re welcome.**

This is a kind of joke that an Iraqi speaker used to deal with the other friends. It is mutual interrogative sentences. Both of the interrogative sentences indicate a speech act of invitation. Both of interlocutors have a desire to meet one another. In the first utterance, an addresser hides his desire ‘performative act’ to meet an addressee under a question ‘where are you’. It is a code by an addresser to meet another one that understood by both of them, so the

perlocutionary act of the second utterance indicates the addressee's accepting the meeting by uttering an interrogative sentence too and sends a welcome message "You're welcome." The utterance can be rewritten as follow:

Where are you? I want to see you.

I also want to see you in my place.

An interrogative sentence presents a speaker's question about the hearer existence. The circumstance of the utterance shows a speaker's implied meaning that he/she wants to meet him. A hearer's response is an interrogative sentence also. It is a kind of interaction, that an Iraqi speaker characterized with, when one is eager to meet another one. Both of interlocutors know the encoded message which implies a speech act of invitation. The context of the utterance refers that the interlocutors fulfilled the proposition condition. When a speaker says this question of the utterance, he/she knows that a hearer will respond positively because the relationship between them leads to such behavior, so in this case, a speaker fulfills felicity of preparatory condition. The sincerity condition is fulfilled when a speaker asks a question "Where are you?" And stop! And a hearer responds in the same way by asking the

same question. This utterance indicates the sincere of feeling which Iraqi speakers hold towards each other. When one says "Where are you," it is an encoded message that one is eager to meet another and invite him to meeting. It is an inference that a sincerity condition is observed. The essential condition is observed through the mutual interrogative sentences. Both of speakers show their compliment; the former presents an invitation and the later presents and accepts it. In short, both speakers show the desire to perform the speech act of invitation of meeting.

**Situation (8):** Hospitality is socially rooted in Iraqi community. One of the traditional and social habits in Iraqi community is sharing food with others. This situation is happened between two friends who have the same place of job.

/zo:ğtj ʔabhat ho:š gada šadgu:l/

/ha šakran ʔni: tğadit/

**A. My wife cooked a good food for lunch, what do you say?**

**B. Oh, thanks, I already had my lunch.**

An Iraqi speaker intends to use interrogative sentences to invite others to share food as for this expression "What do you say?" The speech act of invitation here is realized indirectly through an interrogative sentence preceded by a



declarative sentence. An addressee refuses that directly. He knows, when the addresser mentioned the word 'food', he intends to invite him to have lunch. This saying can be reconstructed as; *My wife cooked a good food. Can you have lunch with us?*

Propositional condition can be seen from the circumstances of the speaker A's saying. He suggests that his wife cooks a good food, the food is for lunch, so a speaker proposes to invite B to have meal which did not eat till now. Preparatory condition is shown from the fact that a speaker A believes that B would like to accept a speaker's invitation, the hearer refuses the invitation because he already had a lunch, and A be able to offer the food for his guest. Because the speaker invitation is done before lunch, a speaker is sincere in doing his invitation. This sincerity intention makes a hearer recognizes that a speaker invitation is genuine. Furthermore, a speaker here observes the sincerity condition. An essential condition can be realized through the speaker's desire to invite a hearer to have lunch with him, due the meal did not eat till the time of speaking, if a saying utters after lunch, the hearer would think

that such invitation is insincere, as a result, a speaker fulfilled the essential condition.

**Situation (9):** Iraqi women always go shopping. Shopping for women is an interesting habit. Iraqi women love to go shopping in groups. The conversation is between two women A and B. A invites B to go with her to a new supermarket.

/ʔnfatah so:q ʔadjd/

/ʔoh ʔi: ʔalj narwh/

**A. A new supermarket is opened.**

**B. Oh! OK. Let's go.**

The utterance indicates an indirect speech act of invitation. The addresser used the word 'new' to bring an addressee's attention to the place which is opened recently. This utterance affects the addressee and bring him to think that it is an invitation, so she directly accepted it. This saying can be contracted as follow; let's go shopping to the new supermarket.

In her utterance, a speaker A suggests to go to a new opened supermarket with his friend B, so in this circumstance A observed a proportional condition. Preparatory condition can be seen from the hearer B's response when she said 'let's go', this phrase is a reference that she would like to go to the new supermarket. Furthermore, a speaker B is also has an ability to perform such an act. If the

speaker A went to visit a new supermarket and then told her friend B to do that, this case may allow the hearer B to believe that such invitation is ostensible, but a speaker utterance is performed before she goes to that place, it leads the hearer to infer that her saying refers to genuine invitation, thus, a speaker observes a sincerity condition. Essential condition can be shown from the obligation of speaker A to go to the supermarket with B and her invitation expresses her desire to perform such act with B.

**Situation (10):** Friday is a holy day. A lot of people go with their families and friends for shopping and visit friends and relatives.

/bêar ġo:ma/

/ʔi: xo:š waqt/

**A. Tomorrow is Friday.**

**B. Yes, it is an appropriate time.**

The first sentence is declarative. It tells a weekend. Friday implies a connotation that it is a day of recreation, a day of prayer, a day that families and friends visit each other. An addressee inferred that the addresser's utterance implies an invitation, so he/she soon responds by saying 'yes'. 'Yes' is a short answer to accept a request or an invitation. Although there was not formally request or invitation, an addressee inferred that. An addressee's declarative

sentence "*it is an appropriate time*" come into contact with addresser's expression 'Friday'. If an addresser says that "*tomorrow is Sunday*". An addressee may keep silent or refuses.

The circumstance of the utterance refers to the time of action which will be in the future. It is a proposed suggestion for the hearer to do an act in the future, as a result proportional condition can be observed. A hearer's utterance "*Yes, it is an appropriate time*" reveals that B would like to do an act suggested by a speaker A. The shared knowledge implied by a speaker and inferred by a hearer gives an intention that both of the interlocutors know what they are planning to do, a speaker ability and a hearer's willing, therefore a speaker recognizes a preparatory condition. Sincerity condition can be observed through the speaker's claim that tomorrow is Friday and a hearer response by saying 'appropriate time'. If the day that is referred by a speaker is not Friday, then the hearer's response would be different or even keep silent. An obligation of the speaker to do an act in the future and hearer acceptance indicates that essential condition is observed.

**5. Conclusion**

The present study was an attempt to examine the speech act of invitations characterized by Iraqi speakers. The study showed the following conclusions:

1. Iraqi Arabic speakers use declarative and interrogative sentences to show indirectly of speech acts. He always uses general facts or refers to daily habits, such as /bêar ġo:ma/ *Tomorrow is Friday.*, /maħtaġ maswak/ *I need to go shopping.*, and /baêar raħ nar:ħ nalʕb to:ba/ *Tomorrow we will go for playing football.* Sometimes he uses interrogative sentences implied invitations, such as /ʔnta balbi:t/ *Are you in your apartment?* /we:n ʔnta/ *Where are you?* and /šadgu:l/ *What do you say?*
2. The Iraqi speaker usually uses interrogative sentences to express his/her desire for a hearer to perform a genuine invitations; leaving the decision for the hearer to accept or refuse it, for instance /šano rʔjk bʔ.../ *“What is your opinion....?”*, /wanta/ *“How about you?”* and /hai: hi:a/ *‘It’s OK.’*
3. Both of the speaker and hearer realize genuine invitations through the shared knowledge which is

regarded as an accommodation of social habits and experiences. For example, when a speaker says /a:lġʔw ħʔlw ʔlyo:m/ *The weather is nice today.* A hearer already responses /ʔi: ʔni: ʔhab ʔro:ħ balsafra/ *Yes, I would love to go for a walk.* The Accommodation of experiences of such sayings leads the hearer to infer that a speaker saying is an invitation.

4. A mutual question is used to perform and accept the genuine invitations. When a speaker, for example, says /we:n ʔnta/ *Where are you?* a hearer is already accept invitation by saying /ʔnta we:n hala bi:k/ *Where are you too?*

## References

- Allan, K. & Jaszczolt, K. M. (2012). *The Cambridge handbook of pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Allan, K.(ed.).(2016). *The Routledge handbook of linguistics.* New York: Routledge.
- Abbood, H. H. (2016). *Investigating the use of the two speech acts of invitation and offer among Iraqi EFL university learners.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University Science Malaysia. USM. Malaysia.

- Al-Asadi, L. M. M. (2015). A comparative study of the insincere speech act of inviting in American English and Iraqi Arabic. *Journal of Basra Researchers for Human sciences*, 40(2), 11-28.
- Al-Darraji, H., Foo, T., Ismail, S., & Abdulah, W. (2013). Cultural values underlying speech act of inviting: The case of Iraqi EFL speakers. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, 4, 1051-1057.
- Al-Khatib, M. A. (2006). The pragmatics of invitation making and acceptance in Jordanian society. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 5(2), 272-294.
- Al-Marrani, Y. M. A., & Suraih, N. S. (2018). Invitation strategies as produced by Yemeni EFL learners. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 3(2), 15-24.
- Bach, K. & Harnish, R.M. (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech acts*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Bella, S. (2009). Invitations and politeness in Greek: The age variable. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 5, 243-271.
- Chapman, S. (2011). *Pragmatics*. Great Britain: MPG Books Group, Bodmin and Kings Lynn.
- Dastpak, M., & Mollaei, F. (2011). A comparative study of ostensible invitations in English and Persian. *Higher Education of Social Science*, 1(1), 33-42.
- Eslami, Z. R. (2005). Invitations in Persian and English: Ostensible or genuine?. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2(4), 453-480.
- Griffiths, P. (2006). *An introduction to English semantics and pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hady, S. A. (2015). The pragmatic functions of the ostensible communicative act of invitation in Jordanian Arabic. *SKY Journal of Linguistics*, 28.
- Isaacs, E. A., and Clark H. H. (1990). "Ostensible Invitations." *Language in society*, 19, (4), 493-509.
- Kaburise, P. (2011). *Speech act theory and communication: A univen Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Singapore: Selector Printing Co Pte Ltd.
- Levinson, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Link, K. E., & Kreuz, R. J. (2005). The comprehension of Ostensible sActs. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 24(3), 227-251.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: University Printing House.

Salmani-Nodoushan, M. A. (1995). A socio-pragmatic comparative study of ostensible invitations in English and Farsi. Unpublished MA thesis . University of Isfahan.

Salmani-Nodoushan, M. A. (2006). A comparative sociopragmatic study of ostensible invitations in English and Farsi. *Speech Communication*, 48(8), 903-912.

Verschueren, J.(1999). *Understanding pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press Inc.

Wardhaugh, R.(1986). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. China: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.