

RESEARCH ARTICLE



INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA
2395-2636 (Print);2321-3108 (online)

VOCATIVES IN NKENGASONG'S *BLACK CAPS AND RED FEATHERS* AND ACHEBE'S
ARROW OF GOD: A PRAGMATIC PERSPECTIVE

YEPDIA LEUNDJEU WALTER

Department of English, Faculty of Arts, Letters and Social Sciences, University of Ngaoundere,
Cameroon.

E-mail: yepdialeundjeuwalter@yahoo.fr



Article Received: 20/02/2021
Article Accepted: 25/03/2022
Published online:31/03/2022
DOI: [10.33329/rjelal.10.1.273](https://doi.org/10.33329/rjelal.10.1.273)

Abstract

This paper shows insight into the use of vocatives in two literary texts, *Black Caps and Red Feathers* by John Kengasong and *Arrow of God* by Chinua Achebe. The study examines vocative forms in characters' speech acts and also describes the illocutionary and perlocutionary forces of expressions uttered. The data, which are corpus-based, derived from narratives and dialogues in the books selected and their analyses follow Austin (1962) and Searle (1969)'s Speech Act theories. It came out of the findings that the forms of address sampled from characters' propositions included titles of respect or markers of status, familiarisers, epithets, family names and the use of the personal pronoun you. The illocutionary acts emerging from characters' vocative patterns among others were directives, assertives, expressives, interrogatives and wishes, of which intentions were nominative, evaluative, relational, emotional, brotherly, reverential, etc. Adversely, the perlocutionary effects on addressees which were not uniform embodied offence, fulfilment, familiarity, confirmation, assurance, fear, anger, alignment, violence, humiliation, reduction, ridicule, serenity, distance, obedience, inferiority, sympathy, fun, reverence, appeasement and shame. The study indicates that addresses in speech acts help speakers construct and enact different aspect of their identity or negotiate personal and interpersonal relationships.

Keywords: literary texts, vocative forms, speech act, illocutionary acts, perlocutionary acts

1. Introduction

In everyday interactional transactions, people exchange to negotiate relationships of several kinds. Among the diverse communicative transactions, Malinkowski (1923) functionalist pragmatic argument is that language primary communicative function is to perform phatic

communion, that is, to establish and maintain social relations through expressive means such as greetings, leave-taking, pleasantries, enquiries about health, casual discussions on weather and small talk topics during the opening and closing of conversations, etc. In a macro perspective view, Roman Jakobson (1960:350-377) identified six functional models of communication known as

referential, emotive, conative, phatic, poetic and metalingual, some of which are functional instruments inherent in vocative forms, the core of this research endeavour.

This study, which falls within the framework of pragmatics, looks into the linguistic forms of address used in John Nkengasong's *Black Caps and Red Feathers* and Chinua Achebe's *Arrow of God*. Noteworthy, the former is a play while the latter is a novel. The work also analyses the pragmatic functions of vocative markers emerging from the texts under analysis emphasising illocutionary acts and perlocutionary effects residing in characters' utterances.

Vocative is an underexplored area in pragmatics which remains a poorly understood category (Schaden, 2010). As a feature of the noun case, vocative patterns in both *Black Caps and Red Feathers* and *Arrow of God* display shades of multiple dimensions. Characters, in their interactions, select assorted vocative paradigms to influence addressees psychologically and emotionally.

The above problem leads to the following research questions:

1. What are the vocative forms used by characters in both *Black Caps and Red Feathers* and *Arrow of God* during interactions?
2. What are the illocutionary acts and perlocutionary effects performed by characters' choices?

This research work is significant as it shows how the use of vocative patterns in speech maintains or reinforces interpersonal relationships. In addition, it demonstrates the psychological, emotional and social effects of vocative choices on participants in social interactions.

2. Literature review

This section reviews previous studies on vocatives including their syntactic, pragmatic and semantic classifications without neglecting the functions.

2.1. Vocatives and theoretical underpinnings

Traditional grammar regards vocative as an 'outlier case' (Daniel and Spencer, 2009). Vairel (1981:444) demarcates it from other forms of case positing that "it denotes the role assumed by the referent of the noun as a participant in the act of speech, whereas the other cases mark the syntactic function of the noun as a constituent of the sentences". David Crystal (2004:220) providing a functional definition of 'vocative' assumes that it is "a name used for the person (s) to whom a sentence is addressed. It may be there to attract attention (as in *Mike*, phone for you), or to express a particular social relationship or personal attitude (as in *Doctor*, I need a tonic or Leave it alone, *imbecile!*)".

Attempting a morpho-syntactic analysis of the vocative, he argues that:

- The vocative is an optional element, which can be added to or removed from a sentence without affecting the rest of the construction.
- It may occur in various positions in a sentence, as in (*John*) I'd like auntie (*John*) to be here (*John*).
- It is not an element of clause structure like subject or verb.
- A vocative belongs to a whole sentence, however many clauses it contains, as in *Mary, come in, sit down, and tell me what happened.*

Crystal's dichotomy of vocative forms shows that they showcase typical patterns which are:

- Names, with or without titles: *David, Mrs Smith.*
- Family labels: *mum, uncle.*
- Markers of status or respect: *sir, my Lord.*
- Labels for occupation: *waiter, nurse.*
- Evaluative labels: *lads, ladies and gentlemen.*
- The pronoun *you* (an extremely impolite use): *You, where is the phone?*
- Certain kinds of clause: come out, come out, *whoever you are!*

- Some vocatives can be expanded: *old man, you fat fraud!*

The vocative is categorised as a specific paradigm with morphological (case), prosodic (intonation), or paradigmatic (speech act) features but with a number of classification problems (Sonnenhauser & Hanna, 2013). These problems are attributed here mainly to the underlying assumption of 'paradigm'. The importance of paradigms for the classification of vocatives can partly be attributed to the still prevailing tradition of classical, i.e., Greek and Latin grammars.

Vocative constructions have often been described as showcasing a specific contour, referred to as vocative chants (Lieberman, 1975), stylized falls (Ladd, 1978), or chanted calls (Hayes & Lahiri, 1991) usually consist of a rising pitch movement, followed by a sustained mid to high plateau. The function of addressing someone is often performed by intonation or other prosodic means. The lengthening of vowels or the reduction of the noun stem is also commonly used, as well as vocative particles. These particles combine with the unmarked or nominative case-form of a noun to form a kind of detached vocative according to Daniel and Spencer (2009: 630).

Hill (2014:5) makes another classification of vocatives where he discriminates them from exclamations, which do not refer to the referee as shown in the pair of sentences below:

- a. *Dear God*, please hear my prayer. Address
- b. *Oh my God*, I can't believe it! Exclamation

Hill (2014, p.6) further distinguishes between direct and indirect address, as shown in the utterances below:

- a. *John*, would you please come here? Direct address (vocative)
- b. Would *the gentleman* like another glass? Indirect address

Using American and British English corpus data, Biber et al. (1999: 1108-1113) brought out several types of vocatives classified into endearments, kinship terms, familiarisers (all of which are primarily American English such as *dude*, with the exception

of the British English *mate*), first names familiarised/shortened, first name full form, title and surname, honorifics, nickname and other structures. In general, they conclude that these vocatives maintain or reinforce interpersonal relationships. For example, endearments are used with intimates, close friends and family members, kinship terms with older generation family members, and familiarisers with friends of equal status, for example, teenagers to signal social solidarity and in-group membership.

Osenova & Simov (2002) contribution echoed Ivanova & Nicolova (1995)'s classification of vocatives grouped into referential and non-referential. Vocatives are referential when they nominate the hearer and non-referential when they only refer to the hearer without nominating him or her.

Kubo (2002:334), from a perspective of illocutionary acts, classify vocatives into eight sub-types which are:

- i) Associative referential calling: calling the other by his/her first name that is a member of in-group terms to express his/her emotion to each other.

Kip: **Hana**.

She turns to the voice. He steps out of the darkness.
Hana: (happy) **Kip**. And he goes to her.

- ii) Dissociative referential calling: calling which expresses the speaker's detachment from the hearer. Example:

Katharine [Mr.Clifton's wife; Alması's lover]: Will you not come in?

Alması: No.

Katharine: Will you please come in?

Alması : (a beat) **Mrs. Clifton**.
(Katharine turns, disgusted).

- iii) Associative referential addressing : Here, the speaker performs a perlocutionary act of association by performing an illocutionary act of addressing the hearer by an in-group term, which satisfies the hearer's sense of identity.

D'Agostino : I can't guarantee the vintage, my friends. I just dug it out of the hill. Madox and Almásy have seen many such jugs. Madox: Excellent. That's terrific, **D'Ag.** (to Almásy, of a tool) Toss that up, would you. D'Agostino: (Mischievously) There are some others.

iv) Dissociative referential addressing: the speaker expresses his negative feeling to the hearer by performing an illocutionary act of addressing him by his family name with a pejorative adjective nominal. E.g: O'connor[Ted's boss]: (sardonic) If it's all right with you, **Mother** Kramer, can we get down to work now?

v) associative non-referential calling: the speaker performs a perlocutionary act of association by performing an illocutionary act of calling the hearer by those in-group terms, which bring about a perlocutionary effects on the hearer such that the hearer feels relieved.

Clifton: (into the phone) **Darling**, it's me, I'm sorry, something's come up. (Katharine responds) Don't sulk - I'll be back tomorrow evening. I promise. (Katharine responds)

Okay **my precious**, I love you.

vi) dissociative non-referential calling: the speaker performs a perlocutionary act of dissociation by performing an illocutionary act of calling the hearer by an out-group term, "You bastard", which brings about a perlocutionary effects on the hearer such that his honour is disgraced.

Harmsway: Do come in Mr. Bond, Sidney... You're just in time for a nuclear meltdown! Coming closer, Sidney struggles against her cuffs, swinging at him - Sidney: **You bastard**.

vii) associative non-referential addressing: The speaker does not have any intention to disgrace the superior's honour, but intends to bring about a perlocutionary effect such that the speaker relieves the mind. For instance, in reply to Colonel Henry Brake's stirring remarks, Captain Duke Forest

friendly addresses Brake, as "pal" to show his confidence as a professional chopper.

viii) Dissociative non-referential addressing: the speaker performs a perlocutionary act of dissociation by performing an illocutionary act of addressing the hearer with an out-group term. Each act offends the hearer and brings about a perlocutionary effect such that the hearer feels disgusted to the speaker. E.g. Lewis: (into phone) Vote your conscience, you **chicken-shit, lame-ass**.

Discussions on the semantics and pragmatics of vocatives show that they are interdependent. Portner (2004) claims that vocatives are relevant to information structure because:

1. They are indexical, involving reference to the addressee.
2. Their contribution to the meaning of the sentence does not seem to be truth-conditional in nature.
3. They are very similar to topics both syntactically and pragmatically.

His main hypotheses are summarised in the following ideas:

1. The addressee is represented in its own syntactic projection, as revealed by imperatives and vocatives.
2. Vocatives are separate performatives, and can be analysed as expressive meaning (in the sense of Potts 2003a).
3. Topics – similar as they are to vocatives – should be thought of as separate performatives as well.

2.2. Pragmatic and semantic functions of vocatives

Research on the pragmatic and semantic functions of vocatives in the literature has shown that they carry miscellaneous functions.

Zwicky (1974:796), acknowledging functional roles of vocatives in speech act, has noted that "vocative NPs in English are almost never neutral: They express attitude, politeness, formality, status, intimacy, or a role relationship, and most of them mark the speaker," characterizing him or her

in relation to the addressee. Others have observed how vocatives are used as markers of power and solidarity (Hook 1984), in-group status (Brown & Levinson, 1978; Wood & Kroger, 1991) or pseudo-intimacy (McCarthy & O’Keeffe, 2001), equality (Troemel-Ploetz, 1994), or condescension (Wood & Kroger, 1991); as conversation initiators and topic change contextualization cues (Ostermann, 2000); and as repressive action for face-threatening acts (Brown & Levinson 1978; Ostermann, 2000).

Biber et al. (1999:1112) discussed three functions of vocatives: “(1) getting someone’s attention, (2) identifying someone as addressee, and (3) maintaining and reinforcing social relationships.”

Parrot (2010) identified functions such as evaluative, appellative (attracting the attention of the listener), nominative (naming the person the speech is directed to) and expressive (expression of the speaker’s attitude to the listener). McCarthy and O’Keeffe (2003) highlight six discrete functions which are relational, topic, badinage, mitigator, turn and summon.

(Schaden 2010:175-183), defending the ‘IPA hypothesis of the meaning of vocatives, came out with three semantic functions of vocatives which are: identification of the addressee, predicating something on the addressee and activating the addressee arguing that the traditional call vs. address dichotomy is insufficient.

To sum up, the functions of vocatives highlighted above highly depend on the prosodic and paralinguistic signals produced by the speaker as well as the address form utilised.

3. Theoretical framework and methodology

This study rests on John Austin (1962) and John Searle (1969)’s Speech Act theories who perceive language use as an action rather than an abstract system for describing reality. Austin in his introduction of Speech Act Theory argues that every normal utterance has both a descriptive and an effective aspect: that saying something is also doing something (Horn & Ward 2006:54). He posits that all speech acts have a dimension of meaning and a particular force which involve:

- 1) a Locutionary Act, which is the act of speaking, act involved in the construction of speech, such as uttering certain sounds or making certain marks, using particular words and using them in conformity with the grammatical rules of a particular language and with certain senses and certain references as determined by the rules of the language from which they are drawn.
- 2) an Illocutionary Act, the performance of an act in saying something or what you intend to do by means of saying it (statements, commands, requests, questions, invitations, suggestions, apologies, etc) and
- 3) a Perlocutionary Act, which refers to the effect the utterance has on the thoughts, feelings or actions of the listener/receiver of the message. Much as an illocutionary act has an illocutionary force, a perlocutionary act has a perlocutionary effect – typically an effect on the person being addressed.

Based on Austin’s speech act, Searle elaborated on five illocutionary points that speakers can achieve on propositions in an utterance, namely: the assertive, commissive, directive, declaratory and expressive illocutionary points. Speakers achieve the assertive point when they represent how things are in the world, the commissive point when they commit themselves to doing something, the directive point when they make an attempt to get hearers to do something, the declaratory point when they do things in the world at the moment of the utterance solely by virtue of saying that they do and the expressive point when they express their attitudes about objects and facts of the world (Vanderkeven & Kubo, 2002). The analysis of vocative forms in *Black Caps and Red Feathers* and *Arrow of God* as well as the pragmatic roles of utterances will draw on illocutionary and perlocutionary forces developed and elaborated by the tenets of speech acts theories discussed above.

This research is a descriptive qualitative research which samples data from the dialogue containing vocative features in Nkengasong’s *Black Caps and Red Feathers* and Achebe’s *Arrow of God* as well.

Forms of address are collected, classified, categorised and summarised in tables. Discussions and conclusions are drawn from the signs identified in the materials of interest.

4. Findings and discussion

At the outset of this study, two research questions were devised. The first research question found out the vocative forms used by characters during social interactions in *Black Caps and Red*

Feathers and *Arrow of God*. The findings are presented and discussed below.

4.1. Inventory of vocative forms in *Black Caps and Red Feathers* and *Arrow of God*

Morphological constructions of vocatives as noun features in *Black Caps and Red Feathers* and *Arrow of God* include titles of respect or markers of status, epithets, familiarisers, family names, and the personal pronoun *you* counted and summarised in Table 1 below. Examples are highlighted in bold.

Table 1: Vocative forms in *Black Caps and Red Feathers* and *Arrow of God*

N ^o	Form and example	Occurrences		Total
		<i>Black Caps and Red Feathers</i>	<i>Arrow of God</i>	
1	Titles of respect / markers of status You messenger of truth!	03	03	06 (18.75%)
2	Epithets Imbecile king Traourou. Kleptocratic King Traourou.	08	03	11 (34.37%)
3	Familiarisers 'Keep quiet, you children , and let me hear what they are saying.'	-	07	07 (21.88%)
4	Family names 'Do not agree, Nkechi ,' said Nwafo.	02	05	07 (21.88%)
6	Personal pronoun <i>you</i> You , shut your mouth,' said Ezeulu, turning to her; 'nobody has called your name.'	-	01	01 (03.12%)
	TOTAL	13 (40.62%)	19 (59.38%)	32 (100%)

Table 1 above showcases that 13 (40.62%) forms of addresses were sampled from *Black Caps and Red Feathers* while 19 (59.38 %) instances were retrieved from *Arrow of God*. It shows that there is an overuse of epithets (34.37%) over other vocative paradigms used in the books under analysis.

4.2. The pragmatics of vocatives in *Black Caps and Red Feathers* and *Arrow of God*

The second research question checked the illocutionary acts and perlocutionary effects performed by characters' choices. The outcomes are presented in Table 2 for *Black Caps and Red Feathers* and in Table 3 for *Arrow of God* followed by discussions.

Table 2: Illocutionary and perlocutionary forces in *Black Caps and Red Feathers*

Nº	Extracts	Illocutionary force	Perlocutionary force
1	Lunatic: “But the wailing voices of future generations filled my mind and peals of thunder rumbled in my heart, and I felt Fuandem’s wrath in his stormy voice that spoke: “You Messenger of Truth! You are the divine bat that sees all in a dream! I sent you to the world of prophesy, To fill the lives of men with Truth; now you lie there musing, feeding on your own thoughts like the hen that ate its own eggs.” (p.7)	Directive/attention seeking	fulfilment
2	Lunatic: That is why I came to you, clansmen , as soon as I saw the first crack of down, to make you see the truth about our fates Here at life’s farthest end (pointing towards the stage)... p.8	Expressive/attention seeking	fulfilment
3	Creature: Women need work, need to be worked. While you lie there browsing on the boons of power a starving sweetheart might have gone to graze on the virility of lowly men. It cannot be. But what noise? Noise from the devil’s steward’s bedchamber, sweetheart whimpering under the weight of devil steward grinding, crushing, pounding, rising and falling, rising, falling, rising, falling... “Hoi!” maniacal voice shrieks from the armpit of a bunker. “Paradise gone to minions! Minions licking King Traourou’s dish!” Hullabaloo in the palace. “Slave! Negro! Ape! Take him to the slaughterhouse! Quarter the slave. Slice his testes. Cut his throat.” p.22	Expressive/indignation	humiliation
4	Creature: Imbecile King Traourou. Kleptocratic King Traourou. Adulterous King Traourou. Bastard King Traourou. Traitor. Oppressor. Murderer of peace. Murderer of happiness. Blood sucker. Phallus eater... Free me...Free me...p.23	directive/insult	dishonour
5	Creature: Ngwi , do you know you are an unmatched mistress in kitchencraft? I thought about you the other day when the berets...those mad boys drugged by Traourou came into my hole. p.25	Expressive/Affection	esteem
6	(8) Creature: I believe in one God, His Imperial Majesty King Traourou! The Giver and Taker of Life, King beyond king, Life beyond Life, Life after Life , I believe in you....p.26	Expressive/flattery	omnipotence

Table 2 Continue...

Nº	Extracts	Illocutionary force	Perlocutionary force
7	<p>Creature: Woman, you've lost your head, unh? (Pauses.) There is water rumbling in it, unh? I hunger for you that's why we must stay here and go nowhere. (Pauses, then consolidating.) Don't Ngwi, don't go. Don't leave me in the cold. You must never leave me alone...you are my only friend I have in all this damned world...(Pauses. With agitation.) No. (As before.) Headstrong woman! I say no. (Pauses.) The little ones. (Pauses.) A charming mother. (Pauses.) Demons. (Pauses.) Phantoms. (Pauses.) Swines guffawing. Crickets snorting. Crabs yawning. Neophytes pounding stones. p.27</p>	Expressive/insults	hurt
8	<p>Creature: Let me ask you. Where is Bobe Khom? Why did you kill him? [...] And they killed Bobe Khom from our own side of the Great River. Go away tempters. Go away and don't tempt me anymore. You desired that I live in a hole till I rot, you and your man, Traourou. I don't understand why you come here in ugly shapes to tempt me. I know how Ganje died but not Oumi's hiding. Release me if you want. Or you go away from my sight. You showed greed for the cap and feather, and you must leave me alone if you'll not release me. Swindlers, sell-outs, butchers, traitors! Send your berets and I'd leave the hole for you. P.34-35</p>	directive / hatred	shame
9	<p>Creature: You have no conscience, Traourou. You have no conscience. I tried to appeal to your conscience...to make you feel the plight of the people...the sufferings of the people...to make you understand that the lords of the Alps are only out to use you to ruin the clan. P.42-43</p>	Assertive/appeal	guilt
10	<p>Creature: (collecting bone and rising with furious indignation.) What's this madness? Go away you starving wizard. Go, devil. I have nothing for you. Go hunt and beg in the Alps where you have made fortunes out of wretched men. p.47</p>	Directive/insult	humiliation
11	<p>Voice: Please, only a crumb. Creature: I say leave me alone, you bastard. Go to the country of the devil and beg. Send your berets to release me. Send them to free me. I have been underground for too long. I want to be freed so that I can see my children. And you come instead, asking for crumbs. p.47</p>	Directive/insult	hurt
12	<p>Creature: Gods of my ancestors, bastards have brought woe to the clan. A king in the clan is supreme but his subjects are more supreme. A red feather on a king's black cap is the committed token of love and service to the clan. A king shoots an elephant and shares it out to the clan. It is not taken to the Alps as Traourou and his men do. p.48</p>	Assertive/attention seeking	fulfilment
13	<p>Creature: "Hoi! Traourou! Was it a plan of yours to untie the knots of the earth and let it crumble on my head? What mad</p>	Directive /insult	hurt

<p>world! Mad Traourou! Mad King Traourou! Send your berets...So I can be freed...(Loud) Traourou...Traourou...Free me...Fre-e-e-e me-e-e..." (p.50)</p>		
---	--	--

As shown by Table 2 above, in (1) Fuandem utters the directive ‘You Messenger of Truth!’, a title of respect which emphatically draws the attention of Lunatic to the mission he invested him with, which consists in telling clansmen what is happening to their community. Fuandem is upset that the man he values so much takes too long to fulfill that request. Thus, Fuandem performs the illocutionary act of attention seeking and the perlocutionary effect of fulfilment given that Lunatic, on hearing that direct call, will shake himself up to fulfil the task assigned to him as illustrated in extract 2 below.

In (2), Lunatic catches the attention of his addressees calling them through their markers of status ‘clansmen’. In fact, he alerts the rulers of the clan on a fatal issue which disintegrates their land. The illocutionary act achieved is expressive and attention seeking which brings about a perlocutionary act of fulfilment, because clansmen after getting Lunatic’s message must take action to save the land.

In (3), King Traourou caught a steward having sex with a lady in a bedchamber of the palace as reported by Creature and he indignantly ordered the guards to take him to the slaughterhouse where he would be savagely eliminated. King Traourou uttered the epithets “Slave! Negro! Ape”, to evaluate the poor steward. The king’s illocutionary act is expressive as he got angry over the steward’s sacrilege, sending him to the world of the dead. The steward in return feels disgraced hence the perlocutionary force of humiliation.

In (4), Creature insults King Traourou. He employs a concatenation of offensive statements to order King Traourou to release him from captivity. They are epithets such as “Imbecile King Traourou. Kleptocratic King Traourou. Adulterous King Traourou. Bastard King Traourou. Traitor. Oppressor. Murderer of peace. Murderer of happiness. Blood sucker. Phallus eater...” used to describe the king. The illocutionary force is directive because Creature requires a prompt reaction of the

King. The perlocutionary effect is that the king feels wounded and dishonoured .

In (5), Creature addresses his wife in a lovely tone. He utters her family name ‘Ngwi’ to express his deep affection for her. Thus, Creature’s illocutionary act is expressive because he lends a rhetorical question to extol the virtues of his wife in kitchen craft. The woman, as a result of this, feels honoured hence the perlocutionary act of esteem is met.

In (6), Creature addresses King Traourou in flattering and ironical terms. His illocutionary act is expressive; he magnifies King Traourou’s power. Actually, Creature is in prison, he uses overstatements to please the king who may in return free him from prison. The perlocutionary effect is that Creature’s stratagem would make the king feel omnipotent.

In (7), Creature out of anger calls his wife with the epithet ‘woman’ since she wants to quit him. He proceeds with ‘Headstrong woman’ and the little ones, his children are not spared from his fury whom he tags as ‘demons’, ‘phantoms’, ‘swines guffawing’, ‘neophytes’, ‘crickets snorting’, ‘crabs yawning’, ‘neophytes pounding stones’. Such epithets showcase the character’s psychological trauma and agony which are expressive illocutionary acts. The perlocutionary effect is that Creature’s wife feels insulted and wounded.

In (8), Creature performs a directive illocutionary act since he orders Traourou’s men to leave him away if they have not come to release him from jail. He uses epithets such as ‘swindlers’, ‘sell-outs, butchers, ‘traitors!’ to evaluate those men that he suspects of killing people to get power. He hates them actually. The perlocutionary effect of such descriptors is that the king’s soldiers feel ashamed.

In (9), Creature’s illocutionary act is assertive. He calls the king by his family name “Traourou”. Through this means, he calls the attention of the king to his lack of scruple thereby

appealing him to change. The perlocutionary effect on Traorou is that the latter will feel guilty.

In (10), Creature drives Traourou’s men away achieving a directive illocutionary act. He uses vocative epithets as ‘you starving wizard’, ‘devil’ to depreciate them. The perlocutionary effect of the speaker’s speech act on the king’s men is that of humiliation because they are insulted and chased.

In (11), Creature uses another epithet to denigrate the character Voice. He calls him ‘you bastard’ and orders him to send men to release him from prison. The illocutionary act employed is directive. Voice feels insulted, hence the illocutionary force of humiliation.

In (12), Creature speaks to the God of ancestors calling them directly, to draw their attention to the fact that bastards have brought woe to the clan. The illocutionary act is therefore assertive. The perlocutionary effect is that of fulfilment because the Gods will use their power to clear those evil people from the community.

In (13), Creature once more insults Traourou using epithets as ‘Mad Traourou! Mad King Traourou!’, to order him to send his men to free him from jail. The illocutionary act performed is directive. The perlocutionary effect on the king is that he feels deep hurt.

Table 3: Illocutionary and perlocutionary acts in *Arrow of God*

Nº	Extract	Illocutionary act	Perlocutionary act
14	<p>‘Does the moon kill people?’ asked Obiageli, tugging at her mother’s cloth.</p> <p>‘What have I done to this child? Do you want to strip me naked?’</p> <p>‘I said does the moon kill people?’</p> <p>‘It kills little girls,’ said Nwafo, her brother.</p> <p>‘I did not ask you, anti-hill nose.’</p> <p>‘You will soon cry, long throat.’</p> <p><i>The moon kills little boys</i></p> <p><i>The moon kills anti-hill nose</i></p> <p><i>The moon kills little boys...</i> Obiageli turned everything into a song. pp.2-3</p>	Expressive/insult	offence
15	<p>The little children in his compound joined the rest in welcoming the moon. Obiageli’s tiny voice stood out like a small <i>ogene</i> among drums and flutes. He could also make out the voice of his youngest son, Nwafo. The women too were in the open, talking.</p> <p>‘Moon,’ said the senior wife, Matefi, ‘may your face meeting mine bring good fortune.’ p.2</p>	wish	fulfilment
16	<p>Not very long after Oduche’s return Ezeulu was visited by one of his in-laws from Umuogwugwu. This man, Onwuzuligbo, was one of those who came to Ezeulu one year this planting season to find out why their kinsman and husband of Ezeulu’s daughter had been beaten and carried away from their village.</p> <p>‘It looks as if my death is near,’ said Ezeulu.</p> <p>‘Why is that, in-law? Do I look like death?’</p> <p>‘When a man sees an unfamiliar sight, then perhaps his death is coming.’</p> <p>‘You are right, in-law, it is indeed a long time since I came to see you.’ p.61</p>	Question/familiarity	appeasement

17	<p>Ugoye stirred the soup on the fire and tasted it by running her tongue on the back of the ladle. The sound of the <i>ogene</i> caught her in the action.</p> <p>‘Keep quiet, you children, and let me hear what they are saying.’ P.64</p>	Directive/authority	fear
18	<p>The crier’s voice was already becoming faint as he took his message down the main pathway of Umuachala.</p> <p>‘Shall we go back to the beginning?’ asked Nkechi.</p> <p>‘Yes,’ said Obiagely. ‘The big ukwa fruit has fallen on Nwaka Dimkpolo and killed him. I shall sing the story and you reply.’</p> <p>‘But I was replying before,’ protested Nkechi, ‘it is now your turn to sing.’</p> <p>‘You are going to spoil everything now. You know we did not complete the story before the crier came.’</p> <p>‘Do not agree, Nkechi,’ said Nwafo. ‘She wants to cheat you because she is bigger than you are.’</p> <p>‘Nobody has called your name in this, anti-hill nose. p.65</p>	Directive/disagreement	anger
19	<p>‘You think it is something for making people laugh? Ugoye sounded very hurt. ‘No wonder you are the only person in Umuaro who did not care to come and ask what was happening.’</p> <p>‘Was anything happening? Nobody told me. Was it a fire or did someone die?’</p> <p>‘Do not mind Adeze, Ugoye,’ said her sister, ‘she is worse than her father.’</p> <p>‘Did you expect what the leopard sired to be different from the leopard?’</p> <p>No one replied.</p> <p>‘Do not be angry with me, Ugoye. I heard everything...’</p> <p>Ugoye and Akueke laughed. They could clearly visualize their aggressive sister putting this question. P.74</p>	Directive / advice	alignment
20	<p>‘How are your people?’</p> <p>‘They are quiet.’ This was always how Akuebe answered about his family. It amused Nwafo greatly. He had an image in his mind of this man’s wives and children sitting quietly with their hands between their laps.</p> <p>‘And yours?’ he asked Ezeulu.</p> <p>‘Nobody has died.’</p> <p>‘Do they say that Obika was whipped by the white man?’ Ezeulu opened both palms to the sky and said nothing.</p> <p>‘What did they say was his offence?’</p> <p>‘My friend, let us talk about other things. There was a time when a happening such as this would have given me a fever; but that time has passed. Nothing is anything to me anymore. Go and ask your mother to bring me a kolanut, Nwafo.’</p> <p>‘She was saying this morning that her kolanuts were finished.’</p> <p>‘Go and ask Matefi then.’ p.94</p>	Directive/familiarity	fulfilment

21	Oduche replied with even more fiery slaps and a final, vicious blow with his knee on Ojiugo’s belly. This brought great criticism and even abuse on Oduche from any of the people who had gathered to help separate them. But Ojiugo clung to her half-brother crying: kill me today. You must kill me. Do you hear me, Eater of python ? You must kill me.’ She bit one of the people trying to hold her back and scratched another? P.127	Question/insult	violence
22	Matefi stopped her screaming. She moaned resignedly: ‘I have shut my mouth. Why should I not shut my mouth? After all Oduche is Ugoye’s son. Yes, Matefi must shut her mouth.’ Let’s nobody call my name there!’ shouted the other wife as she came out from her hut where she had sat as though all the noise in the compound came from a distinct clan. ‘I say let nobody mention my name at all.’ ‘You, shut your mouth,’ said Ezeulu, turning to her; ‘nobody has called your name.’ p.129	Directive/authority	humiliation
23	Ezeulu listened silently to him, holding back with both hands the mounting irritation he felt. ‘Have you finished?’ he asked when Akuebe ceased talking. [...] ‘Who tells the clan what it says? What does the clan know? Sometimes, Akuebe , you make me laugh. You were here – or had you not been born then – when the clan chose to go to war with Okperi over a piece of land which did not belong to us. Did I not stand up then and tell Umuaro what would happen to them? And who was right in the end? What I said, did it happen or did it not?’ p.131	Assertive/irritation	ridicule
24	‘I am not the man to dispute any of the things you say, Ezeulu . I am your friend and I can talk to you as I like; but that does not mean I forget that one half of you is man and the other half spirit. And what you say about your father and grandfather is very true. But what happened in their time and what is happening today are not the same; they do not even have resemblance. Your father and grandfather did not do what they did to please a stranger...’ p.133	Expressive/familiarity	serenity
25	‘ Stranger , you are welcome,’ said Ezeulu. ‘What is your name?’ ‘He is called Jekopu,’ said the escort. ‘As I said, nobody sees the Destroyer of Guns without his consent. There is no one in Okperi who does not know the name of Jekopu. The Destroyer of Guns asked me to accompany him on this journey because he is a stranger to these parts.’ P.136	Wish	social distance
26	The two men looked puzzled. Then Nwodika’s son said: ‘That is so; but we have not come on a mission of death.’ ‘No. I did not say so. It is only a manner of speaking. We have a saying that a snake is never as long as the stick to which we liken its length. I know that Wintabota will not send a mission of death to Ezeulu. We are good friends. What I said was that a stranger could not come to Umuaro unless a son of the land showed him the way.’	Expressive/anger	reduction

	<p>‘That is true,’ said the escort. ‘We have come...’</p> <p>‘My friend,’ interrupted the Chief Messenger, ‘you have already done what you were sent to do; the rest is for me. So put your tongue into its scabbard.’ pp.136-137</p>		
27	<p>As soon as he had made his offer and it was refused Okeke Onenyi rose to go although the first sporadic drops of a heavy rain had started to fall.</p> <p>‘Won’t you wait and watch the face of the sky awhile?’ asked Edogo.</p> <p>‘No, my son,’ replied Okeke Onenyi and, feigning light-heartedness, added: ‘Only those who carry evil medicine on their body should fear the rain.’ He walked out into the coming storm. The darkness was lit up at short, irregular intervals by lightning; sometimes it was a strong, steady light, sometimes it flickered before it went out as if the rushing wind shook its flame. p.146</p>	Assertive/denial	inferiority
28	<p>‘Please do not tell me such a story again. Edogo, get ready now, we are going to Okperi.’</p> <p>‘Ezeulu is not a small child,’ said Anosi, their neighbor. ‘He cannot be taught those with whom he may eat.’</p> <p>‘Do you hear what I say, Edogo? Get ready now; I am going home to get my things.’ P.164</p>	Directive/familiarity	fulfilment
		Confirmation	fulfilment
29	<p>‘So my brothers,’ continued Nwodika’s son, ‘that was how your brother came to work for the white man. At first he put me to weed his compound, but after one year he called me and said that my handiwork was good and took me to work inside his house ...’</p> <p>‘It is not your fault,’ said Akueke.</p> <p>‘I blame myself,’ said Nwodika’s son sadly. pp.170-171</p>	Expressive/familiarity	sympathy
30	<p>‘You should not give too much thought to that,’ said John Nwodika. ‘How many of those who deride you at home can wrestle with the white man as you have done and press his back to the ground?’</p> <p>Ezeulu laughed. ‘You call this wrestling? No, my clansman. We have not wrestled; we have merely studied each other’s hand. I shall come again, but before that I want to wrestle with my own people whose hand I know and who know my hand...’ p.179</p>	Expressive/denial	fun
31	<p>Meanwhile the Mask had proceeded to the <i>okwolo</i> to salute some of the elders.</p> <p>‘Ezeulu de-de-de-de-dei,’ it said.</p> <p>‘Our father, my hand is on the ground,’ replied the chief Priest.</p> <p>‘Ezeulu, do you know me?’</p> <p>‘How can a man know you who are beyond human knowledge?’</p> <p>‘Ezeulu, our Mask salutes you,’ it sang. p.200</p>	Expressive/respect	Reverence
32	<p>‘Obiesili did not use his words well,’ said Chukwulobe. ‘We do not reckon the year for Umwaro; we are not Chief Priest. But we</p>	Rhetorical question/anger	shame

<p>thought that perhaps you have lost count because of your recent absence –’ ‘What! Are you out of your senses, young man?’ Ezeulu shouted. ‘There is nothing that a man will not hear these days. Lost count! Did your father tell you that the Chief Priest of Olu can lose count of the moons? No, my son,’ he continued in a surprisingly mild tone, ‘no Ezeulu can lose count...’p.203-204</p>		
---	--	--

As depicted by Table 3 above, extract 14 showcases an exchange between Obiageli and her brother Nwafo. Obiageli insults her brother calling the epithet ‘anti-hill nose’. The illocutionary act carried out is expressive. The perlocutionary effect is that Nwafo feels wounded.

In (15), the illocutionary act is a wish. Matefi addresses the Moon directly as a God praying the moon to bring her luck when it appears. The perlocutionary effect is that the moon must fulfil that dream.

In (16), Onwuzuligbo has visited Ezeulu, who is surprised to see him since they have not met for ages. Ezeulu suspected his presence as a sign of bad. Onwuzuligbo in return wonders about his brother’s attitude questioning (illocutionary act) him in these words: ‘Why is that, **in-law**?’ The familiarizer ‘in-law’ has been used to achieve the perlocutionary effect of appeasement on Ezeulu.

Extract 17 exhibits a conversation where Ugoye talks harshly to her noisy children. She silences them authoritatively using the familiarizer ‘you children’ to call them to order. The illocutionary act performed is directive. The perlocutionary effect is that the children develop a feeling of fear.

In (18), Nwafo calls Nketchi’s proper name in his address. He utters an illocutionary act of command requiring Nketchi not to accept Obiageli’s proposal who wants her to reply to the song she intends to sing. The perlocutionary effect of Nwafo intervention arouses anger on Obiageli.

Extract (19) portrays a conversation between Akuke, Adeze and Ugoye. Akuye instructed Ugoye emphatically not to pay attention to Adeze talking point using an illocutionary act of command. The perlocutionary effect is that Ugoye aligned with her sister as they are siblings.

In (20), Akuebe requests Nwafo to go and tell her mother to bring him kolanuts. He utters her family name employing the illocutionary act of command prompting a perlocutionary act of fulfillment since the child has to obey.

In (21), Ojiugi fights Oduche whom he insults as ‘Eater of Python’, an epithet which sounds as an offence. A rhetorical question as illocutionary act has been used by the speaker. The perlocutionary effect on Oduche is that he grew violent.

In (22), Ezeulu orders a woman to shut her mouth. He personalised the addressee using the pronoun ‘you’ to insist that the woman should stay quiet. The illocutionary act here is a command. The perlocutionary effect is that the woman feels ridiculous in public.

In (23), Ezeulu is irritated that the clan did not listen to him when he discouraged them to fight Okperi people over a piece of land. The illocutionary act performed is assertive as he makes a declaration. Now that the reality proved him right, he mocks at Akuebe he calls directly. The perlocutionary effect is that Akuebe feels ridiculous.

In (24), Akuebe, in a friendly tone, confesses to Ezeulu, he calls the family name directly, to show familiarity, to tell him that he will never oppose himself to his arguments. The illocutionary act is expressive. The perlocutionary effect on Ezeulu is that he feels serene and reassured.

In (25), Ezeulu wishes welcome to a newcomer he does not know the name using thereby the epithet ‘stranger’. The illocutionary act performed is a wish. The perlocutionary effect on the stranger is that he feels distant from the members of the group.

In (26), the Chief Messenger vehemently orders Winbota's man to stop talking uttering the familiariser 'my friend' using an illocutionary act of command. The perlocutionary effect is that the man feels reduced.

In (27), in a feigning light-hearted tone, Edogo suggested that Okeke wait to see the face of the moon but he denied uttering the vocative 'my son', a familiariser which marks Okeke's inexperience performing an illocutionary act of assertion. The perlocutionary effect is that the child feels inferior.

In (28), Okperi requests Edogo to follow him using the illocutionary act of command. He shouted his name 'Edogo' expecting him to heed to his call. The perlocutionary effect is that Edogo must obey. In the second illocutionary act, Okperi asks a question to find out whether Edogo has fulfilled his instructions realising the same perlocutionary act of fulfilment.

In (29), Nwodika's son illocutionary act is expressive; he explains to the members of the community how he proceeded to work for the White man. He introduces his speech act with the familiarizer 'my brothers' to show that they are close. The perlocutionary effect is to attract the sympathy of the addressees.

In (30), Ezeulu in a comical tone calls his hearer through the marker of status 'my clansman' in an expressive illocutionary act. Through a strong denial, Ezeulu minimises the fight he carried out against the White man. The perlocutionary effect on John Nwodika is that he feels amused.

In (31), the chief Priest answers the Mask's greeting using the marker of status 'Our father' performing an expressive illocutionary act. Ezeulu, the Chief Priest submits himself to the Masks assuring the God that he has put his hands on the ground. The perlocutionary effect is that the Mask feels happy and revered.

In the last extract (32), Ezeulu shouts at Chukwulobe with the help of the epithet 'young man'. He wonders whether his interlocutor possesses all his senses using a rhetorical question in his illocutionary act. As result of this, the

perlocutionary effect is that Chukwulobe feels ashamed.

Conclusion

The purpose of this research endeavour was to explore vocative markers in both Nkengasong's *Black Caps and Red Feathers* and *Achebe's Arrow of God*. In the same vein, the study considered the illocutionary and perlocutionary values performed by characters' vocative patterns. The method of data collection was qualitative and a descriptive method was applied to the corpus retrieved from the books concerned. Austin (1962) and Searle (1969)'s theoretical paradigms guided the discussions of findings. Two research questions were devised at the beginning of the study and the results revealed that the vocative markers identified entailed titles of respect or markers of status, epithets or descriptors, familiarisers, family names and the use of the second person personal pronoun you which embodied several illocutionary acts as expressives, directives, assertives, wishes and questions. Descriptors outclassed other forms of address. Remarkably, speakers' intentions in their propositions aimed at attention seeking, indignation, insulting, affection, flattery, hatred, appeal, authority, disagreement, advice, familiarity, anger, denial and respect. Speakers' illocutionary acts prompted reactions from their interlocutors which were categorised as offence, fulfilment, familiarity, confirmation, assurance, fear, anger, alignment, violence, humiliation, reduction, ridicule, serenity, distance, obedience, inferiority, sympathy, fun, reverence, appeasement and shame. All in all, vocative markers and pragmatic functions studied in the above-mentioned textbooks played personal, psychological, emotional and social roles.

References

- Achebe, C. (1978). *Arrow of god*. London: Heinemann.
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do things with words. Revised edition (1975)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G, Conrad, S. and Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of*

- spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S.C. (1978). *Politeness – Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2004). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Daniel, M. and Spencer, A. (2009). The vocative – an outlier case. In *The Oxford Handbook of Case*, Andrej Malchukov and Andrew Spencer (eds.), 626–634. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hayes, B., & Lahiri, A. (1991). Bengali Intonational Phonology. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 9(1), 47–96.
- Hill, V. (2014). *Vocatives: How syntax meets with pragmatics*. Brill.
- Hook, D. 1984. First names and titles as solidarity and power semantics in English. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22(3): 183-189.
- Horn, R. & Ward, G. (2006). *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. USA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Ivanova, K. and Nicolova, R. (1995). *Nie, govoreštite chora*. Sofia: Sveti Kliment Ochridski.
- Jacobson, R. (1960). “Closing statement: linguistics and poetics”, in T. A. Sebeok (ed.). *Style in language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Kubo, S. (2002). ‘If you don’t mind as regulation’ as a regulation Act marker. *The rising generation 3*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Ladd, D. R. (1978). Stylized intonation. *Language*, 54(3), 517–540.
- Lambrecht, K. (1996). On the formal functional relationship between topics and vocatives. Evidence from French. In A. Goldberg (Ed.). *Conceptual structure, discourse and language*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, pp.267-288.
- Lieberman, M. Y. (1975). *The intonational system of English*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Malinowski, B. (1923). “The problem of meaning in primitive languages”. In Charles K.Ogden & Ian A. Richards (eds.). *The meaning of meaning*. London: Kegan Paul, pp.296-336.
- McCarthy, M. J. and O’Keeffe, A. 2003. ‘What’s in a name?’: Vocatives in casual conversation and radio-phone-in calls. In *Corpus Analysis: Language structure and language use*, P. Leistyna and Ch. Meier (eds), 153-185. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Nkengasong, N. J. (2001). *Black caps and red feathers*. Bamenda: Patron Publishing House.
- Osenova, P. and Simov, K. (2002). *Bulgarian vocative within HPSG framework*. <http://www.bultreebank.org/papers/bgvocativeOS.pdf>,18.10.2011
- Ostermann, A.C. (2000). Reifying and defying sisterhood in discourse: communities of practice at work at an all-female police station and a feminist crisis intervention center in Brazil. *Ph.D Thesis*. The University of Michigan: Ann Arbor MI.
- Parrot, L. A. (2010). Vocatives and other direct address forms: a contrastive study. In A. Grønn & Marijanovic (eds.). *Russian in contrast, Oslo studies in language 2* (1). 211-229.
- Portner, P. (2004). Vocatives, topics, and imperatives. *Paper given at the IMS workshop on information structure*. Bad Teinach. Retrieved October 18, 2011, from http://www9.georgetown.edu/faculty/portnerp/my_papers/.
- Schaden, G. (2010). Vocatives: a note on addressee-management. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 16/1: 176–185.
- Schaden, Gerhard. (2010). *Vocatives. A note on addressee-management*. University of Pennsylvania working papers in Linguistics. Retrieved from http://www9.georgetown.edu/faculty/portnerp/my_papers/.

Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sonnenhauser, B. & Hanna, P.N.A. (2013). *Vocative! Addressing between system and performance*. Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Troemel-Ploetz, S. (1994). "Let me put it this way, John": conversational strategies of leadership positions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22/2: 199-209.

Vairel, H. (1981). The position of the vocative in the Latin case system. *The American Journal of Philology* 102/4: 438-447.

Vanderveken, D. and Kubo, S. (2002). *Essays in speech act theory*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wood, L.A. and Kroger, R.O. (1991). Politeness and forms of address. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 10/3: 145-168.

Zwicky, A.M. (1974) Hey, what's your name! In M. La Galy, R. Fox. & Bruck, A. (Eds.), *Papers from the Tenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 10: 787-801.