CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

1.1 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES:

Contrastive Analysis of various linguistic areas of two or more languages in order to improve language teaching and translation has gained wide currency since 1950’s. It was Robert Lado (1957)\(^1\), who proposed Contrastive Analysis as a means of identifying areas of difficulty for language learners and managing the same with suitable exercises. It was, however, pointed out that such areas of difficulties had already been widely known and discussed by experienced professionals and that while headway had been made in analysing English, few other languages had been sufficiently studied to allow balanced comparison. It is, nonetheless, generally agreed that mother tongue and target language merit comparison so that both teaching and learning of the target language can be made more effective. Linguists involved in pedagogical activities consider that contrastive linguistics is still in its infancy and continued research is likely to bear fruit.

It is in this context of relevance of Contrastive Research for pedagogical purposes, we propose to have a Contrastive Analysis of English and Oriya at the level of sentence word order and discourse functions. Our hypothesis is that in spite of the differences at the surface level, languages share a common care of experiences, which get expressed through divergent structures. It is against this premise, we undertake to point out the major word orders of English and Oriya and the various communicative functions that may be associated with them. The aim of our Contrastive Study will be to point out the similarities and differences between the major patterns of the two languages, i.e. English
and Oriya and locate the areas of difficulty in English Word Order for the Oriya speakers learning English as second the language.

It is hoped that the thesis will be useful to both Oriya learners of English and English learners of Oriya. The results of our study can be incorporated both in the English language syllabus, meant for Oriya learners of English and in the Oriya language syllabus for the English learners of Oriya. It is also presumed that the study will render useful service to the scholars who wish to work on Contrastive Linguistics in general and on Contrastive Studies between English and Oriya in particular.

1.2 THEORY OF CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS:

Oriya, like Bengali and Assamese, is a member of the Eastern group of Indo-Aryan family of languages. Oriya is spoken by about 25 million people spreading along the North-Eastern sea-coast of India. Beyond the political boundary of the state of Orissa, Oriya extends to North, North-East, South and West ways. To the North of the state lie the regions of the Bhojpuri tongues, to the North-East region of Bengali tongues and to the South those of Telugu and other Dravidian tongues. On the West, Oriya is spread to a long distance, gradually merging into the dialects of Badri, Halvi and Chattisgadi in Madhya Pradesh. There are still thousands of Oriya speaking people beyond the political territory of Orissa. Though English and Oriya are continentally different from each other, both of them belong to the Indo-European family of languages. In this sense, both of the languages are genetically related to each other and so share many syntactic features in common. But there are significant differences between the two in various aspects, the most important of them being in the Word Order. Whereas the Word Order in
English is fixed and it follows the pattern of Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) in the sentence structure, Oriya has no fixed order, though the Subject-Verb-Object (SOV) sentence pattern is prominent.

A learner, when exposed for the first time to a second language, finds himself in a difficult situation. It will be difficult for him not because he will have to express two different things but because he will have to represent the same thing in a completely different and unfamiliar way. In doing so, he will obviously seek the help of the rules of his own language, i.e. his mother tongue and use them in the productive and understanding of the second language. In the process of doing so, he is subject to commit errors as long as he is unaware of the full nature of the difference between his mother tongue and the second language. 'Interference' or 'the negative transfer of language habits' of the mother tongue to the second language poses problems for effective learning of the L₂. Such problems can however be correlated with that of differences between L₁ and L₂. A knowledge of the differences between the two languages can facilitate the teaching and learning of the second language. At the same time, the similarities of the two languages cannot be ignored in order to have acquisition of L₂.

Second language learning normally starts after the learner has already achieved a command over his mother tongue. In other words, he would have acquired an 'implicit' knowledge of the nature of human language, and makes use of a major part of the total range of communicative functions of the language and can perform a vast range of speech acts in his mother-tongue. A learner's task, in learning L₂, is therefore not exactly to acquire a new language, but to learn a 'new code' because no two human languages are totally different from each other formally, and share, in varying degrees, features in common. Hence, the learner's task is to discover the similarities as well as the differences
between $L_1$ and $L_2$. Here at this juncture, Contrastive Study comes to the picture as it aims at finding out the similarities and differences of the mother tongue and the target language.

In our second language teaching-learning situation, written English gains more focus than spoken English. Indian learners of English are tested more on their ability to communicate in the written form. It is true of all the examinations starting from school / college to university level. Besides the classroom situation, the learners hardly require spoken English in their day-to-day situations (outside the classroom) as they can best communicate among themselves in their mother tongue. Even the English spoken by the teacher in the classroom is just a kind of oral delivery of the written form of English. The learners' spoken English is generally confined to the question-answer activity in the classroom. Hence, there is little motivation for the learners to develop their spoken English skills.

The need for spoken English is felt only as an intra-national link language in a multilingual setting like that of India. Even then effective communication in written English has its own weight and importance especially when spoken English spoken in different part of the country varies greatly. There is no reason why learners should not be trained to learn how to communicate in written English effectively.

It is stated that learning of the second language becomes easier if the learner is exposed to a comparison of $L_1$ and $L_2$ in terms of their structures and discourse functions. There is thus a great need for Contrastive Analysis between $L_1$ and $L_2$ at both the syntactic and discourse function levels.
1.3 REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

There are a lot of similarities and differences between English and Oriya in the areas of syntax, semantics and phonology. However, the sphere of Contrastive Research between the two languages presents a rather poor and inadequate scenario. Though Contrastive Studies are of vital significance from pedagogical perspectives, not much work has been carried out so far. A few studies at the Ph.D. level, however, deserve attention. It may be mentioned that B.N. Patnaik (1976)\(^2\) has studied Complementation; U.P. Pattnaik (1987)\(^3\) with Empty Categories; T.S. Ray (1987)\(^4\), Binding Principles; Sabita Mishra (1988)\(^5\), Modifiers; Rath Nayak (1987)\(^6\), Non-finite Clauses; K.B. Patel (1987)\(^7\), Reporting; B.N. Dash (1985)\(^8\), Sentence Connection; and U. Thakur (1998)\(^9\), Cohesion. These studies have attempted to bring out the similarities and differences of different linguistic aspects between the L\(_1\), i.e. Oriya and the L\(_2\), i.e. English. The models chosen are, however, different in the studies of different scholars. While B.N. Patnaik, U.P. Pattnaik and T.S. Ray have carried out their studies after the Chomskyan model, S. Misra, B.N. Dash, K.B. Patel and U. Thakur have broadly followed the Hallidayan frame work for their research. The works by Patnaik, Pattnaik and Ray are reflective of deep theoretical probing which might be exploited for the writing of modern Oriya grammar, but are of little relevance for immediate pedagogical application. On the other hand, the findings of Mishra, Dash, Patel and Thakur can be readily utilised for purposes of teaching English to the Oriya speakers learning English and of teaching Oriya to the English speakers learning Oriya. We, therefore, decide to do a brief review of the works of the latter four scholars.
1.3.1 S. Mishra’s (1998) intention, in her thesis, is to bring out a comparative study on the devices of modification in English and Oriya Noun Phrases. After a detailed analysis of the pre-modifiers and post-modifiers of both the languages in different chapters of her thesis, she has found out several similarities as well as differences in the intended field of her study. As per her findings, the differences between the modifiers of English and Oriya Noun Phrases are within the framework of an overall similarity between them in the inventory of the categories, their order of occurrence, concord with the head and mutual exclusiveness. The difficulty faced by the Oriya Learners of English is due to their unawareness of the differences in delicate structure details, the lower level rules inclusive of all the subtle restrictions relating to concord, agreement, etc.

Mishra’s comparative study reveals the fact that the NP structure in Oriya is simpler than that in English in the sense that Oriya language preposes modifiers in relation to the head whereas English sometimes obligatorily preposes and sometimes obligatorily postposes the modifiers under a variety of conditions. By comparing the positions of the different grammatical items like articles, adjectivals, adverbials, ordinals, cardinals, emphatics, participial modifiers, non-finite relative clauses, indefinite pronouns, etc. in both the languages through examples, she has shown the complexities of English which may be viewed as a source of difficulty for Oriyas learning English. The errors of the learners are caused due to the internal restrictions in the English language. These delicate structural details do not get necessary emphasis in the teaching of English grammar to the Oriya learners. As a result, the learners generalize from the higher level rules without knowing the lower level rules of English NP construction. It is rightly observed that a good
pedagogical grammar of English for Oriya learners would be adequate for handling the delicate details of the English Noun Phrases.

1.3.2 A comparative study of the processes of sentence connection in English and Oriya in B.N. Dash's (1985) investigation reveals many similarities as well as differences. In both English and Oriya, sentences are connected by explicit indicators of sentence connection, such as logical connectors, coordinators, subordinators, correlatives, time relators and place relators. In both the languages, the coordinators coordinate two equal and independent phrases and clauses, the subordinators join one independent clause with another dependent one, and the correlatives are two part-connectives. Apart from the formal indicators, sentence connection, in both the languages, can also be established through other devices, such as comparison, ellipsis, substitution, discourse reference, etc.

Dash has also found out certain differences between English and Oriya in many aspects, such as placing the subordinators, prepositions, coordination of pronouns, use of correlatives and in other processes like comparison, ellipsis, substitution and punctuation. These are the areas in which the Oriya learners may find themselves embarrassed. They have to be careful and take note of these areas so that they will overcome these difficulties while learning English. The investigation of Dash would help in understanding the problem areas in cohesion between English and Oriya. His finding will also be helpful to teachers in their preparation of study materials, error analysis and in actual classroom teaching. It will also benefit the syllabus designers engaged in preparing syllabi for undergraduate students learning English.
1.3.3. K. B. Patel's (1987) objective is to bring out a study in Contrastive Discourse Analysis in the field of reporting in Oriya and in English. He has cited the reporting from the different texts like newspapers, essays, scientific facts, novels and other texts of both the languages and brought out certain generalizations in the structures of Oriya and English at different levels, such as (i) Theme-Rheme and Prepositional relationships, (ii) Rhetorical Organisation, and (iii) Syntactic Organisation.

Patel's observations relating to the following areas are worth noting:

(a) Sentence Patterns: There is a reoccurrence of particular sentence types in the writings of non-native speakers of English. Descriptive writing may precede comparison and contrast, which in turn may precede analytic writing. The past tense and reported speech forms are dominantly used in descriptive and narrative writings. The Oriya learners use more of simple and compound sentences. So the language teacher's job is to give them sufficient drills in constructions such as, 'it' extraposition, clefting, pseudo-clefting, etc.

(b) Lexico-Semantic linkers: The English discourse has a large numbers of lexico-semantic connectives and anaphors for effective cohesion and coherence, whereas Oriya has a few discourse linkers. The language teacher has to provide the Oriya learners of English with an inventory of frequently used discourse linkers.

(c) Paragraph Writing: The language teacher should give the learners a scrambled paragraph and ask them to unscramble. The learners may be given title of the paragraph which would help them re-arrange the sentences coherently. They may be given help from the science texts. They should be asked to write reports on scientific experiments thus building confidence in them in handling other types of paragraph writing.
(d) Rhetorical Organisation: The second language teacher's business is to extend the knowledge of L₁ to L₂. With the small repertoire of rhetorical devices he can do the effective teaching of L₂ in the communicative way.

(e) Theme-Rheme Organisation: English is a theme-oriented language. So it needs repetition of the given information since it typically comes in the subject position. Oriya being a rheme-oriented language, the Oriya learners of English produce subjectless English sentences. The teacher's duty is to make the learner aware of this difference between the two languages.

(f) Discourse Grammar: Inadequacy of sentence grammar necessitates the introduction of discourse grammar as part of the curriculum.

1.3.4 U. Thakur's (1998) study is an attempt at looking at the phenomenon of cohesion in Oriya vis-a-vis English to facilitate a Contrastive Study. Thakur has analysed learners' writings along with educated writings. He has taken care of both Grammatical Cohesion and Lexical Cohesion in the context of the English language as well as Oriya. His analysis reveals certain generalizations regarding the overall organization of both the languages. It is found out that Reference as a grammatical device and Reiteration as a lexical device are more prevailing than other devices such as Substitution, Ellipsis, Conjunction and Collocation. Of course, it is established that there is no one to one correspondence between the two languages as far as the use of cohesive devices is concerned. He suggests that the course material has to be designed in such a way that the idiosyncratic features of both of languages could be juxtaposed side by side. The teacher should then give them sufficient drills so as to negate the possible negative transfers by the learners. He may give his students a familiar text removing all cohesive expressions and ask them to supply appropriate cohesive
devices. The learners should also be demonstrated how the use of one device in place of another could change the meaning of the text. At an advanced stage, they could be given short stories of great writers in place of text of a general nature. They could make them realise how a text could be highly well-knit, i.e. cohesive and coherent. The teacher may provide his learners with scrambled texts and ask them to rearrange the structures so as to make a coherent and cohesive meaningful text. Under Grammatical Cohesion, Thakur has dealt with such concepts as Reference, Substitution, Nominal Ellipsis and Conjunction, and under Lexical Cohesion, he has discussed Reiteration and Collocation, taking examples from both Oriya and English. Thakur's study is quite good from both theoretical perspectives and practical considerations, and will be of much help to the Oriya learners of English learning the skills of writing.

1.4 WORD ORDER:

Word order may be defined as "the arrangement in which words occur in clauses and sentences. It is an important component in that it is, to some measure, carries meaning, and a change in word order might greatly affect the meaning"10.

Many languages use inflection, a change in the form of words, to show how the parts of a sentence fit together. However, English having very few inflections, has almost a fixed word order. It is in this sense that the place that a word occupies in a sentence, is quite significant.

The study of Word Order is a relatively recent phenomenon in the domain of linguistic research and investigation. Only after the sixties, have some studies been done in this field with reference to languages like Spanish, German, French, Dutch, English, Chinese. Greenberg,
Keifer, Lehmann, Venneman and Ross might be said to have made major contribution to the field.

Greenberg’s (1963) article “Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the order of Meaningful Elements”\(^{11}\) might be considered a classic study on the universals of word order. On the basis of the various syntactic occurrences found in 30 languages he has studied, he proposes 45 universals pertaining to Word Order. We may, for example, note that he has pointed out that languages with SOV order are post positional while VSO order has the adjective after the noun. Greenberg uses the terms subject, object and verb without defining them. He also uses the term ‘basic word order’ without precisely explaining its meaning.

Keifer (1970) defines a word order to be basic “if it can stand without any presupposition as to what should be considered as being already known.”\(^{12}\) According to him, ‘presupposition’ can be defined either in terms of ‘a relation between statements or sentences’, or in terms of ‘what a speaker must assume in saying a given sentence’.

Lehmann’s (1973)\(^{13}\) **Structural Principle of Language** is the explanation of Greenberg’s universals. The latter says that modifiers follow the head-noun in VSO languages while the former supports it saying that modifiers are placed on the opposite side of a basic syntactic element from its primary concomitant. According to this principle, modifiers precede head nouns in SOV languages because V, the primary concomitant, occurs to the right of S and O. On the other hand, in VSO languages, modifiers follow their head nouns because V occurs to the left of S and O. Thus the position of modifiers can be predicted from the position of the primary concomitant, i.e. V.

Venneman (1975)\(^{14}\) explains the theory that SOV languages have case markings or postpositions. In these languages two nominals occur
one after another, and their grammatical function can be distinguished with case marking, while in SVO languages the intervening category V plays the role of two nominals.

Vijay Gambhir's (1981) Ph.D. dissertation *Syntactic Restrictions and Discourse Functions of Word Order in Standard Hindi* claims that Word Order Change and Movement Rules are closely related. They are functionally and operationally quite similar because they both involve a change of pragmatic effect and the movement of elements. But the difference between the two is that Change in Word Order means simply 'scrambling' of elements or constituents in a sentence, while Movement Rules such as passive construction, subject replacement, question movement, etc. not only involve the movement of words but also trigger some other changes such as addition, deletion and replacement.

We propose to present Sentence Word Order in terms of the sequential chain of the basic categories such as subject, verb, object, complement, adverbial, adjunct, non-finite clause, finite clause, etc. Hence, it will not be out of place to give brief definitions of the grammatical categories.

(a) **Subject:** The subject of a sentence may be defined as that part which refers to the person or thing doing the action expressed by the verb. The subject may be a noun, a pronoun or a noun phrase. For example, *Rama killed Ravana.*

\[ S(N) \]

He is an intelligent boy.

\[ S(Pr) \]

The old man is begging.

\[ S(NP) \]

(b) **Verb:** A verb is a word or a group of words used with the subject to say what someone or something does, or what happens to them. In other
words, a verb is a word that denotes the 'being of a fact' or 'doing of an action'. For example,

Savan killed a snake.

Verbs can be divided into many types as illustrated below.

(i) Transitive Verb: A transitive verb is used to talk about an action or event that involves more than one person or thing, and so is followed by another noun or pronoun called object. For example,

The police caught the thief.

(ii) Intransitive verb: An intransitive verb is used to talk about an action or event that only involves the subject and so does not have an object. For example,

My friend arrived at 8 p.m.

(iii) Ditransitive Verb ( Double transitive Verb ) : A verb which can take both a direct object and an indirect object is called ditransitive verb. For example,

Mother brought me a boiled egg.

(iv) Complex transitive Verb : The transitive verb which consists of two or more words is called complex transitive verb. For example,

Manas has been doing this sum for one hour.

(v) Auxiliary Verb : An auxiliary verb is one which helps to form a tense or mood of the main verb and forgoes its own significance as a main verb for that purpose. It is also called an operator. For example,

We have completed our task.
(vi) Link Verb: A verb which links the subject and the complement of a clause or sentence is called a link verb. Most link verbs do not occur in the passive voice. For example,

be, become, seem, appear, etc.

(vii) Modal: A modal is used before the infinitive form of a verb. For example,

You may come inside the room.

(c) Object: An object is a noun group (i.e. a noun, pronoun or noun equivalent) which refers to a person or thing, other than the subject, which is involved in or affected by the action of the verb, or to which a preposition indicates some relation. For example,

Jivan knew the answer.

Object can be of two types: Direct object and Indirect object.

(i) Direct object: A noun group referring to a person or thing affected by an action in a sentence with an active verb is called the direct object. For example,

Nelson was searching his room.

D.O.

(ii) Indirect Object: An indirect object is the second object used with a transitive verb to indicate who or what benefits from an action, or gets something as a result of it. For example,

The brother had given the girl an apple.

I.O.

(d) Complement: A transitive or intransitive verb may not make complete sense when sometimes used normally. It may require some word or phrase to complete its sense. Such verbs are called verbs of
Incomplete Predication. The additional word or phrase which comes after a link verb such as 'be', by which the predication is made complete, is called the complement.

The complement may be in six different forms -- a noun, an adjective, a participle, a preposition with its object, an infinitive verb or an adverb.

Noun Complement: A noun used as complement is called a noun complement. For example,

They elected him president.

N.C.

Adjective complement: An adjective used as complement is called an adjective complement. For example,

The judge set the prisoner free.

Adj. C.

Subject Complement: When the complement comes after an intransitive verb, it is called the subject complement because it relates to the subject. For example,

Mr. Das is a doctor.

Cs.

Object Complement: When the complement comes after a transitive verb in the Active Voice, it is called an object complement because it relates to the object. For example,

The doctor declared him fit.

Co.

(e) **Adjunct**: An adjunct is a word or group of words which is added to qualify or define another in a sentence.

There can be various types of adjuncts such as adverbs, adverbials, adverbial particles, noun phrases, prepositional phrases, non-finite clauses, finite clauses, that-clauses, conditional clauses, etc.
Adverbial adjunct: Adverbial groups usually consist of adverbs. There can be adverbial adjuncts of distance, duration, weight, cost, etc. For example,

Our meeting lasted (for) one hour.

Adverbial Particle: The preposition used as adverb is called an adverbial particle. For example,

Please come in.

Noun Phrase: A noun having a determiner or an adjective as pre-modifier is called a noun phrase. For example,

She is going to handle it her way.

Noun Group: Occasionally, noun groups can also be used as adjuncts. For example,

There is a massive market that side of the water.

Prepositional Phrase: A preposition followed by its object (which may be a noun, pronoun, gerund, or phrase) is called a prepositional phrase. It is, in other words, a phrase made up of a group of words used as preposition to indicate position or direction e.g. in front of, on top of, etc. For example,

The noise was coming from the room.

(f) Non-finite Clause: A non-finite clause is a sub-ordinate clause which contains a non-finite verb, i.e. a particle or an infinitive, but which does not contain a finite verb.

(i) To-infinitive (Infinitive with 'to'):

The best thing would be to finish the work in time.

(ii) Bare infinitive (Infinitive without to):

All he did was hit the ball with his bat.
(iii) 'ing' participle:

Completing his work, he left his college.

(iv) 'ed' participle:

Tired with work, he sat down under the tree to take rest.

(g) Finite Clause: A clause containing a finite verb with or without other words is called a finite clause. It contains a subject and a predicate.

Finite clause can be of three types as illustrated below.

(i) Noun Clause:

Everybody knows that he is honest.

N. Cl.

(ii) Adjectival Clause:

The man who stole my potatoes escaped in the dark.

Adj. Cl.

(iii) Adverbial Clause:

He is going home because it is already late.

Adv. Cl.

1.5 DISCOURSE FUNCTIONS:

Theoretically, the functions of word order can be classified into three categories as follows:

(i) Syntactic: In this function, a change in sentence word order indicates a change in grammatical relations.

(ii) Semantic: In this function a change in sentence word order indicates a change in the truth conditions of a sentence.

(iii) Discourse: Here a change in the order of elements of a sentence does not change the truth conditions but it changes the contextual meaning such as focus, contrast, afterthought, announcement, or reinforcement of a topic.
The study of discourse functions is essential because it helps the reader in the understanding of a communicative system. The knowledge of merely grammatical rules and the word meanings are not sufficient for the understanding of a linguistic unit.

Various discourse functions like announcement of a topic, emphasizing or de-emphasizing a constituent, creating suspense and so on are performed through word order only and hence the relevance of the discourse analysis of word order.

The following discourse functions deal with only those situations where elements or constituents move to sentence-initial or sentence-final position.

(i) **Topic**: A topic is that part of the sentence which tells the hearer what the speaker is talking about (Hornby). It may be either explicitly told or implicit in a context. It is generally placed in the sentence initial position for the benefit of the hearer or the reader, and thus contributes to effective communication.

(ii) **Contrast**: To present a contrast between two or more members of a given set is another important function of word order. Generally, in contrastiveness one of the members is considered as the correct one (Chafe, 1976). The contrasted element is mostly placed in sentence-initial position but can also be placed in sentence-final position depending on discourse conditions.

(iii) **Emphasis / De-emphasis**: Emphasis is the most important function of word order in literature. According to Xellog, any deviation from unmarked order, except for meter in poetry and rhythm in prose is considered either for emphasis or de-emphasis. Emphasis is generally conveyed through stress in spoken speech and through emphatic particles in written speech. But, when neither stress nor emphatic particles are used, word order is the only means to express emphasis in
our speech. For emphasis, constituents are placed in the sentence-initial position, or in the sentence-final position depending on the discourse situations. On the other hand, for de-emphasis element or constituents are placed in the sentence-final position. They may also be deleted, depending upon the degree of de-emphasis.

In the present study, our objective is to deal with the "discourse functions" of the word order in terms of various pragmatic and communicative roles with regard to the two languages, that is English and Oriya. Therefore, it is customary to highlight on the various "communicative acts". We may refer to the "Speech Act Theory" developed in the 1960's. According to this theory, an utterance is treated as an act performed by a speaker in a context with respect to an addressee.

1.5.1 Austin (1962)\textsuperscript{19}, classifies the Speech Act into three types: "locutionary", "illocutionary" and "perlocutionary".

(i) Locutionary act: It is the way of uttering a sentence, an act of producing a recognisable grammatical utterance in a language. In other words, when a speaker performs a locutionary act, he uses a speech. Phonology, syntax and semantics focus on the locutionary act. For example,

He said to me, "Write a letter to your father."

(ii) Illocutionary act: Illocutionary act is a performative act. It is the attempt to accomplish some communicative functions like promising, greeting, commanding, informing, reminding and so on. Pragmatics focuses on the illocutionary act. For example,

He advised me to write a letter to my father.

(iii) Perlocutionary act: Perlocutionary act is the effect of locutionary act where the effect may be intentional or unintentional. It means, in a
perlocutionary act, something is brought about by saying something. For example,

He persuaded me to write a letter to my father.

1.5.2 Sinclair (1968) goes to examine the grammatical structure of an utterance and its function in discourse. He says, questions, for example, can have declarative, interrogative, imperative or mood less structure. The situation will decide which form is given to be most appropriate to the context–cheekiness, condescension, sarcasm or so on.

1.5.3 J. R. Searle (1979)\textsuperscript{20} recognises five kinds of Speech Acts, namely, Representatives, Directives, Commissives, Declarations and Expressives.

(i) Representatives: Speakers are committed in varying degrees to the truth of the propositions they have uttered: swearing, believing, reporting.

(ii) Directives: Speakers try to get the hearers to do something: commanding, requesting, urging.

(iii) Commissives: Speakers are committed in various degrees to certain courses of action: promising, vowing, undertaking, etc.

(iv) Declarations: Speakers alter states of affairs by performing such Speech Acts as, "I now declare the meeting closed."

(v) Expressives: Speakers express attitudes such as congratulating, apologising, etc.

1.5.4 Discourse functions might thus be very subtle and complex. However, we propose to discuss the same in terms of various pragmatic and communicative roles. The traditional labels of statement,
interrogation, imperative and exclamation will, of course, serve our objective to a large extent.

**STATEMENTS** : Statements serve such functions as (i) conveying information, (ii) making an assertion (iii) making a prediction (iv) offering an apology (v) expressing willingness, intention, insistence, ability (vi) giving permission (vii) denoting probability, possibility or hypothetical use (viii) denoting characteristic habit, obligation, duty, logical necessity, compulsion or predication (ix) referring to something (x) presenting a contrast (xi) expressing emphasis or de-emphasis or a topic, and so on.

**INTERROGATIVES** : Interrogatives serve such functions as (i) seeking information on a specific point, (ii) making an inquiry (iii) expressing declarative, imperative, questions or moodless structure (iv) asking for permission (v) denoting request, offer, advice or directive and so on.

**IMPERATIVES** : Imperative functions are such ones as (i) instructing somebody to do something (ii) denoting command, order, request, direction, advice or recommendation (iii) expressing irritation, insistence, persuasion, prohibition, plea, warning, threat, suggestion, invitation or offer (iv) granting permission (v) expressing good wishes, imprecation, incredulous rejection, promise, and so on.

**EXCLAMATIVES** : Exclamative functions are (i) expressing the extent to which the speaker is impressed by something and (ii) expressing surprise, sorrow, happiness, cheer, benevolence or malevolence, and so on.
1.5 METHODOLOGY:

It is already pointed out that the dissertation aims at bringing out a Contrastive Study of Word Orders at the sentence level and their Discourse Functions between English and Oriya. Word orders are presented in terms of combination of the basic categories like Subject, Verb, Object, Complement, Adjunct (Adverbials etc.), etc. while Discourse Functions are discussed in terms of various pragmatic and communicative roles.

The dissertation contains seven Chapters as follows:

Chapter One : Introduction
Chapter Two : Basic Word Order
Chapter Three : Inversion
Chapter Four : Subjectless Order
Chapter Five : Echo Structure
Chapter Six : Irregularity
Chapter Seven : Conclusion

Chapter One entitled "Introduction" presents the Aims, Objectives and Methodology of the present work. It also includes a Review of Literature in the field of Contrastive Analysis. Chapter Two to Chapter Five are concerned with the major Word Orders and their Discourse Functions while Chapter Six talks of the Irregular Structures and their Discourse Functions in the two languages of our study. Each of the Chapters has specifically a sub-section for points of contrast between the two languages over the relevant Word Order. Chapter Seven in the form of “Conclusion” presents a summary of the findings and the relevance of the present study.
Most of the data chosen for both the languages are intelligible expressions, conforming to the rules of the languages concerned and need not be traced to any printed or recorded text. However, the sources of such data as borrowed are mentioned at proper places. It may be pointed out that the scholar is a native speaker of Oriya and has a Master's Degree in English language and literature to his credit.

It is hoped that the thesis would be useful to Oriya learners of English as well as English learners of Oriya. The results of our study can be incorporated in both the English language syllabus meant for the Oriya learners of English and the Oriya syllabus for the English learners for Oriya. It is also presumed that the study would render useful service to the scholars who wish to work on Contrastive Linguistics in general and on Contrastive Study between English and Oriya in particular.
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