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CHAPTER TWO
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Preliminaries

In the beginning of this chapter, an attempt is made to understand the relevant terms and concepts in pragmatics. The chapter defines the pragmatics and proceeds further to delineate its history and development. It states the difference between sentence and utterance, and semantics and pragmatics. J. L. Austin’s (1962) theory of speech acts and the role of pragmatics in speech act analysis are discussed at length. Then, the chapter briefly discusses Searle’s (1969) contribution to the theory with reference to his typology of speech acts. The conversational strategies of indirect speech acts are also discussed briefly. Towards the end of this chapter, important terms in pragmatics such as presupposition, implicature, cooperative principle, politeness principle, sentence and utterance, speech event and speech situation and deictic expression are discussed at length. This chapter lays the foundation for the analysis of highly marked speech acts in the selected novels of Khushwant Sigh. Thorough analysis of the category-wise significant selected speech acts in the novels under consideration is made at length in the third and fourth chapters.

2.2. What is Pragmatics?

Pragmatics studies how people comprehend and produce a communicative act or speech act in a concrete speech situation, which is usually a conversation. However, the users of language, as social beings, communicate with each other using language in social situations and the
society controls their access to the linguistic and communicative means. While defining pragmatics, George Yule remarks that pragmatics is the study of “invisible meaning” (1996). Some of the important definitions of pragmatics by the well-known pragmatists are given below.

**Definitions**

1. Pragmatics is the study of those principles that will account for why a certain set of sentences are anomalous, or not possible utterances. (Levinson, 1983:6)

2. Pragmatics can be usefully defined as the study of how utterances have meanings in situations. (Leech, 1983:06)

3. Pragmatics is about explaining how we produce and understand such everyday but apparently rather peculiar uses of language. (Peter Grundy, 1995:4)

4. Pragmatics as “a general cognitive, social, and cultural perspective on linguistic phenomena in relation to their usage in forms of behavior. (Verschueren, 1999:7)

5. Pragmatics studies the use of language in human communication as determined by the conditions of society. (Jacob Mey, 2001:6)

   It is amply clear from the above definitions that context is at the center of meaning. In other words, pragmatics is more concerned with the meanings that the words or linguistic expressions convey implicitly rather than what they explicitly denote at the surface level. Pragmatics always attempts to analyze how more is communicated than what is actually said. It
also takes into account the contextually shared information. The factors such as culture, religion, history and society play an important role in arriving at an authentic meaning of utterances. Since, conversations are context bound, they need to be analyzed against the various speech situations and speech events

Language is a complex phenomenon because of its association with human mind and it is very difficult to say how a person chooses one interpretation of certain linguistic expressions rather than another in various speech situations. Peter Grundy (1995:8) aptly remarks:

“Communication is not merely a matter of a speaker encoding a thought in language and sending it as spoken message through space, or as a written message on paper, to a receiver who decodes it….but also draw an inference as to what is conveyed beyond what is stated...”

The interpretation of what meanings the speaker wants to convey using particular linguistic expressions is often influenced by factors such as the background knowledge or the context and interpersonal relations of the conversational partners. According to the principles of pragmatics there are four types of contexts. They are as follows:

a. Physical context refers to the situation where the conversation is taking place, what objects are present, what actions are occurring, and so forth.

b. Epistemic context refers to what speakers know about the world. For example, what background knowledge is shared by the speakers is a crucial part of their epistemic knowledge when they are in a conversation with someone else.
c. Linguistic context refers to what has been said already in the utterance. For example, if ‘A’ begins a discussion by referring to Jane Smith and in the next sentence refers to "her" as being a top notch athlete, the linguistic context helps us to know that the pronoun “her” refers to Jane Smith.

d. Social context refers to the social relationship among the speakers and hearers.

The above contexts can be explained with the help of the following piece of conversation that takes place in a college library. The speech situation is that two people ‘A’ and ‘B’ enter a library and sit at ‘C’ s table and continue to speak aloud. ‘C’ looks up at them and says:

"Excuse me, could you please speak up a bit more? I missed what you said."

Here, from the perspective of semantics the utterance produced by ‘C’ denotes that the speakers ‘A’ and ‘B’ should reproduce what they had said earlier since the utterance of ‘C’ is a request. However, from the point of view of pragmatics it connotes something else. The utterance of ‘C’ can be interpreted using the contextual properties of the utterance.

Physical: the conversation occurs in a library.

Epistemic: libraries are quiet places.

Linguistic: sarcastic tone of voice [intonation cues are linguistic].

Social context: you have the right to ask someone to be quiet in a place where people are supposed to be quiet, especially if their rule-
breaking is harmful to the needs of others, which overrides the social norm of not giving orders to strangers.

The illocutionary force of the utterance of ‘C’ is that the interlocutors ‘A’ and ‘B’ should maintain silence in the library. The successful interpretation of any interaction depends on the context and the speech situation in which it takes place.

One more example will make this point more clear:

Passenger: Is there any vacant seat in the bus?

Bus Conductor: Why don’t you see yourself? All are Maharaja’s

The word ‘Maharaja’ in the above conversation is not used as an honorific term. In fact, the term ‘Maharaja’ is not at all respectfully used here to denote the social status of the person in the context. On the other hand, it is a diminutive expression, which is used in a sarcastic tone. Here, the word ‘Maharaja’ in the context of the culture of Maharashtra means ‘King’ who is a great warrior and who exercised great power.

The illocutionary force of the utterance of the conductor is that the passenger should not behave like a king. Instead, he should see for himself if there is any vacant seat. It becomes amply clear from this that the shared and contextual knowledge plays a pivotal role in the analysis of the utterances.

Pragmatics is also concerned with the functions performed by utterances such as promising, requesting and informing which are generally called as speech acts. Sometimes, the interrogative structure is used to fulfill a different purpose as in ‘Could you close the window?’ where it clearly is not a question about ability, but a polite request. Such types of utterances are
described as indirect speech acts. The direct and indirect speech acts are strongly associated with Geoffrey Leech’s (1983) pragmatic concept of politeness, which studies language in use according to the self-image of addressee and addressee. Every person’s self-image in pragmatics is called ‘face’, and utterances presenting a threat to the interlocutor are known as ‘face-threatening acts’, while those which lessen the threats are called ‘face saving acts’. It is assumed that the use of indirect questions is characteristic of ‘face saving acts’.

2.3. Semantics and Pragmatics

Both semantics and pragmatics deal with the meaning but there is a great deal of difference between the two in interpreting the meaning of the utterances in naturally occurring conversations. Semantics and pragmatics are concerned with the meaning of a sentence and an utterance respectively. Semantics attempts to obtain the meaning on the basis of lexemes and syntax, whereas pragmatics studies the meaning as determined by the socio-cultural aspects of the speech community in which the interlocutors are placed. In this context, Charles Morris (1946), the chief promoter of pragmatics, remarks that semantics deals with the signification of signs in all modes of signifying, whereas pragmatics deals with the origin, uses, and effects of signs within the behavior in which they occur.

Semantics studies the structures of language independent of their context. In other words, it can be described as the study of the rules of language that determine the literal meanings of linguistic expressions. In other words, semantics is governed by the phonological, morphological and
syntactic rules. Semantics is the study of meaning in language without the socio-cultural context.

On the other hand, pragmatics is the study of meaning based on the socio-cultural context. In other words, pragmatics can be called the valid stage of analysis, where the meaning is understood with the help of the contextual knowledge of the conversational partners. Contextual knowledge includes knowledge of the previous sentences [spoken or written], general knowledge about the world, and knowledge of the speaker and hearer. It studies how the transmission of meaning depends on not only the linguistic knowledge [e.g. grammar, lexicon etc.] of the addressee and addressee, but also on the context of the utterance, knowledge about the social standing of the interlocutors involved and the illocutionary force of the speaker’s utterance.

Following are the major differences between semantics and pragmatics.

1. Semantics is context free, while pragmatics is context bound.

2. In semantics, sentences are interpreted against the conventional rules whereas pragmatics considers the context while analyzing the meaning of the utterances.

3. Semantics focuses on actual objects or ideas that a word refers to, while pragmatics considers the relationship between signs and objects in context.
4. In semantics, the literal meaning of the sentence is central, on the other hand, in pragmatics meaning goes beyond the literal meanings.

5. Semantics studies meaning of words, phrases, and sentences without taking into the context. On the other hand, pragmatics studies the meaning of utterances in the context.

6. The meaning of sentences in semantics remains constant as long as the same language is being spoken but in pragmatics, the meaning of utterances changes from context to context.

7. The rules of syntax, morphology and phonology play an important role in semantics whereas cooperative and politeness principles, speech acts, deictic expressions and speech situations are important in pragmatics.

2.4. Sentence and Utterance

A sentence is purely a grammatical unit of language that fulfills the properties which requires being a sentence i.e. it begins with a capital letter and ends with punctuation mark such as a full stop, a question mark or an exclamatory mark and does not depend on the context to make a complete sense. On the other hand, an utterance is a unit of pragmatics. Therefore, it is free from the grammatical norms and it does not make a definite sense but it is bound to the context in which it is uttered for the sense or the meaning.

Though, the interlocutors in everyday life seem to be speaking in sentences, every expression is not "well-formed" enough to qualify as a sentence. When one looks at the Taj Mahal and says ‘Oh!’ we probably would not call that utterance as a sentence because it does not fulfill the grammatical requirement though, an utterance is the product of grammar. On
the contrary, if speaker says, ‘What a beautiful monument it is!’ it can be called a sentence as well as an utterance because it is acceptable as such according to the rules of our language. It is also true that every sentence, when it is uttered for the purpose of communication, is an utterance but every utterance is not a sentence because not every utterance may follow the rules of grammar. For example:

a. I have a book on history. [Sentence and utterance]
b. Oh! [Only utterance]
c. Really! [Only utterance]
d. My name is Ravi. [Sentence and utterance]

In the above examples, acceptable expressions such as ‘Oh!’ and ‘Really!’ are not the sentences, though they fulfill the purpose of communication, but are the examples of an utterance because an utterance is not a complete sentence but a piece of speech produced by an individual on a particular occasion.

A sentence is said to be ‘a complete thought’ but will not be very useful, if most of us speak many sentences that have no thought behind them at all. It is true that different sentence functions are most often performed by particular sets of words and some of those words can serve only one function. Nevertheless, we need to be careful as some functions can be performed by more than one kind of words or phrases as mentioned in the above examples, and many words can serve more than one function.
2.5. Developmental Stages of Pragmatics

The origin of pragmatics could be attributed to the great philosophers in ancient Greece and Rome. The term ‘pragmatics’ is derived from the words ‘pragmaticus’ and ‘pragmaticos’ in Latin and Greek respectively. Both the terms refer to the practical use of language or the performative use of language. The term ‘pragmatics’ for the first time, was used in linguistic philosophy in 1936.

Pragmatics was a reaction to structuralism, which believed that language has an analyzable structure, composed of parts that can be defined in relation to others. Ferdinand de Saussure claimed that language could be better understood by studying the binary opposition terms such as synchronic and diachronic.

In the beginning, pragmatics was studied as an associate branch of semiotics. Therefore, origin of pragmatics goes into the philosophical domain because the origin of pragmatics is affected by the three major contemporary disciplines of the twentieth century i.e. semiotics, linguistic philosophy and function of language.

The philosophers such as Morris, J. L. Austin, J. R. Searle, H. P. Grice, G. N. Leech, S. C. Levinson, Petre Grundy, Jeff Verschurean, Jacob Mey, etc have contributed to the development of pragmatics.

Charles Morris (1938) was the first language scientist to throw light on the term pragmatics. In fact, he played a major role in the first stage of the development of pragmatics. He was of the opinion that the study of pragmatics must involve the aspects of society, psychology, culture and other aspects that govern the symbols and their meaning. He made the
division of semiotics into three parts; syntactics, semantics and pragmatics as stated in Foundations of the Theory of Signs (1938). The famous philosopher Carnap agreed with Morris that the study pragmatics should take into account the relationships between the interlocutors and the context in which the linguistic expressions are used. Morris believed that ‘pragmatics studies the relations of signs to interpreters’, whereas ‘semantics studies the relations of signs to the objects to which the signs are applicable’ and ‘syntactics studies the formal relations of signs to one another’.

During 1940 and 1960, the study of pragmatics went through the period of hibernation. The field of pragmatics remained undiscovered in this period.

The book How to Do Things with Words (1962) focusing on the study of speech acts by J. L. Austin and J. R. Searle’s (1969) standardized contribution provided illuminating explanation into sociolinguistic conduct. The findings of the cooperative principle and politeness principle also provided insights into person-to-person interactions. The choice of different linguistic means for a communicative act and the various interpretations for the same speech act elucidate human mentality in the relevance principle, which contributes to the study of communication in particular, and cognition in general.

Later, H. P. Grice (1975) came on the scene of pragmatics and enlightened on two kinds of meanings, natural and non-natural. He laid the foundation of the modern study of pragmatics and studied the differences and relationships between speaker meaning and linguistic meaning. He explained that the non-literal speech is the result of the Cooperative
Principle and its four maxims i.e. quantity, quality, manner and relation. Grice suggested that pragmatics should lay emphasis on the more practical dimension of meaning, specifically the conversational meaning. Then, G. N. Leech (1983) came on the scene of pragmatics and advocated the Politeness Principle and its maxims.

Subsequently, Green (1989) explicitly defined pragmatics as ‘natural language understanding’. This was echoed by Blakemore (1990) in her book Understanding Utterances: The Pragmatics of Natural Language and Grundy (1995) in his Doing Pragmatics. The impact of pragmatism has led to cross-linguistic international studies of language use, which resulted in, among other things, interpreting an utterance involves answering three questions as given below:

(a) What did the speaker intend to say,
(b) What did the speaker intend to imply and
(c) What was the speakers intended attitude to the propositions expressed and implied?

Sperber and Wilson (1996) put forward the relevance theory that convincingly explains how an addressee utters a communicative act. Sperber and Wilson set out to develop Grice©s ideas into a more explicit theory of communication and cognition, with the notion of relevance at the heart of the theory. There are two major components in the theory of relevance:

1) Contextual effects
2) Processing cost
In order to be relevant, an utterance must have some contextual effects. Contextual effects involve the addition of new information to the context of old information, thus, leading to a modification of the context. The result is that interpreting an utterance involves more than working out what assumptions are being conveyed. It also involves working out the consequences of adding this set of assumptions to a set of assumptions, which have already been processed, i.e., seeing the contextual effects of the assumptions in a context determined partly by earlier acts of comprehension. An assumption with no contextual effects in a context is irrelevant in that context. Thus, having contextual effects is a necessary condition for relevance. The greater contextual effect of an utterance, the greater is its relevance.

Processing costs, on the other hand, reflect the amount of effort involved in working out the assumptions conveyed by an utterance. Here, the greater the processing effort, the lower is the relevance. In other words, relevance is defined in terms of the conjunction of two conditions:

1) An assumption is relevant in a context to the extent that its contextual effects in this context are large;

2) An assumption is relevant in a context to the extent that the effort to process it in this context is small.

The role of the relevance in communication is at the center. Relevance is discussed in terms of a guarantee from the speaker to the hearer that the communication is relevant. Thus, each ostensive act of communication carries a guarantee of its own relevance. In addition, it is the task of the hearer to work out by means of inferences which assumptions the speaker is
trying to convey. Though simple, this principle has far-reaching implications for the role of context in communication.

Understanding is achieved when the communicative intention is fulfilled. When the hearer recognizes the informative intention of the speaker, the informative intention itself is fulfilled. There is a gap between understanding and believing. For understanding to be achieved, the informative intention must be recognized.

Jef Verschueren (1998) contributed to the field of pragmatics and wrote a book Understanding Pragmatics. He raised the basic questions in this book as follows:

1. What do people do when using language?
2. How exactly is meaning generated when we communicate?
3. Why do we say one thing when we usually mean another?

Examining the mental and social processes involved in communicating through language, Understanding Pragmatics is a comprehensive introduction to the subject. The book provides an outline of the theoretical basis of pragmatics, examines its major theoretical perspectives, and explores its methodological issues.

Jacob Mey (1993) wrote a book Pragmatics: An Introduction and shed light on the principles of pragmatics. According to him, pragmatics is the study of language as determined by the conditions of society in which we live.
Thus, the trajectory of pragmatics is very interesting as well as revealing.

2.6. The Concept of Speech Acts

The term ‘speech act’ is derived from the works of the Cambridge Philosopher J. L. Austin (1962) and from Sir William James Lectures Series he delivered at Harvard in 1955. Later, his lectures were published in the book entitled How to Do Things with Words (1962). Speech act theory believes in identifying utterances and turns as actual actions. This theory not only considers language used by the speaker but studies change in the state of behavior of the speaker as well as the listener at the time of communication.

Before Austin, very limited attention was given to sentence types in which language was considered as essentially propositional. Sentences are not only assertive but there are other possibilities of asking questions, giving commands, accepting invitations as well.

J. L. Austin, for the first time, studied language from different point of view and brought to notice that apart from true and false statements, and truth conditions there are other possibilities in language, which are non-assertive categories that include questions, commands, exclamations, etc. He studied language from non-conventional point of view which is a kind of reaction to traditional view of language. Austin and Searle contributed a lot to the speech act theory.
Searle (1969:16) says

“Speaking a language is performing speech acts, acts such as making statements, giving commands asking questions, making promises and so on.”

George Yule (1996:46) defines speech acts as

“Speech acts are actions performed via utterances.”

David Crystal (2003) mentions that speech acts is a theory which analyzes the role of utterances in relation to the behavior of the speaker and the hearer in interpersonal communication. It is not an ‘act of speech’ [in the sense of parole] but a communicative activity. In the process of communication, a speaker performs various acts of ordering, asking, arguing, mocking, blaming, warning, advising, praising etc.

2.7. Austin’s Theory of Speech Acts

The theory of speech acts is a unique concept in pragmatics and it describes how language is basically used to do things, rather than merely providing information. When people produce utterances, they do not merely use words but they also have intentions or desired goals to make their hearers, to perform certain actions. They speak with the illocutionary force via the use of words. They do not simply exercise their vocal cords unnecessarily. The utterances, ‘Today is my first day of college’, ‘How many students were absent yesterday?’ ‘Close the door’ are usually used to state the fact, ask a question and to give a command respectively. However, all these utterances have the potential to bring a change in the state of affairs. They do not actually contain the power to do anything on their own because
any successful performance of speech acts depends upon the context. Therefore, the significance of context in which speech acts take place is studied in the light of speech act theory proposed by Austin.

J. L. Austin in his posthumously published book How to do Things with Words (1962) outlined the theory of speech acts. He affirmed that to say something is to do something. Austin reminds that we perform all sorts of speech acts besides making statements, and that there are other ways for them to go wrong or be “infelicitous” (1962:39) besides not being true.

Austin made a distinction between performative utterances and constatives. Austin (1962:67) held that performatives are neither true nor false; unlike what he called constatives in the following words:

“that the performative is not altogether so obliviously distinct from the constative- the former happy or unhappy, the later true or false”.

However, he came to realize that constatives work just like performatives. Just as a suggestion or an apology can be made by uttering I suggest ...or I apologize ..., so an assertion or a prediction can be made by uttering I assert ...or I predict ....Accordingly, the distinction between constative and performative utterances is, in Austins general theory of speech acts, superseded by the difference between saying something and in saying it.

The theory of speech acts aims to do justice to the fact that even though words, phrases and sentences encode information, people convey more things with words than imparting information. When people convey information, they often convey more than what their words encode. The
focus of speech act theory has been on utterances, especially those made in conversational and other face-to-face situations.

The phrase ‘speech act’ should be taken as a generic term for any sort of language use, oral or otherwise. Speech acts, whatever the medium of their performance, fall under the broad category of intentional action, with which they share certain general features. An especially pertinent feature is that when a speaker acts intentionally, generally he/she has illocutionary force in mind.

Austin identifies three distinct levels of action stated below:

1. The locutionary
2. The illocutionary
3. The perlocutionary

1. Locutionary Act

A locutionary act is a simple speech act, which consists of generating sounds that are linked together by grammatical conventions to say something meaningful. Among speakers of English, Speech act theory broadly explains these utterances as having three parts.

a. There is the phonetic act of making sounds.

b. The phatic act of making a grammatical sentence.

c. The rhetoric act of saying something meaningful.

(Austin, 1962:109)
These together make up the locutionary act. For example, ‘it is raining cats and dogs’ performs the locutionary act of saying that it is raining heavily. In short, a locutionary act is a simple speech act. The term ‘locutionary act’ refers to the surface meaning of an utterance. In other words, a locutionary act is a simple speech act generating sounds that are linked together by grammatical conventions to say something meaningful.

2. Illocutionary Act

An illocutionary act is any speech act that amounts to stating, questioning, commanding, promising, and so on. It is an act performed in saying something, as contrasted with a locutionary act, the act of saying something. Illocutionary force is roughly the speakers intention behind the production of an illocutionary act, including its communicative point, attitudes involved, and presuppositions (Austin, 1962:109).

The illocutionary force of some utterances is less obvious if someone says ‘It’s sure. It is cold here’, and the effect of the statement is contextual. It could be that the person is simply describing the room, in which case the illocutionary force would be the description of the temperature of the room. If it is possible to change the environment, say by turning up the heat or closing a window, the addressers intention may be to get someone else to do something about the cold, in which case the illocutionary force would be the addressee’s action. This is in contrast to perlocutionary force, which involves the effects that an utterance has upon the addressee/s.

3. Perlocutionary Act

A perlocutionary act is a term used in speech act theory to designate an utterance that has an effect upon the actions, thoughts, or feelings of the
hearer of the utterance e.g. convincing, frightening, insulting, pardoning, etc. The perlocutionary effect of an utterance may differ from the intended effect of the speaker’s illocutionary act. A perlocutionary act is any speech act that amounts to persuading, convincing, scaring, enlightening, inspiring, or otherwise getting someone to do or realize something. When examining perlocutionary acts, the effect on the hearer or reader is emphasized. Unlike illocutionary acts, which stress some linguistic performance, a perlocutionary act’s effect is in some sense external to the performance. It may be thought of, in a sense, as the effect of the locutionary act (Austin, 1962:109). For example, a travel agent produces an utterance ‘The bus will start in five minutes’. He apparently seems to be performing the locutionary act of saying that the bus will start in five minutes apparently. The utterance seems to be simple and reporting some kind of information but the ‘uptake’ (Austin, 1962:121) content of this locutionary act is not fully determined by the words alone. In saying this, the travel agent is performing the illocutionary act of informing the passengers and perhaps urging them to get into the bus immediately. As perlocutionary acts are performed with the intention of producing a further effect, the effect of this illocutionary act is understood on the part of the passengers. The travel agent’s illocutionary force is causing the passengers to believe that the bus is about to leave in five minutes. He is performing all these speech acts, at all three levels, just by uttering the said words.

There seems to be a straightforward relationship in this example between the words uttered and what is thereby said. The act of informing the passengers that the bus will depart in five minutes is accomplished. There seems to be apparently less direct connection between the utterance and the
act of urging the passengers to get into the bus. Clearly, there is no linguistic connection or the words do not mention of getting into the bus. This indirect connection is inferential. The passengers must infer that the travel agent intends to urge them to get into the bus immediately and, indeed, it seems that it is the reason, his utterance counts as an indirect speech act.

Similarly, there is an indirect connection when an utterance, ‘Its getting cold in here’, is made not merely as a statement about the temperature but as a request to close the window or as a proposal to go to some warmer place. Whether it is intended to make a request or as a proposal, depends on contextual information that the speaker relies on the hearer to understand. This is true even when the connection between the word and the deed is more direct than in the above example.

Towards the end of the book, Austin (1962:32) categorizes the speech acts into five different types on the basis of their illocutionary force which he calls implicit or explicit definite purpose, such as asserting, requesting, promising and apologizing, etc. The perlocutionary act is a matter of trying to get the hearer to form some correlative attitude and in some cases to act in a certain way. For example, a statement expresses a belief and normally has the further purpose of getting the addressee form the same belief. A request expresses a desire for the addressee to do a certain thing and normally aims for the addressee to intend to and, indeed, actually do that thing. A promise expresses the speakers firm intention to do something, together with the belief that by his utterance he is obligated to do it, and normally aims further for the addressee to expect, and to feel entitled to expect, the speaker to do it.
Thus, taking into account the various forces and functions of speech acts Austin (1962:109) classifies the speech acts into five major categories such as verdictives, commissives, exercitivies, behabitives and expositives. The classification of speech acts made by Austin (1962:151) is as follows:

a. Verdictives: These are the utterances which change the external reality of the world via utterances. For instance, the umpire on the playing field says to one of the players, "Out" and the player is declared out. Verdictives are similar to performative utterances.

b. Commissives: These are the utterances, which are committed to the future course of actions. For example, father says to his son. "I promise to buy a new dress for you on the occasion of Diwali".

c. Exercitivies: These are the utterances, which exercise powers, rights, or influence. For example, in Christian religion if the priest says, "I hereby, announce you husband and wife", the couple gets married.

d. Behabitives: These utterances are related to social behavior and attitudes. These speech acts include congratulating, apologizing, condoling etc. For example, "I congratulate you on your grand success".

e. Expositives: These are the utterances, which are characterized as expressions of views, clarifications, arguments, references etc. For example: I argue that he was not there.

The above classification of the speech acts was criticized by the followers of Austin on the ground that there is overlapping in the classification. Therefore, his disciple J. R. Searle (1969) systematized the
2.8. Searle’s Typology of Speech Acts

J. R. Searle (1969) made a significant contribution in the study of speech acts. He says that to understand language one has to understand the speaker’s intention. According to him, language is intentional behavior.

Therefore, it should be treated like a form of action. Searle refers to statements as speech acts. The speech act is the basic unit of language that expresses meaning. In fact, an utterance expresses an intention. Mostly, a speech act is a sentence, but it can be a word or phrase as long as it follows the rules necessary to carry out the intention. When a person speaks, s/he performs an act. Speech act is not only used to choose something but also essentially to do something. Speech act lays stress on the intent of the act as a whole. According to Searle, understanding the speaker’s intention is crucial to arrest the meaning. Without the speaker’s intention, it is not possible to understand the words as a speech act. According to him, there are five types of speech acts such as Assertives, Commissives, Expressives, Directives and Declaratives.

A] Assertives

Assertives are the speech acts in which the speaker asserts ‘a proposition to be true, using such verbs as affirm, believe, conclude, report, deny, etc (Searle,1969). This class also includes stating, suggesting, criticizing, replying, concluding, predicting, denying, disagreeing, etc. Assertives are usually expressed through declarative form. However, this is not the only form to express representatives or assertive speech acts. They
can be expressed using the imperative and interrogative forms as well. It is observed that assertive speech acts not only present the real state of affairs but they are also ‘tellable’. In the books on Physics, assertive speech acts are used for asserting something or providing some scientific information regarding heat, light, sound, gravity, etc. Following are some of the glaring examples:

1. Light travels faster than sound.
2. The objects thrown in the air fall down.
3. The earth rotates around the sun.
4. Water boils at hundred degrees celsius.

The above speech acts are assertive and have a truth-value. Here, the speaker presents the world, as he believes it.

**B] Commissives**

Commissives are the speech acts in which the speaker commits himself/herself to a future course of action by using verbs such as guarantee, pledge, promise, swear, vow, undertake, warrant, etc. They express the intention of the speaker. These speech acts also express promises, threats, refusals, etc. Following are some of the examples:

1. I promise you I will never cheat you.
2. I undertake not to punish the sincere students.
3. I pledge my devotion in the well-being of the nation.
4. I guarantee that India will win the match.
In using a commissive, the speaker undertakes to make the world fit the word. Commisives can be performed by the speaker alone or by the speaker as a member of a group.

C) Expressives

Expressives are the speech acts in which the speaker expresses an attitude to or about a state of affairs using such verbs as apologize, appreciate, congratulate, deplore, detest, regret, thank, welcome, etc. In other words, they express the psychological state of the speaker’s mind in making statements of pleasure, pain, joy, sorrow, etc. The feelings of the speaker are expressed by these speech acts. Following are some of the examples:

1. I apologize for my mistake.
2. Hearty congratulations!
3. I deplore the assassination of Dr. Narendra Dhabholkar.
4. I welcome you all for this august gathering.

Using expressive speech acts, the speaker expresses his/her inner state. He/she tends to be polite as in greeting, thanking, congratulating, etc and the reverse is true as in blaming, accusing, etc.

D) Directives

Directives are the speech acts in which the speaker tries to make the hearer do something, with such words as ask, beg, challenge, command, dare, invite, insist, request, etc. In other words, these speech acts express what the speaker wants from the hearer. This class includes commands,
requests, suggestions, orders, etc. Following are some of the glaring examples:

1. Get me a glass of water.
2. Could you open the window, please?
3. May I request you to make less noise?
4. I would like to invite you for my daughter’s wedding.

Using directive speech acts, the speaker intends to get the hearer to do something.

E] Declaratives

Declaratives are the speech acts in which the speaker aims to change the world via his/her utterances. In other words, the speaker alters the external status or condition of an object or situation, solely by making the utterance. Here, the speaker has a special institutional role in specific contexts. This class includes resigning, sentencing, christening, naming, appointing, etc. Following are some of the glaring examples:

1. I now pronounce you man and wife. [Priest]
2. I sentence you ten years imprisonment. [Judge]
3. You are out! [Umpire]
4. I name this mission as ‘Operation Vijay’. [Chief of the Army]
Using declarative speech acts, the speaker brings a correspondence between the propositional content and the state of affairs.

The above stated five categories of speech acts help us understand the speaker’s communicative intention and the hearer’s recognition of it. Thus, both the speaker and hearer are usually benefited in this process by the circumstances surrounding the utterance. The study of speech acts will go a long way to sensitize students of English to language itself. It will also help them to understand literature as an art form realized through language.

2.9. The Concept of Indirect Speech Acts

Speech acts are commonly used to accomplish certain tasks i.e. to commit something, to make a promise, to give an order, to ask a question or to give a command to others to accomplish certain task, etc. Indirect speech acts are commonly used to reject proposals and to make requests implicitly in order to maintain the social face.

For example:

A speaker asks, ‘Shall we go to movie tonight?’

Another replies, ‘My father is coming tonight to meet me.’

It seems that the second speaker has used an indirect speech act to politely reject the proposal by giving a reason for his refusal. Apparently the utterance seems to be adding more information but at implicit level. This is indirect because the literal meaning of ‘My father is coming tonight to meet me’ does not entail any sort of rejection apparently but the context and convention of language user enables the listener to make out the intended meaning appropriately. This poses a problem for linguists because it is
confusing to see [using a strict approach] how the person who makes the proposal is able to understand that his proposal is rejected. Searle suggests that we are able to derive meaning out of indirect speech acts by means of a cooperative process out of which we are able to derive multiple illocutions. The following utterances illustrate this point:

a. Give me a ride to the mall.
b. Would you mind giving me a ride to the mall?
c. I haven’t been to the mall yet.

In appropriate context, all three utterances propose the meaning ‘give me a ride to the mall.’ However, the hallmark of an indirect speech act is that its literal meaning is different from its intended meaning. People are intuitively aware of this. That is why they can play with words as in the following interaction:

A: Could you please pass me the bowl?
B: Yes. [does nothing]

From the above example, it becomes amply clear that ‘B’ has responded to the question made by ‘A’. However, intended meaning of the utterance ‘A’ was a request for ‘B’ to pass the bowl, and not a query regarding ability of ‘B’ to engage in the activity of passing the bowl.

Why we use indirect speech acts at all is a complex question. That is why we do not always just go straight to the point, stop beating around the bush, etc. In this question/request, we can think of the indirect speech acts as a way of communicating to the hearer without offending his ‘face’. A
request made in the form of a question such as, ‘could you pass the bowl?’ gives the hearer an opportunity to refuse the request more gracefully. There are many subtle elements here. Perhaps the speaker has the power to make the hearer a direct order but does not want to make a show of that power by making a direct command. Perhaps the speaker may be unsure about whether the hearer will accept his request or not.

Indirect speech act is fundamental to the way in which we communicate, because much more is communicated than the literal meaning of our utterances when we use language.

2.10.1. Key Principles, Concepts and Terms in Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a logical approach for an authentic interpretation of language use in context for various purposes. It seeks to explain various aspects of meaning which cannot be found in the plain sense of words or structures. As a field of language study, pragmatics is fairly new. Its origin lies in the philosophy of language and the American philosophical school of pragmatism. As a discipline within language science, its roots lie in philosophy and contribution made by various philosophers of language such as J. L. Austin, J. R. Searle, Stephen Levinson, Penelope Brown, Geoffrey Leech, Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. Therefore, it is mandatory to formulate a review of the contribution made by these language philosophers in general and pragmatists in particular to get deep insight into analysis of speech acts with the help of the principles of pragmatics in general and the theory of speech acts in particular.
2.10.1. Cooperative Principle

The British philosopher, H. P. Grice (1975), first formulated the notion of the cooperative principle. According to Grice, people converse with each other and acknowledge a kind of inferred meaning or interpretation, which he calls ‘cooperative principle’. This is not to say that only one type of cooperation underlies all communication. Rather, it attempts to characterize a more general cooperative aspect of human behavior across situations. It provides a guideline that governs the talk exchange. Grice proposes the following four maxims:

1. Maxims of Quality

Here, in this maxim the speaker is expected to speak the truth and what he believes to be true. In addition, the speaker is expected to produce adequate evidence. Grice (1975: 46) says:

a. Don’t say what you believe is false.

b. Don’t say something that you lack adequate evidence for. This is illustrated in the following examples:


   In the above interaction, the speaker ‘B’ observes the maxim of quality by providing the correct information to the speaker ‘A’s’ question.

2. A: What is the capital of India? B: I think it must be Mumbai.

   In the above interaction, the speaker ‘B’ violates the maxim of quality because the speaker ‘B’ lacks the correct information and yet confidently
adds the information, which he lacks. It is a violation of the maxim of quality by the speaker ‘B’ because ‘B’ is not sure about the answer given.

B. Maxims of Quantity

Here, the speaker is expected to be as informative as is required in the current conversation. He is also expected no to make his contribution more informative than required in the current conversation.

a. Make your contribution as informative as is required.

b. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

(Grice 1975: 45)

This is illustrated in the following examples:

1. A: How far is Mumbai from Pune?

   B: It is 175 Km.

   In the above interaction, the speaker ‘B’ has observed the maxim of quantity by providing the information to ‘A’s’ question as is required for the current purpose of communication.

2. A: How far is Mumbai from Pune?

   B: Last year, I had a chance to go to Mumbai to participate in the agitation held at Azad Maidan by the teachers’ organization. Then, I realized that Mumbai is just 175 Km from Pune.
In the above interaction, the speaker ‘B’ has violated the maxim of quantity by providing more information to ‘A’s’ question than is required for the current purpose of communication.

C. Maxims of Manner

The maxim of manner expects the speaker to avoid obscurity and ambiguity in expression. In the same manner, he/she is expected to be brief and orderly in conversation.

a. Avoid obscurity of expression.

b. Avoid ambiguity.

c. Be brief.

d. Be orderly. (Grice 1975: 46)

This is illustrated in the following examples:

1. I’m going to sell my land along with my wife.

2. He called her a taxi.

3. Flying planes can be dangerous.


B: If the child doesn’t drink milk, boil it.
In the above interaction, the response given by ‘B’ is ambiguous because the utterance, ‘If the child doesn’t drink milk, boil it’, has two inferences of meaning due to the structural ambiguity. The reference of the pronoun ‘it’ is ambiguous because it may refer to either ‘milk’ or ‘child’. Therefore, the utterance can trigger two inferences of meaning such as ‘the milk should be boiled’ or ‘the child should be boiled’.

**D. Maxim of Relevance**

Maxim of relevance expects the speaker to be relevant in the current conversation.

a. Be relevant. (Grice 1975: 46)

This is illustrated in the following examples:

A: Do you like cottage cheese?

B: Well, I travel to Cleveland every other Tuesday.

Here response given by ‘B’ is not relevant unless Cleveland is known to be the cottage cheese capital of the world

**2.10.2. Politeness Principle**

The concept of politeness principle was initially introduced by Geoffrey Leech in his book, Principles of Pragmatics, (1983) and later developed by other philosophers and linguists. He affirmed that there is a politeness principle with conversational maxims similar to those formulated by H. P. Grice (1975). Leech proposed six maxims of politeness principle, which govern the conversation as follows: Tact, Generosity, Approbation, Modesty, Agreement, and Sympathy. According to Leech, these maxims
vary from culture to culture because what may be considered polite in one culture may be strange or downright rude in another.

According to George Yule (1996:60)

“It is possible to treat politeness as a fixed concept, as in the idea of ‘polite social behavior, or etiquette, within a culture’.

He believes that there are many politeness expressions in social interaction, which serve to save the Face of a person in public. The face saving acts are associated with a person’s psychology and social status arising from his self-hood. If one disturbs or offends the feelings of other person in public it hurts him and gives birth to crisis. Therefore, Yule (1996:60) rightly says that the politeness is a means employed to show awareness of another person’s Face i.e. image. Leech further points out that in a social interaction this ability of interlocutors is necessary to create and sustain an atmosphere of relative harmony. Geoffrey Leech categorizes politeness principle into six maxims as follows:

**A. The Tact Maxim**

a. Minimize the expression of beliefs, which imply cost to other.

b. Maximize the expression of beliefs, which imply benefit to other.

The first part of this maxim fits in with Brown and Levinson’s negative politeness strategy of minimizing the imposition, and the second part reflects the positive politeness strategy of attending to the hearers interests, wants, and needs.
For example:
1. Could I interrupt for a second?
2. If could just clarify this then.
3. May I use your pen?
4. Shall I leave now?

B. The Generosity Maxim

a. Minimize the expression of beliefs that express or imply benefit to self.

b. Maximize the expression of beliefs that express or imply cost to self.

Unlike the tact maxim, the maxim of generosity focuses on the speaker, and says that others should be put first instead of the self.

For Example:
1. You relax and let me do the dishes.
2. You must come and have dinner with us.

C. The approbation Maxim

a. Minimize the expression of beliefs, which express dispraise of other.

b. Maximize the expression of beliefs, which express approval of other.

It is preferred to praise others and if this is impossible, to sidestep the issue, to give some sort of minimal response [possibly through the use of euphemisms], or to remain silent. The first part of the maxim avoids
disagreement; the second part intends to make other people feel good by showing solidarity.

For Example:

1. I heard singing at Sarasbagh last night. It sounded like you were enjoying yourselves!

2. Ramesh, I know you are a genius- would you know how to solve this problem here?

**D. The Modesty Maxim**

a. Minimize the expression of praise of self.

b. Maximize the expression of dispraise of self.

Modesty maxim is operative in expressive and assertive speech acts. Here, the speaker minimizes the praise of self. In other words, the speaker maximizes the dispraise of self.

For Example:

1. Oh! I’m so stupid- I didn’t make a note of our lecture! Did you?

**E. The Agreement Maxim**

a. Minimize the expression of disagreement between self and other.

b. Maximize the expression of agreement between self and other.

It is in line with Brown and Levinson’s positive politeness strategies of seek agreement and avoid disagreement, to which they attach great importance. However, it is not being claimed that people totally avoid
disagreement. It is simply observed that they are much more direct in expressing agreement, rather than disagreement.

For Example:

A: I don’t want my daughter to do this; I want her to do that.
B: Yes, but madam, I thought we resolved this already on your last visit.

F. The Sympathy Maxim

a. Minimize antipathy between self and other.
b. Maximize sympathy between self and other.

This includes a small group of speech acts such as congratulation, commiseration, and expressing condolences—all of which is in accordance with Brown and Levinson’s positive politeness strategy of attending to the hearers interests, wants, and needs.

For Example:

1. I’m sorry to hear about father.

2.10.3. The Concept of Face

In linguistic interaction, Face is considered as a universal concept. It is employed in culture specific ways. It is defined according to psychological, philosophical and symbolic point of view by various linguists and pragmatists. According to Goffman (1955:213) the Face is defined as the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself during a particular contact. In other words, Face generally involves interlocutors’
mutual recognition as social members of a society. Face can be lost, maintained, or enhanced and must be constantly attended to in interaction.

According to Fraser (1990), the Face is a social norm of politeness. These norms belong to a set of core-cultural concepts and religious beliefs, which provide the basic framework to explain the practices of linguistic actions in communicative encounters. Any analysis and theory of politeness, therefore, taps its data from the core-cultural concepts. Goffman (1955:215) points out:

“The combined effect of the rule of self-respect and the rule of considerateness is that the person tends to conduct himself during an encounter so as to maintain both his own Face and the Face of the other participants”.

Face maintenance is a two-way business. That is to say that the speaker must defend his own Face, but in so doing he must make sure that he does not threaten the Face of the other interlocutors by the use of ‘Face threatening acts’ [FTAs]. Face is considered as a basic want that every member knows and desires and which is generally in the interest of every member to partially satisfy. For Brown and Levinson (1987), a Face consists of a set of wants convincible only by the actions of others, and it is socially and emotionally invested. It affects the emotions of participants in interaction. It is the mutual interest of the two interlocutors to maintain each other’s Face.

Thus, Face is an essential and indispensable component in every discourse and social interaction. A brief account of ‘Negative Face’ and
‘Positive Face’ notions is necessary in order to relate them to the Face expressions in day-to-day conversation.

The ‘Negative Face’ is the maintenance and defense of one’s territory and freedom from imposition. The ‘Negative Face’ is inalienable and it keeps away the individual from others. The speaker within his private sphere wants to enjoy his rights, personal autonomy, social class, age, gender, status, etc. On the other hand, the ‘Positive Face’ is the claim for the recognition and appropriate validation of one’s social self-image or personality. The ‘Positive Face’ is the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some other members of the society. Brown and Levinson (1987:62) point:

“the most salient aspect of a person’s personality in interaction is what that personality requires of other interlocutors in particular”.

It includes the desire to be understood, approved, liked or admired. ‘Positive Face’ thus, combines the individualistic and the societal aspect of a person.

2.10.4. Speech Situation

Speech situation is nothing but a social occasion in which the interlocutors come together to perform some linguistic functions. It occurs within a speech community. You come across a speech situation when people talk or do not talk. For instance, celebration a birthday of some close friend is a social occasion, which is called a speech situation in pragmatics. A speech community may be small or large, and it may be highly homogeneous or decidedly heterogeneous. What matters is that everybody in it should regularly speak to at least some of the other people in it, and that
the community should not be broken up by sharp boundaries across which speaking rarely or never takes place.

2.10.5. Speech Event

A significant piece of speaking conducted according to the rules in a conversation is called the speech event. It has a beginning and an end. It also refers to activities that are governed by the rules or norms for speech. For example, organizing a party is a speech situation and a conversation at the party is a speech event. All speech possesses structure of some kind, but there are certain pieces of speaking which are rather special. Each has a recognizable beginning and an end is constructed according to the rules known to both the speakers and listeners. For example, it includes a lecture, a sermon, an after-dinner speech, a debate, a job interview etc., such highly structured piece of speech is called speech event.

2.10.6. Presupposition

The term ‘Presupposition’ is introduced by British philosopher, Peter Strawson, around 1950, and in the late 1960s the term was made popular in the field of linguistics. It is basically concerned with the knowledge of the world and the situations in which the speakers are engaged. The term, ‘presupposition’ helps the interlocutors to produce and understand the utterances in a given context because presupposition is the assumption that controls the language when it is used. George Yule (1996:25) observes:

“Presupposition is something the speaker assumes to be prior to making an utterance” or ‘what a speaker assumes to be known by the hearer’ (1985:132).
Interlocutors use any references in communication assuming that the hearers know it and build their messages. Consider the following example to identify the associated information with an utterance.

‘Ann’s brother stopped smoking.’

Here, the speaker is expected to have presupposition that a person called Ann exists and she has a brother who used to smoke. Levinson (1983) considers a presupposition as the relationship between propositions. Presupposition can be maintained even when the original sentence is negated. For example:

A: Dr. Patil’s car is very expensive.

B: Dr. Patil has a car.

In the above sentence, ‘A’ presupposes ‘B’. If we negate the same sentence as follows:

A: Dr. Patil’s car is not very expensive.

B: Dr. Patil has a car.

The relation between ‘A’ and ‘B’ remains the same. This property of presupposition is called ‘constancy under negation’. It shows that whatever we presuppose is sustained whether the original sentence is affirmative or negative.
2.10.7. Implicature

H. P. Grice first introduced the term ‘Implicature’ in the Sir William James lecture series, which he delivered at Harvard University in 1967. According to Grice, the concept of ‘Implicature’ is essentially a theory about how people use language to mean more than what they say. The study of implicature facilitates the study of meaning not only in oral communication but also in the interpretation of any piece of literature including fictional discourse. Grice (1975) defines implicature as a special, non-conventional inference that is intended by the speaker.

Grice introduced the term ‘implicature’ basically to explain how in conversational activity speakers mean more than what they actually say. Obviously, the term ‘implicature’ contrasts with the term ‘entailment’. The meaning derived from the implicature does not involve the meaning, which we try to deduce from ‘What is said’. It is a point, which distinguishes the concept of implicature from ‘entailment’ and ‘presupposition’. The unsaid is conveyed non-conventionally via implicature. It requires the mechanism of interpretation on the part of the hearer. Thus, implicature conveys extra meaning or additional meaning attached to it. Entailment is the logical consequence or conclusion.

For example, ‘Dr. Narendra Dabholkar was assassinated’. It logically leads that he is dead.

Grice wanted to explain the addressee’s and the addressee’s cooperative use of an inference in the linguistic exchange. He argued that an implicature could be predicted after examining the maxims of the cooperative principle and the interpersonal relationship. Gazdar (1979) says
that implicature is a proposition that is implied by the utterance of a sentence in a context even though that proposition is not a part of an entailment of what was actually said.

It is explicit from the above discussion that there is a difference between entailment and implicature. Grice broadly classifies implicature into the following major types:

A] Conventional Implicature

B] Conversational Implicature

C] Generalized Implicature

D] Scalar Implicature

A] Conventional Implicature

In conventional implicature, what is implicated is determined by the conventional use of words. For instance, from the utterance, ‘The Britishers were very courageous’ one may deduce that the Britishers were courageous because they ruled many countries including India. Here, it is interesting to notice that conventional implicatures are very similar to presuppositions. A conventional implicature does not take into account the four maxims of cooperative principle. It is free from the special context for its interpretation.
B] Conversational Implicature

On the other hand, conversational implicature is non-conventional in nature and is based on the shared knowledge of the speaker and hearer. It does take into account the maxims of the cooperative principle i.e. quantity, quality, manner and relation.

For example:

A: Where is Dr. Patil?

B: His BMW car is in front of the Taj Hotel.

In this example, if the speaker ‘A’ shares the information that Dr. Patil has a BMW car, he can make inference that Dr. Patil may be in the Taj Hotel at the time of current conversation.

C] Generalized Implicature

Generalized implicature is exactly opposite of conversational implicature. Here, the meaning is not entirely calculated on the basis of special contextual knowledge but a few linguistic items are considered to convey the additional meaning. According to Grice (1989), an utterance containing indefinite article such as a/an is easily identifiable example of generalized conversational implicature. It visualizes the fact that any linguistic expression that follows indefinite article does not belong to the speaker. George Yule (1996:41) illustrates the generalized implicature in the following example:
I was sitting in a garden one day. A child looked over the fence.

The indefinite article ‘a’ in the above example has been deliberately highlighted in bold letter to prove the fact that both ‘garden’ and ‘child’ do not belong to the speaker. This inference has been made on the ground that if the speaker had been more specific, then he would have said ‘my garden’ or ‘my child’.

**D] Scalar Implicature**

While defining scalar implicature Levinson (1989:133) says:

“a linguistic scale consists of a set of linguistic alternates or contrastive expression of the same grammatical category which can be arranged in a linear way by degree of informativeness or semantic strength”.

In other words, such types of implicature are having the form of order. In conversational act, when a speaker is expected to inform something quantitatively. He has a number of linguistic expressions denoting quantity on the scale of value. He has to pick up a word that expresses one value from the scale of values.

George Yule (1996) has suggested the terms of scale from the highest to the lowest values. Such as: all, most, many, some, few - always, often, sometimes.

When a speaker produces the utterance, ‘I have read some books on linguistics.’ The speaker selects word ‘some’ from the scale, which is most informative and truthful. In this example, when the speaker chooses the value ‘some’ the speaker creates an implicature ‘not all’. The fundamental principle of this implicature is that when one value from the scale is
selected, all values from the scale are negated. As the speaker has selected value ‘some’, it negates rest of the values like all, most and many.

When a speaker produces the utterance, ‘I often play cricket’. The speaker selects one word ‘often’ from the scale and chooses the value ‘often’. The speaker creates an implicature ‘not sometimes’. As the speaker has selected value ‘often’, it negates rest of the values like always and sometimes.

2.10.8. Deixis

The term ‘deixis’, in pragmatics, is basically concerned with pointing via words. It helps to study how the interpretation of utterances depends on the analysis of that context in which the utterances take place. Therefore, the term ‘deixis’ is very important in the field of language study in general and discourse analysis in particular. It has indispensable importance in the analysis of complex and difficult utterances in pragmatics. It is often described as ‘verbal pointing’ i.e. pointing by means of language. These linguistic pointing forms in the pragmatic theory are generally called deictic expressions, deictic markers or deictic words. Deictic expressions are indicated via the following lexical items in grammar of English:

1. Personal or possessive pronouns [I/you/mine/yours],
2. Demonstrative pronouns [this/that],
3. Adverbs [spatial/temporal] [here/there/now],
4. Other pro-forms [so/do],
5. Personal or possessive adjectives [my/you],

6. Demonstrative adjectives [this/that],

7. Articles [the].

When a deictic expression makes a backward reference or pointing, it is called an ‘Anaphoric deixis’. For examples demonstrative pronouns: such, similar, [the] same etc come under this category. But when a deictic expression makes a forward reference or pointing, it is called a ‘Cataphoric deixis’. The examples of this kind include the following, certain, some [“the speaker raised some objections...”], this [“Let me say this...”], these, several etc. When deictic expression makes reference to an object which is near to the speaker, it is called ‘Proximal deixis’ and if the denoted object is away from a speaker, it is called ‘Distal deixis’.

1. Proximal deictic expressions include this, here and now.

2. Distal deictic expressions include that, there and then.

Proximal expressions are generally interpreted in relation to the speakers location or deictic center. For example, ‘now’ is taken to mean some point or period in time that matches the time of the speakers utterance. The deictic expressions are generally classified into three major categories according to their function and behavior in the context and outside the context of the text as follows:
A. Person Deixis

The person deixis are generally used to make a personal reference with the help of personal pronouns such as I, we, you, he, she and they. Usually, English does not use personal deixis to indicate relative social status in the same way that other languages do. For instance, we say ‘He is the principal of our college’ and not ‘They are the principal of our college’.

B. Spatial Deixis

The spatial deixis are divided into two types i.e. ‘proximal’ and ‘distal’. The proximal and distal deictic expressions are confused by deictic projection. This is the speaker’s’ ability to project him/herself into a location at which he/she is not yet present. A familiar example is the use of ‘here’ on telephone answering machines [“I m not here at the moment...”].

It is likely that the basis of spatial deixis is psychological distance rather than physical distance. Usually physical and psychological distance will appear the same. But a speaker may wish to mark something physically close as psychologically distant, as when you indicate an item of food on your plate with “I dont like that”.

C. Temporal Deixis

Psychological distance can apply to temporal deixis as well. We can treat temporal events as things that move towards us [into view] or away from us [out of view]. For instance, we speak of ‘the coming year’ or ‘the approaching year’. This may stem from our perception of things [like weather storms], which we see approaching both spatially and in time. We treat the near or immediate future as being close to utterance time by using
the proximal deictic expression ‘this’ alone, as in ‘this [that is the next] weekend’ or ‘this evening’ [said earlier in the day].

2.11. Relevance Theory

Relevance theory is proposed by Sperber and Wilson (1995) in order to justify that conversational implicature is understood by hearers simply by selecting the relevant features of context and recognizing whatever speakers say as relevant to the conversation. According to the hearers’ sense and their interpretation of the relations of utterances as meaningful, Sperber and Wilson (1995:193) say that the purpose of communication is not to ‘duplicate thoughts’ but to ‘enlarge mutual cognitive environments’. Thus, the theory is a psychological model for perception of the cognitive interpretation of language in general and an inferential approach to pragmatics in particular. It rejects the traditional notion of classical code model in which information is encoded into a message, transmitted and decoded by another party, with another copy of the code. Inferential approaches to pragmatics hold that linguistic meaning of the words decoded by the receiver is just one of many inputs that can affect interpretation.

Wilson and Sperber (1995:252) argue that the thing that causes an input to stand out from others is its relevance to the receiver as follows:

i. Other things being equal, the greater the positive cognitive effects achieved by processing an input, the greater the relevance of the input to the individual at that time
ii. Other things being equal, the greater the processing effort expended, the lower the relevance of the input to the individual at that time.

Thus, we have cognitively speaking a cost/benefit analysis whereby the cost of processing is weighed against the possible positive cognitive benefits, which is summarized by Wilson and Sperber (1995:255) as The Cognitive Principle of Relevance.

“Human cognition tends to be geared towards the maximization of relevance”

This rule helps to make sense of the cognitive relevance of information, but if we were just sucking in every possible input and scanning it for relevance then communication would become quite difficult. Inferential models of communication make the claim that communication contains not only the information that you wish to transmit, but also the information of your intention to inform the audience of your intention.

Relevance theory states that receiving communication is a process of sifting through the available inputs to find the communication of most relevance. However, messages carry information about their own ostensive relevance, which allows the receiver to infer which are the most important, and permits the sender a degree of control over their importance. For evolutionary analyses, one finds the idea that human cognition is geared towards maximizing relevance very useful.
2.12. Pragmatics of Indian English

Pragmatics of Indian English in its literary use in the forms like fiction, poetry, short story and drama involves certain syntactic and lexical choices. Since it is the English being used by the characters who may be unlettered Indians like Meet Singh, Jugga or the Lambardar, Banta Singh in Train to Pakistan, or Dhanno and the South Indian nurses in The Company of Women, their English must reveal their social standing, their lack of education or the lack of sophistication in their English speech. If the Indian characters in the fiction are highly educated like Iqbal in Train to Pakistan and Mohan Kumar, Sarojini, Yasmeen and others in The Company of Women, their English expression would naturally approximate to the SE [Standard English]. The writers of Indian English fiction portray their characters realistically through their use of English. Therefore, Indian writers in English extensively make use of code-mixing and code-switching strategies.

Yamuna Kachru (1992) has to make a point about this when she says that socio-cultural knowledge plays a significant role in the structure of discourse and its interpretations. She cites some texts to show that utterances are interpreted differently in different cultures even if the language remains the same. For example, “Large wedding expenses at all social levels are intended to assure the social welfare of the family’s children and to enhance family’s reputation”. We can see the evidence of it when Mohan Kumar’s father-in-law tries to absorb Mohan Kumar in his own business world, and his mother-in-law would like her daughter to have every kind of luxury at her home.
The SE speaker or reader is puzzled by the large wedding expenses in Indian social culture, where this expenditure is identified with the notion of ‘social welfare’ and ‘social security’ of the bride. However, Mandelbaum (1991) points out that in Indian society members of a family, however, typically feel that no investment deserves higher priority than investment in the social security of their children. Parasher (1994) says significant differences between Indian English and SE [Standard English] can be expected to occur in the areas of lexis and style; because IE is also a product of languages in contact, and it is used for certain specific purposes in the Indian socio-cultural context.

The fiction of the Indian writers in English has a number of special linguistic aspects, which distinguish it from the Standard English. Since, fictional works present a cross-section of the native Indian society and culture; it inevitably forces the creative writer to use vocabulary and syntax, which can aptly convey the aspects of Indian life, character and situation. This is a very important feature of Pragmatics of Indian English. The Indian English, especially in its fictional use, contains deliberate use of certain syntactic structures, address terms, use of honorifics, use of kinship terms, the abuses and curses, and a number of cultural references to birth, marriage, death, funeral rites, rituals, worship, prayers, festivals and culture-bound religious ceremonies. The use of all these in the Indian English Fiction is unavoidable as the writer has to make his fiction realistic and endow it with socio-cultural authenticity. The Indian writers in English, sometimes, make use of a strategy for translating such culture-specific Indian expressions into English. For example, rustic, uneducated Indians in the olden days used to address the government officials as “Government” (P.40) [Sarkar in Hindi],
while “Cherisher of the poor” (P.37) is the translation of the Hindi honorific ‘Garib Nawaz’. Honorific terms are used for addressing the elderly persons to show respect. For example, Mohan Kumar would address his father and his father-in-law as “Pitaji” (P.113) means father. In Hindi, the suffix ‘ji’ is attached to any term of relation or the name of a person: For instance, Sher Singh in I Shall Not Hear Nightingale is addressed as Sardarji, Chote Sahib etc

Similarly, the words of abuse are used in the Indian English fiction either translating them into English or as they are found in Hindi or any other Indian languages. For example, the sub-inspector irritatingly calls his head-constable, “You are an ass of some place.” (P.77), which in Hindi terms of abuse, is ‘Gadhaa Kahinkaa’. When Jugga is told that the robbers threw bangles at his door, he uses the words of abuse, “seducer of his mother” (P.72), which is a translation of Hindi expression of an obscene phrase of abuse, which is not worth mentioning here.

Then, there are typical customs as well as religious rituals and practices, which are expressed using code-mixing or code-switching. When Mohan Kumar’s father expires, his father-in-law asks him, “When should we have Chautha and Uthala?” (P.161) ‘Chautha’ and ‘Uthala’ are typical rituals after the death of a grown man among the Hindus. Similarly, he suggests “book a time at Mata ka Mandir for Keertan” (P.161), which is a Hindu cultural practice of holding a congregation for peace of the soul of the dead. When Mohan Kumar’s little son asks him where ‘Dada’ has gone, Mohan Kumar tells him “He has gone to Vaikunth” (P.160), from where no one comes back. Such cultural references indicated by code-mixed words lend authenticity to the story and to the characters created in it.
In view of the foregoing discussion, it is inevitable in the Indian English Fiction that the writers have to make use of linguistic devices and typical cultural vocabulary items to lend local colour and authenticity to their setting, narration and the characters and the society created by them.

2.13. Conclusion

The chapter has laid down the theoretical framework after thoroughly examining and studying the key principles, concepts and terms in pragmatics. It serves as a solid foundation for the analysis of highly marked speech acts in Khushwant Singh’s selected novels to be studied in the next chapters. The chapter began with a history and development of pragmatics and gave a brief account of the speech act theory proposed by J. L. Austin and J. R. Searle. The relevant principles such as cooperative principle, politeness principle, concept of face, speech situation, speech event, presupposition, implicature, deixis, relevance theory and pragmatics of Indian English have been explained with illustrations from ordinary day to day conversations and the novels under study.