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2.1 Preliminaries

The present chapter provides introduction and background to the research that will begin in the third chapter. This chapter begins with the fundamental notion of ‘Pragmatics’ and its development till date. ‘The Speech Act Theory’ introduced by J.L. Austin and expanded by J.Searle will be discussed in detail. Direct and Indirect Speech Acts will be the major focus. Various conversational principles will be explained. Relevant terms like Sentence and Utterance, Context, Deixis, Implicature, Presuppositions, Turn taking and Adjacency pairs, Cohesion and Coherence etc. will be introduced briefly. Some significant issues related with the present research such as immigration, identity, Diaspora, code mixing and code switching, multiculturalism etc. will be explicated. Thus, an attempt will be made to build a theoretical background to the present research.

2.2 Pragmatics: Its Development

The first Pragmatic approach to Linguistics is evident in the late sixties and early seventies in the works of Ross, Lakoff and others. In the theory of sense and reference which was introduced by Frege in his article ‘Funcktion and Begriff’ (1891) and extended in his work ‘Uber sinn and Bedeutung (1892) the seeds of Pragmatics can be traced.
Charles William Morris (1903), in his writing on the General Theory of signs explains syntactic, semantic and pragmatic relations of linguistics and non-linguistic signs. He asserts that language may be governed by syntactic, semantic and pragmatic rules. Morris attempted to define Pragmatics as,

....the study of the relation of signs to interpreters

(1938:6).

It was Bloomfield who related Linguistics with phonetics, phonemes and moreover morphophonemics. In the later 1950s, Chomsky posed the importance of Syntax in language study. But he too neglected ‘meaning’. In the earlier 1960s, Katz and his collaborators attempted to include meaning in a formal linguistic theory. Lakoff tried to establish a link of Syntax with the study of language use. Though, Linguistics was dominated by American scholars, independent thinkers like Firth, who insisted on the situational study of meaning and Halliday who propounded comprehensive social Theory of language are equally important. Apart from Ross and Lakoff, the more lasting influences on modern Pragmatics owes to Austin (1962), Searle (1969), Grice (1975) and Leech (1983).

Reconsidering Chomsky, it was he who spoke about the importance of semantics in language study. Gradually, his successors were unable to exclude the fact that meaning varies according to its context. Thus, semantics gave way to Pragmatics. J.L. Austin (1911-1960) introduced the Speech Act Theory and Searle expanded it. He proposed conditions for producing felicitous utterance. He categorized the Speech Acts in to five major classes and it was he

According to Leech (1983:04) “Grammar and Pragmatics are complementary domains within linguistics”. Language cannot be understood without studying these domains and the interaction between them. Pragmatics also can be distinguished from other *interdisciplinary* fields of investigation such as neurolinguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics and anthropological linguistics. Each of these fields has its own limitation. They are bound to certain aspects of human life, whereas Pragmatics is concerned with the full complexity of *linguistic behaviour*.

Language cannot be understood thoroughly by ignoring Pragmatics that deals with use of language in communication. Jacob Mey describes the emergence of Pragmatics as,

… a shift from the paradigm of theoretical grammar (in particular syntax) to the paradigm of the language user. (2001:04)

Unlike structuralism, the main focus of Pragmatics is the process of *language production and its producers not in the end product language*. The seeds of the definition of Pragmatics can be found in Chomsky’s famous terms, ‘performance’ that is the way the utterer uses language and ‘competence’ that is related with the utterer’s knowledge of the language and its rules. Grammar and Pragmatics can be well distinguished in the words of Katz, who says,
Grammars are theories about the structure of sentence
types … Pragmatic theories in contrast … Explicate
the reasoning of speakers and hearers. (1977: 19)

Levinson stresses on the importance of context and considers
Pragmatics as,
… the study of those relations between language and
context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the
structure of a language. (1983:09)

Context is essential to reach to the exact meaning of the utterance.
Pragmatics operates when the utterance imply something more or
different than what is said. Considering all the various views stated
above, Mey defines Pragmatics in these words:

Pragmatics studies the use of language in human
communication as determined by the conditions of
society. (2001:06)

Regarding the importance of Pragmatics, Mey asserts,

Pragmatics is needed if we want a fuller, deeper and
generally more reasonable account of human language
behaviour. (2001:12)

‘Context’ plays a vital role in determining the illocutionary force of
the utterance. Context is the most important pragmatic concept.
Pragmatics explains how the interpretation varies in different
contexts. Any utterance is meaningless if not placed in its human
context. As per the opinion of Bilmes, the context is the social
setting in which the Speech event takes place. Thus, the chief task of
Pragmatics is to explain the illocutionary force of certain utterance and its consequence in the given situation of context. Studying only the structure of language would be incomplete without the consideration of language used by human beings in a particular context. It is worth noting that language is important because it is applied by interlocutors as a means of communication. There may be varieties of utterance with varieties of interpretations which can be understood only with the help of Pragmatics. The dictionary meaning of Pragmatics is – the study of the way in which language is used to express what somebody really means in particular situations, especially when the actual words used may appear to mean something different (Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary: 2005:1182 ). Hence, a real base of Pragmatics is practical and not theoretical.

To sum up, we might say that Pragmatics is the investigation of invisible meaning. Pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said (Yule: 1996).

2.3 Speech Acts

Along with our physical and mental activities we also perform ‘linguistic activities’, such as, asking, stating, requesting, ordering, promising etc. These linguistic activities are ‘Speech Acts’.

Prior to Austin (1911-1960) language was considered simply as a combination of ‘sound and meaning’ or ‘set of correct sentences’. Language was studied through the glass of a scientist and not of a humanist. The structural or formal point of view was the focal point
in language study. The basic purpose of language, that it is used for communication was somehow ignored. A linguistic act is included in each and every linguistic communication. It was J.L. Austin who diverted the approach of philosophers towards language from the structural point of view to the functional viewpoint. He asserted that language is used for performing Actions. Austin (1962) defined Speech Acts as, “the act of uttering a certain sentence in a given context for determined purpose, i.e. an act of communication.” Some other definitions of Speech Acts are: …

Speaking a language is performing speech acts, as making statements giving commands, asking questions, making promises and so on…

(Searle 1969:16)

Speech acts are actions performed via utterances.

(Yule G. 1996:47)

Utterances are speech acts. (Thorat A. 2002:25)

A sentence is studied by grammarians from grammatical point of view. The rules of Syntax and Semantics can be studied on the basis of a sentence. For grammarians the structure of sentence is more important than its function. Any example can be cited to explain a certain type of sentence by grammarians. To explain the SVO (subject, verb, and object) structure of declarative sentence in general the following example may be cited,

I write a thesis.

S+V+O

Though, the above sentence satisfies the essential rules of assertive sentence, yet practically, it bears little communicative value. In day to day life, we do not utter any sentence simply to follow the
grammatical rules but we mean something while uttering it. A sentence is ‘context free’, whereas an utterance is ‘context bound’. Without the knowledge of context one cannot identify what the utterance mean. An utterance is used for communicative purpose. An utterance is not the exposition of grammatical rules but it is the exposition of intended meaning. The degree of intended meaning varies in different context or situations. Therefore, in the words of Nozar Niazi,

… an utterance is a unit of communication whose significance or value is established by its contextual situation… (2004:13)

Thus, an utterance, “Its three o’clock.” will have different value and significance depending upon speaker, hearer and situation. If the utterer is a friend, it will cause an immediate reaction of the other friends who have planned to go for watching afternoon movie. If the utterer is an invigilator, the students appearing in the exam will be alerted of time to hear the same utterance.

Context plays vital role in understanding Speech Acts. The relationship between form and function of any utterance is arbitrary. Formal utterances like declaratives, imperatives, and interrogatives can be explained functionally as making statements, ordering, requesting, asking questions etc. However interrogatives can be used for requesting or suggesting for e.g. “Will you help me?” is not a question but a request. Thus, form and function do not always comply with each other. A sentence has to follow grammatical structure, whereas an utterance may or may not follow the same. An utterance may be without subject, for example, “Want a pen?” or it
may contain incomplete sentence. The force or function of what is said is important in an utterance. The ‘propositional content’ of different types of sentences may be same but its function may be different. For example,

1. Please listen carefully.
2. Will you listen carefully?
3. I order you to listen carefully
4. If I were you, I would listen carefully.

The above sentences have the same reference (You) and predication that is ‘listen carefully’ but they differ in their function or force such as making a request, asking a question, giving an order, making a suggestion respectively. Thus, it is force or function of any expression which distinguishes utterance and sentence from each other.

Speech Acts are both culture specific and universal that is some Speech Acts differ in their expression in different cultures. However, some are commonly expressed in the same way. The Speech Act of Blessing, greeting, thanking, complimenting etc. are culture specific, whereas making statements, asking questions and giving orders are universal. Any study of language is complete only if it takes into consideration its actual use in communication. Theoretical and practical studies of language are the two sides of the same coin (language).
2.4 Austin’s Contribution to Speech Act Theory

Right from ancient philosophers such as Plato, St. Augustine till modern philosophers, such as, Russel, Wittgenstein, Carnap Ryle, Quine, Strawson an attempt was being made to link logic with language. It was their strict dogmatic notion that language is a matter of logic i.e. only that language is correct which uses logic. The other uses of language were considered metaphysical, emotional or simply bad. Thus, logic was considered most essential to language. On the other hand, J.L. Austin the ‘father of the Speech Act Theory’ lays emphasis on the study of the way the people use language for communication. J. L.Austin’s ‘William James lectures’, delivered at Harvard in 1955, were posthumously published under the title *How to Do Things with Words* (1962). It is the study of the way people use language for communication. The central focus of the study is language user’s linguistic knowledge of the world. In the words of J. Lyons,

It is a theory of saying as doing within the frame work of social institutions and conversations. (1981:175)

The grammarians and philosophers insisted that ‘a statement (of fact) ought to be verifiable’. As a consequence, many statements were considered pseudo-statements. Obviously as KANT first argued many grammatically well written statements were shown to be strictly nonsense, and the discovery of such types of sentences went on. Austin observed that some verbs merely describe facts or situations. They were used to produce true or false ‘statements’ about certain situations. Austin called such stating (describing) verbs as ‘constatives’. The institutionalised Speech Act verbs such as ‘to
baptize’, ‘to sentence’, ‘to dub’ etc. seem to perform some act rather than merely describing facts or producing true or false statements. Austin called ‘performatives’ to such types of verbs. In the philosophy of language it was indeed a novel idea to consider the issuance of the utterance as the performance of an action. It became clear that uttering is not merely saying something but performing something (action). We do something with words when we utter them. Some other kinds that Austin suggests for performatives are such as contractual (‘I bet’), declaratory (‘I declare’) or operative (used by lawyers). After explaining the notion, that is, to say something is to do something, Austin suggested some conditions to consider performance to be ‘felicitous’ (successful). He called these conditions as felicity conditions. They are:

1. ‘There must exist an accepted conventional procedure having a certain conventional effect …’(P:26)
2. The procedure must be executed by all participants both i) correctly and ii) completely (P:15)
3. Having certain thoughts or feelings or intentions (P: 15)

According to Austin utterances which fulfil felicity conditions are called felicitous and those which do not fulfil those conditions are called infelicitous (or unhappy). Austin says that if the feelings, thoughts and intentions do not conform to the utterance (performative) or no accepted procedure followed, or the procedure was falsely or incompletely executed then such type of utterance should not be defined as performative utterance. For example, praising or sympathizing with others only superficially and not whole heartedly or saying something exactly opposite to what one does not believe or think, like to flatter somebody and even the...
utterance of promising, betting or declaring something, when one does not intend to do so. For instance, If A and B are friends and A tells B, “Pay the fine of 100 Rs. for not attending the class” then this utterance will not be considered felicitous as A is not the teacher or authorised person. In this case first condition will not be fulfilled. Similarly, if A is the authorized speaker but B is not his student then again it will be infelicitous as the act will not fulfil the second condition (due to only one sided communication). In the same manner if a thief tells a man, “If you give me your money, I will count it for you”, obviously his intention behind this utterance is not sincere and his only purpose is to steal the money. The act will be infelicitous as it violets the third condition.

Austin further discusses ‘three of the many ways in which a statement implies the truth of certain other statements’. These three ways are:-

Austin attempts to distinguish between performative and connotative utterance. While doing so he thinks about ‘some grammatical (or lexicographical) criterion for distinguishing the performative utterance’. Austin’s examples of performatives are those of verbs in the first person singular, active such as, ‘I name,’ ‘I do’, ‘I bet’, ‘I give’ etc. He calls these examples as the commonest explicit performative. However he himself is quite aware that the verb is also used in the second or third person and even in the passive voice. For example:

1 You are hereby authorized to pay.
2 Passengers are warned to cross the track by the bridge only.
Austin gradually arrives at the solution that, ‘person or voice is not essential’. The word ‘hereby’ is the tool affecting the act of warning, authorizing etc. According to him ‘hereby’ is a useful criterion to decide the utterance performative. However, not all the performatives apply person or voice. Instead of saying, ‘I order you to stand up’, a speaker simply says ‘stand up’. Austin realized that even a single word utterance like guilty or out also are ‘performatives.’ Thus Austin points out that:

1. We may get the performative without the operative words thus;
   i) In place of ‘dangerous corner’, we may have ‘corner…’
   ii) In place of ‘you are order to…’ We may have you will, and in place of
   iii) ‘I promise to …’ we may have ‘I shall’. (1962: 59)

2. Similarly, Austin also states that we may get the operative word without the utterance being performative for e.g. ‘It was over’ or ‘You were guilty’ etc.

Austin reminds us the history of utterance and says that the primary utterance developed the explicit performatives. For e.g. ‘I will …’ is earlier than ‘I promise that I will….’ Thus, Austin was convinced that all constatives were in fact primary or implicit performatives. He arrived at the conclusion that constatives and performatives cannot be distinguished or separated and all utterances are actions (Performatives).
Concerning ‘mood’, Austin says that the utterance ‘shut it’ may vary in many contexts. It may be an order, an advise, permission etc. Tone of voice, cadence, and emphasis also may affect the utterance. Adverbs or adverbial phrases like, probably or ‘without fail’ may change the ‘force’ of the utterance. Similarly the ‘force’ may vary by using connecting particles such as still, that, therefore, whereas etc.

The accompaniment of gesture to the utterance obviously plays an important role. The circumstances of utterance also determine the force of utterance. Austin then distinguishes utterances between performative half descriptive and merely reports, such as ‘I thank’ ‘I am grateful’ and ‘I feel’ respectively. Austin calls the performative utterance connected with feelings and attitudes as ‘BEHABITIVES’ that is ‘a kind of performative concerned roughly with reactions to behaviour and with behaviour towards others and designed to exhibit attitudes and feelings’. Similarly, he classifies utterances into ii) expositives such as ‘I predict’ or ‘I endorse’ etc. iii) Verdictives, such as ‘I pronounce that …’, ‘I hold that …’etc. iv) exercitives, such as ‘I pronounce …’ v) commissives such as, ‘I hereby bequeath…’

According to Austin saying anything consists of:

1. Performing the act of uttering certain noises (a phonetic act) and the utterance is a phone.
2. Performing the act of uttering certain vocables or words, that is, noises of certain types belonging to a certain vocabulary in a certain construction, conforming to a
certain grammar, with a certain intonation. He calls it a ‘phatic’ act, and the utterance as a ‘pheme’.

3. Performing the act of using that pheme or its constituents with a certain more or less definite ‘sense’ and ‘reference’ (which both equal to ‘meaning’). He calls this act as a ‘rhetic’ act and the utterance as a ‘rheme’.

The final amalgamation of constatives and performatives and the above mentioned description of utterance, led Austin to divide the act of utterance into three phases, such as i) a locutionary ii) an illocutionary and iii) a perlocutionary act.

Austin explains that we use Speech to perform a locutionary act. Performance of an act in saying something normally produces certain effects upon the feelings, thoughts or actions of the audience, or of the speaker or of the other persons and it may be done with the design, intention or purpose of producing them. To such type of act, Austin calls perlocutionary act. For e.g. ‘Show me your ticket’ is simply a locutionary act wherein mere words are uttered. ‘He ordered me to show my ticket’ is an illocutionary act and, ‘He made me or got me to show my ticket’ is a perlocutionary act. These three levels according to Austin are necessary to perform ‘acts’. As explained previously, Austin divided the locutionary act into three sub acts; the phonetic act, the phatic act and the rhetic act. A speaker while performing the locutionary act also performs the illocutionary act such as asking, giving information, warning, announcing etc. The illocutionary act emphasizes on the way and ‘sense’ in which we use language. Regarding ‘the use of language’,
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i. Austin differentiates between using language for ‘arguing’ or ‘warning’ and ‘for rousing and alarming’. The former use of language is conventional, whereas the latter is non-conventional.

ii. The use of language, for example for joking has nothing to do with illocutionary act.

iii. We use language for relieving our feelings (for e.g. swearing). Therefore, an illocutionary act is a conventional act.

iv. Austin distinguishes between the act of attempting to perform a certain illocutionary act and the act of achieving such an act.

v. He clarifies the distinction between producing effects or consequences either intended or unintended such as attempt and achievement.

vi. Austin remarks that the consequence of utterance may be produced unintentionally or by mistake.

vii. Speaking about the three acts Austin says that both locutionary and illocutionary acts are conventional and the perlocutionary act always includes some consequences.

Austin further distinguishes between illocutionary act and perlocutionary act as follows.

Illocutionary acts are bound with securing uptake, taking effect and inviting a response. By saying we also perform illocutionary acts such as informing, ordering, warning, undertaking etc. that is, the utterances which have a certain force. We also perform perlocutionary acts; what we bring about or achieve by saying
something such as convincing, persuading, deterring, surprising or misleading etc. Illocutionary acts are conventional, whereas perlocutionary acts are non-conventional. Regarding constatives and performatives, Austin asserts that with the constatives utterance, the focus is on the locutionary act, whereas with the performative utterance, the central point is the illocutionary force of the utterance.

Austin reconsiders the classification of illocutionary force which he left incomplete in the preceding chapter. He classifies Speech Acts into five categories;

i. Verdictives

ii. Exercitives

iii. Commissives

iv. Behabitives

v. Expositives

The Verdictives are characterized by giving of a verdict, say by a jury, arbitrator or umpire for e.g. an umpires calling ‘out’. The exercitives are the exercising of powers, rights or influence for e.g. appointing, voting, ordering, advising etc. Commissives deal with committing to doing something for e.g. promising. The Behabitives are a very miscellaneous group related with attitudes and social behaviour for e.g. apologizing, congratulating, commending, challenging etc.

Expositives are related with the expression of view, arguments, references etc. for e.g. ‘I reply’, ‘I argue’, ‘I assume’ etc. However, Austin’s classification of Speech Acts according to their illocutionary force is not clear-cut. They are overlapping.
Verdictives may have the dimension of exercitives as declaring the accused guilty and also show the exercising of the power or authority of the judge. Exercitives like declaring war also commit the speaker to future responsibility. Regarding Behabitives ‘to approve’ may be an exercise of authority or a reaction to behaviour. Expositives such as swearing, accepting, agreeing also may be cited as examples of commissives.

### 2.5 Searle’s Contribution

Searle, being Austin’s follower, too emphasizes that ‘speaking a language is performing Speech Acts’. According to him,

> Speaking a language is engaging in a rule governed form of behaviour (Searle 1969:16)

Searle introduces the principle of expressibility, that is the principle that whatever can be meant can be said. Asking and responding correspond to each other generally. However, the principle of expressibility does not imply the possibility of finding or inventing the exact form of expression to produce the intended effect/s in hearer/s. This principle does not imply that whatever can be said will be always understood or recognized by others. Speech Act, the basic unit of communication, includes the connection between the notions of Speech Acts, what the speaker means, what the uttered sentence means, what the speaker intends, what the hearer understands and what the rules governing the linguistic elements are.

According to Searle a speaker performs minimum three kinds of acts;
a. Uttering words (morphemes, sentences) = performing utterance act.
b. Referring and predicating = performing propositional acts
c. Stating, questioning, commanding, promising etc. = performing illocutionary acts.

Along with these acts Searle adds Austin’s notion of perlocutionary act that is,

“…the notion of the consequences or effects such acts have on the actions, thoughts or beliefs etc. of hearers”. (Searle 1969: 25)

Searle made a distinction between two major types of rules to which he calls constitutive and regulative rules. Regulative rules, according to Searle, regulate a pre-existing activity, whereas constitutive rules constitute (and also regulate) an ‘activity’ which exists due to these rules, for e.g. the activity of playing football is constituted by acting in accordance with these (constitutive) rules. Football and the rules of playing football cannot be separated. Regulative rules can be ‘paraphrased’ as imperatives, having the form of ‘Do x’ or ‘If Y do X’. Along with this form the constitutive rule also has the form ‘X counts as Y’. For e.g. in the case of ‘chess’ game, constitutive rules constitute or make up the game of chess that is the existence of game becomes impossible without these constitutive rules. “Regulative rules, by contrast regulate the behaviour of the players in the game” (Mey 2001: 102). Any changes in regulative rule do not change the nature of the game it self. ‘Chess’ can be played as per the constitutive rules; however the way the game is played by each player differs than each other. This handling of the game is dealt
with regulative rules. Similarly, regarding Speech Acts, if the example of promise is taken, the constitutive rules deal with the definition of ‘promise’ that is in the words of Searle, “promise is uttered and accepted as creating an obligation from the promiser to promisee,” whereas regulative rules deal with ‘how are promises dealt with in an actual social context’ (Mey 2001:102). Promises should not be repeated and made about those things or events that are surely going to take place in the future. These are regulative rules that regulate the behaviour of promiser and promisee.

After establishing the distinction between constitutive and regulative rules, Searle proposes four major conditions for producing any felicitous utterance. These conditions are, i) propositional content ii) preparatory iii) sincerity and iv) essential conditions.

To explain the propositional content condition, Searle takes the act of promising as an example and states that promise should be uttered only in the context of a sentence. The content of the utterance must predicate some future act of the speaker.

Preparatory conditions include background circumstances and knowledge of speaker and hearer prior to the performance of actual act (say promising). The hearer should get benefit out of the speaker’s act of promising and both speaker and hearer should believe it be so. If the speaker says “I promise, you won’t see tomorrow’s sunrise,” then such type of utterance cannot be considered as a promise, but on the other hand it is considered ‘a threat’. In short, the promise should be to the interest of the promisee. Similarly, the promise will be considered invalid if the
promiser is going to do the proposed act anyhow or if it is already scheduled, self justifying or natural happening.

Sincerity condition deals with speaker’s belief, that it is possible for him to do the act. While promising, the intention of the speaker should be committed towards fulfilling it (promise). Regarding essential condition, promising is the undertaking of an obligation to perform a certain act. The promiser should consider his responsibility to keep his word in future.

Thus, Searle has successfully attempted to capture various dimensions of what is said that is, Speech Act in general and the act of promising in particular. Regarding these conditions, Searle goes beyond the example of the act of promising and discusses the above conditions applied in giving an order, requesting, asking questions, thanking, advising and warning.

Searle points out that the sincerity condition is an expression of the psychological state of the speaker. Similarly, the preparatory condition tells us what the speaker implies in the performance of the act. An utterance in a context can satisfy an essential condition without the use of the explicit illocutionary force- indicating device. Thus a request can be made in the form of interrogative illocutionary force indicating devices for e.g. “Could you help me?” Further it is remarkable, what ever can be meant can be said and what ever can be implied can be said. Searle realized that certain conditions overlap which shows that certain kinds of illocutionary acts are really special cases of other kinds; thus asking questions is really a special case of requesting something for e.g. “Tell me the definition
of democracy.” or “what is the definition of democracy?,” are equivalent though the former is a request and the latter is a question. It also explains to some extent, how and why the verb ‘ask’ is used both as requests and questions. Finally, Searle concluded that, “…there are several different dimensions of illocutionary force, and because the same Utterance act may be performed with a variety of different intentions, it is important to realize that one and the same utterance may constitute the performance of several different illocutionary acts”.

(1969:70)

Searle, therefore, considers illocutionary point as the basic criterion in his classification of Speech Acts. The five classes of Speech Acts suggested by Searle are:

1. Assertives: In assertives the speaker presents the world as he believes it is. Assertives have truth value that conforms to the speaker’s belief for e.g.
   i) The earth is round.
   ii) The thief was a strong man with beard.

2. Expressives express the psychological state of speaker in statements of pleasure or pain. Expressives are praising, blaming, thanking, apologizing, congratulating, forgiving etc. For e.g.
   i) I am sorry.
   ii) Wow! That’s great!

In the use of expressives the speaker makes words fit the world.

3. Directives direct the hearer to do some thing. They are closer to the perlocutionary Acts for e.g. commanding, ordering, requesting, suggesting etc. for e.g.
i) Please help me.
ii) Don’t behave foolishly.

In using a directive, the speaker attempts to make the world fit the words.

4. Commissives are speaker centred. They commit the speaker to some future course of Action. Acts, such as, promise, pledge, refusal and threat are commissives for e.g.
   i) I will complete this work within a week.
   ii) I will not repeat the mistake.

In using commissives, the speaker undertakes to make the world fit the words.

5. Declaratives change the world via their utterances these are the institutional Acts to which Austin called performatives for e.g.
   i) I pronounce you husband and wife
   ii) I appoint you as a manager.

In using a declaration the speaker changes the world via words. Although the above classification is based on ‘features of meaning’ some of these are close to ‘moods’ such as imperatives or indicatives.

2.6 Direct and Indirect Speech Acts

Speech Acts can also be distinguished on the basis of structure. The three major forms of Speech Acts and their functions in English are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Declarative</td>
<td>assertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Imperative</td>
<td>order/ request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interrogative</td>
<td>question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning the above pattern, if I say,
1. I feel tired. (Declarative used as an assertion)
2. Give me something to eat. (Imperative used to give an order)
3. What are you doing? (Interrogative used to ask a question).

then the form of the above examples does match with their function respectively. When the form and function match, it is called as a Direct Speech Act. Direct Speech Acts, thus, have only one function which corresponds to its form or structure. Direct Speech Act is a plain, ordinary way of saying things as it is. In the words of Yule G.,

a) Whenever there is a direct relationship between a structure and a function, we have a direct speech act (1996: 54-55).

b) Whenever there is an indirect relationship between a structure and function, we have an indirect speech act. (1996:55)

For instance, if the speaker asks, ‘Will you show me the way to the bus stop?’ he does not merely expect the answer yes or no but he is requesting the hearer to show the way to the bus stop. Instead of using declarative form, ‘Show me the bus stop ’, the speaker prefers interrogative form to make his request rather polite and to achieve the expected effect on hearer for obtaining his help. In the words of Peter Grundy,

When form and function do not match we call the effect an indirect act (1995:95).

If a son asks his father, “Shall we buy a bicycle for me today?” and father responds “You are too short to ride it.” Then the question and answer superficially do not correspond to each other. Yet the son understands that the response of his father is, in fact, a rejection of
the proposal of buying a bicycle for him. In the above pair of question – answer, the son is directly asking whether they would buy a bicycle for him or not and indirectly requesting his father to buy the bicycle. However, the father’s response is thoroughly indirect. Instead of saying, “we shall not buy a bicycle for you” he tells him the reason behind not buying the bicycle. The face value of the father’s response is rather deeper. He is trying to communicate more than what he is saying superficially. As the son knows that due to his height his father does not want to buy it, he easily recognizes the rejection. Thus, we may conclude that the father’s intention in mentioning ‘the reason is to reject his son’s proposal. (based on Searle’s ten steps of reasoning: 1975: 63).

Levinson, in this connection, remarks that of ‘most usages (of requests) are indirect’ (1983:264). He also points out that ‘imperatives are rarely used to command or request (275). Indirect Speech Act performs more than one function in the same utterance. Sometimes the speaker says what he does not mean and means what he does not say. Generally, we wish ‘Good morning’ to the person we meet for the first time in the day or in the morning. Good morning refers to a cheerful expression. However, in the following example, the function of the same greeting is exactly opposite. In the humorous essay, ‘My Financial Career’ by Stephen Leacock, when the bank manager comes to know that the author is neither a detective nor a rich man but he just wants to open a bank account and deposit only fifty six dollars for what he has met him (the manager) personally, he could not stand it and tells his accountant like this, ‘Mr. Montgomery’, he said unkindly loud ‘this gentle man is opening an account. He will deposit fifty six dollars. Good
morning.’ (this to the author). Here, the manager does not intend to express his good wishes cheerfully but indirectly, rather politely, suggests the author to get out of the private room. This indirect hint is understood properly by the author and he goes out of the private room. The other examples of the speaker saying one thing and intending another are, rhetorical questions, circumlocutions, euphemisms, ironical statements, sarcastic remarks, metonymic expressions, exaggerations, understatements etc.

To sump up, it is interesting to analyze Indirect Speech Acts to identify the hidden meaning behind the superficial utterance. For analyzing Indirect Speech Acts successfully, linguistic, contextual and cultural background should be common. In the words of Thorat A., “…without these shared beliefs, experience, and institutions, communication would not be effective” (2002: 30).

2.7 Principles of Conversation

Leech precisely distinguishes between rules and principles. According to him semantics is rule governed and general Pragmatics is principle – controlled. He relates rules to grammatical category, whereas principles to rhetorical form. He associates the rules of grammar with Searle’s notion of ‘constitutive rules’ and principles of Pragmatics with his concept of regulative rules. In short, rules are theoretical and principles are practical. This distinction is similar to the difference between language and language use.

The chief purpose of using language is to communicate one’s feelings, views, attitudes, information etc. Communication is the
base of all linguistic transaction. This is what Jacob Mey calls ‘the communicative principle’. People need to communicate with each other. “No matter how one may try, one cannot not communicate.” (Watzlawick: 1967:49)

It is, however, the speaker who decides how much is to be communicated and in what way the communication should take place. In Gazdar’s opinion, we can talk about a ‘strength’ scale of expressions ranging from stronger to weaker for e.g. all, most, many, some, few, none etc. Speaker selects any one of these expressions according to the context of what is being communicated. Communicative principle is based on the cooperative principle, particularly on the maxim of quantity using which we provide ‘the’ suitable amount of information’. Without cooperation, communication cannot take place successfully.

H.P. Grice, the late British/ American philosopher was the originator of cooperative principle (1975, 1989). He expects interlocutors to be cooperative in their communication in the following manner:

Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. (1975:47).

Grice calls this general principle as ‘the cooperative principle and classifies it under four sub principles or maxims’.

1. **Quantity**
   i) Make your contribution as informative as required.
ii) Do not make your contribution more informative than required.

2. **Quality**
   i) Do not say what you believe to be false;
   ii) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

3. **Relation**
   Make your contribution relevant.

4. **Manner**
   Be perspicuous and
   i) avoid obscurity,
   ii) avoid ambiguity,
   iii) be brief,
   iv) be orderly.

The maxims suggested by Grice are ideal and to some extent formal. However, it is not always possible to follow all these maxims and be cooperative in interaction. Had it been so, the conversation would be static, formal and straightforward. In fact due to the ‘flouting’ of the above stated maxims, language appears interesting. However, deep down, the interlocutors try to follow these maxims as far as possible. Sometimes on the other hand, they may be unwillingly flouting to these maxims for e.g. if a friend (A) asks his friend, (B) ‘Shall we have a cup of tea?’ and the latter answers, “Oh! I just drank it,” can we say that the answer is relevant or clear? Superficially, we cannot say so. However, if thought deeply B’s answer can be easily understood by A that B does not want to accompany A because he already had it(a cup of tea). B avoids refusing directly and to avoid rudeness or impolite behaviour, flouts the maxim of quantity, quality, relevance and even manner. He expects the listener to identify his denial implicitly, that if he just had a cup of tea, then
obviously he does not want it again. However the procedure of understanding response takes place quickly and in no time. In the above example we find that the interlocutor has to flout the cooperative principle in order to be polite with his friend.

As per the opinion of Leech the general Pragmatics is the general condition of the communicative use of language. Leech also proposes two further systems; i) Pragmalinguistics in which we consider the particular resources which a given language provides for conveying particular illocutions, ii) Socio Pragmatics, which studies the more specific local conditions on language use (Leech 1983: 11).

Historically rhetoric has been understood as the art of using language skilfully for persuasion, or for literary expression, or for public speaking. For Leech, rhetoric is the effective use of language in its most general sense applying it primarily to everyday conversation and secondarily to more prepared and public uses of language. The speaker uses language in order to produce a particular effect in the mind of hearer.

According to Leech the two systems of rhetoric are: 1. Textual rhetoric and 2. Interpersonal rhetoric.

Textual rhetoric consists of the possibility principle, the clarity principle, the economy principle and the expressivity principle. Interpersonal rhetoric consists of the cooperative principle, politeness principle and irony principle.
The Politeness Principle consists of six maxims;
1. **Tact maxim** (in impositives and commissives)
   a. Minimize cost to other
   b. Maximize benefit to other.
2. **Generosity Maxim** (in impositives and commissives)
   a. Minimize benefit to self
   b. Maximise cost to self
3. **Approbation maxims** (in expressives and assertives)
   a. Minimize dispraise of other
   b. Maximize praise of other
4. **Modesty maxim** (in expressives and assertives)
   a. Minimize praise of self
   b. Maximize dispraise of self
5. **Agreement Maxim** (asserting)
   a. Minimize disagreement between self and other
   b. Maximize agreement between self and other.
6. **Sympathy Maxims** (in assertives)
   a. Minimize antipathy between self and other

Speaking at the wrong time or being silent at the wrong time is considered impolite. Along with informative, expressive, directive functions of language social or phatic function is also equally important. Leech suggests the necessity of adding one more maxim that is the metalinguistic ‘phatic maxim’. Grice and his followers argued that conversational rules are motivated by rational principles.

Sperber and Wilson (1986) replaced Grice’s Cooperative principle and maxims by a single Principle of Relevance, whereas, Brown and Levinson based their rationalism on Erving Goffman’s (1967) notion of ‘face’. They propose politeness principle which is motivated by the desire to save face. Face means the public self image of a person. Politeness is employed to show awareness of another person’s face. People generally expect that their public self image should be respected. This expectation is termed as their face wants. A person has two types of faces – public and private. There are both positive and negative faces. Sympathizing, praising satisfies the hearer’s positive face, whereas commanding, criticizing etc. threaten the negative face of the hearer.

In the words of Yule, negative face is the need to be independent and the positive face is the need to be connected. Lakoff (1974), a sociolinguist, proposes three principles of politeness, they are:

1. don’t impose
2. make the addressee feel comfortable and
3. give options

The hearer should not be imposed and given option to accept or reject the offer of the speaker. The second principle deals with pleasure principle. According to Thorat A.,

‘…politeness is a context specific and a communicator –dependent phenomenon’. (2002:19)

In the Indian context a student may greet his classmate by his first name such as ‘Hi Raju!’ But while greeting to his teacher he must use the ‘polite’ form such as ‘Good morning, Sir/Madam’.
Irony principle is an Indirect Speech Act which is the verbal attack in apparently polite language. Leech has stated the irony principle in following words:

If you must cause offence, at least do so in a way, which doesn’t overtly conflict with the politeness principle but allows the hearer to arrive at the offensive point of your remark indirectly by way of implicature. (Leech: 1983:82).

In being polite, one exploits the PP in order to uphold the CP. A person who is being ironic actually deceives or misleads hearer, in an honest form of apparent deception, at the expense of politeness for e.g.
A: I was absent yesterday.
B: Oh, so nice of you! That’s what can be expected of you!

2.8 Significant Relevant Terms

The present section is aimed at explaining the fundamental terms and ideas. These terms are relevant and essential for analyzing the Indirect Speech Acts and their significance in the novel under consideration. The chief terms discussed in this section are:
1. Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics
2. Discourse and Conversation Analysis
3. Context
4. Sentences and utterances
5. Speech Events
6. Cohesion and Coherence
7. Deixis
2.8.1 Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics

Syntax is the study of the sentence structure. Various components in the sentence are studied in Syntax. In the words of Yule,

   Syntax is the study of the relationships between Linguistic forms, how they are arranged in sequence, and which sequences are well formed. (1996:4)

The structure of the sentence is the whole concern of syntax. It neither pays attention to its reference nor its user. Meaning is the core of Semantics. Palmer defines semantics as,

   Semantics is the technical term used to refer to the study of meaning, and since meaning is a part of language, semantics is a part of Linguistics. (1986:1)

Semantics deals with the literal connection of words with things. Meaning is dynamic. It depends upon context, interactional situations, speaker’s relations, their background, personal factors of both the speaker and the hearer. It is this fact that gave rise to Pragmatics. Both Syntax and Semantics deal with the logical aspect
of language, whereas Pragmatics deals with the user of language. Yule says,

Pragmatics is the study of the relationship between linguistic forms and the user of those forms. (1996:4)

Thus, it is seen that Syntax and Semantics relate with theoretical framework whereas Pragmatics deals with practical use of language.

2.8.2 Discourse and Conversation analysis

The dictionary meaning of discourse is,

1. A long and serious treatment or discussion of a subject in Speech or writing or
2. The use of language in Speech and writing in order to produce meaning; language that is studied, usually in order to see how the different parts of a text are connected. (Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary: P: 434). Whereas discourse deals with formal speech or writing, conversation deals with informal talk. In the same dictionary conversation means, an informal talk involving a small group of people or only two; the activity of talking in this way. (P: 335)

Thus, the conversation is smaller and informal whereas discourse is longer and formal spoken language. Conversation deals with only talk but discourse deals with both spoken and written language. Conversational discourse is one of the types of discourse. In the words of Thorat A. (2002: 2)

It could also mean any continuous composition of the sentences which shows different levels of anchorage.
The aim of the present research is to analyze the selected conversational pieces in the light of Indirect Speech Acts.

2.8.3. Context

In any type of conversation, context, involves place and time, background knowledge of the world of hearer and speaker, their interpersonal relationship and shared experience. Context is,

the physical environment in which a word is used.

(G. Yule 1996: 128)

Speaker expresses his intention in various manners. If hearer understands speaker’s intention behind his utterance and reacts accordingly, only then communication can be successful, for e.g. the following utterance will have different interpretation in different contexts,

“What is your name?”

if the speaker is a policeman and asking the name of a criminal, if the speaker is a teacher and asking the name of a small newly admitted child, if the speaker is a boy asking the name of a girl. The inference of the above utterance varies as per the place, time and speaker–hearer relationship.
2.8.4.  Sentences and Utterances

A sentence is governed by grammatical rules. It has a specific structure according to its types. It can be split into various parts. The following sentence for example can be divided in various manners.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Sita has a golden chain.} \\
S \quad \text{Predicate} \\
\text{Sita has a golden chain.} \\
\text{s. h.v. article adjective noun.}
\end{array}
\]

‘A sentence is context free.’ (Niazi N 2004:P12) Even though the above sentence is grammatically well written, it does not convey any meaning due to the lack of context. Such as who is Sita? What is her relationship with the writer? Why does she have a golden chain? etc.

An utterance, on the other hand, is a speech act which performs action via uttering words. It is always context bound and hence sensible. The speaker uses grammatical rules flexibly, as per his / her intension. An utterance is produced for communicative purpose. Nozar Niazi says that:

\[
\text{…an utterance is a unit of communication whose significance or value is established by its contextual situation.} \quad (2004:13)
\]

For example, a question like, ‘Did you take Rs. 500 from my pocket yesterday?’ will convey different meanings as per the context, such as, if the utterer is a father asking his wife or if the utterer is a mother and asking her child or if the utterer is a lady asking to her
servant etc. The impact of the utterance will vary as per the variation of context. Thus, a sentence deals with meaning but an utterance deals with meaning and force (action performed via words) both.

2.8.5. Speech Events

A Speaker, prior to his utterance has some intention in his mind. Primarily the intention is to convey his message to the listener. Both the speaker and hearer try to communicate with each other in the circumstances of the time. These circumstances as well as utterances are called the speech events. It is the speech event that helps the listener to interpret the utterance. A speech event does not consist of single speech act but a group of speech acts produced in certain situation highlighting one central point such as requesting, asking information etc.

2.8.6. Cohesion and Coherence

Cohesion can be considered as a grammatical link (markers) between utterances, whereas coherence indicates semantic links between utterances, paragraphs or chapters. The instances of cohesion are tense sequence, use of pronouns, discourse, context, ellipsis, additives, summatives, the definite article and deixis.

Coherence, as has been stated above, largely depends on semantic connections. Cohesion is a visible part of utterance and coherence is its hidden part. The implied meaning between the lines does not always correlate with its formal or structural meaning. Apparently
incoherent utterance of a speaker can be rightly understood and recognized by the hearer on the basis of their shared knowledge. Different types of coherence, according to Elam (1980:182-184), are textual, proairetic, referential, discourse, logical rhetorical and stylistic and semantic. According to Throat A.,

...Continuity of signifiers and signified of communication and signification, of signification and value, denotations and connotations, gives the discourse its semantic coherence. (2002: 10)

2.8.7 Deixis

Deixis means ‘pointing’ via language. A deictic expression is a form used to accomplish this ‘pointing’ for e.g. that, me, you, here, there, now, then etc. For the interpretation of deixis both the speaker and hearer should share the same context. The meaning of deictic expressions depends on the context in which they are used. Person deixis (I, you, he, she, it, etc.), Spatial deixis (here and there), Temporal deixis (now, then, yesterday, etc.) are the different types of deixis.

2.8.8 Turn Taking and Adjacency Pairs

In fictional discourse turn-taking is arranged systematically, whereas in day to day conversation the interlocutors overlap, interrupt or echo each other. In the absence of turn taking, the conversation remains incomplete. In a successful and live conversation, the position of speaker and hearer keeps on changing. In the words of Yule,
During conversation the position of speaker and hearer keeps changing. This process can be called as turn-taking. Any possible change-of-turn point is called a Transition Relevance Place. (Yule G. 1996:72)

As per the definition provided in Wikipedia Free Encyclopaedia, turn taking refers,

to the process by which people in a conversation decide who is to speak next. It depends on both cultural factors and subtle cues.

During everyday conversation interlocutors seem to cooperate with each other for e.g.

A: Could you show me the way to the post office?
B: Yes, Sure /No, I don’t know.

This ‘automatic sequence’ is called adjacency pair. Some common examples of adjacency pairs are greetings, goodbyes, question–answer etc.

2.8.9. Presupposition

Every utterance underlies some assumption/s. This underlying assumption is called presupposition. According to Bates, (1976:25) as cited by Niazi in Novel and Interpretation: ‘A Pragmatic Approach’ (2004:41), presupposition is the act of using a sentence to make a comment about some information assumed to be shared or verifiable by speaker and listener. For instance,
I know he is ill.
Or
I don’t know that he is ill.
Both these utterances presuppose that ‘he is ill’ Potential, existential, factive, non-factive, lexical, structural, counter factual are the types of presuppositions.

2.8.10. Implicature

‘To imply’ means ‘to fold something into something else’. In Implicature ‘more is communicated than is said’. The terms implications and implicature differ from each other in some respect. Implication deals with a logical relationship between two propositions. For example, if a mother tells to her child –
1. Do your homework.
2. I will give you a chocolate.

Then, the logical relationship of the utterance (1 and 2) will be – ‘if you do your home work, I will give you a chocolate’. The negative implication of the same is, ‘if you do not do your home work, I will not give you a chocolate’. However, if the child starts crying loudly without doing homework and demanding for the chocolate then the mother still can give a chocolate to her child. Thus, logic and everyday life do not go always hand in hand. Logical implication is not always followed strictly in conversational implicatures. Mey says –

‘Conversational implicatures concerns the way we understand an utterance in conversation in accordance with what we expect to hear’ (2001:46)
For instance, if A asks B, ‘What time will you reach home?’, and B answers, ‘I have just left the office’, then the context should be the fact that A knows how much time does it usually take to B to reach home as per the distance between the office and the home. Thus, superficially irrelevant responses may be understood well if they are interpreted properly. Along with logical and conversational implicatures there are conventional implicatures too.

Certain expressions in language implicate by themselves such as the words, first, last etc. Similarly, it is the dialect of the speaker that reveals his/her identity. Such implicatures cannot be changed in any context and hence they are called ‘conventional implicatures’. The conventional implicatures are historically developed, culture specific and class related.

2.8.11. Reference and Inference

Yule considers reference as an act in which a speaker or writer uses linguistic forms to enable a listener or reader to identify something. These linguistic forms can be proper nouns, noun phrases either definite or indefinite and pronouns. Reference depends on the speaker’s intention whereas inference depends on the listeners shared knowledge with the speaker. When reference occurs after the introduced referents then it is called as anaphora. On the other hand when reference is put prior to the referent it is called as cataphora. When no linguistic expression or reference is present, it is called zero anaphora or ellipsis. For instance, generally in any organization the name of the boss or principal is not taken directly but some suggestive expressions like baba or the black/ blue chair or suit or
initials of his or her name etc. are used so that only listener should be able to interpret the reference of the speaker.

2.8.12. Pragmatic Acts

Language can be applied in various ways. If the speaker and the listener share the same contextual background, then language can be used even in unconventional ways. In a pragmatic act speech acts may be or may not be involved. However, in any pragmatic act the circumstances, context and its effect or uptake should be proper. Body language is equally important in pragmatic acts. Pragmatic Acts are based on the language used in certain situation. Pragmatic acts are situation oriented and not based on semantic or syntactic rules. In the words of Mey,

‘…. they are determined by the broader, social context in which they happen …’ (2001:228)

Doing nothing or silence are also included in Pragmatics Acts. For instance if a naughty child tells its mother, “I am not doing anything”, the mother suspects that the child must be doing something that is prohibited to be done, such as, playing with scissor or using powder, lipstick etc. Thus Pragmatic acts include all different types of acts used in various situations. Speech Acts are one of them.

2.8.13. Pragmatics and Literature

As in oral communication both the speaker and the listener are equally important. In the absence of either of them (the speaker or
oral communication cannot take place. Similarly, a work of art (written text) cannot be successful without either the writer or the reader. It is said that if the author is a creator of a text, the reader is a co-creator of it. The text written by the author is interpreted by the reader. Thus, both of the activities writing and reading are essential in understanding the text. Mey says,

Reading is a collaborative activity, taking place between author and reader: Reading is an innovative process of active recreation not just the passive, pre-set and pre-determined use of some recreational facility.

(2001:237)

Both the reader and the writer are interdependent and interactive. Words are powerful and have different force. However, they can be sensible only in the presence of context. The reader has to consider the whole scene to understand the conversation that takes place between the characters in the novel. Context and presupposition are very important in understanding literary works.

2.8.14. Nativization of English in India

The term Nativization implies the process of nativizing a language which is not native. The native language is the mother tongue, the speech community in a multilingual or bilingual country. While learning second or foreign language the impact of one’s native language is visible. Thus, the other language becomes a different variety of the same language. In the same manner, English is a nativized language in India. English is affected by the regional languages in India. There are verities of Indian English such as
Hindi- English, Marathi-English, and Guajarati-English etc. The two languages native and non native are codes and they are mixed or switched while speaking by the speaker.

### 2.8.15. Code mixing and Code switching

The word code is used in place of speech variety, language or dialect. It also implies the uses of language or language variety in a particular community. In a bilingual or multilingual speech community, the speaker may use two or more languages. When the speaker transfers linguistic elements of one language into another, it is called code mixing. Words or phrases or the native and non-native languages are mixed into each other in code mixing. For example, an Indian person may mix words of Hindi and English together. He may say, “Kitna hot hai kutch cool mangate hai.”

Code switching means the switching of the speaker from one language to another. The speaker uses some sentences in one language and then suddenly changes his language. For example A says to B,

A: Hi where were you my friend? *Tum to gayab hi ho gaye the.*

Code switching is seen when,
1. the speaker uses one language and the hearer answers in another,
2. two languages are used simultaneously.

Due to code mixing and code switching a wider range of mixed vocabulary is built up. A common vocabulary emerges, sharing a common context, connotational values and semantic area.
Conversational communication is made easier due to code mixing and code switching.

### 2.9 Diaspora

The word Diaspora refers to the people who leave their homelands and settle outside for various purposes. Diaspora is a word of Greek origin that is Diaspeiro meaning scattering or sowing of seeds (people). Today diaspora is defined as population of migrant origin scattered among two or more destinations. Diaspora is an emerging word in literature. Diasporic literature is produced by migrant (Diasporic) writers. They explore the problems and experience of migrancy in their writings. The Diasporic writing which is also known as ‘Expatriate’ or immigrant writing often focus psychic trauma, cultural attachment to the mother land, feeling of alienation and rootlessness in alien land of the immigrant writers. In *The Inheritance of Loss* by Kiran Desai Biju’s feelings of alienation in alien country can be a fine example of this.

Indian Diaspora refers to the people who have migrated from India. They constitute NRIs and PIOs like V.S. Naipaul, Vikram Seth, Rohinton Mistry, Uma Parmeshwaram, Salman Rushdie, Lakshmi Gill, Arvind Adiga, Jaishree Misra, Kiran Desai, and Bharati Mukherjee who are some of the Indian diasporic writers.
2.10 Identity

Loss of identity is one of the prevailing themes in Indian immigrant literature. Regarding identity Frade Dallmayr says in *Identities Local and Global*, (2003:14-15)

Clearly, human identity implies certain distinctness of character that is a specifiable difference of persons or groups from other persons of groups and also from a universal sameness divide of distinct features. In addition, difference seems to include the prospect of reidentification that is the possibility of holding, distinct features steady over a period of time.

The term identity has various aspects such as individual /personal, social, economic, cultural etc. Identity is a product of different thoughts and actions. The impact of class, culture and society influences the process of identity formation. The term identity is also related with a sense of personal worth and ability which is fundamental to an individual’s identity. In Diaspora writing one witnesses the loss of and search of identity as a major force of the immigrant writer. The awareness of geographical dislocation, cultural ambivalence, social and political alienation and absence of centrality etc. are some of the themes of Diaspora writing. It is nostalgia and cultural attachment that connect them with their home land. The sense of loss and anxiety are mostly reflected in their writings.
2.11 Conclusion

In this chapter the researcher has briefly explained those basic concepts and terms that are the sources of analyzing speech acts in general and Indirect Speech Acts in particular in the selected novels. As the selected novels are written by Indian immigrant writers, some current fundamental notions like Diaspora and Identity are also highlighted in this chapter. An attempt will be made to demonstrate how more is communicated by the speakers by employing Indirect Speech Acts. In this connection the significance of Indirect Speech Acts in both fictional and actual life will be illustrated, which is the central theme of the present research.