CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Communicative Use of Language and Pragmatics

Language is a tool. People use it to do things. It stands at the centre of human affairs. It is used for dealing with store assistants, gossiping with friends, negotiating contracts, planning vacations, debating politics and so on. These are examples of language use activities in which people do things with language. Language is considered as a basic ingredient in every social situation. Communication is the thread that moves through all these activities, people try to exchange their ideas to others. Language is indispensable as the main instrument of human communication. People talk as a way of conveying ideas to others. Communication with language is done through two basic human activities listening and speaking.

In speaking people bring their opinions into words, talking about their feelings, desires and intentions. Through speaking and listening something important must be revealed about the mind and how it deals with feelings, desires and intentions. People talk to convey facts, ask for help, make promises and others listen to receive this information. We continue conversations and we are capable to understand each other, then language use expresses both individual and social processes. Speakers and listeners have to do actions as individuals if they are supposed to be successful in their use of language and they have to work together as participants in the social units. Language use is really a kind of joint action. A joint action is the one that is done by a small group of people in co-ordination with one another.

When people are asked for examples of language, they mention ‘conversation’, ‘reading a novel’, ‘producing a play’ etc. The answers are noticeable for their range and can be classified by scene and medium. The scene is where the language use takes place. The medium refers to whether the language use is spoken or it can be a
medium of expression i.e. gestural or written or printed. The forms that people use to communicate can be divided into spoken and written forms. The spoken form is a conversation. Conversation may be devoted to gossip, business trades, etc. But they can be characterized by the free exchanges of turn between the two or more participants. The written settings have many of the characteristics of spoken ones. When printing and writing came to existence, people adopted spoken language to the printed medium. Written settings, like spoken ones, can introduce mediators between the person who tries to express his/her intentions and the intended audience.

As Fillmore (1981:152) observes, ‘The language of face-to-face conversation is the basic and primary use of language, all others being best described in terms of their manner of deviation from the base’. If so the principal of language may be set in two kinds—those for face-to-face conversation and those that say how the secondary uses are derived from or dependent on it. Face-to-face conversation is the most common setting. It is the principal setting that does not need any special skills. The participants speak for themselves, in a joint activity they determine who says what, when and prepare their utterances as they continue.

Language settings—spoken or written—can be considered only as arenas of language use, as arenas of activity where people do things with language. At the centre of these arenas are the roles of speaker and addressee. When Jack is addressing Mary, he is the speaker and she is the addressee. Jack is speaking and trying Mary to understand him. He cannot be successful unless Mary takes her own actions. She must listen to him, get notice of his gestures and try to understand what he means, when he is speaking. They take actions with respect to each other and they coordinate these actions with each other. They do joint action. Their coordination can be based on two factors. Their common ground which is their knowledge, beliefs and suppositions they believe and speaker’s meaning and addressee’s understanding. When Jack produces a signal for Mary to identify, he
means something by it, he has certain intention, she is to recognize. For all joint
actions, common ground is the foundation and it is essential to the creation of the
speaker’s meaning and addressee’s understanding.

Language use has more than one layer of activity. Layer 1 is used in all forms of
language use, representing the actual world. Layer 2 is built on top of layer 1 and
represents a second domain. Layer 1 is real, whereas layer 2 is hypothetical. Face-to-
face conversation is different and has only one layer of action, the speaker at any
moment is the principal formulator of what is said and the addressees are identifiers
and respondents. As a whole the study of language can be considered both a
cognitive and social science. Since language use is a joint activity it cannot
be understood from one of the perspectives alone. The term pragmatics covers the
study of language use in relation to language structure and context of utterance. It is
a systematic way of explaining language use in context. This is equivalent to saying it
deals with utterances, by which it will be meant certain events, the intentional acts
of speakers at times and places, typically involving language. Although pragmatics is
a relatively new branch of linguistics, research on it can be dated back to ancient
Greece and Rome where the term pragmatics is found in Latin and ‘pragmaticos’ in
Greek. Pragmatics was defined by Morris (1938) as the third major component of
semiotic theory, Morris explained three ways of studying signs:

- Syntax is the study of formal relations of signs to one another.
- Semantics is the study of how signs are related to the objects to which they are
  applicable.
- Pragmatics is the study of the relations of signs to interpreters.

A contemporary version of pragmatics is Gricean pragmatics which focuses on
meaning in context. Grice (1975) made a treatment of meaning by distinguishing two
kinds of meaning, natural and non-natural meaning.

Natural meaning is without human intentionality, non-natural meaning is equal to
intentional communication. Grice suggested that pragmatics should centre on the
more practical dimensions of meaning, namely the conversational meaning. Practical concerns also helped to shift pragmaticians focus to explaining occurring conversations which resulted in discovery of the cooperative principal by Grice (1975) and the politeness principal by Leech (1983).

Pragmatics is considered as a branch of linguistics which studies how utterances communicate meaning in context. According to Yule (1996:3), ‘Pragmatics is the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It has consequently, more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves.’

Based on Yule’s (1996) definition, there can be a distinction between Semantics and Pragmatics. Both these terms concerning the transmission of meaning through language, but there are two quite different aspects of meaning. The first type of meaning is intrinsic to a linguistic expression which is containing it and it cannot be separated from that expression. This is the domain of semantics. The second type of meaning is one that is not intrinsic to the linguistic expression containing it, but which rather results from the interaction of the linguistic expression with the context in which it is used. The study of this kind of meaning is called pragmatics. Then in a simple way we can say semantics deals with the meaning of sentences outside of any specific context, while pragmatics deals with utterance meaning i.e. the meaning of sentences used in a certain context. Context refers to the conditions in which something exists or occurs. Linguistically, this is the part of a discourse surrounding a word or a passage that helps make its meaning clear.

Leech (1983:13) defines the term as ‘any background knowledge assumed to be shared by speaker and hearer and which contributes to the interpretation of what speaker means by a given utterance.’ Context includes factors such as the place and time of the utterance, interlocutor’s background, knowledge of the world, shared experience and interpersonal relationship. Knowledge of the world and shared
knowledge plays an important role in the interpretation of speech acts. There are three different sources for the knowledge which might be distinguished:

- Source computable from the physical context
  A- I need that book. (Pointing at the book)

- Source available from what has already been said
  A- I’m thirsty.
  B- Me too.

- Source available from background or common knowledge
  A- Come to my house for dinner next week.
  B- It’s Ramadan. (If A and B are Muslims, then A will infer that B’s answer means ‘no’)

Depending on the context in which an utterance is used, multiple functions can be performed. Let us consider the utterance ‘The Sea over there is very deep’. This could be employed in different contexts to perform acts such as issuing a warning, making a suggestion and etc. If the utterance is addressed to a non-swimmer, it can function as a warning, but when it is used to address a fisherman who is looking for a nice spot for fishing purpose; it has the force of recommendation. Then, context is necessary for the identification of the force of the utterance.

Speaker and hearer interpersonal relationship is another contextual factor, which has a crucial role in the act of interpretation. An utterance receives different interpretation depending on factors like rank, age, social status, etc. For example, the utterance ‘shall we change the class?’ told by a student to his teacher, can be interpreted as asking for permission, but told by the teacher, the utterance is taken as a request.

The place of an utterance is the other crucial contextual factor that affects hearer’s interpretation. In a bakery, for example, when a buyer points at a special item and says ‘that’s a hot one’, seller would certainly interpret the utterance as a request for having that item, instead of taking it as a compliment. Here, the function of the utterance depends upon the physical context in which it happens. Let us imagine a
different context where the same utterance is used for a different communicative purpose. In a restaurant a friend tells his friend who is ordering food ‘that’s a hot one’. In this particular context, the function of the utterance is to give a warning to prevent the friend from ordering a spicy food. Thus, the same utterance has performed two completely different functions depending on its different physical contexts. It is clear that such meanings convey the full communicative intention of the participants involved. The advantage of studying language through pragmatics is that one can talk about people’s intended meanings, their assumptions, their aims, and the kind of actions they are doing when they speak. Pragmatics involves basic categories which can be defined in brief as follows:

1.1.1 Presupposition

Whenever we speak, we make assumptions about the knowledge that we share with our listeners. Such assumptions which affect our use of language called presupposition. For example, the proposition ‘Even Mary could swim in this pool’ presupposes that Mary is not a good swimmer and that the pool is small. Presuppositions are speaker dependent. Speakers, not utterances, have presuppositions. The utterance ‘When did you stop smoking?’ has at least two presuppositions. The speaker presupposes that the hearer used to smoke, and that he does not smoke anymore. Questions like this are very useful for lawyers or interrogators. It is worth noting that even the opposite of an utterance made by negating does not change the relationship of presupposition. This property of presupposition is generally known as ‘Constancy under negation’. The utterance ‘Sonia’s cat is cute’ presupposes that ‘Sonia has a cat’. In the same way ‘Sonia’s cat isn’t cute’ also presupposes that ‘Sonia has a cat’. Presuppositions do not change in interrogative sentences also. The question form of utterance ‘Is my friend coming home from Canada?’ and ‘Isn’t my friend coming home from Canada?’ have the same presupposition, i.e. ‘I have a friend’. Presuppositions have different types which can be given as follows:
a) Existential Presupposition: This type of presupposition is one which is associated with a possessive construction. For example, in ‘your flat’, the presupposition is ‘You have a flat’. This presupposition is also found in any definite noun phrase. For example, in ‘The king of India’, the presupposition is ‘There is a king of India’.

b) Factive Presupposition: The presupposed information after the verbs like ‘Know’, ‘Regret’, ‘realise’, etc. can be treated as a fact. It is described as a factive presupposition. For example,

(1) Everybody knows that John is gay. >> John is gay.

c) Lexical presupposition: In the lexical presupposition, the use of one linguistic form is interpreted with the presupposition that another meaning is understood. For example, the sentence ‘He managed to escape’ has the asserted meaning that ‘he succeeded in some way’. On the contrary, in the sentence ‘He didn’t manage to escape’, the asserted meaning is that ‘he did not succeed’. However, in both the cases, the presupposition is ‘he tried to escape’.

d) Structural presupposition: In this type of presupposition, certain sentence structure have been analysed as presupposition that a part of the structure which is already assumed to be true. For example, in the question ‘When did she arrive?’ the presupposition is ‘she arrived’ which is already known.

e) Non-factive Presupposition: A non-factive presupposition is one that is assumed not to be true. Here the associated verbs are such as ‘dream’ ‘imagine’ etc. For example,

(2) I imagined I was in Canada. >> I was not in Canada.

f) Counter-Factual Presupposition: This type of presupposition implies that what is presupposed is not only ‘not true’, but the opposite of that is true. The if-clause is the best form of this type. For example,

(3) If you were my friend, you would help me. >> You are not my friend.
1.1.2 Implicature

The term ‘implicature’ is used to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean as different from what the speaker actually says. An implicature may be said to be the extra meaning attached to, but distinct from, the sense of the utterance. In order to distinguish implicature, Grice (1975) makes the differences between three categories of meaning, i.e. (a) what is said, (b) what is conventionally implicated, and (c) what is non-conventionally implicated. He divides implicatures into two distinct categories—conventional implicature and conversational implicature.

In a conventional implicature, what is implicated derives from the conventional meaning of the words used. The examples of conventional implicatures are utterance initial ‘oh’, and the use of ‘therefore’, ‘even’, and ‘yet’. Consider the following example.

(4) He is an Englishman. He is, therefore, brave.

In the above example, the speaker implicates ‘that his being brave follows from his being an Englishman’. This implicature seems to result from the conventional meaning attached to the use of the word ‘therefore’. The main focus of Grice’s analysis is to determine and explain conversational implicatures. Conversational implicatures belong to the category of non-conventional implicatures. Conversational implicature is a message that is not found in the plain sense of the sentence. These implicatures refer to the implication which can be found out from the form of an utterance. The speaker implies it. The hearer is able to infer this message in the utterance by applying to the rules governing successful conversational interaction. They are derived from a general principle of conversation and the maxim of the Cooperative principle. For example,

(5) There’s some chalk on the floor.

This is taken to mean you should pick it up. Implicatures share some of the properties of presuppositions, but they are different from presupposition in many respects. For example, implicatures are attached to the semantic content of an
utterance, whereas presuppositions seem to be built into the linguistic structure of sentences.

Apart from these two kinds, there are other types of implicatures that pragmatists have classified in different ways. Grice (1975), for example, classifies implicatures into two categories—Generalised implicatures and Particularised implicatures. Yule (1996:41) notes, ‘When no special knowledge is required in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning, it is called a “generalised implicature”’. One common example in English involves any phrase with an indefinite article. Consider the following example,

(6) I was sitting in a garden some day. A child looked over the fence. [Re-produced from Yule (1996:41)]

In the above sentence, the implicatures are that the garden and the child are not the speakers. They are calculated on the principle that if the speaker was capable of being more specific, he would have said ‘my garden’ and ‘my child’. Implicatures can be calculated without special knowledge of any particular context. Yule (1996:42) believes, ‘Most of the time our conversation takes place in very specific contexts in which locally recognized inferences are assumed. Such inferences are required to work out the conveyed meanings which result from “particularized implicatures”.’ For example,

(7) A- Where are you going with the dog?
B- To the V-E-T. /vi: i: ti:/ [Re-produced from Yule (1996:42)]

In the above example, the dog is supposed to know the word ‘vet’. So he may hate being taken there, so ‘B’ produces a less brief version of his message. He does not want the dog to know the answer to his friend’s question.

1.1.3 Turn-taking and Adjacency Pairs

Turn-taking is a unique feature of ordinary, everyday conversations, discussions and question-answer sessions. It simply means that in a conversation, the speakers take their turns. It is the change of speakers during conversation. One participant in the
conversation (A) talks, stops; another speaker (B) talks, stops. Thus we get an ‘A-B-A-B’ distribution of talk across two participants. However the organization of turns does not always follow ‘A-B-A-B’ pattern. There are gaps, overlaps, encroachments and manipulations. The following conversation is an example of the fact.

(8)A: May I have a ticket? (Q 1)
B: are you 21? (Q 2)
A: No (A 2)
B: No (A 1)

As it is noticeable, there is a gap between (Q) and (A). One question –answer pair (Q 2- A 2) is embedded with another (Q 1- A 1).

Another point regarding turn-taking is that many persons can take part in the conversation. Similarly, one person may produce a single utterance or many utterances. Even many groups of speakers can take turns in a conversation. The mechanism which governs turn-taking is a set of rules which operate on turn-by-turn basis. An important feature of turn-taking is that the speaker can become the listener and the listener can become a speaker.

Another feature of turn-taking is that turns can be verbal or non-verbal. Non-verbal turns include gestures like smiles, raised eye-brows, etc. Non-verbal turns are common in the context of instructions given by the speaker to the hearer. In verbal turns there are certain expected structures. For example, a question is expected to be followed by an assertive sentence.

Adjacency pairs are the utterances in a dialogue which occur in pairs. There are many almost automatic patterns in the structure of conversation. Greetings and goodbyes are some clear examples. Adjacency pairs always consist of two parts. They are produced by different speakers. The utterance of the first part leads to expression of the second part of the same pair. Requests are responded to by promises of compliance, questions by answers, offers by acceptances or refusals. The first half of each adjacency pairs makes an expectation of the second half of the
same pair. In conversations, it is these adjacency pairs that enable the participants to co-ordinate turn-taking to introduce and change the topics and to open and close the conversation itself.

Not all first parts immediately get their second parts. It often happens that a Q- A sequence will be postponed while another Q- A sequence intervenes. The sequence then takes the form of Q 1- Q 2- A 2- A 1. The middle pair Q 2- A 2 being named an insertion sequence. Consider the following example,

(9)-Do you want a ticket for an early show or late show? Q 1
-What time is your early show? Q 2
-Five thirty. A 2
-Ok. That’s good. A 1

An insertion sequence is one adjacency pair within another. In conversation, speech acts ordered with a first and second part and categorized as Q- A, offer-accept, blame-deny, and so on. Each first part expresses an expectation about a particular second part. This is known as preference structure. It divides the second parts into preferred and dispreferred response. The preferred is structurally expected response. The dispreferred tends to be the refusals or disagreements. An absence of response can be taken as the hearer not having heard or simply refusing to cooperate. According to Yule (1996) from a pragmatic perspective, the expression of a preferred clearly represents closeness and quick connection. The expression of a dispreferred would represent distance and lack of connection.

1.1.4 Speech Act Theory

Language is used to do things. We can use language to make promises, lay bets, offer congratulations, issue warnings or swear testimony. Speech act theory describes how this is done. By saying I warn you that there is a snake in the garden, we not only say something, but also perform the act of warning someone.
Actions performed via utterances are generally called ‘Speech Acts’. Austin (1962) claims that when people use language, they perform actions with their words. The following examples justify Austin’s position:

(10) - I bet you 10 dollars the man wins.

(11) - I pronounce you husband and wife.

The speakers of the utterances perform the act of putting a bet and affecting a marriage. The acts of putting a bet in (10) are different from pronouncing in the sense that by putting a bet the speaker commits himself to a future course of action. Whereas in the second case, the speaker performs the action in the very utterance of the act, and that is why Austin calls these utterances, performatives.

Performatives involve the use of right words by right persons in right circumstances. Austin argued that it is not useful to ask whether performative utterances such as (10) are true or not. In Austin terminology a performative utterance which works is called ‘Felicitous’ and one which does not work is called ‘Infelicitous’. For some cases, such as (10), the performance will be infelicitous if the speaker is not a specific person in a specific context. Austin’s name for the conditions necessary to the success of a performative is ‘Felicity condition’.

There are various types of speech acts given by the linguists and philosophers like Austin and Searle. There are three dimensions of the actions produced by an utterance. Austin calls them Locutionary, Illocutionary and Perlocutionary acts.

The locutionary acts are simply the speech acts that have occurred. The illocutionary acts are the real actions which are performed by the utterance. The utterance ‘I’ve just made some tea’ might be used to make an offer, an explanation, or for some other communicative purpose. The perlocutionary acts are the effects of the utterance on the listener. For example, the utterance ‘I have made some tea’ might be said on the assumption that the listener will recognize the effect intended by the speaker and respond properly. Illocutionary acts therefore, are under the control of the speaker, and perlocutionary acts under the control of the hearer.
Austin (1962) developed the speech act theory as a theory of language use. He proposes that all acts fall into five general types:

a) Verdictives are typified by the giving of a verdict by a judge or umpire.
b) Commissives are typified by promising and they commit the speaker to a course of future action.
c) Exercitives are exercising of powers, rights, or influence.
d) Behabitives are a ‘miscellaneous group’ having to do with attitudes and social behaviour, such as apologizing, congratulating, and condoling.
e) Expositives make plain how our utterances fit into the course of an argument of conversation.

Searle (1969) finds fault with Austin’s (1962) original classification of speech acts for different reasons. The reasons include inconsistency and incompleteness. The five classes of speech acts suggested by Searle (1969) are as follows:

a) Assertives are speech acts that commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition.
b) Directives are speech acts which embody the speaker’s effort to get the hearer to do something or direct him towards the goal.
c) Commissives are speech acts that commit the speaker to some future course of action.
d) Expressives are speech acts that tell about the feeling of the speaker. They express the psychological state of the speaker in statements of pleasure, pain or joy.
e) Declaratives are speech acts that change the world through their utterances. The successful performance of declaratives brings the correspondence between the propositional content and reality, such as declaring war.

Speech acts can also be distinguished on the basis of structure. Whenever there is a direct relationship between a structure and a function, it is a direct speech act. For example, if a declarative is used to make a statement, ‘I hereby ask you if you can close the door’ it is a direct speech act. On the other hand, when there is an indirect
relationship between a structure and a function, it is an indirect speech act. For example, if a declarative is used to make a request, it is an indirect speech act. Consider the following sentence:

12) I hereby request you that you close the door.

A direct speech act has only one function. Direct speech acts are those which are expressed by the construction designed for them. In case of an indirect speech act, it performs more than one function at the same time. For example, an interrogative construction maybe used for making a request.

1.1.5 Co-operative Principle

People usually cooperate with each other in their daily communication by considering specific rules. Grice (1975) was the first to think about co-operation in relation to the act of linguistic communication. Grice (1975:46) observes, ‘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.’ Grice labels this general principle ‘The Co-operative principle’ and he proposes that in ordinary conversation, speakers and hearers share a co-operative principle. It can be explained by four basic maxims,

a) The Maxim of Quality: Try to make your contribution such that it is true. It is ‘Be truthful.’ The more specific maxims under this category are

   I) Do not say what you believe to be false.

   II) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

b) The Maxim of Quantity: Give the right amount of information. Under the category of quantity fall the following two maxims.

   I) Make your contribution as informative as is required.

   II) Do not make your contribution as informative as is required.

c) The Maxim of Relevance: Make your contribution relevant, or in short ‘Be relevant’ the category relates to the relevance of information.
d) The Maxim of Manner: Be clear and orderly. The category of manner includes the super-maxim ‘Be perspicuous’. It also consists of the following sub-maxims.

I) Avoid obscurity of expression
II) Avoid ambiguity
III) Be brief
IV) Be orderly

We usually think that people will give us appropriate amount of information. They try to be clear and tell us the truth. Thus, with thinking that people are truthful and clear in their conversations, we interpret what they say. However, people usually do not observe these maxims properly. A speaker can be said to violate a maxim or more in an utterance. Although maxim violation might happen on the surface of our talks, yet we actually adhere to them at some deeper level of communication, namely the pragmatic level. It leads the hearer who faced with an apparently irrelevant utterance to try to find relevance somewhere beyond the surface level. If we were to hear someone described as having ‘one good eye’, we might well infer the person’s other eye was defected, even though nothing had been said about it at all. Inferences are interpretations that other people draw from the utterance, for which we cannot directly account. They arise by preserving the assumption of co-operation.

1.1.6 Politeness Principle

According to Leech (1983), politeness concerns a relationship between two participants who can be called the ‘self’ and the ‘other’. In conversation, the ‘self’ is identified with the speaker and the ‘other’ is typically identified with the hearer. Politeness is the ability of participants in a social interaction to engage in interaction in an atmosphere of relative harmony. Politeness principles are those which control the ways in which we use language in order to provide and make stronger our social relations.
Within an interaction, however, there is a more specific type of politeness at work. In order to describe it, we need to know the concept of face. The face means the public self-image of the person. It refers to that emotional and social sense of self that a person expects everyone to recognize. Face consists of two related aspects. One is negative face which is the need to be independent and not to be imposed on by others. The other is positive face which is the need to be appreciated and approved of by at least some other people. People within their everyday social interaction like their personal image to be appreciated and not criticized. If a speaker says something that represents a threat to another person’s expectations it is described as a ‘face threatening act’, such as advising, directing, criticizing, etc. Alternatively, given the possibility that some action might be interpreted as a threat to another’s face, the speaker can say something to lessen the possible threat. People use acts such as compliments, appreciation, agreements, etc. as solution to save the positive face of the other. These are called face-saving acts. When we try to save another’s face, we can consider what their negative face wants or their positive face wants. So a face saving act which is oriented to the person’s negative face will tend to emphasize the importance of the other’s concerns. This is called ‘negative politeness’. A face saving act which is concerned with the person’s positive face will tend to show solidarity, emphasize that both speakers want the same thing. This is called positive politeness. (See Yule, 1996)

According to Leech (1983), there is a politeness principle with conversational maxims. He defines six maxims; tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy. The tact maxim, the most important kind of politeness focuses on the hearer and says ‘minimise cost to other’ and ‘maximise benefit to other’. The first part is the negative politeness and the second part is the positive politeness. Thus imperatives are not always impositions on the listener, but often used indirectly to do the act of offering. The following sentence is a good example of the maxim ‘maximise the benefit to the hearer’.
13) Have another cup of tea.

The maxim of generosity focuses on the speaker, and says ‘minimise benefit to self’ and ‘maximise cost to self’. This is shown in:

14) You relax and let me do the washing up.

The maxim of approbation says ‘minimise dispraise of other’ and ‘maximise praise of other’. The first part of the maxim is similar to the politeness strategy of avoiding disagreement. The second part matches with the positive politeness strategy of making other people good by showing your support.

15) You are very efficient and make notes of everything – you must have a copy of important questions and answers.

The modesty maxim says ‘minimise praise of self’ and ‘maximise dispraise of self’.

Consider the example:

16) Oh, I’m so stupid. I didn’t write his phone number! Did you?

The maxim of agreement says ‘minimise disagreement between self and other’ and ‘maximise agreement between self and other’. It fits in with positive politeness strategies of ‘seek agreement’ and ‘avoid disagreement’.

The last maxim, sympathy maxim says ‘minimize antipathy between self and other’ and ‘maximize sympathy between self and other’ includes polite speech acts as congratulate and condolences, as in, ‘I was sorry to hear about your mother’.

1.1.7 Deixis

‘Deixis’ is a Greek term and it is often described as ‘verbal pointing’, that is to say pointing through language, the linguistic forms of this pointing is called ‘deictic expressions’. For example, when one sees a strange thing and asks ‘What’s that?’ one uses that as a deictic expression. Deixis concerns the ways in which the interpretation of utterances depends on the analysis of that context of utterance. For example, first and second person pronouns such as my, mine, you, your, we, ours, are always deictic because their reference is
entirely dependent on the context. We must know who the speaker and listener are to interpret them.

The utterance like ‘I’ll put it here’ is easily understood by the people present, but may need a translation for someone who is not right here. Deictic expressions can be used to indicate a person through ‘Person Deixis’ (you, us) or location through ‘Special Deixis’ (here, there) or time through ‘Temporal Deixis’ (now, then) or distance through ‘Proximal Deixis’ (this, here) and ‘Distal Deixis’ (that, there). Deictic terms include tense, demonstratives, first and second person pronouns and specific time and place adverbs like now and here. All of those need a situation known both to the speaker and hearer, to be interpreted.

Fillmore (1975:38-39) states, ‘the importance of deictic information for the interpretation of utterance is perhaps best illustrated by what happens when such information does not exist.’ For example, suppose we find an undated notice announcing a ‘BIG SALE NEXT WEEK’, we would not know whether the sale had already taken place. Thus, deictic expressions are other examples of more being conveyed than actually being said in the act of linguistic communication and their interpretation depend on immediate physical context in which they are uttered.

Since ‘Deixis’ is the focal point of the thesis, it will be explained in detail in the next chapter.

1.2 Aims and Procedures

1.2.1 The Rationale of the Present Study

Some words like this, that, here, there, now, then, I, him, etc. which are different deictic expressions cannot be interpreted at all if the physical context of the speaker is not known. Some sentences of English are virtually impossible to understand if we do not know who is speaking, about whom, where and when. For example,

(17) I’m going to ask you to help me lift this and put it here.
Out of context this sentence is vague. It contains a lot of deictic expressions such as I and you as person deixis, here and this as place deixis. They depend for their interpretation on the immediate physical context in which they are uttered. Thus, deictic expressions are grammaticalised elements of the utterance whose meaning depends on the context in which they are used. For example, the demonstrative adverb here does not refer to any particular place on all occasions of use. Depending on the context it may refer to any particular place such as school, bedroom, bank, etc. Deictic expressions have their basic uses in spoken interaction. For example, the utterance like ‘I’ll put it here’ is easily understood by the people present, but may need a paraphrase for someone who is not right here. Deictic expressions can be used to indicate a person through ‘Person Deixis’ (me, him) or location through ‘Spatial Deixis’ (here, there) or time through ‘Temporal Deixis’ (now, then). Deictic terms include tense, demonstratives, first and second person pronouns and specific time and place adverbs like now and here. All of those require a situation known both to the speaker and hearer, to be interpreted.

1.2.2 The Aims of the Study

The study is an attempt to analyse two dramatic texts and two novels from the point of view of deixis to examine the interrelationship among its different categories---person, spatial, temporal, social, proximal and distal. The ways in which the interpretation of utterances depends on the analysis of the context of utterance is the main concern of deixis. The importance of deictic information for the interpretation of utterance and what happens when such information does not exist is another concern. Deixis concerns the way in which some expressions can only be interpreted in terms of their relationship with the speaker. Consider the following example.

(18) I’m going to ask you to go there and bring that here.

If a speaker were to say the above example, a listener would not need to know who was speaking (to identify the referent of I), to whom (to identify the referent of you),...
of what (to identify the referent of that), and the place of speaking (to work out which location the expressions there and here refer to). It is necessary for a listener to identify the speaker, the time and place of utterance to interpret what was said, and what was meant by what was said. The present study is made in the light of Elam’s observations about the use of deixis in the two genres. Since there are a lot of examples of these categories in both the plays The Caretaker by Pinter and Enter a Free Man by Stoppard and the novels Lucky Jim by Amis and Animal Farm by Orwell, this study tries to identify those deictic expressions, which have the greatest importance in their context and to comment on their significance.

1.2.3 The Approach Followed in This Study

In this study, it is attempted to follow an eclectic model to review some of the most relevant theories about the deictic system. The researcher attempts to pinpoint some of the most crucial theoretical approaches.

In linguistics, deixis is a phenomenon in which understanding the meaning of certain words and phrases in an utterance needs contextual information. A word or phrase whose meaning needs contextual information is called a deictic item. The most common categories of contextual information referred to by deixis are those of person, place and time- what Fillmore (1975) calls the ‘major grammaticalised types’ of deixis, and also they can be considered traditional deictic categories. The grammatical category of person directly reflects the different roles that different people play in the speech event--- speaker, addressee and others. Time deixis concerns itself with various times involved in time adverbs like now and then and different tenses. Place deixis concerns itself with the spatial location relevant to an utterance. Besides these deictic categories, there are other types of deixis that are also widespread in language like discourse, social, proximal and distal deixis. These additional categories of deixis were introduced by Fillmore (1975) and Lyons (1977b). Discourse deixis are expressions used within the utterance in order to refer to parts of the discourse of utterance. Social deixis is concerned with the social
information fixed within different expressions, such as close social relations and familiarity. Proximal deixis covers items and individuals, which are the nearest to the point of reference and distal deixis covers those items or individuals, which are far from the point of reference. Among all those linguists who worked on deixis and its different categories, the researcher focused on the views of Fillmore (1975), Lyons (1977b), Levinson (1983), Elam (1980) and Yule (1996) as they classified deixis into the same seven categories based on their features and properties. Their views and observations will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

1.2.4 The Passages Selected for Analysis

The analysis will be made of ten passages from two plays The Caretaker by Pinter and Enter A Free Man by Stoppard and two novels Lucky Jim by Amis and Animal Farm by Orwell. The two plays and novels are selected at random. They are representative of the two genres and the findings may be applicable to the entire genre. The selection of the authors, plays and novels is based on certain criteria. First, all of them are British playwrights and novelists who have been chosen due to researcher’s familiarity with their plays and novels. They all have an impressive position in British literature and have left a great impact on modern writers. Secondly, a large portion of their novels and plays consist of dialogues with innumerable examples of different categories of deixis which gives a lot of scope for the analysis of utterances. Ten passages from each play and novel are selected which are seen as representative samples of the entire texts.

1.2.5 Analytical Procedure

Since there are practical difficulties in analysing whole plays and novels, ten passages, which have plentiful material for the analysis of different categories of deixis have been chosen. An attempt is made to find examples of each category in them. Each passage is approximately one thousand words long. Stage directions are not counted, as they are not part of dialogue and also the names of the characters.
Each passage is viewed as a representative of the entire text. The number of all deictic devices in the selected passages is counted and grouped according to five types of deixis—person, spatial, discourse, temporal and social and proximal and distal deixis under each type are dealt with to find out how many examples of each particular type are there in each passage. At the end of each analysis there is a table, which gives the exact number of proximal and distal deictic devices belonging to each category in the passage. After analysing both the plays and novels there is a table which shows the total percentage of proximal and distal deictic items. This information is used to scrutinise the authenticity of Elam’s finding concerning the importance of proximal deictic devices in dramatic discourse and the importance of distal deictic devices in fiction. Elam (198:143) notes, ‘Dramatic discourse is egocentric: the speaking subject defines everything (including the you-addressee) in terms of his own place in the dramatic world. The here-and-now simply marks his position as speaker. It is for this reason that the semantically marked ‘proximal’ deictics relating to the speaker’s present context and situation of utterance (‘here’, ‘this’, ‘these’, ‘now’, the present tense, etc.) have a far more important function in the drama than the unmarked ‘distal’ variety regarding distant or excluded objects, times and places (‘there’, ‘that’, ‘those’, ‘then’, the past tense, etc.), which, instead, are typical of narrative language’. Finally, different ideas and points emerging from the analysis are combined in the form of some observations.

The following are some important points emerging from the analysis of the selected passages, which require some discussion. The first point concerns different uses of there in the plays and novels. As it has been noted, there is a distal deictic device. Consider the following example.

(19) DAVIS: What’s all that under that tarpaulin out there?
ASTON: Wood. (PP.86-88)

But sometimes it is used as an existential there and not as a distal deictic device, as in the following examples,
(20) ASTON: Well, there’s things like the stairs ...And the...The bells. (P.67)

(21) Aston: There’s nothing to worry about. (P.37)

The existential use of *there* has not been taken into consideration in the analysis, as it is not a deictic item.

The second point concerns different uses of *then* and *now*. *Then* is employed as a temporal distal deictic device, which refers to the time preceding and following the time of utterance. In the following exchange, *then* is used as a distal deictic device.

(22) PERSEPHONE: Linda! (pause.) You like him as much as Bernard?

LINDA (derisive): Bernard!

PERSEPHONE: As much as that David, then? (P.53)

In the next exchange, however, it does not have deictic value. It is used as a way of joining a statement to an earlier piece of conversation.

(23) RIELY: Feel guilty about it.

PERSEPHONE: About what?

RIELY: About not coming back.

LINDA: Aren’t you coming back then?

RIELY: No! As of now, no. (P.50)

It is the same concerning *now*, which is a temporal proximal deictic device and refers to the time at which the speaker is making the utterance. Consider the following example.

(24) The soil of England is fertile, its climate is good, it is capable of affording food in abundance to an enormously greater number of animals than now inhabit it. (P.2)

But, in the following exchange it is used as a proximal discourse deictic marker and not a temporal deictic device.

(25) ASTON: There’s nothing to worry about.

DAVIES: Now look here, don’t you worry about it. (P.37)
The third point is about features of the perfective aspect. Sometimes the meaning is ambiguous and it can refer to immediate past or distant past. Such uses are ignored in the analysis.

1.2.6 The Descriptive Procedure

Chapters IV and V give a description of the passages and analysis has been presented in a certain format. The passages are reproduced in the chapter in the following way. At the beginning of each passage there is a brief introductory paragraph which describes the situational context of the passage and gives a brief outline of the main events in the passage. First, there is an analysis of person deixis followed by the analysis of spatial and discourse deixis, temporal deixis and social deixis. Appropriate examples from passages are given to illustrate the analysis. There is a table giving analysis of frequencies of proximal and distal deixis under the four categories. At the end of each of these chapters, a summary of the main findings is given.

1.3 The Plan of Research

1) Introduction

The chapter deals with the study of language and pragmatics as a subfield of linguistics. Language use is really a form of joint action. A joint action is one that is carried out by a small group of people in coordination with one another. Language use therefore, embodies both individual and social processes. Speakers and Listeners must carry out actions as individuals, but they must also work together as participants in social units. Since Language use is a joint activity it cannot be understood from one of the perspectives alone. The term ‘pragmatics’ covers the study of language use in relation to language structure and context of utterance. Pragmatics is concerned with the fact that in every conversation more is communicated than is actually said. Yule (1996) thinks that pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and the users of those forms. Pragmatics
includes the study of Presupposition, Implicature, Turn-taking, Adjacency Pairs, Speech Acts Theory, Co-operative Principle, Politeness Principle and Deixis.

II) The Survey of the Studies on Deixis

In this chapter, reviews of related theories and previous studies on deixis and its categories are presented.

III) Theoretical Framework of Deixis

The concept of ‘Deixis’ and its different categories--- Person, Spatial, Temporal, Discourse, Social, Proximal, Distal--- are discussed here.

IV) Analysis of Deixis in The Caretaker and Enter a Free Man

In this chapter the researcher deals with major categories of Deixis--- Person, Spatial, Temporal, Discourse, Social, Proximal, and Distal. Some passages from the selected plays The Caretaker by Pinter and Enter a Free Man by Stoppard are chosen and analysed within the framework of these major categories of Deixis.

V) Analysis of Deixis in Animal Farm and Lucky Jim

This chapter deals with major categories of Deixis--- Person, Spatial, Temporal, Discourse, Social, Proximal and Distal. Some passages from the selected novels Animal Farm by Orwell and Lucky Jim by Amis are chosen and analysed within the framework of these major categories of Deixis.

VI) Conclusions

This chapter presents the major findings of the research, pedagogical implications of the study and some suggestions for further study in this area.