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INTRODUCTION

1.1 Preliminaries

Language is specifically a human capacity for acquiring and using complex system of communication. Human beings express, perceive and react through different modes of communication, be it the verbal, nonverbal or written form. Any communicative event is accompanied by other essential components like who is using the language, how, when and why. The answer lies in analyzing language and language use in the totality of social interactions and cultural conventions and principles along with the context of communication. Thus language, communication and culture are more complex among humans. While an individual’s cultural background answers the ‘how’, the context or situation in which an individual chooses to communicate in a certain manner takes care of the ‘when’. However, the inquiry to ‘why’ human beings coordinate their speech in a particular manner in a given situation elevates the study of language from the componential linguistic level to the supra-sentential platform where language is studied in the framework of texts, dialogues, conversation or discourse. This socio-cultural perspective on language usage has been primary to the study of Pragmatics and subsequently to Discourse Studies. It is vital to understand the concepts of Pragmatics before moving ahead towards the study of Discourse. The first section of the present chapter discusses the inception, development and position of Pragmatics in the study of Language.

1.2 Pragmatics: Meaning in Abstract v/s Meaning in Use

The word pragmatics is genealogically connected to the Greek word Pragmaticos and its Latin counterpart Pragmaticus both meaning ‘of being practical’. An offshoot of Linguistics, Modern Pragmatics came as a reaction against Ferdinand de Saussure’s Structuralism. The Structuralist approach focused on the formal and
logical analysis of language. The new study offered to examine ‘the use of language as distinct from, but complementary to, language itself seen as a formal system.’ (Leech, 1983: x) Leech calls it the **Complementarist** view to Pragmatics. As Linguistics holds a semantically abstract approach to language, Pragmatics, as the name suggests, proffers a communicative and contextual use of language. Leech defines Pragmatics as ‘the study of how utterances have meanings in situations.’ (1983: x)

Pragmatics studies linguistic phenomena in the perspective of their usage, properties and processes. The pragmatic approach to language focuses on the inherently contextualized nature of language rather than on abstract linguistic systems. Jesus Romero Trillo in his article “The pragmatic fossilization of discourse markers in non-native speakers of English” states that ‘The formal track of language development relates to the grammatical and semantic rules that conform the competent use of a given language; the pragmatic track, on the other hand, relates to the social use of language in different contexts and registers.’ (2002: 770)

Similarly, George Yule’s definition touches upon four areas that Pragmatics is concerned with. Yule (1996) defines Pragmatics as the study of (i) **speaker meaning**, i.e. ‘Can you pass me the salt, please?’ (ii) **contextual meaning**, i.e. a couple saying ‘I do’ inside a church, in front of a priest (iii) how more gets communicated than is said, i.e. ‘Do you have a minute?’ and (iv) the expression of relative distance i.e. ‘What is that?’. He summarizes his proposition by calling it the study of intentional human action.

According to Levinson, ‘Pragmatics is the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalised or encoded in the structure of language.’ (1983:9)
The ability to judge the context and understand the speaker’s intended meaning is called pragmatic competence. Pragmatic awareness is regarded as one of the most challenging aspects of language learning and comes only through experience. Thorat in his article “Pragmatic competence and Socio-psychological growth” mentions that ‘Pragmatic competence is rightly understood as learners’ ability to make their conversational contributions socially acceptable, relevant and effective.’(2008:23)

Noël Burton Roberts in his article “Pragmatics and Wittgenstein: Ostensive and Non-descriptive Definition” analyses Pragmatics as a kind of inquiry that is parasitic on Linguistic theory. By parasitic he meant to derive the correlations and discrepancies between what can be said of sentences as such and what can be said of utterances. With this revelation Pragmatics established itself as a distinct discipline of research and analysis in the field of Linguistics.

1.2.1 Modern Pragmatics: A Historical Preamble

The establishment of Pragmatics as an independent discipline experiences three stages. In the late 1930s’ and 40s’ philosophers like Pierce, Morris and Carnap considered Pragmatics to be a branch of Semiotics, the science of Signs. Saussure’s Structuralist approach to language paved the way for Bloomfield’s scientific basis to Linguistics. Bloomfield’s adherence to Behaviourism made the study of Linguistics synonymous to Phonetics, Phonemics or Morpho-phonemics.

The influence of both approaches declined in the late 50s’ and 60s’ as Noam Chomsky developed the theory of Linguistic competence and subsequently the theory of Transformational-Generative grammar. Syntax became the centre of Linguistic analysis as Chomsky studied Semantics through Syntax and for the first time considered ambiguity and synonymy to be part of syntactic analysis. Till then the abstract and potentially universal features of language were in the limelight
and crowded the centres of the tables of linguistic research. The concepts of ordinary language use were not paid much attention and were knocked off the tables to end up in the waste basket.

Once Semantics was admitted alongside syntax it was difficult to exclude structure from meaning in context. Structural analysis of language could no more suffice to analyze the communicative use of language. It was time to take out the discarded data from the wastebasket and start afresh with the study of language in communication. This came to be known as the emergence of Pragmatics from the ‘rag-bag’ or ‘wastebasket’ theory. It was proven between the 1950s’ and late 60s’ when philosophers like J. L. Austin (1962), J. Searle (1969), and P. Grice(1957) formulated the theories of Speech Acts and Conversational Implicature. These theories were a major breakthrough in the study of Pragmatics. Pragmatics as a sub-branch of Linguistics started taking shape post 1970. In the third stage, with the advent of the *Journal of Pragmatics* in 1977, S. Levinson’s *Pragmatics* and G.N. Leech’s *Principles of Pragmatics* in 1983 and finally the setting up of the International Pragmatic Association (IPrA) in 1988 allotted Pragmatics a substantial position in the field of Linguistics. Lakoff’s (1971) argument that Syntax cannot legitimately be separated from study of language use broadened the scope of Linguistics from form to meaning and ultimately culminated in context. Chomsky complemented it in his later book *Rules and Representations*. He stated that

A fuller account of knowledge of language will consider the interactions of grammar and other systems, specifically the system of conceptual structures and pragmatic competence and perhaps others, for example, systems of knowledge and belief that enter into what we might call commonsense understanding of the world.

(1980:92)
The scope of Pragmatics widened after the 1980s. It not only encompassed the study of language as action but also as an interaction in various social settings across cultures. Jef Verschueren in his article “Whose discipline? Some critical reflections on linguistic Pragmatics” elaborates, ‘Pragmatics is ‘a general functional perspective on (any aspect) of language,’ i.e. as ‘an approach to language which takes into account the full complexity of its cognitive, social and cultural (i.e. meaningful) functioning in the lives of human beings’. (1999:870) It specifically influenced the study of conversation analysis or discourse analysis where the discourse analyst is committed to an investigation of the purpose of language use.

As Brown and Yule put it

In discourse analysis, as in Pragmatics, we are concerned with what people using language are doing, and accounting for the linguistic features in the discourse as the means employed in what they are doing. (1983:26)

Atkinson, Kilby and Roca define Pragmatics as having to do with ‘The distinction between what a speaker’s words (literally) mean and what the speaker might mean by these words.’ (1988:217)

The following section of the chapter offers an overview to discourse studies and discusses the scope of discourse analysis taking into account the principles of Pragmatics.

1.3 Discourse: An Introduction

The study of Discourse is gaining a multidisciplinary status in present time. Linguists refer to discourse as ‘language in use’—be it in the form of a public speech or more generally, in any possible way of speaking. In other disciplines
like History, Philosophy, Social Sciences, Anthropology, Political Science and Culture Studies, the term Discourse is used to imply what is say-able or thinkable about a topic in any socio-political-cultural context.

The evolution of Discourse as a distinct topic of study and analysis dates back to the 1960s alongside Pragmatics. It first emerged in the area of Ethnography and subsequently gained recognition in other related fields like Linguistics, Sociolinguistics and Pragmatics and also in the study of Cognitive Psychology.

Discourse Studies has come a long way since then. Since the present research primarily focuses on Discourse Studies in the Pragmatic perspective, the study of Discourse will be treated as a branch of Pragmatics which aims at providing an explanatory description of systematic differences between form and function and the relationship between them in any written or verbal piece of communication.

The study of Discourse in the field of Communication Studies has been the most recent development. Any written or spoken piece of communication today is considered part of discourse that embraces language and issues related to it. More than just looking into language and language in use, the study of Discourse also takes into consideration factors like time, space, objects, beliefs, culture and context. Michael Foucault, philosopher and one of the pioneering names in Discourse Studies, attempts to understand Discourse as a bridge that links languages, social institutions, subjectivity and power. Foucault advocates idea of discourse in communication and how it encapsulates culture in it. Culture plays an integral part in the study of communication. The following paragraph derives an intersection between culture, communication and discourse.


1.3.1 Discourse, Culture and Communication

‘Communication and culture are not separate entities or areas. Each is produced through a dynamic relationship with the other’ (Schirato and Yell, 2000:2). Many researchers have approached these concepts in their own different ways. Tony Schirato and Susan Yell in the book Communication and Culture discuss that ‘Culture can be understood as the totality of communication practices and systems of meaning where Communication stands for the practice of producing meanings and also the way in which systems of meanings are negotiated by participants.’ (2000:1) As Thorat puts it, ‘without shared beliefs, experience and institutions, communication would not be effective.’ (2002:30)

Experts define two modes of Discourse: ‘talk’ and ‘text’ i.e. the spoken and written form of discourse. All sorts of verbal communication ranging from a presidential speech to an informal friendly chat comprise the ‘talk’ while the ‘text’ could be a newspaper advertisement, an essay or a book of fiction. Present day analysts are keener on studying communication in its abstractness that reveals the actual discourse of the ‘talk’ and ‘text’. Thus, the study of Discourse unfolds as an integrated affair to three concepts – language in use, the communication of belief (cognition) and interaction (in social situation).

Hence, Discourse can be understood as a mode of organizing ideas that are rooted in language and cultures. As Shi-xu, Professor of Discourse and Culture Studies puts it, ‘Discourse is linguistic communication in social, cultural, historical and political context’ (2005:1).

In his recent book A Cultural Approach to Discourse Shi-xu looks beyond the conventional meaning of language, culture, and communication. Instead, he coins new phrases like ‘versions of events’ and ‘ways of speaking’ to give a new
dimension to Discourse Studies. Quoting May (2001); van Dijk (1985) and Verschueren (1999), Shi-xu points out that

Discourse is neither merely text and talk reducible to linguistic forms, as in the case in some language-oriented disciplines, nor just a unit of meaning independent of the forms of realization, as often occurs in the other social sciences. Rather, discourse is conceived of as construction of meaning – representing and acting upon reality – through linguistic means in concrete situations…. Thus, a unity of both form and meaning … and not merely a form of talking or writing, but also a way of thinking. (2005:1)

It entails that the concept of discourse can be understood as being equivalent to the way of thinking and further to the way of responding. The discourse-culture correlative leads to the elaboration on the notion of text, context and the role they play in the analysis of discourse.

1.3.2 Text, Context and Discourse Analysis

David Crystal defines discourse as ‘a continuous stretch of (especially spoken) language larger than a sentence, often constituting a coherent unit, such as a sermon, argument, joke or narrative.’(1992:25) For Cook, it is ‘the stretches of language perceived to be meaningful, unified, and purposive.’(1989:156) Discourse in this regard can be understood as ‘the actual instances of communication in the medium of language.’(Johnstone, 2002: 2) The notions of text and context are integral to the understanding of discourse. In Pragmatic terms, the word text is defined as any piece of a language unit with a definable communicative function. ‘In terms of utterances, ‘text’ is the linguistic content: the stable semantic meanings of words, expressions, and sentences…’ (Schiffrin, 1994: 363)
To sum up, discourse refers to the coherent pieces of texts that form a meaningful whole. The coherence in the text enables it to perform an action within a piece of discourse. According to Mey, ‘Discourse is what makes the text context bound, in the widest sense of the term.’ (1993:187) As text alone cannot explain the function that language performs, it becomes necessary to bring in the concept of context for further elaboration.

While discourse is perceived as language in action, it cannot exist in void. A communicative event that supports the oral or written record of a language becomes integral to comprehend the action happening via language. A communicative event is defined as ‘a piece of oral or written interaction, which contains a complete message.’ (Nunan, 1993:117) It also takes into consideration the environment in which communication happens. In technical term the communicative environment is referred to as the context. According to Nunan, contexts are of two kinds - linguistic and experiential. The linguistic context refers to the words, utterances and sentences surrounding a piece of text whereas the experiential context refers to the real world environment in which the text occurs. For example, the safety measures that are explained by the air hostess as the flight is ready to take off are typical to the environment when the flight is leaving the ground. The same utterances don’t hold true inside the airport.

Jacob L. Mey rejects the context-free concepts of text as developed by text grammarians as he states

The answer is simply that the text … is not a particularly helpful or interesting concept in understanding human behaviour. What we need to do is to transcend the limited approach that sees texts as collections of language productions and ascribes these productions to single individual uttering sentences, or even to pairs of individuals
exchanging standardized text units such as questions and answers, orders and acknowledgements, promises and acceptances, and other simple conversational repartees. (1993: 184)

In the present study as the researcher aims at carrying out a Discourse Analysis of select modern Indian English novels as part of the text or written communication, it can be assumed that the preliminary study done on Discourse would give a definite angle to the study.

As discussed earlier, the linguist concentrates on the linguistic structures and forms while a discourse analyst views fictional discourse from the communicative potentials. In prose fiction, the concept of discourse carries an extended connotation. Thorat in his book *Five Great Indian Novels: a Discourse Analysis* asserts, ‘Discourse manifests itself in two modes or channels in any linguistic transaction. It could be written discourse or oral/spoken discourse.’ (2000:9)

Any work of fiction is the manifestation of the writer’s imagination. He binds together his thoughts in the words he chooses. As the writer chooses his fictional characters he assigns him dialogues to carry the story forward. As the characters emote through the words, their words are loaded with multiple layers of meanings. Discourse analysis offers various analytical devices to investigate the hidden communicative intent of the speaker. On many occasions characters express more than they speak.

Every novel is set in a socio-cultural backdrop. The characters in the story abide by the rules and restrictions of the culture they are set in and react to it. A very powerful influence of the society and culture can be seen in their communication and behavior.
The novels selected for the present study have a global appeal that reflects on various cultural and socio-political issues, both at the national and international levels. The issues of racism, question of identity, social class disparity and caste conflict, increasing economic inequality, political injustice, gender bias, psychological trauma and questions related to it have been touched upon by the authors. Analyzing the texts in their respective contexts in relation to the acting and reacting dramatic personae would help the researcher configure the parameters of Discourse analysis.

1.4 Aims and Objectives
The following are the major aims of the research:
1. To apply the parameters of Pragmatics to carry out a discourse analysis of the selected Indian novels in English.
2. To evaluate the discourse strategies used by various authors.
3. To observe how fictional discourse proves to be a very powerful tool to organize and realize meaning beyond the limit of words and sentences.
4. To find out the significance of the in depth meaning of the dialogues against the socio-cultural backdrop of the novels and
5. To demonstrate how Discourse analysis would help the reader put the works of fiction in the social and cultural perspective.
6. To examine fiction as social discourse.

1.5 Hypothesis
1. Speakers choose Indirect Speech Acts to be more polite with their interlocutors. Direct Speech Acts, on the contrary may sometimes sound rude and prove to be a hindrance to achieve the desired conversational goals.
2. The maxim of Quality is the most widely violated maxim in human interaction.

3. Speakers violate the maxims of Cooperation to become more polite. More often than not speakers attempt to observe various maxims of Politeness in order to abide by the social relationships they are committed to.

4. The speaker’s intended meaning becomes relevant only under proper felicity conditions. Context plays a major role in reaching the desired inference. Speaker’s utterances and hearer’s response become ambiguous if considered out of context.

1.6 Methodology
The researcher begins by examining different approaches to discourse. To begin with, existing theories of discourse have been considered to evolve an independent model of analysis during the research. The four Indian English novels selected for the research are the primary source of data. Conversations having multiple meaning potentials have been identified from the novels. The relevant data collected from the novels has been systematically classified and grouped. The pragmatic parameters of Paul Grice’s ‘Cooperative Principle’, the ‘maxims of Politeness’ modeled by Geoffrey N. Leech and J.R. Searle’s ‘theory of Speech Acts’ have been adopted as points of reference for the analysis of data. Under the proposed theoretical framework the selected data has been analyzed in order to demonstrate how discourse study helps one understand the finer nuances of the fictional discourses. The above theories have been categorically applied to the data and the analysis has been elaborately analyzed in the form of conversational implicatures. Various research journals, reference books, unpublished M.Phil. and Ph.D dissertations and related websites have been referred to in the course of research as secondary data sources to support the central theory.
1.7 Scope and Limitations

The present research would be primarily based on the various theories proposed by linguistic philosophers Paul Grice, Geoffrey N. Leech and J.R. Searle. For practical purposes Critical Discourse Analysis will not be used. The researcher has confined the study to the discourse analysis of four modern Indian novels in English. The following are the novels selected for the study.


1.8 Rationale for Selection of Novels

Literature mirrors society. Fiction is a very powerful instrument to deal with social problems. In different ages different novelists dealt with grave social issues to create human awareness. With the use of various linguistic strategies they send the message across. The skillful use of words and expressions enables them to express their thoughts without being offensive to any particular group or system of the society. Fictional Discourse helps the writer both camouflage and reveal his ideologies at the same time. The fictional characters become the mouth piece of the author. As the reader starts reading, the hidden implications of the discourses gradually surface. A story teller is not a therapist, but he is definitely a pathfinder, a guide who makes the reader contemplate. Study of fictional discourse has attracted attention from many scholars of Sociolinguistics. The researcher also aims at revealing the potential of fictional discourse in dealing with social problems and issues.
The novels selected for study present a panoramic view of modern-day fiction. The authors concerned are all prestigious award winners and are eminent personalities in the literary circle. The discourse they have drawn on in their fictions is contemporary and fascinating. All of them have traveled widely, exposed themselves to different world cultures and have established themselves as global citizens. Therefore, they have developed an ability to look at the problems and issues in hand both from local as well as global viewpoint. Hence, it would be very interesting to examine the discourse created by these authors.

In everyday discourse sometimes individuals utter what they don’t mean but it also happens very often that it is expected from the addressee to understand what is not overt in the speech but only hinted. Communication becomes a success if the interlocutor exercises his pragmatic competence to understand the meaning of the unspoken words by judging it from the context. How the hearer sees through the inherent meaning of the speech is the subject of research. Study in Pragmatics elaborates on such intentional and contextual meaning of utterances searching for the rationale of their occurrence. Justifying the rationale further, the next section offers short summaries of the selected novels.

1.9 Summary of the Novels

Four modern Indian English novels written and published between 1997 and 2008 have been selected for the present research. As mentioned in the earlier section, the writers of all these novels are all prestigious award winning authors in the recent times and have been critically acclaimed by readers and critics all over the world. A renowned social activist and now an acclaimed writer, Arundhati Roy was the recipient of the 1997 Booker Prize. Jhumpa Lahiri received the prominent Pulitzer Prize in the year 2000. Kiran Desai was awarded the prestigious Man Booker Prize in 2006 and journalist turned novelist Arvind Adiga was the winner.
of the 2008 Man Booker Prize. The success of these novels is remarkable as the genre of Indian English fiction reached a new height with them.

1.9.1 The God of Small Things

Arundhati Roy’s *The God of Small Things* is a tragic saga of dizygotic twins Esthappen and Rahel in the backdrop of an orthodox Syrian Christian family. It is a journey through their birth, union, separation and reunion. Roy deals with the themes of love, desire, separation, child abuse, caste discrimination, and the issue of communism efficiently.

The plot encircled the Ayemenem House, the ancestral residence of the Ipe family. Estha and Rahel were born to Ammu, the second generation daughter of the family and a born rebel who went all the way to Calcutta and got married to a non-Christian, defying the family values. Ammu’s marriage proved to be a failure on the account of the drunken husband, trying to trade her in prostitution to his English boss in the tea estate. Divorced, with two children, Ammu returned to the Ayemenem House to live a life of neglect and shattered dreams. She eventually met with a tragic and lonely death.

Baby Kochamma was the first generation daughter of the house and Ammu’s paternal aunt, who never got married following a one sided love affair with a clergy man. Chacko was Ammu’s brother who studied at Oxford and cherished communist ideologies in him. While at Oxford, Chacko fell in love with Margaret and got married to her. The marriage did not last long and they got divorced. While Chacko returned to India with a degree and a broken family, Margaret got married to another man, who died in a fatal car accident a short while later. She was left with a daughter named Sophie.
When the story began, Estha and Rahel were grown up and were meeting each other after a long gap of 20 years. Estha was permanently silent and Rahel was divorced. They then, returned to the Ayemenem House. They had a troubled childhood and by the time they were adults, they completely lost their individualities. The novel travels back and forth accounting the twins’ tryst with a series of inopportune incidents of their childhood. Be it their visit to Cochin to receive Margaret Kochamma and Chacko’s step daughter Sophie Mol, be it Estha being handled indecently by the Lemondrinkorangedrink man at the theatre or Baby Kochamma permanently nagging and hating them. Fatherless and perpetually craving for paternal love, the twins developed a special bonding with Velutha. So did Ammu, who craved for a little affection. Velutha, a low class Paravan, was the carpenter at Chacko’s pickle factory, Paradise Pickles and Preserves.

The plot reached its culmination with Sophie Mol drowning in the river, one fateful night when Estha, Rahel and Sophie went on a stormy night voyage. The same night Ammu’s secret affair with Velutha was revealed to the family. Sophie Mol’s last rites were carried out in the church and Velutha, accused of abduction and physical abuse succumbed to the injuries inflicted by the police. The incident left a deep scar on their hearts which was never healed.

Another prominent subplot in the novel is the communist procession encountered by the family on their way to Cochin. Velutha was spotted in the march by Rahel, which aroused an unknown fear of insecurity inside Chacko. Baby Kochamma condemned Velutha’s involvement with the communist party workers and this hatred led her to falsely alleged Velutha in the incidents that followed. Subsequent to Sophie Mol’s death, Estha was sent to his father and Rahel stayed at the House till Ammu’s death. At the end, Rahel and Estha rediscovered themselves and realized that no one ever understood them better than each other.
1.9.2 The Namesake

Jhumpa Lahiri’s *The Namesake* deals with the themes of cross-culturalism, cultural clashes, conflict of assimilation of two cultures and the question of identity. It narrates the story of a Bengali couple Ashoke and Ashima Ganguli, and their son Gogol. The novel portrays their struggle in a foreign land in search of identity. Ashoke joined MIT as an engineering student, Cambridge and continued taking up a faculty position. Ashima came with Ashoke to America leaving her family in India to start a new life in an alien land. She could never come to terms with the western cultural nuances. The couple faced a cultural clash when their first child Gogol was born and they were waiting for his ‘good name’ to arrive via post, chosen by Ashima’s grandmother.

Gogol was his ‘pet name’ by Bengali family tradition. The letter from India got lost and the birth certificate registered his name as Gogol. As Gogol grew up, his discomfort with his name intensified. He felt that his name attracted more attention than him. Consequently, he changed his name legally from Gogol to Nikhil. His parents were hurt but supported their son’s decision. In a later incident, one day the train in which Gogol used to travel home, unusually got delayed; then taking the cue from the incident Ashoke spoke about the fateful train accident that had changed his life. He recounted how he was found holding on to the book by Russian writer Nicolai Gogol, when he was rescued. Ashoke believed that he was alive because of the book; which was the reason why he named his son after the Russian writer. Gogol felt betrayed and guilt stricken because he never liked his name that was so revered to his father.

Ashoke died of a heart attack a few days later and an unusual void filled Gogol’s life. Subsequently, he broke up with his long time girlfriend Maxine for whom he neglected his family. On Ashima’s insistence, he met a Bengali girl named Moushumi and later got married to her. Moushumi was going through an
emotional breakdown when she got married. Post marriage, both of them realized that they were searching for their lost love in each other. The marital life started falling apart as their careers became demanding and separated them physically for a while. The physical distance only widened as Gogol, subsequently came to know of Moushumi’s affair with a French artist. They legally got separated while Ashima sold off her property in America and shuttled between India and America every six months. Gogol’s sister, Sonia got married to an American, assimilated in the culture and settled there.

Gogol could neither accept the West nor could he identify himself with Indian culture- the culture of his ethnic identity. The quest remained unresolved. Gogol finally took refuge in the books of Nikolai Gogol, his namesake, with whom he shared more than just a name. In the books, he felt the presence of his father who always equated the name Gogol, to life.

1.9.3 The Inheritance of Loss
Kiran Desai’s novel The Inheritance of Loss is set in the period of the Indo-Nepal insurgency. The locale of the novel is Kalimpong, a small border town near Darjeeling. Along with the issues of fundamentalism and social unrest, Desai also deals with the problems of the illegal immigrants along with the question of cultural identity. It is the story of Sai, a Convent educated teenager and her London educated Anglophile grandfather, Jemubhai Patel, a judge.

In the narrative, the judge led a life of sheer contempt. His attitude turned brutal towards the rest of the world from the time, he was not able to acquire a decent rank in the IFS exam. He settled for a job lesser than his expectation. He got married to a woman, whom he despised the most in his life. His wife Nimi, being a village simpleton was not able to match up to her husband’s expectations. The
forced physical intimacy, along with physical and verbal abuses destroyed the judge’s married life.

Nimi was sent back to her maternal house where she gave birth to a daughter and met a tragic end after a short while. The judge never took responsibility of his daughter and broke all ties with her, when she married a non-Gujrati man. The daughter and the son-in-law were killed in a tragic car accident in Russia. They were survived by a daughter Sai, who was now the judge’s responsibility. Sai’s arrival brought back the long subdued feeling of insecurity and anguishes him and he turned hostile towards her. Sai, on the other hand was a neglected child and turned a rebel, long since then. She wanted to enjoy her newly discovered freedom. Gyan, a Nepali young man was appointed her home tutor. Gradually, Sai and Gyan developed a romantic affinity towards each other.

Another predominant subplot in the novel tells the story of the judge’s cook and Biju, the cook’s only child, who went to America to make money. Biju was struggling in America where he was an illegal immigrant. The cook sent him there to make a better future but Biju, with his own set of cultural and religious inhibitions kept on switching from one ill-paid job to another. Meanwhile, the GNLF unrest became worse in the town and the Gorkhas rebelled and started looting people in that area of their food stock and personal belongings. Gyan’s active involvement in the rebellion upset Sai and they fell out. Gyan taunted Sai for her noble birth and western upbringing. Gyan became the mouthpiece of the rebels and blamed rich people like her for their poverty. A riot ensued in the town and innocent people like the cook and others suffered the trauma. Sai was hurt but the judge was indifferent to everything.

Towards the end of the novel, the judge’s pet dog, Mutt was kidnapped by an impoverished couple which left the judge disoriented for the rest of his life. Biju
left America but before he could reach home, he was robbed by the rebels. He returned home half dead. Though, all characters exhibit their set of idiosyncrasies, they met with the same fate in the end; a perpetual sense of loss, which they could never overcome.

1.9.4 The White Tiger

Aravind Adiga, in his debut novel, *The White Tiger* contrasts India’s booming economy with the people in the dark who still lead a life in crushing poverty. The themes of corruption, the hypocritical Indian feudal system, the wide economic disparity, the caste system and the search for individuality are integral to the novel.

Adiga tells the story of Balram Halwai, the son of a rickshaw puller who killed his master and prospered as an entrepreneur in later life. Balram came from a backward village Laxmangarh, which was in the grip of a corrupt politician. Balram’s village was under his dominance who misused the villagers and their constitutional rights to win elections and to hoard money.

Balram was a school dropout but was the smartest among all. As he grew up and learned driving, he went to the landlord’s place seeking for a job. He used his skills of flattery and settled in the job. In the first person narrative, Balram assigned animal imageries to the members of the landlord’s family. He called them ‘the Mongoose’, ‘the Stork’ which contributed to their qualities. His sincerity and dedication to his masters paid off and he moved out of the Darkness to the posh city of Gurgaon as Mr. Ashok’s driver and domestic help.

Mr. Ashok was the local politician’s America returned son, who had only one job in hand- to bribe the authorities and other politicians to get various illegal and unethical jobs done. As he spent many years abroad, Mr. Ashok was not able to
come to terms with the way the Indian political system worked. He despised the job he was compelled to do but couldn’t complain. He was a puppet at the hands of his father, the Stork and his brother, Mukesh, the Mongoose.

Pinky madam was Mr. Ashok’s wife who loathed India and Indians. Once he reached Gurgaon, Balram learned the ways of survival in the city, met other drivers, joined them in gossip, lied to his master, visited brothels and finally made a sinister plan to get rid of poverty for good. The city transformed him from a meek ‘Country Mouse’ to a ferocious, invincible ‘White Tiger’. Balram took the extreme step followed by an incident when a homeless got run over by Pinky madam and the family threatened Balram to take the blame on himself and surrender.

Balram was hurt to see his master Mr. Ashok joining the oppressors’ brigade which fuelled his vindictive attitude. He had always been at the receiving end of physical and verbal abuse. He felt hopeless and humiliated when his family got vindicated. He put an end to his sufferings by murdering Mr. Ashok and ran away with a bag full of money. His, was a very common face in the crowd which helped him to evade the police. He started his life afresh as a car rental entrepreneur in the city of Bangalore. In this way, he displayed his resistance to submit at the hands of exploitation and made his way through misery never to look back.

1.10 Conclusion
The introductory chapter constructs the background for the proposed research. The chapter begins with a historical background of the present research and discusses the position and scope of Pragmatics in modern Linguistics. The concept of Discourse is introduced; its role in culture and communication studies is elaborated, accompanied by a brief overview of the notions of text and context long with their relevance in Discourse Studies. The following sub-section enlists
the aims and objectives of the research. The methodology of research along with the research hypothesis has been stated in points. The chapter also discusses the scope and limitations of the study and the rationale for selection of data. This is followed by short narratives of the four novels selected for the research. The background of the study being set, chapter II constructs the theoretical framework of the present study in Discourse Analysis.