CHAPTER 3

JUDGEMENT: THE EVALUATION OF BEHAVIOUR

Discourse and language can be used to make unbalanced power relations. Portrayals of social groups appear to be commonsense, normal, and natural though in reality they are of prejudice, injustice, and inequity. “Using just words, those in power, or wishing to be so, can misdirect our concerns for persistent, larger systemic issues of class, gender, age, religion, and culture seems petty or nonexistent. Unless we begin to debunk their words, we can be misled and duped into embracing the dominant worldview (ideology) at our expense and their gain. When discourse is effective in practice, evidenced by its ability to organize and regulate relations of power, it is called a regime of truth (Foucault 1980:124). It is this regime, a system through which a political and a social system is controlled. Sentences and words of a text can also convey information about power relations.

The present chapter tries to answer the following questions:

Who is depicted as in power and over whom the evaluations are passed?

Who is depicted as powerless and passive and which lexical items of Judgement are used to exhibit their powerlessness?

Who evaluates human conduct and whose behaviour is being evaluated?

Who is exerting power with whom and with what type of Judgements and why?

In this chapter, an attempt is made to investigate those lexico-grammatical structures that Tehmina Durrani has used for negotiating power in both the texts *Blasphemy* and *My Feudal Lord*. The term Judgement has been chosen to reference attitudinal evaluation in which human behaviour is negatively or positively assessed by reference to some set of social norms. Where Judgement is explicitly indicated, we find terms such as corrupt, dishonest, tyrant, bully, hero.
betray, skilled, genius, eccentric. The term Judgement has been taken from common parlance and has been given a more specialized or technical meaning. So it can be said that a specialist or technical term “Judgement” has been made out of a term, which does not have a particularly precise meaning in everyday vernacular language.

Attitudes try to answer the questions of how the textual voice positions itself with respect to other voices and other positions. Attitudes also evaluate people’s character. Martin has named this judging people’s behaviour as Judgement. It is the second major Attitude in Appraisal theory. “Through this Attitude we construe people and the way they behave and how they ethically set up their standard into society” (Martin and White 2005; 52). As it is stated earlier that under Judgement, we are concerned with language which criticizes or praises which condemns or applauds the behaviour-the actions, deeds, sayings, beliefs, motivations of human individuals and groups.

When we judge a person, we more or less take the authority to judge a person i.e. he is good or bad. Through our evaluations towards one or the other’s behaviour, we make the other person feel powerless before us. “With Judgement we move into the region of meaning construing our Attitudes to people, the way they behave and their character” (Martin and White 2005; 52). Judgement constitutes the semantic resources for constructing evaluation of behaviour in the context of institutional norms about how people should or should not behave. It has evolved out of the problem of subjectivity and objectivity in media texts (Idemea et al 1994). The term Judgement, can be taken as a system of particular cultural and ideological situation in which it operates. The Judgements that we pass about people, about their morality, legality, capacity, normality will always be determined by the culture in which we live and by our own individual experiences, expectations, assumptions and beliefs. So there is always the possibility that the same event will receive different Judgements according to the ideological position of the person making those Judgements.
For similar reasons, the way particular words in actual texts will be interpreted may also depend on the social and ideological position of the reader. The actual meaning of a word, with its specific Judgement value, will often be determined by where it occurs in the text and by what other Judgements have been made previously in the text.

Bakhtin’s notion of heteroglossia is that utterances make chains of texts responding to previous utterances and inviting future utterances. In negotiating power, these chains play an important role and are clearly seen in the texts related with Judgements through lexico-grammatical resources (Bakhtin 1981).

There are many lexical items in both the texts which Tehmina Durrani has used to evaluate people’s behaviour which clearly shows how the major voices of the texts use and negotiate power in all kinds of interaction. Even a monologic piece of the text clearly reveals the role and importance of power for the major voices. Tehmina Durrani, in her autobiographical text *My Feudal Lord*, portrays so many women like her suffering and struggling for their existence in Pakistan. The second novel *Blasphemy* also exposes male dominance under the cover of religious power.

Through the use of various lexico-grammatical structures which evaluate and judge people’s behaviour, Tehmina Durrani has tried to present the pitiable and oppressed condition of women in Pakistan. Social, cultural and domestic constraints have suppressed their identities. In Pakistan’s case, one must fully analyse the cultural constraints and how they have reinforced the subordinated social role of women. The social structures in the cover of political process consist of power relations. The relative positions of individuals and groups establish identities and determine roles. The larger question about sex and power can only be understood in terms of the social structures and how they distribute values in society. In Pakistani society, where the Muslim patriarchs dominate, the entity of women is that of inferior beings, both intellectually and socially. She is
considered to be an instrument for the satisfaction of the man’s sexual desires and maintenance of the species.

Henley (1977) proposed that gendered power differences are usually reflected in patterns of communication. Henley and Harmon (1985:152) asserted that patterns of communication between men and women provide a “micro political structure that underlines and supports the macro political structure”. In the present chapter, these patterns are used as lexical resources by powerful men and powerless women in both the texts and these patterns take the form of macro patterns that represent society.

Both the texts reveal many types of power used and exhibited by major and even minor characters. This power is political, religious and social. The passage in Appendix 01 reveals thirteen motifs of Judgement. This is the second most used category after Appreciation by the author. By evaluating people’s behaviour positively or negatively, the author wants to exhibit the power dichotomy in the society. She makes us understand how the major and minor characters negotiate and subjugate power through their lexical choices. The first part of the passage is monoglossic in nature again where Heer narrates her mother’s beauty, her visit at Pir Sain’s shrine and her becoming Pir Sain’s mureed (follower) after the visit. The second part is heterglossic where mother interacts with her daughters and then announces her future plan for Heer. The passage is important piece because Heer’s mother’s decision to marry Heer to Pir Sain is the beginning of endless torturous path for Heer.

**Distribution of Positive and Negative Judgement in Appendix 01:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The passage given in Appendix 01 shows more positive motifs as compared to negative motifs. Almost in all the passages, the author has attributed almost the same vibes of Judgement- both positive and negative. This passage evaluates more of good behaviour of characters appraised by Heer’s mother than the bad conduct of them.

Positive vibes are:

_Blessing_

_Murred_

_Sain_

_Holy_

_Extremely Lucky_

_Dignity_

_Good_

_Powerful_

_Not a burden_

It is surprising that all the positive motifs are inscribed by mother or by Heer during her narration while evaluating mother’s beauty. So this shows that this text is dominated by Heer’s mother and her positive description about Pir Sain and his kingdom. The lexical motifs like *kingdom, powerful, Sain* exhibit the strong status owned by Pir Sain. The motifs like *mureed, extremely lucky, good girl and blessing* exhibit that mother indirectly negotiates for the power inherited by Pir Sain. She does not want it for the cause of ruling the society but for the
purpose of security for her and her family in the absence of her husband. The next positive vibe is inscribed by Pir Sain when she sees Heer. He evaluates her as she won’t be a burden. Though the lexical choice is of negative evaluation, the use of negative assertion not makes its meaning positive.

The negative motifs are:

**Burden**

*People did not think we are worth of any thing*

**Too holy**

Again these inscriptions are used by Heer’s mother. But these are used for her daughters and her family and her family’s dignity. She evaluates her daughters as burden over her tired shoulders. She wants Pir Sain to pray for her daughters to get married soon. Then mother again evaluates her family when she says:

*After your father’s death, people did not think we were worth anything.*

This sentence clearly proves mother’s feelings and hidden desires for a good status which she doesn’t have after her husband’s death and which she seeks from Pir Sain because he is having the same position as that of god.

The passage is purely interactive and heteroglossic in nature where the author has given a chance to the minor characters to let their hidden desires come on the surface. The evaluations of major characters through minor characters also present that view for which the author does not want to take the responsibility so she authorizes minor characters to share views about others. She leaves on the readers. It is up to them how they take these views.
Distribution of Different Categories of Judgement in Appendix 01:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Social Esteem</th>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that there is almost the equal distribution of lexical motifs in both the subtypes of Judgement. Seven motifs are used from every day evaluations like burden, extremely lucky and good. Six motifs are chosen from social sanction.

Distribution of Subtypes of Social Esteem in Judgement in Appendix 01:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social esteem</th>
<th>Normality</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Tenacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table depicts the division of evaluations under social esteem. We find from the above table again almost the same distribution of evaluations of Judgements from all the different kinds of social esteem. There are three motifs from capacity as usual at the highest, two from normality and two from tenacity.

Distribution of Subtypes of Social Sanction in Judgement in Appendix 01:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
<th>Propriety</th>
<th>Veracity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above table displays that all the motifs fall under *propriety*. The subsystem of *propriety* is concerned with the evaluation of compliance with or resistance to ethical norms. The modal system of obligation allows for degrees of compliance between the polar absolutes of ‘do’ and ‘don’t’. According to these norms, to be right provides positive evaluations and to defy these moral imperatives attracts negative evaluations. For example, *oppressor* and *selfish* is evaluated as negative, implying that without this behaviour, Mustafa and Pir Sain would not otherwise have achieved the status which they are enjoying at present. Other Judgements are judicial. They work as a kind of legal morality that we associate with legal institutions.

**Distribution of Inscribed and Invoked Judgement in Appendix 01:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Inscribed</th>
<th>Invoked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table displays that there are ten motifs which are used to inscribe Judgement and three are used to invoke Judgement.

The passage given in Appendix 02 has less Judgement motifs as compared to the other texts. There are only seven inscriptions of Judgement.

**Distribution of Positive and Negative Judgement in Appendix 02:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The text has five negative inscriptions and only two vibes give positive evaluations. Here Heer is the appraiser. She is narrating the first night of her wedding life. The one positive motif used here is *beautified* that has been used for Heer. She narrates that her relatives has beautified her on her wedding, thinking a good and beautiful relation might enter into her life. They have enhanced her beauty in all the possible ways so that she can instigate her husband’s passions for her. The second motif is also used for her family members and relatives who have celebrated her marriage. Only two positive vibes are used in the passage that too are related with the time of her marriage. These motifs indicate that immediately after her wedding night, Heer has felt that she is in a world of woes, not in a world of joyfulness.

The rest are negative motifs. They indicate Pir Sain’s behaviour. Strong adjectives have been used for his animal haste towards his wife. These are:

*Madness*

*Cruelty*

Heer uses a metaphor to evaluate her behaviour which her parents have considered justified. Not only her parents but society considers it right to decorate and beautify a daughter on her wedding so that she can tempt her husband. Heer uses a metaphor when she writes:

*...to tempt like a sorceress and unleash upon myself this madness, this cruelty?*

The metaphor *like a sorceress* is used for Heer herself. Heer thinks that her relatives had beautified her for the special day, thinking that she could put a spell on her husband *like a sorceress*. They could have never imagined that Heer’s spell would leave her in a pitiable condition. She would be treated with madness and cruelty of her husband. What was considered to be a blessing seemed to Heer an evil on the very first dawn of her marriage.
Distribution of Different Categories of Judgement in Appendix 02:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Social Esteem</th>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are four motifs which are related to social esteem and three are used from social sanction. So we find almost the same distribution of motifs from both the categories.

Distribution of Subtypes of Social Esteem in Judgement in Appendix 02:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social esteem</th>
<th>Normality</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Tenacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we look into the subtypes of social esteem, only single motif comes from tenacity. Three choices fall under normality that shows the extraordinary qualities of appraised ones. One is from capacity that is used by applying metaphor where Heer allies her with a sorceress who can put a magic spell on the onlookers and tempt him to do anything for her but exactly the opposite becomes her fate.

Distribution of Subtypes of Social Sanction in Judgement in Appendix 02:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
<th>Propriety</th>
<th>Veracity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again the table exhibits the subtype *propriety* having three motifs and *veracity* having none. The motifs used by the narrator are strong adjectives:

*Cruelty*

*Evil*

*Slaughter*

Distribution of Inscribed and Invoked Judgement in Appendix 02:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Inscribed</th>
<th>Invoked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This passage is significant because it has almost half of the motifs which are meant to provoke the readers. Through Heer, the writer provokes her readers by writing:

*Did I sleep that night or was it some kind of death?*

Again she writes:

*I jumped like a frightened bird.*

*A further provocative sentence is again used:*

*…to prompt like a sorceress and unleash upon myself this madness and cruelty?*

She further writes:

*I had been sacrificed to a god on earth.*
This passage given in Appendix 03 shows nineteen Judgement motifs in all. Heer appraises eighteen evaluating items but Amma Sain also appraises one evaluation. The evaluation inscribed by Amma Sain, the mother of Pir Sain clearly indicates the power possessed by her son and her ancestors. Her evaluation direct decedents of Prophet expresses her thinking that her family is very near to God and they are the direct descendents of Prophet. Tehmina Durrani has used direct evaluation here which is again the indication of the power and the feel of the power that is there also in Pir Sain’s mother too.

The rest of the Judgements are appraised by Heer, the protagonist of the novel. Firstly, she evaluates women like her whom she calls faceless and nameless because they are all trapped by Pir Sain. She feels these women powerless before Pir Sain and his trap. Tehmina wants to feel her readers the plight and powerlessness of many women like Heer who are trapped. That’s why she has chosen these words like faceless and nameless. According to the author, these women have lost their identity and that is why they are nameless and faceless.

Heer uses the metaphor to judge common masses to look like rats then she calls them an army of deformed beggars. This evaluation shows that Pir Sain’s grip is so powerful that not only women but common men have also lost their existence. At the time of birth, child’s head was fitted into an iron cage so that his head could not grow. As a result, their growth used to deform and this was an army of deformed beggars who used to beg alms.

Heer judges people and evaluates their helpless situation again when she calls them trapped:

People were trapped so much in Pir Sain’s trap that Pir Sain could extract any thing from them.

Again the appraised items a direct link between the Almighty and the link between God and wretched show the great heritage owned by Pir and his family.
This passage clearly and strongly expresses Pir Sain’s power and the powerlessness of common men including women. One thing more comes out from this analysis that Pir Sain’s mother, though a woman herself, feels proud of her son’s kingdom. She is a proud teller that they are the direct descendents of Prophet. The passage also reveals that though they are considered direct descendents yet they are exploiting and trapping people and that is what makes them more powerful and people more wretched and trapped. Amma Sain also told Heer that their power cannot be challenged. By making Amma to utter this sentence, the writer wants her readers to know that all the ways to challenge this system are closed.

**Distribution of Positive and Negative Judgement in Appendix 03:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We get nineteen inscriptions from Judgement. Out of nineteen, twelve are negative only seven are positive. Out of the twelve positive evaluations, only one has been evaluated by Amma Sain and it is about her family and her position. The rest of the positive evaluations are narrated by Heer. This motif is used for the narration about those suffering common masses whose behaviour is being evaluated with following choices:

_Worship_

_Fall at his feet_

_Fell over each other_

_Godly_
Powerful

Light of god

Though these choices are positive in nature yet these express common man’s pitiable condition, having no choice at all.

Then there are negative vibes. Heer evaluates these motifs in her narration. Some are used for people:

Trapped
Wretched
Look like rats
Chuhas (rats)
Deformed army of beggars

The rest are for Pir Sain and his powerful system:

Oppressor

Power can not be challenged
Meager

According to Heer, Pir and his power and the power of Shrine can not be challenged but by using negative vibes for Pir and his system, the author has clearly challenged that system through her writing.

**Distribution of Different Categories of Judgement in Appendix 03:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social Esteem</th>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the two categories of Judgement, the author again has preferred *social esteem* to the later. *Social esteem* has fifteen motifs and *social sanction* has only four motifs of Judgement.

**Distribution of Subtypes of Social Esteem in Judgement in Appendix 03:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Esteem</th>
<th>Normality</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Tenacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From *social esteem*, we again find *capacity* subtype as the most used type by the author. *Capacity* has the maximum motifs and *normality* has the minimum. There are three motifs *trapped, trapped and meager* that come under the subtype *tenacity* that pictures the dependency of the people over Pir Sain. *Tenacity* is the assessment of a speaker’s state of mind and commitment to perform an action. The motif *trapped* is used two times in the passage in order to emphasize the dependency of trapped people.

**Distribution of Subtypes of Social Sanction in Judgement in Appendix 03:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
<th>Propriety</th>
<th>Veracity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table exhibits the subtypes of *social sanction* and the author’s use of the motifs. Again we get four motifs from *propriety* alone, not a single motif from *veracity has* been acknowledged in the analysis.
**Distribution of Inscribed and Invoked Judgement in Appendix 03:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Inscribed</th>
<th>Invoked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table displays six motifs given in Appendix 04, which are used to provoke readers because Judgement values may not always be inscribed in a passage. The provoked Judgement depends on the evaluative positioning which has been made in the proceeding sentences. Evoked judgment is made through the use of that lexis which is of neutral value but attaches to it some culturally charged value. The communicative context is construed as single voiced or, in Bakhtin’s terms, monoglossic at least for the brief textual moment taken up by the utterances. By this, the writer presents the current proposition as one which has no dialogistic alternatives which need to be recognized. In broad terms, these can be classified as monoglossic when they make no reference to other voices and viewpoints and as heteroglossic when they do invoke or allow for dialogistic alternatives.

Though most of the parts of *Blasphemy* are in the monologue form but the present text is heteroglossic in nature. There are rare pieces where Durrani has left some scope for heteroglossia (term as coined by Bakhtin) but in this passage Tehmina Durrani has allowed dialogistic alternatives. The whole text is a tale told by Heer, the major voice in the novel. The novel is a sad story told by Heer. We are told whatever she wants to tell. But the present passage is an instance of heteroglossia where evaluation has come from a minor voice. The foreign journalist Gori who has met Pir Sain has all the *words of praise* for him. She is very much influenced by Pir Sain’s personality.

The passage is an example of people’s views about Pir Sain especially those people who live outside shrine. Here Pir is evaluated by a foreign journalist who visits Pir Sain and his Shrine. These motifs which Gori chooses for Pir Sain
are in total contrast with those lexical choices used by Heer for her husband Pir Sain. Thus the passage shows the views of one female, who is an outsider totally in contrast to the other female who is Pir’s wife.

**Distribution of Positive and Negative Judgement in Appendix 04:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table exhibits that the present passage has nineteen tokens of Judgement. Twelve motifs are positive and the rest are negative. Nine positive motifs are appraised by Gori and the appraised one is Pir Sain. She evaluates him by using words like:

*Humble*

*Serene*

*Peaceful*

She calls him all *powerful* which shows that an outsider is also conscious of Pir Sain being *powerful*. Then there are more positive evaluations:

*Purity on his face*

*Works miracles*

*More words of praise for him*

*So much tranquility*

*Provides people with something divine*
Negative vibrations come from Heer. She appraises Pir Sain and his system negatively. She even considers Gori a fool because she is unable to see the other side of Pir Sain who is known to that woman who is his wife. Heer appraises Pir’s mother whose wise words she values. Though Heer considers Gori intelligent yet she has a doubt that is why she says;

_She wanted to know if Gori was intelligent too._

The word intelligent is a positive evaluation but I have kept the word in negative category because it is very clear from the passage that Heer doesn’t think Gori intelligent as she is not looking deep inside Pir’s personality. The author’s use of _too_ after the lexis intelligent and the lexes _wanted to know_ make it clear that she wants to use lexis intelligent negatively.

In this passage, there are some values of Judgement which are mediated through attribution. The author is never their immediate evaluative attributer. The motifs like _Pir Sain has influence over common masses_ are attributed to Gori, a foreign journalist. Some lines make regular use of unmediated (authorially sourced) Judgement that is to say, in unattributed contexts where responsibility for the proposition is unambiguously being taken by the author. This is demonstrated in lines where it is the author who passes the Judgement that Gori has drawn a conclusion without realizing that there is always a cruel method behind undying devotion of people towards Pir and that she is not looking deep.

Gori admires Pir Sain directly when she uses words like:

_Humble_

_Powerful_

_Peaceful_

_Serene_
But she appraises Pir Sain indirectly too when she says about Pir that he *works miracles*. Again Gori appraises Pir Sain indirectly when she says:

He *provides the people with something divine*.

Implied motifs of Judgement have also come from Heer when she condemns Gori and her poor Judgement about Pir. She says:

Gori is *not looking deep enough*.

**Distribution of Different Categories of Judgement in Appendix 04:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Social Esteem</th>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that there are seventeen motifs from *social esteem*. *Social esteem* tends to be polished with humour has a critical role to play (Eggins and Slade 1997). All the three categories used by the writer to evaluate are realized under *social esteem*. Judgements which are oriented to *social sanction* are not much used in this passage. Only two motifs have been used from *social sanction*. This again shows that Tehmina Durrani doesn’t want any legality to be attached with when she makes her characters to evaluate other characters of the text.

**Distribution of Subtypes of Social Esteem in Judgement in Appendix 04:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Esteem</th>
<th>Normality</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Tenacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table clearly shows that there are seventeen motifs which are used under *normality* category. On the one hand, Gori has appraised Pir Sain in highly
positive words like serene, peaceful and tranquility; on the other hand, Heer condemns Gori as a fool who is not looking deep into Pir’s system. She even finds her helplessness before Pir’s system.

The table exhibits that there are seven inscriptions that come under capacity. Capacity refers to the assessment of a person’s ability to perform an action or achieve a result. All the motifs give positive vibrations and there is no negative evaluation done by both the insider and outsider. Three evaluations have been done by Heer to appraise Gori and four have been done by Gori.

Only three belong to tenacity. Out of them, two are negative and one is positive. Heer considers Gori frail and weak and she thinks herself strong.

**Distribution of Subtypes of Social Sanction of Judgement in Appendix 04:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
<th>Propriety</th>
<th>Veracity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are only two motifs from social sanction and all fall under propriety again. Social sanction is not used much in this passage.

**Distribution of Inscribed and Invoked Judgement in Appendix 04:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Inscribed</th>
<th>Invoked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are some inscriptions in the passage that don’t have the direct inscription of Judgement which move us and in a way have been successful in provoking us:
Nor had she tasted the venom of a man.

The poison inside Pir would kill her.

The above mentioned sentences are able to provoke us as readers.

The author has also used some intensifiers in the text. Here in the text these are realized through isolated lexeme and all the realizations are non figurative like so, so much, all. These intensifications are isolated intensifications and they are grammatical.

Gori talks about the devotion of people for Pir Sain. On the one hand, she is obsessed with the devotion of people for Pir Sain but on the other side, the writer has made her say that she has been prohibited by Pir to write about women of the Shrine which clearly and strongly resonates Pir’s superiority and may be his fear also if an outsider gets to interview the women of his family, he and his real persona will be exposed.

The passage given in Appendix 05 exhibits twenty motifs of Judgement, which is the most used type in both the texts.

**Distribution of Positive and Negative Judgement in Appendix 05:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table indicates equal number of positive and negative motifs used by the author. Though there are equal numbers of positive motifs yet they produce negative sense. Six positive motifs are evaluated by Jagirdar. First he evaluates Pir when he calls him sain and baadshah. The author again has shifted her responsibility from Heer, the narrator towards the Jagirdar. She lets the Jagirdar
speak out his evaluations what he thinks of Pir. Pir is called *sain* (mentor), *badshah* (master king). These words have the superlative sense when used in Hindi and Urdu language. The author by giving Jagirdar this authority to evaluate Pir as *sain, badshah* wants to give the outside views about Pir, particularly that of Pir’s friends. He again appreciates him by saying:

*You are the greatest.*

He evaluates Pir Sain as *the greatest* because Pir Sain has presented him Heer, a real beauty.

Jagirdar evaluates Pir Sain three times that denotes the powerfulness of Pir who is called *sain, badshah and the greatest*. The choice of these motifs laid an emphasis on author’s intentions to show the readers the place of Pir in his friend’s eyes. He then evaluates Heer as a *rare jewel*. He is a *pleasure* seeker, so after getting a beautiful woman from Pir, he is more than happy. Without knowing her real identity, he evaluates Heer in positive motifs again by using strong adjectives for Heer’s *evaluation*. He calls her:

*What a find!*  

Again he admires her beauty:

*What a rare jewel!*

Next positive motif is chosen to appraise Jagirdar. Heer is the narrator. She evaluates people like Jagirdar who command *the respect of a king*. These people have got a high status in a society. They are given so much respect by the people that can only be given to a king of any country. Then Heer uses the motif *custodians* for Jagirdar.
She writes:

*These custodians of the people revered for adherence to the faith, were concealing their sins under my burqa (veil).*

These are the people who are caretakers of the society. In spite of shipping society not to commit any type of crime and unethical deed, they themselves are busy in committing sins. These people who are revered by society by common masses are indulged in lustful relations. The high status which they have is giving them license to do and to commit any type of wrong openly.

The last positive motif of this passage is used by Heer for Pir’s wife, for herself whom she calls as *venerable* wife of the Pir. Heer doesn’t evaluate herself as *venerable* rather she recalls that position of a wife whose husband is Pir. She thinks Pir’s wife is having a respectable position on whom no one can lay his eyes.

Then there are negative motifs in the passage evaluating Pir’s behaviour negatively. These are:

*Fat*

*Sins*

*Whose*

*Trapped*

*Corrupt*

*Sons of a Pig*

*Sins*

*Corrupt*

*Crimes*

*Idiot*
These negative evaluations are attributed by Heer, the narrator of the passage. She describes Jagirdar’s physical structure by calling him *fat*. She writes about these respected custodians about them being corrupt and *committing sins*. She also evaluates women like Heer who are *trapped*. She chooses a strong adjective for faceless women who are *trapped* in Pir’s powerful ruling area. Then she shows her strong hatred by calling herself as *whore* of the city. These motifs describe Heer’s pitiful plight where she has been transferred from his status to the lowest rank for what a woman can never imagine.

**Distribution of Different Categories of Judgement in Appendix 05:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Social Esteem</th>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table again shows an equal distribution of motifs between these two types of Judgement. This is the only passage where *social sanction* is used at the maximum.

**Distribution of Subtypes of Social Esteem in Judgement in Appendix 05:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Esteem</th>
<th>Normality</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Tenacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is again an equal distribution of ten motifs, five from *normality* and five from *capacity*. The choice of lexical items from *normality* shows that characters are special. The subcategory *normality* assesses behaviour against expectations of what is usual or normal and the extent to which behaviour complies with these norms. They have something different from the rest of the
people so they are being evaluated. The choice of lexical motifs from capacity exhibits that characters are very much capable/incapable in particular field. The author has not used any motif that belongs to tenacity perhaps the author doesn’t consider her characters dependable which is the foremost requirement of tenacity.

**Distribution of Subtypes of Social Sanction in Judgement in Appendix 05:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
<th>Propriety</th>
<th>Veracity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surprisingly, all the lexical items are inscribed from the subtype propriety not a single motif comes under the second subtype which shows that author is not bothered about honesty or truthfulness of behaviour of any character. She strongly chooses those motifs which are based on ethical/unethical values to strengthen her point of view that Muslim power and kingly structure of Pir is far beyond approach. It may be based on ethical values or distort the ethical values.

**Distribution of Inscribed and Invoked Judgement in Appendix 05:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Inscribed</th>
<th>Invoked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table exhibits the distribution of inscribed and invoked motifs of Judgement. In this passage again, the author has decided not to provoke her readers but just to present her narration in standard accepted norms.

Now I will take *My Feudal Lord* and try to analyze the lexical items used by the author from which the behaviour of those who use power and of those on whom power is being exercised comes on surface. The two types of power i.e.
social and political that is being exercised in the text are found in abundance when Mustafa’s behaviour is being evaluated politically and personally by Tehmina and the other minor voices of the text. Tehmina describes Mustafa Khar as a feudal lord who has a very powerful presence. He is a very powerful person having a great personality and an overpowering presence, and he is also a good politician. But he also has some negative traits too; he is violent, aggressive, very short tempered man who is in habit to beat his wife, to beat his children and oppressed women and is extremely possessive. He has all the traits of feudal lords. He expects his women to be faithful while he himself wants to have the license to practice philandering anyway he likes to and where he wants to and with whom he likes. Feudalism plays a prominent role in giving Mustafa the authority with which he treats his wife and other women.

The passage given in Appendix 06 deals with feudalism exhibited in Pakistan. The writer wants to provide information to the readers about the feudal system inherited by Mustafa and his ancestors. There are eighteen lexical items used by the writer to evaluate power exhibited and exercised by feudal lords. Six motifs are used for criticizing feudalism:

- Plunder
- Rape
- Murder
- Neither pious nor moral

Rests are positive values:

- Holy
- Pious
- Righteous
- Envoys
- Lords
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The writer has condemned feudalism by the choice of very strong words as feudalism was a license to plunder, rape and murder.

The writer has illustrated two points in this text:

Certain loyal individuals whom the white masters had bestowed land and absolute power upon had multiplied their wealth by exploiting the feudal practices with the passage of time (Durrani 1995: 40).

The other is:

British rule ended in 1947 and the feudal system collapsed but in Pakistan although democratic principles were formed but in reality feudal lords remained in control (Durrani 1995: 40).

In My Feudal Lord, we find common masses from Pakistan facing and confronting the terrible neglect and deprivation, as opposed to the endless wealth, luxuries, and wastefulness of the powerful. Tehmina Durrani in her narration does develop a social conscience and wants to help the people but she wants to do this without changing herself and her own life style. Thus, the ‘social revolution” Pakistani elites often talk about that would be one in which their own wealth and life style would remain unchanged and unchallenged. An attitude of charity and care cannot transform a society which is, at its very heat, sickened by the parasitical hold that the power elites have on Pakistan.

**Distribution of Positive and Negative Judgement in Appendix 06:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table exhibits twenty five motifs of judging people and their behaviour. Fourteen evaluations are inscribed positively and eleven present negative evaluations.

The writer has used five motifs as positive evaluation for feudal lords which fall under propriety. She considers patriarchs as holy men. The writer thinks that at some earlier time they were pious and righteous. She uses the word lords for them to share her views that feudal lords used the same power inherited by God. The illiterate people respected and perceived them as envoys of Allah.

*What then does Islam mean to the Pakistani ruling elites?*

Tehmina Durrani herself, even after she has finally managed to get Khar out of her life, does not understand that she has suffered because she does not know what it means to be a Muslim or she has suffered due to something else. For both Khar and Tehmina, Islam is a fallback last resource. Tehmina Durrani gives many examples which show that her entire class of society thinks that it can use Allah and Islam when the going gets really rough.

Then there are six motifs which strongly condemn feudalism such as plunder, rape and murder.

The author has used two words pious and moral by adding negative conjunctions before them i.e. neither pious nor moral.

**Distribution of Different Categories of Judgement in Appendix 06:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Social Esteem</th>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The passage has seventeen values dealing from *social esteem* and there are eight items which are from *social sanction*. By using values from *social sanction*, the writer has tried to underpin civic duty and religious observances as stated by Martin and White (2005).

**Distribution of Subtypes of Social Esteem in Judgement in Appendix 06:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Esteem</th>
<th>Normality</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Tenacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The passage has eleven motifs of *capacity*, one of *tenacity* and five from *normality* as the table shows which are of *social esteem*. The author has called a feudal lord, an absolute *ruler* who can justify any action. The lexical choices like *patriarchs and privileged* clearly express the power and position held by feudal lords. This feudal system is one form of the social power. Social power concerns with the ability to influence others or to control the outcomes of others (Elyson and Dovidio 1985). Social power here will be summarily defined as a social relation between groups or institutions, involving the control by an (the members) over a less powerful group. Such power generally presupposes privileged access to socially valued resources, such as force, wealth, income, knowledge or status (Bertrand Russell 1938).

**Distribution of Subtypes of Social Sanction in Judgement in Appendix 06:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
<th>Veracity</th>
<th><em>Propriety</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are seven motifs from *propriety* which clearly indicates that Tehmina wants the readers to know that feudal lords with the system by their side used to have a license for exploiting the multitudes. Some feudal families even
used Islam as a weapon of control. We get only one motif from veracity that again stresses the point that power has little to do with honesty. Under the subsystem of veracity, what is at stake are not degrees of certainty but honesty, credibility, authenticity (that is whether behaviour confirms with or deviates from expectations of adherence to the truth).

**Distribution of Inscribed and Invoked Judgement in Appendix 06:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Inscribed</th>
<th>Invoked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the inscriptions are inscribed ones, only six are invoked. Again it is found that inscribed values encompass the invoked ones. Invoked values can be a part of strategy from the author to win reader’s sympathy which Tehmina Durrani has successfully achieved.

Tehmina Durrani has vividly explored the political power many times in the novel. The passage given in Appendix 07 has seven motifs of Judgement in all. All the seven motifs indicate the power possessed by Bhutto and especially by Mustafa politically.

**Distribution of Positive and Negative Judgement in Appendix 07:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are six motifs which are positive in nature. The author has evaluated Mustafa when he gained power in Pakistan. As a chief minister of Punjab, he developed a reputation. He became an effective administrator. By the choice of these words, Tehmina has tried to make us understand the position and reputation Mustafa developed when he became the Chief Minister of Punjab. But at the same time she tells us that his close relationship with Bhutto gave the opportunity to use power and to crush any opposition. This shows that Bhutto provided power and became a ladder for Mustafa to reach his aspirations. The rituals of politics, meetings and applause led to a misapprehension of personality as a source of power. Mustafa as a political orator spoke regularly to audiences that were already fully conditioned in his belief. And he adjusted his thoughts and expressions, often automatically to what he knew to be that belief. That’s how Mustafa developed a reputation and became an effective administrator.

The author’s evaluation for Mustafa as an effective administrator shows that she also admits his administration as effective cause. Mustafa knows that the fountain head of power is the people. His power is that of preacher among people who correctly judging the rain clouds, proceeds to pray for rain. As a leader to achieve his accomplishments, he must gain the submission of people. But also in the every day reference he is as often merely adept at identifying himself with the conditioned will of the crowd and identifying the crowd for its own purposes.

Mustafa is evaluated as the strong political personality in Bhutto’s party.

The strong motif is added which is again to express Mustafa’s political personality in a strong sense. He is considered a strong support to Bhutto.

The motif loyalty is used to exhibit close relationship of Bhutto and Mustafa. It also throws light of Mustafa’s loyalty towards Bhutto. Again Mustafa used to be considered as a shock absorber by Bhutto. But gradually their relationship grew strained after Mustafa getting into power. The author has used
mentor lexis for Bhutto. The novel also gives the details of how Bhutto getting a sad end.

Politicians are frequently described as power hungry. The obvious implication is that they seek power to satisfy their appetite. Mustafa, as a politician is seen by many as powerful and effective leader; but he in his power even forgot his mentor, Bhutto.

Distribution of Different Categories of Judgement in Appendix 07:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Social Esteem</th>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though the passage has only seven motifs of Judgement but these motifs throw a powerful light on Mustafa, his political achievements and relation between Mustafa and Bhutto. There are six motifs chosen from social esteem and one from social sanction.

Distribution of Subtypes of Social Esteem in Judgement in Appendix 07:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Esteem</th>
<th>Normality</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Tenacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are four variables from capacity that shows that Mustafa is portrayed as a capable personality. Normality is used for one time only. Although the author has presented Mustafa of being capable the power he has got yet only single motif from tenacity proves that she has not used many lexical resources
that are related with Mustafa like being resolute and left some scope for actual reality to be shown to her readers.

**Distribution of Subtypes of Social Sanction in Judgement in Appendix 07:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
<th>Propriety</th>
<th>Veracity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows only one lexical item from social sanction that too from propriety. The word monster depicts that the author wants to tell the readers by choosing lexical resource from propriety that Mustafa and his wrong use of power should have been checked because he was more or less becoming immoral.

**Distribution of Inscribed and Invoked Judgement in Appendix 07:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Inscribed</th>
<th>Invoked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are seven inscriptions in total and surprisingly the author does not want to be in conflict by provoking her readers. So whatever she evaluates, she chooses inscriptions from standard accepted assumptions.

**Distribution of Positive and Negative Judgement in Appendix 08:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis of the passage given in Appendix 08 reveals that there are only two motifs in positive and the remaining nine are in negative. Two motifs have been used for Mustafa’s authoritative nature. The first motif is described to evaluate him while sitting on a chair:

He sat in the chair with his arms extended on either side.

And the second is used as a metaphor to show his supreme and powerful position as a husband who could even ask his wife to remove her clothes and then to call her parents just to humiliate her:

Like a king on his throne.

This metaphor makes the readers understand the self-created world of Mustafa where he sits like a king.

There are nine Judgements which produce negative vibrations. In first negative vibe, Mustafa commands Tehmina to call her mother and tell that she is mad. In the second vibe, she is being evaluated as bitch by her husband. If we consider these two lexical choices made by Mustafa, we feel that he is not a normal person. The choice of these strong motifs exhibits the abnormal state of the appraiser. The obvious social power has made him abnormal.

Distribution of Different categories of Judgement in Appendix 08:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Social esteem</th>
<th>Social sanction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the distribution of lexical choices between the two categories of Judgement. Again social esteem is preferred by the author. These values of Judgement involve evaluations by which the person judged will be lowered or raised in the esteem of their community, but which don’t have the
same legal, religious or moral implications. These values arguably do not carry quite the same social weight as the values from social sanction have. Negative values of this set will make one lowered in the estimation of society but won’t typically make one in trouble with the law.

**Distribution of Subtypes of Social Esteem in Judgement in Appendix 08:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Esteem</th>
<th>Normality</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Tenacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis on the basis of social esteem reveals that this passage contains eight motifs in total and out of eight, two belong to normality category and five to capacity, again just one from tenacity. Here we have the assessments of normality (eccentric conventional, traditional) of competence (skilled, stupid, powerful, and feeble) and of psychological disposition (brave, cowardly, determined and stubborn) all the three categories in this passage.

This makes very much clear that the passage is intended to share the values in the form of information from the writer to the reader. The writer intends to inform the readers about the brutality of Mustafa as a husband and solidarity of Tehmina Durrani as a wife.

Then there are five motifs which deal with capacity. Capacity indicates the capability of people. The writer has used only five motifs again for Mustafa as a powerful husband and Tehmina as a powerless wife. Unlike other passages in the text, this passage is interactive in nature inspite of the writer being present as an omniscient narrator.
There are only three motifs which belong to propriety, a category of social sanction. This indicates the writer’s level of confidence about the ideas presented in the passage. The author’s strong evaluation of the Mustafa’s behaviour shows that there is severely something wrong with people like Mustafa which ought to be checked. In this way, she takes the readers as passive recipients who will accept her evaluated words for Mustafa and the feudal class as true.

In social esteem, values shared are the formation of social networks and in social sanction on the other hand, values shared under the civic duty and religious observances. An analysis of the motifs evaluated for Mustafa brings to the surface the male-dominated structure of society.

The analysis shows the equal distribution of evaluations to Mustafa and Tehmina. The analysis indicates that Mustafa is in obvious power. He is enjoying strong position in the society even though condemned by the society members. Tehmina, on the other hand, is portrayed as subjugated wife who is bearing all the mental and physical assaults by her husband. Even she is tolerating her husband’s brutal abnormalities.

Distribution of Incribed and Invoked Judgement in Appendix 08:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Inscribed</th>
<th>Invoked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table clearly displays the author’s sympathetic attitude towards Tehmina Durrani and she intends to arouse her readers’ attention that’s why she uses seven motifs of invoked Attitude and only four inscribed values of Judgement.

The previous passages have some motifs related to social sanction. The passage given in Appendix 09 is also no exception. Here Tehmina Durrani has used almost half of the total motifs from social esteem. The passage has nine Judgement motifs in all. Surprisingly, six motifs present positive vibrations and only three present negative vibrations.

**Distribution of Positive and Negative Judgement in Appendix 09:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above analysis, we come to know that there are nine motifs. Out of nine, six are positive in nature. These positive motifs indicate that after Tehmina’s decision to leave Mustafa has regained her lost confidence. She has started seeing life once again optimistically. The passage is heterglossic in nature, again a rare piece in this autobiographical work by the writer. This passage throws a light of Mustafa’s pitiable condition after his wife leaves him. The positive vibrations have been used by the writer for Mustafa who is broken. These positive motifs are described by Tehmina. These are:

- Strong man
- Humble
- Repentant
- Innocent
Remorse

Grove

These motifs analyze Mustafa’s behaviour though his behaviour is changed momentarily. Negative motifs also describe Mustafa’s behaviour. These are:

Petulance
Deserted
Jilted

Distribution of Different Categories of Judgement in Appendix 09:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Social Esteem</th>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above analysis indicates that there are five evaluations from social sanction. Four are used from social esteem. Mustafa and his personality are evaluated through both the categories. He is called a jilted lover whose wife has deserted him.

Though passage is narrated by Tehmina yet here the writer has given a voice to the “minor voices” (Bakhtin 1981 ) to support her view point to enlighten the readers to make them feel that there are many more voices who find Mustafa a changed man now. However Tehmina finds this change, a temporary and feigned change.

By making these evaluations, the writer has made it clear that it is Mustafa who is responsible for miserable plight of females like Adilia and Tehmina for using them for his sexual needs and having an illicit affair with his wedded wife’s younger sister.
Distribution of Subtypes of Social Esteem in Judgement in Appendix 09:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Esteem</th>
<th>Normality</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Tenacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis indicates the use of evaluations from capability. Mustafa is called a *jilted lover*. He is portrayed before us in deplorable condition through this evaluation. Again motifs like *deserted* and *strongman* are ascribed to Mustafa.

Distribution of Subtypes of Social Sanction in Judgement in Appendix 09:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
<th>Propriety</th>
<th>Veracity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We get motifs from *social sanction* more than *social esteem* this time in Appendix 09. The choices like *humble*, *repentant* and *grovel* fall under *propriety*. One motif is used from *veracity* i.e. *innocent*.

Distribution of Inscribed and Invoked Judgement in Appendix 09:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Inscribed</th>
<th>Invoked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The present passage is devoid of any invoked motif. Values of provoked Judgement are set up through a series of interrelated statements. As a result, the realization of Judgement spreads over several sentences. It also gives readers a
variety of interpretations but we find this variety in the evaluations of Affect and Appreciation not in the evaluation of human behaviour.

Thus, the evaluative analysis of *social sanction* again presents the author as an omniscient narrator who knows life deeply now after suffering at the hands of the powerful feudal Lord. This passage is the last passage before the epilogue of the book. After hearing the tale of woes from Tehmina, we now hear her conclusions of her life and her decisions of life. This passage is narrated by the writer after the separation of Tehmina and Mustafa. This passage is important from the point of view of quest for identity for Tehmina. Till now she was Mrs. Mustafa Khar known by her husband’s surname. Now after her separation people suggested her to keep her husband’s name. But she couldn’t agree to that because she wanted to find a new Tehmina Durrani inside her which might be wiser though sadder and older.

Looking at the passage from Judgement angle, the writer has used positive Judgement through five motifs, the rest of the two Judgement motifs are negative in nature.

**Distribution of Positive and Negative Judgement in Appendix 10:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the analysis again presents the author as authoritarian narrator who again and again evaluates Mustafa and system in negative sense and thinks about the exploited people. As she has used positive motif five times which indicates that she takes the readers for granted that they would agree with her after reading her woeful tale. She leaves little scope for contradictory argument. This analysis further strengthens the inferences already drawn. Three out of the total seven
motifs contain negative evaluation. There is one motif that indicates positive attitude that is also a forced positive judgement which comes out of two negative evaluations.

Tehmina writes:

Was there a new Tehmina Durrani inside me, older and sadder but also wiser?

This refers to the low confidence of the writer while she is evaluating positively even to herself. Tehmina has given the reality; her being has become older and sadder after living a disastrous life with Mustafa. She is a little positive now that is why she writes:

But also wiser?

Sign of interrogation again indicates her doubts even when she is expressing positive evaluations about herself. Again the use of the comparative degree indicates Tehmina Durrani’s being wiser than before, after suffering from such a big turmoil.

This analysis makes it clear that the writer is quite confident while evaluating persons negatively but in positive sense; she is quite shaky even for herself. This may be due to the tortures she has suffered at the hands of Mustafa and those sufferings have shattered her confidence even for herself.

**Distribution of Different Categories of Judgement in Appendix 10:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Social Esteem</th>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The author has chosen just one lexical motif from social sanction. We have seen in other passages also that there is less use of social sanction as compared to social esteem.

**Distribution of Sub Types of Social Esteem of Judgement in Appendix 10:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social esteem</th>
<th>Normality</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Tenacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social esteem has six motifs in the present passage and these six motifs are not distributed equally. We see that there is not a single inscription from normality; a sub type of social esteem. Again the subcategory capacity has been used five times which again shows power holders are capable of doing anything. One motif comes from tenacity. Tenacity includes the values of the targets and accomplishments. If some values claim to do something successfully or show determination or willingness or sustain work towards some goal, these can be ascribed as tokens of tenacity.

She uses exploited motif for those women who are exploited by society and come in the politics to raise their voices against injustice but are exploited by the political system of Pakistan. Then there are two motifs: older and wiser which have been used, by the writer for herself.

These are motifs of capability; one is used in negative sense and the other is in positive sense. Here by using these words the writer tries to express that though years of life with Mustafa have made her older than before yet probably she has become wiser than before.
Distribution of Subtypes of Social Sanction of Judgement in Appendix 10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social sanction</th>
<th>Propriety</th>
<th>Veracity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This passage has one motif from *propriety* under *social sanction* which clearly indicates the writer’s strong views not to keep silent at her sufferings because silence would be a crime. The writer by breaking up the silence wants to awake Muslim women who have been suffering from people like Mustafa since long. She wants them to raise their voices against injustice. The writer does not want to enter into politics because she believes that in Pakistan, the system exploits more to those who are already exploited. Then she realizes that she can do great service to her country and to her people. She thinks to break her silence and start making people aware of people like Mustafa. The writer uses *injustice* word two times in the passage to support her strong views for woman who are silently suffering at the hands of their cruel husbands in Pakistan and dare not to raise their voice against injustice.

Distribution of Inscribed and Invoked Judgement in Appendix 10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Inscribed</th>
<th>Invoked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this passage, there is not a single inscription that can be called invoked. The author has cleverly avoided those choices that can instigate her readers.
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A Comparison of Categories of Judgement in My Feudal Lord and Blasphemy
The findings of the passage given in Appendix 01 under analysis reveals that in this passage, the positive motifs of Judgement are used in abundance i.e. 76.9% and negative motifs are only 23.07%. As far as the categories of Judgement are concerned, the findings show almost the same ratio is used with social esteem, a little higher than social sanction i.e. 53.8% and 46.15% respectively.

But when we see the findings of the evaluations of Heer’s wedding night from where her life starts a painful journey, the analysis clearly reveals us the much use of negative evaluation at 71.42% as compared to positive which are only 28.57%. This strengthens author’s view point that with Heer’s marriage, she has entered into a life which is like a hell from where she could hardly get respite. Social esteem is used 57.14% again with a slight variation from social sanction which is used 42.85%.

The findings for the third passage reveal 36.8% positive inscriptions and 63.15% negatives. Social esteem amounts at 78.9% while social sanction remains only at 21.05%.

The exact opposite pattern of the above passage is used in this passage where positive motifs are 63.15% and negative motifs are 36.8%. Social esteem rises at 89.4% while social sanction gets down with only 10.52%.

The last passage from Blasphemy has a proportionate ratio for positive and negative motifs i.e. 50% each. And the same repetition is done with both the categories social esteem and social sanction with 50% each.

If we consider passages from My Feudal Lord, we find that in the first passage there are twenty five motifs of Judgement in all. Tehmina has used also the same number of positive and negative motifs in this passage. Positive Judgement motifs are 56.14% of the total Judgement motifs while negative motifs peg at 44%. Out of two categories of Judgement, the author has preferred social esteem with 68% in this passage as compared to social sanction i.e. only 32%.
In the second passage under study, we find there are eleven motifs of Judgement. Interestingly out of eleven motifs, only 18.18% present contains positive motifs and 81.8% is having negative vibes. Likewise the above passage, the writer again has used social esteem much this time i.e. 72.7% while social sanction amounts up to 27.27%.

Whereas the above passages continue to be equal with negative and positive variants, this passage consists of more negative and less positive evaluations. The positive and negative motifs of Judgement are 85.7% and 14.28% respectively of the total Appraisal motifs. Surprisingly, the same ratio is used for the categories of Judgement. So far as social esteem is concerned, it is again 85.7% while social sanction is having just 14.28%.

The only variation in this passage is that positive Judgement is little higher i.e. 57.14% as compared to the 42.85% of the negative motifs of total appraised motifs. But in the use of categories, the writer has made a remarkable change by using 85.7% from social sanction and using just 14.2% from social esteem.

So far as the positive motifs of Judgement are concerned in this passage, it is 66.66% and negative motifs of Judgement are 33.33% only. Likewise the ratio for both the categories used is also present with a little variation. For social esteem, it is only 44.4% but it is the only one passage where the writer has used social sanction much i.e. 55.55% as compared to the rest of the passages. Here the pattern gets reversed as far the use of categories of Judgement is concerned.

It is not only by physical force that women are sometimes kept in marriage against their will. More often, it is social or economic pressures that are used, consciously or unconsciously, to keep them tied in the unwanted relationship. Surah a-Nisa, the Book of God combats such social and economic pressures:

"If a woman fears ill-treatment (mushuz) or indifference (i’radh) from her husband, it is not wrong if (at her initiative) the two set things peacefully to right between themselves; for, peace is best, and selfishness is ever present in human
souls. But if you do good and are conscious of Him, behold, God is aware of all that you do... If the two break up, God provides everyone out of His abundance, for God is resourceful, wise” (4:128-130).

The writer’s choice of capacity or propriety is another important consideration. The resources of Judgement serve to evaluate human behaviour by reference to socially constructed norms or regulations. The close analysis of Judgement shows that some choices are preferred across all the texts under analysis. For instance, capacity and propriety are encountered across all levels, while veracity is found just two times in the two texts. This suggests that the author has developed her arguments in terms of a person’s capability and ethical aspects, not in terms of a person’s honesty. The pervasive deployment of capacity and propriety can be attributed to influence the readers since these two values are the most used in the texts under study.

The use of these resources in the texts suggests that the writer herself views the values of capacity and propriety as important for supporting her argument. The employment of capacity and propriety may be a sign of her high confidence level as represented in the choice of Judgement resources.

Close observation reveals that the passage 05 tends to use propriety rather than capacity when both the choices are available. This interpretation also points to the possibility of seeing capacity and propriety as values of Judgement occupying the same cline, from which the passage 05 inclines more on propriety. This preference is one for more institutionalized Judgement, codified by rules and regulations, in contrast to the Judgement of capacity, where shared values are defined by personal relations and social networks involving family, friends, colleagues, etc. (Martin and White 2005). The author tries to evaluate people’s behaviour in terms of ethics and thus she has the preference for propriety. This strategy is important in bringing out the power structure embedded in the society on the surface both because it reveals sophisticated lexical motifs through which power is sought after and those through which power can be strongly resisted and
because it allows the text to deal with more abstract issues. The use of human or personal participants is likely to be regarded as spoken (Eggins 2004) in that the reference to experience tends to be personally oriented inviting the lack of substantial evidence (Moore and Morton 1997, 2005, 2007) in developing arguments.

In the present chapter, an attempt has been made to analyze Judgement motifs in the language of both the texts by Tehmina Durrani with the view to reach at the ideology underlying these motifs. The above analysis points out that the author through her characters is more concerned about the language which criticizes or condemns the behaviour, actions, beliefs of human individuals and groups. The analysis of human behaviour clearly exhibits the “power behind discourse” (Fairclough 1989) where shaping of orders of discourse by relations of power is not generally apparent to people. The analysis has been successful in exposing that hidden power about which Fairclough talks (1989) which is otherwise not acknowledged by society and if acknowledged is always considered normal.

The above mentioned passages are the examples of Judgement that involve assessments by reference to systems. These systems are concerned with legality/illegality, morality/immorality and politeness/impoliteness that are able to convince the reader that rules of behaviour, more or less confided in the culture that have either been upheld or breached. The analysis shows that religious, moral or sometimes legal rules or regulations are at stake. The negative values of normality, of competence and of psychological disposition make the characters lower in the estimation of society. By lowering these powerful characters in the reader’s eyes, the author negotiates power which is obviously won by her when she is able to evoke readers’ sympathy.

Some motifs of Judgement involve an assertion that some set of religion moral or legal rules or regulations are at issue. They involve assessments of morality or legality. Here for example, we find such terms as immoral, virtuous
sinful, innocent, fair-minded, cruel, brutal, caring, honest and deceptive. Such assessments can carry a heavy weight socially. I will agree with White’s model of Engagement here in which he says “those resources by which a text references, involves and negotiates with the various alternative positions put at risk by a text’s meaning” (1998:20). He shares Fuller’s view on Bakhtin’s notion of intertextuality or heteroglossic which he finds as an alternative to approaches which interpret values of intersubjective positioning as vagueness, hedging, face saving, truth value and interims of subjectivity versus objectivity (White 1998:32). White sees these approaches as giving undue weightage to the experiential metafunction and not enough to the interpersonal. In SFL metafunctional theory, an utterance construes experiential and social reality simultaneously.

White prefers a heteroglossic approach also as a more suitable model for written texts, where there is no immediate, direct contact between interactants and for the exchange of information rather than goods and services. As an alternative, White (1998) proposes an intertextual view to model, evidential and hedging values which construes meaning making in social rather than individualized terms and which emphasizes the interpersonal rather than the experiential “under the heteroglossic perspective, rather than necessarily reflecting the speaker’s state of knowledge, it (a model value) can additionally or alternatively be seen as signaling that the meanings at state are subject to heteroglossic negotiation. It may have no connection at all with doubt or vagueness, being used, instead, to acknowledge the contentiousness of a particular position, the willingness of the speaker to negotiate with those who hold a different view, or the deference of the speaker for those alternative views (White 1998:29-30). This commonsense point of view ignores the fact that utterances do not exist in social isolation from their context and from other possible utterances that could have been made. Thus, the positive declarative is not interpreted as factual or a commitment to some truth value but as a statement that either excludes any possible alternatives or that anticipates agreement with its audience. In the context of these two texts; My
Feudal Lord and Blasphemy, these statements have anticipated agreement with its reader.

*My Feudal Lord* is about power and the ways people in Pakistan get it and use it. The text also reveals the ways in which expressions of power emerge for feudalism and feudal culture. The text also talks about the principles that organize Pakistan society.

Patriarchal discourse limits and sets down the image and distinctiveness of Tehmina but she reverses the social and familial norms to emerge as a new woman. She fights against all odds to escape all forms of essential categorizing that provide the subaltern or minority woman both the victims and unwilling perpetrators of damning stereotypical metaphors both by Eurocentric imperialism and the patriarchal tenets of her Islamic society, the power politics in Pakistani Government and the social ethos of Pakistani marital life. Tehmina has made an attempt to awake her readers and other socio-culturally repressed women to rediscover their marginal self and thereby gain liberation and empowerment.

*My Feudal Lord* describes how individuals provoke different relationships at different times. Sometimes the bonds of the relationships impose themselves on individuals. The above findings indicate that both texts not only discuss power within the family but also deal with power in society and how asymmetrical power relation has become the stepping stone for Pakistani society.

The analysis shows that there are choices of *capacity* and *normality* more than other choices of Judgement that strengthen the point that in Pakistan the high status leads them to get more power. They are considered capable and above normal from the social point of view.

This gives them access to power which they can command directly. It is not the power but it is the use of the power of others that makes them very powerful. The evaluations of Judgement support the view that people in Pakistan
continue to form and maintain relationships of inequality to form and maintain relationships of inequality at all the levels of society, in both public and private spheres.

The results of both the texts indicate that people in Pakistan with power have grown to depend heavily in asymmetry and inequality.

The analysis of these two texts reveals the ways in which power is expressed are not separable from the culture in which it exists. Pakistani culture encourages people to think of strength and position of their group as if it were a direct reflection of their individual strength and position which is clearly seen in both the texts. In *My Feudal Lord* feudalism as a group gives shelter to Mustafa and in *Blasphemy* religious shrine protects Pir Sain’s personal interests.