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3.1 Preliminaries

Language serves the basic purpose of communication that is expressing oneself. In real life situations, language use is not just limited to the expression instrument, but it is used with diverse purposes and goals. These purposes or goals are known as communication motives. These motives could have emerged from different propaganda of speaker, communication motives change as per the requirement of the speaker as per different situations like political, professional or cultural. Often these situations of real life peep into literary works which is considered as a reflection of society or real life. Similar to real life situations, characters of any literary work, indulge in different dialogue situations with different communication motives. Dialogue is a prominent element of drama. Through the dialogues drama takes shape and develops into a literary work. In fiction also we can find dialogues in the form of conversation among characters. Characters evolve through such conversations and reader gets a picture of each character. In fiction the author creates context for such conversation to take place and unravel the characters of the fiction. Such context helps readers to understand the conversations and the literary work easily.

Indirect Speech Acts serve a lot to a speaker to achieve his or her goal without getting directly to it. Indirect Speech Act saves the face of a speaker and gets the purpose done. Indirect Speech Acts
have many aspects like a warning, proposal, request or suggestion made in an indirect way.

The speaker takes shelter of Indirect Speech Acts in sensitive situations where he has a particular communication goal. These situations may be political, social, professional or cultural. Literature being a mirror image of life covers these situations where dialogues take place. Dialogues are prominently seen in drama, but in fiction too dialogues are present in the form of conversation.

A conversation develops through Direct and Indirect Speech Acts. Austin’s theory of Speech Act states that utterances are not used just to say things, i.e. describe states of affairs, but rather actively to do things. It must be understood first that uttering a sentence one might be said to be performing actions. In Direct Speech Act form and function of the utterance is related and they conform to each other, such as interrogatives are used to seek information. Nevertheless, in Indirect Speech Act form and function of an utterance doesn’t match with each other sometime interrogatives are used to make requests. When a speaker says, ‘Will you please give me your pen?’ he is actually requesting the listener to lend him a pen.

It has been observed that Indirect Speech Acts are more frequent than Direct Speech Acts. The reason is the service provided by Indirect Speech Acts to the speaker. Especially in a situation where the speaker may ruin the conversation or the relation with the hearer, if he expresses himself in a direct way. Indirect Speech Acts provide him the necessary liberty to express himself without hurting the hearer or putting the relation with the hearer in danger. Negative emotions like fear, confusion, anger.
irritation, and frustration etc. are expressed or conveyed through Indirect Speech Acts. Speaker implements his/her agenda with the employment of Indirect Speech Acts.

In case of the selected novels the characters of the novel employ Indirect Speech Acts with particular communication goals. The present research aims at analyzing and studying the basic motives for using Indirect Speech Acts by the character in the selected novels and their subsequent effect. This research also aims studying the employment of Indirect Speech Acts by the scholar writers of the selected novels for the study.

3.2 Direct Speech Acts Versus Indirect Speech Acts

Often, Direct Speech Act is responded with Indirect Speech Act. People use Indirect Speech Act to face awkward situations and vulnerable questions. This allows them to answer the questions partially or avoid the questions completely. Not only questions but also requests, commands and suggestions are addressed through Indirect Speech Acts. In a generalised situations when a wife asks her husband, “When will you buy me a washing machine’ and the husband replies indirectly, “Don’t mix up a lot with neighbours?” By employing Indirect Speech Act husband completely avoids the question asked by his wife. Here the husband conveys his wife that he is not thinking to buy anything and avoids the question. In an office when a staff requests his colleagues to switch off the fan. The colleague responds to this request in an indirect way and says, “I am feeling hot today”. With the use of Indirect Speech Act the colleague informs his wish to keep the fan switched on as he is feeling hot. In the both
examples discussed above, it can be observed that people take shelter of Indirect Speech Acts when they have some agenda to follow. At the same time people don’t wish to mess up the situation and attract any unwanted scene. Actually by using Indirect Speech Acts people respond to the linguistic expressions as well as create favourable situations for them.

In case of literary works Characters can be seen using Indirect Speech Acts with some communicative goals which help characters to evolve and communicate more than they say.

In *The God of Small Things* when Baby Kochamma asks father Mulligen a doubt she gets Indirect Speech Act as a reply from Father Mulligen.

‘Morning Father’

“All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient”. Father, how can all things be lawful for Him, but-

‘Oops! We’d better catch him before a cold does’

(P.No. 23-24)

In the above conversation Father Mulligen completely avoids the question of Baby Kochamma and conveys that he will explain it to her later. Father Mulligen understands the intentions of Baby Kochamma. He knows that she has fallen for him and she is trying to take their acquaintance to further level.

‘Behave yourself!’

‘It was Velutha!’ ‘And he had a flag.’

‘You’re a stupid silly girl!’

66
‘Shut up.’

‘And you stole things from the house and took them across the river in it?’
‘We were only playing...’

‘Where is she?’
‘Who knows? Must be around somewhere.’

‘Why are you rowing the Jam?’ Rahel asked
‘India is a free country.’ Estha replied.

(The God of Small Things)

Use of Indirect Speech Acts is very common in the selected novels for the study. It is a part of writers’ orientation of plot development. In A Matter of Time following instances can be seen.

‘Why have you come?’
‘Who told you? That is the stupid question to ask.’
‘You are late.’
‘We are rehearsing...’
‘It’s Seema.’

‘Who is Indubai?’
‘Why Kalyani-akka, what do you mean?’

(A Matter of Time)

‘Why? Why would you say that? May be she’ll find a good home to work.’
‘What good home will take her?’
‘The letter - the letter from oxford - where is it? Did you burn it?
‘Uma’, ‘Are you mad, Uma’

(Fasting, Feasting)

All the above utterances convey more than said. To face the situations where anger, frustration, contempt, etc. negative emotions are dominant and the speaker or listener is not at peace to think and listen carefully. Indirect Speech Acts are used to convey more than words could say and deal with the situations. These negative emotions are a part of our daily communication events and real life situations.

3.2 Expressing Anger

People avoid expressing negative emotions overtly. Negative emotions are those emotions in the presence of which peace of mind is lost. Emotions like anger, frustration, contempt, doubt and fear take away the smoothness of human life. In the presence of such negative emotions development of human relations or open exchange of thoughts and effective communication is not possible.

As human relations are fragile and delicate may get shattered by any negative emotions. People have to save themselves from any situations where negative emotions will have to be encountered with. However, people keep facing these emotions. One cannot escape from these emotions and their subsequent effects, but can avoid them or lessen their effects. Indirect Speech Acts can be seen used by people to deal with situations where negative emotions are dominating and may harm their social face value.
Likewise day to day situations, characters of literary work avoid situations where they may get caught in critical situations during the development of the plot. Indirect Speech Acts help to convey desired things at the same time save us from being blunt or harsh. One need not surrender to the situations by remaining unspoken. Indirect Speech Act helps people to express in day to day life and characters in literary works.

When an undesired or unwanted situation arises it leads to indignation over the situation which comes out naturally and is expressed overtly. But in most of the situations the natural outcome of the indignation is not possible as it may worsen the situations or the future course. Particularly, when someone is not in a position to express ones anger openly Indirect Speech Act is employed to vent out the negative feelings. Uma in Fasting. Feasting puts across her anger when her mother irritates her by bombing with different demands and orders at the same time. Uma does it skilfully with the help of Indirect Speech Act

"We are having fritters for tea today. Will that be enough? Or do you want sweets as well?"

"Yes, yes, yes – there must be sweets – must be sweets, too. Tell cook. Tell cook at once."

"Uma! Uma!"

"Uma must tell cook-

"E. Uma!"

Uma comes to the door where she stands fretting.
‘Why are you shouting?’

‘Go and tell cook-’

‘But you told me to do up the parcel so it’s ready when Justice Dutt’s son comes to take it. I’m trying it up now.’

‘Yes, yes, yes make up the parcel- must be ready, must be ready when Justice Dutt’s son comes. What are we sending Arun? What are we sending?’

The above mentioned conversation takes place between Uma and her mother. In the mid of a day, Uma’s parents are enjoying swinging on the cane mate hang from the arches of the veranda. Uma had been asked by her parents to pack a parcel to be sent to her brother who is living in the United States. Being a girl of the house her parents want her to look after all the home activities.

When Uma is busy in packing the parcel, her mother asks her to arrange some sweets for her father that he wished for. Uma gets irritated by the constant hammering of mother’s order. Uma cannot disobey her mother. Since she is busy, she cannot fulfil the demand of her father as well. In this critical situation Uma takes the help of Indirect Speech Act to convey her inability in carrying out her mother’s order.

Uma says, ‘But you told me to do up the parcel so it’s ready when Justice Dutt’s son comes to take it. I’m trying it up now.’

This utterance of Uma implies that Uma is busy in a work allotted to her by the mother. Uma also indirectly conveys her
inability in fulfilling the order for some sweets. Uma uses Indirect Speech Act to save her from complying mother's order.

On the Locutionary level Uma conveys her current activities, at the same time on the Illocutionary level, she conveys her inability to obey her mother and on the Perlocutionary level, Uma makes her parents to wait for sweets.

Uma’s answer serves her purpose which indicates her busy status that makes her unable to carry out mother’s order. The employment of Indirect Speech Act by Uma serves her well. She saves herself from being a rude and disobedient daughter, which is utterly unapproved in Indian social context. The Indirect Speech Act also helps Uma to be Polite to her parents.

Uma, in one more situation, does not suffocate herself by oppressing her anger over the death of her cousin, Anamika.

Suddenly Uma stirs, puts her hand on Lila Aunty's arm, and asks: 'The letter-the letter from Oxford-where is it? Did you—did you burn it?' (1)

‘Uma’ Mama’s horrified voice calls out. Pap makes a sound in his throat, a cross between a threat and a warning. Fortunately, the parents do not, seem to have heard, or, if they have, have not understood: they do not react.

‘Are you quite mad, Uma?’ Mama hisses later when she has dragged Uma out. ‘You must be mad to ask about that letter now.’
‘I want to know,’ Uma mutters, stubbornly.

(P. No. 155-56)

It is the most strong and powerful example of Indirect Speech Act used by the character of the novel. Anamika, Uma’s cousin, dies by setting herself alight. Anamika was very bright student once and she had earned a scholarship from Oxford. Anamika’s parents get her married and she passes away soon in a pathetic way.

Uma gets a severe shock and distressed a lot, she cannot take Anamika’s death. Uma says,

‘The letter—the letter from Oxford—where is it? (1) Did you—did you burn it?’(2)

In the above mentioned utterance (1) Uma asks Anamika’s mother about the letter Anamika had received from Oxford. The utterance on the Locutionary level seems to be a question seeking an answer, but Uma indirectly points out that Anamika’s fate was not to be a jar of ashes, but she could have lived very honourable and happy life with all prosperity. Uma indirectly blames Anamika’s parents for not recognizing the talent of Anamika and getting her married in a conservative family. Anamika’s death is the outcome of wrong decision taken by her parents. Uma expresses her anger, pity and shock in an indirect manner. Through the (2) utterance, Uma blames Anamika’s parents for burning the letter. She implies that they just did not burn the letter, but Anamika’s life. As in the Indian background children cannot accuse their elders for the decisions taken for them even when the decisions go wrong. Without being very rude and open,
to blame she uses indirect speech act and gets successful in conveying the intended message.

In the above discussed delicate situation Uma takes the help of Indirect Speech Act to express her anger and grief for Anamika’s sad death. Uma achieves her communication goal without ruining her face.

Similar kind of situation is faced by Aru in *A Matter of Time*. Aru is not in a position to lodge her anger to elders for their weird behaviour. Being the elder daughter she is expected to be more responsible and behave herself. But when she cannot bear her outrage she conveys it indirectly.

Stop staring, Nagi,’ Aru exclaims angrily. “Have I suddenly grown an extra nose?”

‘What’s the use of getting angry with me? It’s all our luck, it’s written here, we can’t escape it. Look at my poor Lakshami, we thought he was such a good man and he left her for that other women....’

‘Oh God!’

‘What’s wrong with your sister?’ Nagi asks Charu when Aru stalks out.

‘Nothing, you know how she is. And for God’s sake, Nagi,’ Charu tries to change the subject, “what is that you’re wiping the floor with?”

(P. No. 14)

The above conversation takes place between Nagi and Aru. Nagi has been working with Kalyani for almost ten years and so shares
a close bond with the family of Kalyani. On understanding that Kalyani's son-in-law has walked on her daughter, Nagi visits the family.

Aru gets irritated when Nagi keeps staring her. Aru says, 'Have I suddenly grown an extra nose?' Aru's this utterance is quite symbolic and has multiple implications. Aru shouts at Nagi and asks her whether she has grown an extra nose. Aru conveys that she doesn't want anyone to come and console her for the sad happenings. She also means that it was not her or her mother's decision to quit the family and the house as well, but her father's. Aru indirectly warns Nagi not to show any pity or express sorrow.

The employment of Speech Act, through the character of Aru, writer portrays Aru to be a modern girl who is caught in an odd situation, unable to express herself freely. Aru gets successful in expressing her anguish and anger indirectly.

Aru finds herself in situation where she cannot express her anger for her father, Gopala, who walked out on her mother and the family. Aru knows that her mother, Sumi, has not objected Gopala for opting out of the family.

'I think you should see a lawyer.' she says to her mother.

'You mean because of Gopal? Devi's been saying that to me, too, she wants me to meet Murthy's cousin who's a lawyer, But I don't see the point of it.'

'The point? The point is you've got to do something.'

'What? Get a divorce? I'm not interested.'
But he owes you, he owes all of us, yes, you especially, he owes you—‘lamely, ‘something. He can’t get away like this! He has to give us maintenance.’

(P. No. 60-61)

This is a conversation between a mother and a daughter, Sumi and Aru. Aru advises Sumi to see a lawyer. She indirectly asks her mother to file a case against her husband for walking out on her and punish him. Aru cannot convince her mother openly to summon her farther, as she knows her mother still loves Gopala.

Aru expresses her anger and frustration with the help of Indirect Speech Act. She knows she is talking about her parents. Aru cannot show her anger to her mother as her mother has not expressed any anger for Gopala’s act. In the Indian context, it is not expected daughters to give legal advises to their parents, especially when parents are standing against each other.

Aru uses Indirect Speech Act as she doesn’t want to hurt her mother by reminding her that Gopala has abandoned them. The use of Indirect Speech Act made by the author has been helpful for characters to express themselves in such delicate situations. Aru gets successful in conveying her wish and feelings without hurting her mother.

In Second Thought, Mrs. Verma employs Indirect Speech Act to express her anger to her young neighbour, Maya.

I would have done it too, had Nikhil’s mother not blocked my way. In my confusion, I blurted out stupidly, ‘What are you doing here?’
She gave me an odd look. 'Why? Is there a new law in the building that gives different timings to different people? What do you mean by asking me such a question? This is a public area, not your father's property. Really, I'm surprised at your behaviour, Mrs Malik. I don't know how neighbours behave in Calcutta, but in Bombay we show better manners.'

I'd asked for it. I knew I had. Mortified, I said, 'Oh, Mrs Varma... I don't mean that, I'm sorry. I was slightly preoccupied, you see... busy... besides, it's so hot, I can't think straight.'

She continued to look at me strangely. 'Nonsense', she snorted, 'utter nonsense. Hot! As if Calcutta is Iceland. I tell you...I don't know what happens to these out-of-town women when they come to Bombay. They seem to lose their heads completely.'

(P. No. 25)

The above conversation takes place between Maya and Mrs. Varma. When salesman talks about Nikhil's character Maya gets curious to know. Nikhil is the son of Mrs. Varma. When the salesman departs from the place, Maya runs after him. She encounters Nikhil's mother in the way which makes Maya's effort to catch salesman impossible. Maya gets angry with herself being not able to learn more about Nikhil.

Maya says to Mrs. Varma, 'What are you doing here?' Maya cannot ask Mrs. Varma directly why she interrupted her way so
She takes the help of Indirect Speech Act. Maya's this question connotes her anger, frustration and an attempt to manage with the abruptly aroused situation.

Nikhil's mother doesn't like Maya's question. Instead of answering Maya's question she asks a counter question to Maya and expresses her anger over the rude question asked by Maya.

Mrs. Varma uses Indirect Speech Act as a reply to Direct Speech Act. Mrs. Varma asks is there any law preventing people from standing in the public areas. This Rhetorical question of Mrs. Varma declares her right to stand anywhere and Maya cannot question that. Mrs. Varma is aware of the fact that it would be impossible to have a bad relationship with neighbours and stay happy.

Mrs. Varma doesn't want to be rude like Maya but at the same time she wants to convey that Maya has no right to ask such questions to Mrs. Varma. Indirectly, Mrs. Varma also implies that she is standing in a public place and no one can question her for being there at that time.

At the same time Mrs. Varma indirectly blames that the new generation and especially young girls from Calcutta for lack of communication manners. She indirectly claims herself to be more refined and cultured.

The entire communication would have gone wrong and spoiled their relationship as neighbours, but both the characters skilfully use Indirect Speech Acts for their expressions and finally get successful in achieving respective conversation goals.
Expressing anger in a delicate relationship like husband and wife may be very devastating. In spite of being very careful, some situations arise where one has to express anger. Indirect Speech Act helps husband and wife to express themselves in such situations. In Second Thought Ranjan and Maya face a similar situation.

Ranjan shook his head in disgust. ‘What is this? A man comes back from work dehydrated and exhausted, and there is no cold water in the house. Is this the time to clean the fridge?’

He started pointing at his wrist-watch and then, as though unable to believe what he was seeing, he consulted the kitchen clock. ‘Have you seen the time?’ he asked in horror.

‘Yes—it’s nearly nine o’clock,’ I replied evenly, wiping the shelves clean.

‘And no ice cubes till tomorrow morning, I suppose.’

‘That’s right,’ I said, washing the stainless steel tray at the sink.

‘You expect me to drink warm water on a hot night like this? I won’t be able to sleep tonight, you know. And I have a very busy day ahead of me tomorrow—including a meeting with Becker. How will I face it with a parched throat and a throbbing headache?’

(P. No. 131)
The above piece of conversation takes place between Ranjan and his wife Maya. Ranjan has never been happy with any act of Maya. He considers her to be unskilled, ignorant of modern lifestyle and unknown of the duties of a wife. One day Maya decides to clean up the fridge. Ranjan returns from the office. When Ranjan is served normal water instead of cold water, he gets furious. Ranjan considers it to be a great blunder on Maya's part.

Nikhil says, 'You expect me to drink warm water on a hot night like this?' And I have a very busy day ahead of me tomorrow-including a meeting with Becker. How will I face it with a parched throat and a throbbing headache?'

Nikhil indirectly points out how Maya is not able to carry out basic duties of a wife. He also indirectly remarks that he works hard at the office, but doesn't get any relief at home. Maya being a housewife stays at home all the day, she just needs to take care of her husband even that is not done by Maya.

Ranjan further blames Maya for ruining his next day meeting as he will not be able to sleep well at the night and attend the meeting with usual enthusiasm. Ranjan uses Indirect Speech Act to express himself. Ranjan and Maya share a delicate relationship of husband and wife. Ranjan cannot be direct in his remark and spoil the relationship with Maya. Ranjan takes the help of Indirect Speech Acts, which saves the face of Ranjan and the
relationship with Maya. At the same time he asserts his anger and frustration over Maya’s illogical (From Ranjan’s point of view) way of managing household work.

3.4 Expressing Doubt

When people are not confident about something they suffer from the negative emotion, doubt. The lack of confidence about something makes them unsure of the things. This leads to unrest and peace of mind gets lost. This very negative emotion doesn’t let the person be at calm. Since one is not sure of his either positive or negative emotions one cannot explicitly express it. When someone expresses a doubt on someone / over something he is actually expressing his lack of trust. When a father says is doubtful of his sons passing some examination, actually he is showing his distrust in his own son. This may further demoralised his son and deteriorate the situation so he cannot express it overtly. To get the doubt clarified Indirect Speech Acts are employed, which helps the speaker to express his doubt without displaying his distrust. In A Matter of Time Aru suffers a doubt whether her father is alive or not.

Aru has just returned from her third trip of the day. getting some books, and her face is hollow with exhaustion.

‘Do you think, Charu. he’s dead?’ (1)

‘Don’t you think Sumi would have known if he was?
(2) No, I don’t think he’s dead.’

“But then what? My God, we’ve got to do something.”
‘What do we do? Put an ad in the paper saying-“Come home, Papa, Sumi ill, all forgiven”.

Or do we stick him among the missing persons on TV?’

(P. No. 13)

The above piece of dialogue is a fine example of a dialogue unfolding inner world of the characters. Each character employs Indirect Speech Act and behabitive forces. This conversation is between two sisters, Aru and Charu. Both of the girls are worried about their father leaving the family abruptly. The conversation focuses implying an Illocutionary act. The conversation conveys indirectly the innocence and the pity at the same time. When Aru asks Charu what she thinks about their father’s whereabouts and expresses a doubt that he may not be alive. Aru uses an interrogative structure to express her doubt. She indirectly conveys that she doesn’t believe he is alive and will return home to them.

Charu uses a counter question to answer Aru. Charu says, ‘Don’t you think Sumi would have known if he was?’ (2) This utterance doesn’t expect an answer from Aru, but connotes that their father is alive and if their father was not alive, Sumi would know it. She actually means he cannot be dead. Charu feels uncomfortable with a thought of believing her father dead. She takes the help of Indirect Speech to clarify her stand to Aru on their father’s whereabouts.

Aru uses behabitive forces to clear her stand on their fathers abandoning the family and opens up her heart with the help of Indirect Speech Act.
When Aru’s grandmother tells about the reason for disharmony between Shripati and her relations, Aru gets stuck by another doubt. Aru is not sure whether Kalyani, her grandmother deliberately abandoned her retarded son. Against this context following conversation takes place

‘What’s the matter? Can’t sleep?’

Aru sits up then and tells Charu the story. And ends with the same question she had asked Premi. ‘Do you think she did it deliberately?’

Charu is shocked into an instant ‘No! How can you even think of such thing?’

‘Baba obviously thought she did. If not, why did he….’ She searches for the exact word, ‘Cut himself so completely away from her? Thirty years? No, more than that. Imagine not speaking to your own wife for over thirty years.’

(P. No. 142)

Aru has recently learnt that Sumi had a brother who went missing on a journey and Shripati, Aru’s grandfather considers Kalyani responsible for it. Aru doubts whether Kalyani deliberately did not look after her son properly and let him go because he was mentally unstable or was that an accident.

She opens up herself to Charu and asks her, ‘Do you think she did it deliberately?’ Aru indirectly implies that she is not confident about Kalyani and doubts that Kalyani might have done so to get rid of her son. Aru employs Indirect Speech Act with a purpose to get her doubt clarified by Aru, at the same time she
wants to save her face. If Aru had asked it directly that could have exposed her distrust in her grandmother, Kalyani.

Aru is constantly surrounded by doubts and distrust since her father, Gopala, walked out on them. This time Aru is suspicious about the relation between her mother and Kumar. Kumar is Sumi’s friend. When Kumar rings up Sumi a couple of time, Aru believes that they are having an affair.

‘Do you believe in stepfathers, Charu?’

Charu is taken aback, less by the question than by the way it is put.

‘You talk as if they’re fairies or ghosts or something.’

And then, understanding comes in, ‘Oh, oh, you mean kumar.’

‘He’s called Sumi thrice today.’

‘He’s helping her with the play-her school play.’

‘I know that, but still... Have you seen him looking at her?’

(P. No. 172)

The above piece of dialogue takes place between Aru and Charu. Aru is in a baffled state and seeks Charu’s help to get out of it.

Aru says, ‘Do you believe in stepfathers, Charu?’ This utterance of Aru implies that they are about to have a stepfather. Aru believes that Sumi’s friend Kumar is in love with Sumi. Aru is happy as her mother is getting some company, but at the same time she is not sure of their need of a stepfather?
Aru speaks carefully about it to Charu, since they are talking about their mother having an affair it becomes a very sensitive issue. Aru indirectly conveys that they are about to have a stepfather. She asks Charu that did she believe in stepfather. Charu gets startled by the question, but soon gets the indirect message of Aru. Charu calms down Aru and says, ‘He’s helping her with the play-her school play.’ This utterance connotes that Kumar was just helping Sumi and there was nothing as Aru believes. Instead of answering Aru’s question directly whether she would accept Kumar as their stepfather, Charu refutes Aru’s claim. This utterance also conveys that Charu didn’t find anything between Sumi and Kumar.

Aru informs Charu that Kumar had called Sumi thrice that day. She indirectly asks Charu that if there was nothing between Kumar and Sumi, why he would call Sumi thrice the same day. Aru wants to get confirmed if there is any love affair or inclination towards each other between Kumar and Sumi. When Aru says, ‘He’s called Sumi thrice today.’ She connotes the possibility of a love affair between Sumi and Kumar.

Aru asks Charu if she had observed Kumar taking a look at Sumi. Aru here indirectly asks Charu if she had found any traces of love between Sumi and Kumar.

Both the girls discuss the issue very carefully and without making any open remarks. With the help of Indirect Speech Acts and employment of illocutionary forces Aru and Charu to express intended meanings.

In a social power structure, the weaker sections of the society also employ Indirect Speech Acts to express their suspicions or
doubts. Since they belong to the weaker section they are not in a position to vent out their doubts about the stronger section of the society. If a worker has any doubt and wishes to get it clarified it from his boss, he would prefer to express it with utmost care so that he will not attract any wrath of his boss. In Second Thoughts a salesman representing to the lower section of the society carefully expresses himself to the protagonist of the novel, Maya.

Feeling slightly guilty about my earlier meanness I asked indifferently, ‘Where are you from?’ (1)

He named an obscure town. (2)

‘Where’s that?’ I asked without really wanting to know. (3)

The man wiggled his eyebrows. ‘Bihar, memsaab, Bihar. Do you know where that is?’ (4)

Was I imagining it or was he being sarcastic? I looked at him witheringly and nodded. He still showed no sign of leaving.

‘Do you have any of Saab’s old clothes?’ he asked, wiping the sweat off his face with the end of his filthy turban. (5)

‘I’ll check.’ I said, exasperated, adding, ‘next time.’

He stared up at the moulded ceiling of the landing. ‘Next time. Who can say about the next time? There is no next time memsaab. Only today. Only now.’

(P. No. 23)
The above piece of conversation takes place between Maya and a salesman. Maya inquires about his native place. The salesman answers, 'Bihar, memsaab, Bihar. Do you know where that is?'

(4) The answer given by the salesman is a fine example of Indirect Speech Act. The salesman considers Maya to be a typical Bengali girl who knows nothing about the world. The salesman is not in the position to remark on Maya’s knowledge about the world. The salesman uses Indirect Speech Act to express his views.

The salesman’s utterance, ‘Bihar, memsaab, Bihar. Do you know where that is?’, has multiple connotations. The first connotation is Bihar is a very faraway place from Bombay and he has travelled that distance to come to Bombay. The second connotation is the salesman doubts whether Maya knows where Bihar is actually.

The salesman has visited Maya to sell his properties, so he cannot hurt Maya by asking any rude question, but at the same time the salesman wishes to get his doubt for Maya’s knowledge of Bihar get cleared. The use of Indirect Speech Act serves the salesman and achieves his communication goal without spoiling the scene.

In another situation in the novel *Second Thoughts* watchman of the society makes use of Indirect Speech Act to ask Maya where she had been. He also expresses his doubt whether Maya can manage herself in a city like Bombay.

He stared back shamelessly and said, ‘But memsaab, you are always at home. You never go anywhere. And saab is also not in town. So naturally we became a little worried. Anything can
happen in a city like Bombay. And that too, to an outsider. Who can trust anybody these days? When a woman is all alone in the house…”

I cut him short. “None of this is your business,” I said curtly.

(P. No. 198)

The above mentioned piece of dialogue extracted from the novel is a conversation between Maya and the society watchman. That watchman looks at Maya coming back to the apartment and starts a dialogue with her. The message passed by the watchman seems to be very common on the surface level. But indirectly he conveys a male dominated message.

The watchman says, “But memsaab, you are always at home. You never go anywhere. And saab is also not in town. So naturally we became a little worried.” The watchman takes the help of Indirect Speech Act to convey Maya to be an outsider and considers her to be unknown to the realities of the practical world in Bombay. He doubts Maya’s ability to handle herself in Bombay.

He also mentions that she never goes outside, but today she was out for quite a long time. The watchman implies his worry for Maya.

This also indicates that Maya is not allowed to go out in Ranjan’s absence, she must have used the opportunity to go out in the absence of Ranjan. This entails that watchman doubt that she is taking undue advantage of her husband’s absence. Watchman also comments indirectly on the current situation. He says that the
world has become so unfit to live in since people turned hostile to each other. This indirect remark reveals the current insecurities prevailing in the society.

The watchman also could be seen as a typical male in Indian context. The indirect concern, he expresses about Maya is not because he has been given duty to watch after society members, but he was not able to accept her going out in the absence of her husband, especially when she is not familiar with the Bombay.

The employment of indirect speech act has helped the author and the characters of the novel to express beyond the words.

In delicate situations where a girl and a boy are trying to develop a relationship, doubts cannot be explicitly put across which may endanger the development of the relation between them. In Second Thoughts Maya and Nikhil are exploring any possibilities for their love relationship. When Maya doubts whether Nikhil is keeping a watch on her, she takes the help of the Indirect Speech Act to express herself.

Nikhil followed my eyes, went upto the door and shut it firmly. He stroad back, his eyes questioning and a little hurt. ‘Have I said something to upset you? Did I do anything wrong? What’s the matter? Are you tense because your husband isn’t in town?’

I was startled when he said that. ‘How do you know that?’

I demanded my voice strident and unattractive.

(P. No.182)
The above communication takes place between Nikhil and Maya. Nikhil visits Maya in the absence of Ranjan. Nikhil wants to know why Maya is upset with him. Nikhil uses Indirect Speech Act to convey Maya that he knows Ranjan is not in the city. Nikhil also asks what’s wrong with Maya and why she is upset.

Maya says, “How do you know that?” This utterance of Maya is an attempt to avoid Nikhil’s question and seeks an explanation from Nikhil on his knowledge of Ranjan’s being out of town. This utterance connotes blame on Nikhil of spying on Maya’s husband.

Nikhil too indirectly answers Maya that he is not keeping any watch on her husband or on Maya and says,

Nikhil shrugged and said with utmost naturalness,
“I was up early...I saw him get into a cab with his bags, that’s how I know, Okey? Don’t worry. I’m not spying on you. It’s just a bloody coincidence?”

(P. No.182)

This reply by Nikhil is an effort to pacify Maya and to explain her that he is not spying on her husband. Since Maya indirectly expresses her unhappiness for spying on her husband, understanding the connotations of Maya’s utterance, Nikhil conveys that he accidentally saw Ranjan going out in a cab with a bag. Nikhil with the help of Indirect Speech Act proves his innocence.

These Indirect Speech Acts reveals the emotions of Nikhil and Maya. Nikhil’s worry for Maya and his attempt to convince her, indirectly remarks his involvement in Maya, on the other hand
Maya displays her soft corner for Nikhil when she eventually ignores that fact that Nikhil is keeping a watch on her family activities.

Both the characters carefully take steps to develop their relations further, at the same time both wish to be safe from exposing their feelings openly. The basic communication goal is achieved by the characters with the employment of Indirect Speech Act by conveying more than the spoken.

Maya, being a very careful in the affair with Nikhil, has so many questions and things to ask Nikhil. But she fears that her suspicious attitude may take Nikhil away from her. At the same time she cannot control herself asking her doubts. To save herself getting into critical situation Maya implies her doubts to Nikhil and tries to get peace of mind.

I wished I could. I wished my conversation was different. I wanted more than anything else to laugh and converse freely and ask Nikhil a thousand questions. Instead, I said stiffly, ‘Do you do this often-visit married women after making sure their husbands aren’t in town?’

Nikhil laughed lightly. ‘All the time. My diary is crammed with the travel schedules of various husbands. In fact (he glanced at his watch), I’m due to Pedder Road in another twenty minutes. There is another bored housewife waiting for me there.’

I found myself laughing and feeling very foolish.
What do you mean? Another bored housewife?  
I'm not bored, for your information. Don't presume so many things—okay?

(P. No. 186-187)

Nikhil and Maya go out and enjoy the day. Maya enjoys Nikhil's company and she tries to learn more about Nikhil. A salesman had already sowed a doubt about Nikhil's character in Maya's mind. She doesn't want to lose Nikhil by asking any question which may hurt him. Maya takes the help of Indirect Speech Act to achieve her communication goals.

Maya says, "Do you do this often-visit married women after making sure their husbands aren't in town?" This utterance of Maya implies her doubt that Nikhil may be a Casanova personality. Maya conveys her doubt indirectly since she doesn't want to hurt Nikhil.

Maya asks Nikhil whether he visits all the married woman and enjoy relationships with them. Maya actually wants to know Nikhil's character and his seriousness about Maya. Her question has many implications. She is looking for any possibilities to consider Nikhil to be faithful.

Nikhil says, "All the time. My diary is crammed with the travel schedules of various husbands." This utterance may seem, on Locutionary level, confirming Maya's doubt, but the Illocutionary meaning of the utterance is important. Nikhil indirectly conveys Maya that he is not a womanizer and doesn't run after all the married women. He conveys that Maya is the only woman he has been visiting. Nikhil employs Indirect Speech
Act to make Maya believe in him and open up further possibilities to develop their relationships.

In the above situation a married woman and a young boy are sharing thoughts, they are trying to understand each other. They cannot do it openly, which may encourage any misunderstanding between them. The Indirect Speech Act helps both the characters to save their relationships, avoid any complexities and get successful in expressing themselves. It also takes novel to a certain height as far as the communication strategy is concerned.

3.5 Accusing and Blaming

People blame someone out of a belief that the person is somewhere responsible for some unwanted happenings. Blaming or accusing is the outcomes of the happenings, which are not acceptable according to the speaker. Accusing has an element of presupposition where speaker assumes that a person has done something wrong.

Accusing someone is a direct threat to the relationship with that person. People don’t accuse or blame directly whom they love and care. At the same time accusation can be seen as a self defence strategy.

In Fasting, Feating Uma’s mother blames convent school nuns for spoiling her daughter. She blames nuns indirectly. Uma’s mother uses Rhetorical question to express her accusation. She says.

‘Don’t you know what brackets are? What did they teach you at the convent?’ (P. No. 128)
Uma’s mother holds nuns of the convent responsible for Uma’s disobedience and unacceptable behaviour. She uses dectic expression *they* to refer to nuns of the convents and asks what did they teach Uma. This Rhetorical question doesn’t seek any answer, but implies mother’s accusation.

In the same novel Uma’s mother blames the nuns in another situation.

Then the ignominy of her return, in the school van accompanied by Sister Teresa and the school nurse, with Aruna wide-eyed and Mama scolding like a madwoman, blaming it all on the pink and blue and gilt picture that Mother Agnes had given Uma and that she still held clenched in her fist. The way Mama railed against it, it would seem the holy picture was a poison potion, or some evil charm that had cast a spell on her daughter.

‘See what these nuns do,’ she raged to Papa.

‘What ideas they fill in the girls’ heads! I always said don’t send them to a convent school. Keep them at home, I said-but who listened? And now-!’

(P. No. 29)

The above mentioned conversation is between Uma’s parents. Uma’s mother is very upset with Uma’s going to convent school. She is of the opinion that going to a convent school means disrespecting our own culture and traditions. She also strongly believes that the nuns at the convent school try to convert their students to Christianity.
One day Uma returns after meeting her teacher *Mother Agnes* with a photo given by her. Mama cannot tolerate that and expresses her anger to Uma’s father. She expresses her distress indirectly by advocating her objection for Uma’s convent education. She indirectly blames nuns at convent to be responsible for irrational behaviour of Uma.

Uma’s mother with the help of Indirect Speech Act conveys her feelings. She has been expected to be polite when she expresses her objection to her husband’s act. It was Uma’s father who admitted Uma in a convent school. Being an obedient and cultured wife she could not oppose her husband’s decision. But, with the help of above cited utterance she implies her opposition to Uma’s admission in a convent. Against the background of Indian context, this can be observed that most of the time women express themselves with the help of Indirect Speech Act.

Uma’s mother represents most of the Indian wives who express themselves in an indirect way, a widely used conversational strategy. Speech Acts are concerned with politeness so the unpleasant messages are diminished in a request, a suggestion or an order.

In *Second Thoughts* Ranjan uses Indirect Speech Act to blame Maya for not being a faithful wife. Since Maya is his wife, he cannot hurt her, but at the same time he cannot accept that she is seeing a neighbour’s son in his absence.

I left the chillies to splutter in a tiny pool of oil.
Ranjan wasn’t finished yet. ‘Maybe you should talk about this matter with my mother. You are not from Bombay, after all. It’s different here Young lady.’
married women do not invite loafers into their homes when husband is away. In Calcutta, possibly, nobody misunderstand. But here! Even without doing anything at all people gossip. And this is truly the limit. Your mother will also agree. I may have full faith in you (he sounded as though he didn’t have even a shred) but what about people? How can you face them?’

(P. No.91)

On learning that Nikhil has visited Maya, Ranjan gets furious and the above communication takes place. Ranjan reprimands Maya for letting Nikhil enter into his house in his absence.

Ranjan indirectly blames Maya to be immoral and indifferent to her husband’s prestige in the society. He asks Maya to take an advice of her mother form Calcutta on the issue and see what she would tell her. He wishes to convey Maya that even her mother would not support her.

He says that young moral married women do not invite any loafer into their house when the husband is away. He indirectly blames Maya to be immoral for letting Nikhil enter into the house. He remarks Maya to be unfaithful.

Ranjan’s utterance, “I may have full faith in you, but what about people? How can you face them?”, on Locutionary level asserts that he has full faith in her, but the Illocutionary meaning of the utterance connotes his poor attempt to convince Maya. The utterance suggests that he doesn’t believe in Maya’s loyalty and proves him to be a suspicious husband.
In the same novel Ranjan accuses Maya one more time for inviting Nikhil in his absence. Knowing that he is making serious accusation, Ranjan uses Indirect Speech Act to make his accusation mild.

Ranjan had remained silent for a while. Then he had said slowly, ‘The other day when I got home from work, I thought I smelt cigarette smoke in the house. That fellow smokes, doesn’t he?’

I had whirled around and asked, ‘How should I know? I’m not his mother.’

Ranjan had had a distant look on his face as he tugged at his earlobe. ‘Then who could have been smoking here? Unless you have started doing so behind my back.’

(P. No.253)

The above mentioned conversation takes place between Ranjan and Maya. Ranjan expresses his doubt about Nikhil’s visits to Maya in his absence. He doesn’t blame Maya directly for inviting Nikhil or letting him come home in Ranjan’s absence. Ranjan has no proof to prove the same. But Ranjan takes the help of Indirect Speech Act to convey his doubt to Maya and make Maya clarify for it. The use of Indirect Speech Act saves the face of Ranjan and seeks clarification at the same time.

Ranjan says that he smelt cigarette smoke in the house. This implies that someone other than Ranjan has visited Maya in his absence. Ranjan doesn’t smoke so someone else who smokes has visited Maya. He further reminds Maya that Nikhil has a habit.
of smoking. He indirectly suggests Maya that Nikhil had come in his absence and he smoked as well in the house.

Maya understands the implications of Ranjan, but in order to reject Ranjan's claims she denies of any knowledge about Nikhil and his smoking habit. Maya wishes to avoid the question so she employs Indirect Speech Act as a reply to Ranjan's question and says,

‘How should I know? I'm not his mother.’

(P.253)

Ranjan gets angry for Maya's answer, especially with Maya's implicit denial of the fact. He indirectly blames Maya for lying. Ranjan says Maya might have developed a habit of smoking behind his back. Otherwise, who else would smoke in the house of Ranjan. It was not remotely possible to say that Maya has smoking habit which entails that someone definitely has visited Maya who smokes and that should be Nikhil.

The entire conversation takes place with the help of Indirect Speech Act. Ranjan and Maya both are in a very delicate relationship which may get shattered because of a doubt which has no proof. In such situation Ranjan wishes to get his doubt cleared off without losing his face or blaming Maya directly for seeing Nikhil in behind his back. It would be a serious allegation and may ruin their relationship and married life. It was also impossible for Ranjan to neglect the issue. His employment of Indirect Speech Act has served both the purposes of Ranjan. Ranjan implies his doubt and also asks for clarification.
This puts Ranjan’s and Maya’s relation in danger and a blame game begins.

Ranjan’s eyebrows had shot up. ‘Asthama? Funny nobody told me you come from an asthmatic background. I don’t think my mother is aware of that either. Maybe your uncle “forgot” to tell us.

(P. No.254)

Ranjan blames Maya and her family for hiding Maya’s medical history form Ranajan before marriage. He indirectly blames Maya for deceiving Ranajan. He uses Indirect Speech Act to blame Maya. He ironically says Maya’s uncle might have forgotten to tell Ranjan about Maya’s medical history. He indirectly blames Maya’s uncle for having deliberately kept Ranjan in the dark.

Ranjan and Maya share the one more dialogue, where the blame game continues

Just as I was leaving the room, Ranjan’s voice had stopped me. ‘Does he enter the house in my absence? Come in here, sit down and all that?’

Instead of replying directly, I had looked exasperated and said, ‘I know exactly where that cigarette smoke must have come from?’

(P. No.255)

Ranajan is suspicious about Maya and Nikhil seeing each other. Since he is not confirmed of the same, he takes the help of Indirect Speech Act to convey his doubt. He enquires further the
issue and above conversation takes place. He asks Maya does Nikhil visits often Maya in his absence. This connotes that Ranjan is aware of Nikhil’s visits. He also implies that Maya and Nikhil may be very close to each other that’s why Nikhil has been visiting Maya often. Ranjan wishes to know how far the relationship between Maya and Nikhil has developed.

Ranjan cannot blame Maya directly and put serious allegation of adultery. Ranjan employs Indirect Speech Act for the same.

Maya understands the implications and diverts the issue. She indirectly denies all the doubts of Ranjan. In order to prove Ranjana’s claims to be unfounded, she lies to Ranjan.

Maya says, “I know exactly where that cigarette smoke must have come from?”

This utterance of Maya is not the answer of Ranjan’s question, but Maya informs that a salesman had visited the house and he was smoking ‘Bidi’. The smell Ranjan got may be of the Bidi. Maya gets successful in defending Nikhil without taking an open stand for him. Maya with the help of Indirect Speech Act achieves two communication goals. The first is she defends herself and Nikhil and the other is she proves Ranjan wrong.

Ranjan and Maya encounter again and this time Ranjan accuses Maya not to be attentive and caring wife.

    I stood motionless and unthinking... till Ranjan came out of the kitchen to inform me that the chicken soup had boiled over and was burnt.

    ‘Didn’t you smell it?’ he asked crossly.
The above mentioned piece of conversation takes place between Ranjan and Maya. When Maya forgets she has kept soup on the gas, which gets burnt. Ranjan becomes angry with Maya for being careless. He asks Maya, didn’t she smell the burning of soup. Maya denies it by shaking her head. This interrogative utterance of Ranjan makes an implicit statement blaming Maya to be indifferent to household work. The answer given by Maya irritates Ranjan further. He indirectly blames Maya for being deliberately careless with housework.

I shook my head.

(P. No.315)

‘How come? My mother smelt it burning from the bedroom and sent me to see what was happening.’

(R. 315)

Ranjan says if his mother can smell soup burning from the bedroom then why Maya could not smell it. This conveys that Ranjan believed Maya doing it purposefully as she did not like Ranjan’s mother staying with them. Ranjan also indirectly blames Maya to be indifferent and careless housewife. He thinks Maya is unsympathetic towards his mother.

Ranjan could not blame Maya directly but with the employment of Indirect Speech Act he expresses his anger and frustration over Maya.

In *The God of Small Things* Baby Kochamma accuses Mamachi and Chako for giving Velutha a special favour.
Baby Kochamma indirectly blames Mamachi for favouring Velutha all the time. Baby Kochamma doesn't like the treatment given to Velutha by Mamachi and Chacko, she conveys her anger and disapproval indirectly. She employs Indirect Speech Act to vent out her anger.

In *A Matter of Time* Sumi blames Gopala for her pathetic condition. She knows that she is blaming her husband and tries to be less harsh while blaming him.

I'm surprised none of you have thought of that. But look what happened—it's not him who's going around with the begging bowl, it's I who am doing that.'

Sumi being a mature and responsible woman cannot open up her heart conspicuously even to her friends. She takes the help of Indirect Speech Act. The application of Indirect Speech Act guides us to understand the psychological status of the lead character and understand the development of the novel more comprehensively.

### 3.6 Expressing Frustration

When people get frustrated they express themselves in Indirect Speech Acts through different structures like Rhetorical questions. The same can be explained with the examples from the
Ranjan expresses his frustration in *Second Thoughts* with the help of Indirect Speech Act and says,

‘You expect me to drink warm water on a hot night like this?’ I won’t be able to sleep tonight, you know. And I have a very busy day ahead of me tomorrow—including a meeting with Becker. (1) How will I face it with a parched throat and a throbbing headache?’ (2)

(R. No.131)

Ranjan employs Rhetorical questions (1) and (2) to express his frustration and anger. He doesn’t seek any answer from Maya, but implies his emotions.

In the same novel, Maya vents out her frustration over telephone to her maternal uncle, Prodipda. Maya’s frustration is an outcome of the lack of understanding and emotional connectivity between Maya and Ranjan. Since it’s a matter of husband and wife Maya cannot be explicit in her expressions. One day she calls her uncle and the following conversation takes place.

‘Mamu, what do you say to your wife when you phone her?’

My uncle didn’t snort. He didn’t laugh. He answered carefully, ‘Well, that depends. I mean...it depends on why I’m making the call.’

‘So why do you make calls, generally?’ I continued.

‘Generally, it is to check something,’ my uncle replied.
‘Like what?’ I persisted.

‘Like…what’s for dinner—or has the electricity bill been paid? Or, is there something I have to pick up on the way home—like that.’

I uttered a lame, ‘Oh.’

(P. No.229)

When Ranjan goes out of the town for some office work, Maya calls her maternal uncle and the above conversation takes place over a telephone. The above conversation is significant for the study of Indirect Speech Acts. Maya is not happy with Ranjan and she feels that he is not a romantic husband and speaks very indifferently with her. She is frustrated with her relationship with Ranjan. Maya wants to learn how Prodip mama deals with his wife specially over a telephone call.

Maya and Prodip mama both indirectly try to judge each other. Maya’s questions imply to her uncle that something is wrong with her married life. Prodip mama understands these implications and carefully answers the questions. His answers are his efforts to save Ranjan and married life. Prodip mama’s answers imply Maya that all married couples have a normal and usual talk over a telephone call, and if Ranjan had been so with Maya, then it’s very normal. Both Maya and Prodip mama get successful in conveying their feelings and messages respectively.

The motive of Prodip mama is to convince Maya without hurting her, this conversation goal is successfully achieved by Prodip mama with the help of indirect speech act.
Further, in one more situation Maya takes the help of Indirect Speech Act to articulate her frustration when she learns that Nikhil has got married.

I leaned against the refrigerator to steady myself. My entire body was shaking with mirth. The more I stared at the spilled soup, the funnier I found it. I knew I would have to make it again from scratch.

So what? I had all the time in the world now.

(P. No.316)

This utterance points out Maya’s state of mind. Maya on learning about Nikhil’s marriage feels very lonely and heartbroken. Maya had developed a soft corner for Nikhil. Nikhil was the new hope for Maya. Nikhil had brought happiness and freshness to her life, but with Nikhil’s marriage Maya has lost it. Maya indirectly conveys the readers about her loss. Maya asserts that now she has all the time in the world, which implies her being aimless and hopeless. When Maya says,

So what? I had all the time in the world now.

(P. No.316)

When she says she has all the time in the world, Maya implies that she has lost the meaning of the life. She has nothing to look up to

Very effectively author implies many things to the readers of the novel which make the novel full of suggestive messages and
meanings. This gives the readers to explore novel in a different dimension and enjoy it with his/her own perspective.

Ammu, in *The God Of Small Things* gets frustrated when her son and daughter is not given proper respect and not considered to be one of the family. Ammu expresses her frustration and anger, especially when Estha, Ammu’s son is considered responsible for Sophie Mol’s death.

Margaret Kochamma’s grief and bitterness at her daughter’s death coiled inside her like an angry spring. She said nothing, but slapped Estha whenever she could in the days she was there before she returned to England.

Rahel watched Ammu pack Estha’s little trunk.

‘May be they’re right,’ Ammu’s whispers ‘Maybe a boy does need a Baba.’

Rahel saw that her eyes were a redly dead.

(P. No.31)

Estha has been taken responsible for Sophie Mol’s death. Magaret Kochamma, who had come to Ayemenem to get away her husband’s death, now she has to face her daughter’s death. This is a great shock for the entire family.

Ammu also feels guilty as her son is considered responsible for Sophie Mol’s death. She expresses her feelings and emotions indirectly. She doesn’t say anything to Estha, but she comments that the kids got spoiled because their father is not with them to look after them.
Ammu indirectly approves family member’s blame that kids got spoiled, and Ammu is equally responsible for what has happened. Ammu refers her family members to be 'they' which shows Ammu’s lack of affection for them and feeling alienated from them. Ammu’s utterance, “May be a boy does need a Baba” has significant implications. Ammu implies that it was a wrong decision taken by Ammu to leave her husband and come to Ayemenem. If Estha had been under supervision of his father this would not have happened. Ammu also indirectly remarks that boys are difficult to raise in the absence of their fathers, which implies daughters are easy to raise for a single mother. Ammu’s this remark displays her frustration.

3.7 Complaining

People complain when they are not getting expected results or responses. Complaining arises when some when is is not satisfied with something. Complaining can be about any things like living things, non-living things, conditions, fate, destiny, circumstances or the God. In A Matter of Time Sumi complains about their family God, Ganesh, for not looking after the family and let it suffer.

Kalyani, too, perhaps unconsciously imitating her mother, whom she must have seen doing this as a child, folds her own hands and mutters. ‘Look after us, Ganapati, protect us.’

‘He doesn’t do such a good job of looking after the women in the family does he?’
Sumi’s question takes even her own self by surprise.

The above conversation takes place between Sumi and Kalyani, when Kalyani is worshiping the Lord Ganesha and Sumi is watching her. Sumi’s reaction to mother's pray implies about her mental status and her fear in accepting the family curse.

When Kalyani prays Lord Ganesha and pleads him to look after her family. Sumi says “He doesn’t do such a good job of looking after the women in the family does he?”

This reaction of Sumi connotes the readers that women in her family have suffered a lot including Sumi herself. Sumi says that Lord Ganesha has failed in his job of looking after her family. If it was not so Sumi and her mother Kalyani would not have suffered. Sumi complains that Lord Ganesha has not been looking after the family well. Otherwise the women in the family would not have suffered.

Sumi’s this utterance is significant for its implications. Sumi has been avoiding that she has taken Gopala’s walk out as a suffering and she hopes he will return. But the above mentioned utterance of Sumi which seems to be a spontaneous reaction has revealed her pain. With the help of Indirect Speech Act Sumi vents out her feelings

In the same novel Sumi complains Gopala’s unthoughtful act of walking out on her. She indirectly holds Gopala responsible for family suffering. Sumi expresses herself to her friend.
‘I’ve begun to think that what Gopal has really done is to take Sanyas. I’m surprised none of you have thought of that. But look what happened—it’s not him who’s going around with the begging bowl, it’s I who am doing that.’

(P. No. 123)

Sumi complains that she has been suffering for what Goapla has done. Sumi uses Indirect Speech Act to express herself. In Indian social context husband is not taken responsible if anything goes wrong. The wife is not even given an opportunity to ask for any explanation. She cannot complain directly as well. Sumi in attempt to save herself being a pathetic, complaining, helpless woman implies her.

3.8 Objection

People object when they feel something is not as per the prevalent rules, practices, or procedures. Objections arise when one doesn’t approve something. By objecting one lodges ones disagreement and anger. The act of objecting is registering opposition to someone or something which may not be taken positively by the person who is at objection. This negative emotion may ruin the relation of the person who is lodging objection and the person who is being objected to. In day to day life one finds oneself in many situations where he has to put across his object. A kid may object to eat the food that his mother has cooked. Since he cannot disobey his mother the kid has to
employ some communication strategies to imply his objection to eat the food. As soon as the kid is invited to eat the food, the kid replies

‘Come to eat food, beta.’ (1)

‘I don’t feel appetite.’ (2)

‘I think, I got stomach ache.’(3)

The first utterance of mother is an invitation to the kid to eat the food. The mother implies her assumption that the kid is hungry. The reply given by the kid (2) and (3) imparts its connotative significance. The kid conveys that he doesn’t want to eat the food because he did not like the food she has cooked.

In the selected novels for the study characters come across many situations where they find themselves in unwanted situations. They wish to object to the situations or the happenings. In such circumstances, characters are seen employing Indirect Speech Act to communicate their objection. When Baby Kochamma in *The God of Small Things* doesn’t like the respect and special treatment given to Velutha she objects it in an indirect way. She says,

‘Your beloved Velutha-Whom else?’

(Page No. 184)

This utterance where Baby Kochamma deliberately uses the word ‘beloved’ to object the family’s behaviour with Velutha. She believes that Velutha belongs to the lower class of the society so he need not be given much importance and respect.
In Fasting, Feasting Uma’s father lodges his objection when Ramu the unwanted guest desires to take Uma out for dinner. In Indian context though unwanted, every guest is honoured with the best a host can find. The host does not hurt the guest. Uma’s father takes the help of Indirect Speech Act in order to object Ramu and Uma going out. Uma’s mother as well tries her best to avoid Uma going out with Ramu.

Then Papa gathers himself together. It is up to him to prevent this situation from getting completely out of control. ‘No need. Waste! Kwality’s-bah!’ (1)

‘Dinner has been prepared at home,’ Mama adds, also coming to life. (2)

‘No, no, we must eat out. I insist. I will take Uma out to dinner. The best dinner we can get in this city. Isn’t there a hotel, with a bar?’ (3)

(P. No. 49)

In spite of a very cold welcome of Ramu by family members, Uma tries her best to please Ramu. Ramu decides to take Uma out for a dinner. The parents of Uma cannot resist this openly so they take help of indirect speech act to avoid the situation. When Ramu announces of taking Uma to the best restaurant available in the town Uma’s father denies the fact of having any good restaurant in the town. He says, “No need. Waste! Kwality’s-bah!” (1) He indirectly rejects the idea of going out. Uma’s father shows his objection with the help of Speech Act. On the Locutionary level his utterance is just a denial of the fact that there are good hotels in the city, but the illocutionary meaning conveys his stand on Uma going out with Ramu.
Uma's mother too expresses her objection to going out and says, "Dinner has been prepared at home." This utterance of Uma's mother conveys a fact that dinner is already prepared. The illocutionary meaning of the utterance is a suggestion to Ramu that since the food is already ready, they should not go out for dinner; otherwise the prepared food will be wasted. Both Uma's father and mother utilize Indirect Speech Acts to avert the scene without using any direct and harsh remarks. Both manage to avoid display of their objection overtly, but get successful in conveying desired meanings.

In the same novel characters find themselves helpless, but object to the situations. This time Uma's parent object Uma going to a coffee party thrown by Mrs. O'Henry, Uma's convent teacher.

'Mrs O'Henry- she has invited me to a coffee party.'

Uma can hardly speak; she would like to keep this treasured invitation to herself- it is for herself alone. After all- and would have preferred not to divulge it.

Of course that is out of the question

'Why?' asks Papa.

'Coffee? Why coffee?' asks Mama.

Uma jerks her head back. 'Why?' she snaps back at them. 'She is giving a party-a coffee party, not a tea party- and she has invited some ladies, and me.'
'Tchch!' Mama pronounces her opinion of this ridiculous outlandish invitation, and moodily swings back and forth.

(P. No. 115)

The above conversation takes place between Uma and her parents. Uma gets an invitation to a tea party from Uma's convent school teacher, Mrs O'Henry. Uma's parents don't like teachers from Uma's school. Uma's mother believes that the school teachers are trying to convert Uma to Christianity. When Uma discloses the invitation to her parents, they get suspicious about it. Uma's mother asks why Uma has been invited to the party, whereas Uma's father expresses doubt over coffee itself.

The Indirect Speech Act employed by Uma's parents indicates their strong objection to Uma going to the tea party. When Uma tries to justify, her mother refutes all her justifications. However, Uma's parents do not use the Direct Speech Act to express their objection to the invitation, but they become successful to do so with the help of Indirect Speech Act. Employment of Indirect Speech Act through the device of interrogative words like 'Why' helps Uma's parents to save their face and convey intended meaning to Uma at the same time.

The basic communication goal of Uma's parents is to prevent Uma from visiting her teachers, in which they get successful with the help of indirect speech act.

Aruna Uma's sister as well is seen objecting Uma's visit to Bombay. When Uma suffers from an eye problem, a doctor advises Uma to see a specialist in Bombay. Aruna Uma's sister never treated her well. Aruna is always been jealous of Uma and
looks down upon her. Aruna cannot take the fact that Uma is going to Bombay, where Aruna had been married off. Aruna cannot directly object to Uma’s Bombay visit. She uses Indirect Speech Act to object the visit at the same time saves herself being exposed as a jealous sister.

Aruna objects Uma’s visit to Bombay on the grounds of unnecessary expenditure. Aruna says,

‘A specialists-in Bombay!’ Aruna gave a shriek.
‘Do you know what that would cost?’

(P. No. 112)

The above utterance of Aruna seems to be asking a direct question but it is loaded with implied messages. Aruna wishes to convey that consulting a specialist in Bombay takes a lot of money. According to Aruna Uma doesn’t deserve such expenditure.

Uma too objects her parents indirectly and says,

‘Papa has retired-he doesn’t have any work,’ Uma flares up, ‘and still you go to dinner parties and to the club. And I don’t go running after O’ Henry-she invited me- you heard her.

(P. No. 116)

Uma gets an invitation to a tea party from Mrs O’Henry. Uma’s parents don’t want Uma to attend the party. Uma tries to convince her mother.

When Uma fails to convince her parents she objects her mother’s attending parties. Being a daughter Uma cannot question her
parents’ activities directly. Uma indirectly points out her mother’s independence of attending parties with her father and express her anger for not allowed to go to Mrs O’Henry. Uma uses Indirect Speech Act to save herself from being rude to her mother, but gets successful in putting forth her intended message.

In *Second Thoughts* Maya the protagonist objects her husband when he behaves as if he has been given a right to insult his wife and her family.

'It doesn’t look nice for a wife to criticize her husband’s city,' he had said. (1)

'But it’s okay for a husband to criticize his wife’s—is that it? I had murmured. (2)

'You argue too much.' Ranjan had replied crossly and banged the bathroom door shut behind him. (3)

(P. No.268)

The above conversation takes place between Ranjan and Maya. Both had been to a party and there Ranjan made some remarks about Maya’s native place, Calcutta. The remarks made by Ranjan are contemptuous. Maya doesn’t like the remarks and as a reply to those comments she remarks Bombay to be a filthy place to live where everyone is running throughout a day.

Ranjan doesn’t like Maya making comments on Bombay which is her husband’s town. The abovementioned conversation takes place on this background. Maya asks Ranjan why he shut up Maya when she was making comments on Bombay. Ranjan comes out with the utterance (1) which means that it doesn’t look good for a wife to make any comments on her husband’s town.
This implies that Ranjan as a husband can make any comment on his wife’s town, but Maya, being a wife cannot make such comments. The connotation is, in an Indian context Husband enjoys all the rights and freedom, but wife doesn’t have such rights. Maya objects to this discrimination. Maya doesn’t like the explanation of Ranjan and asks a counter question that is it ok if husband criticizes wife’s town. Maya’s utterance (2) is an Indirect Speech Act.

Maya doesn’t wish to take up a quarrel with Ranjan. She knows her duties of a wife. She also knows that being a wife she cannot question her husband. At the same time she cannot bear the burden of male domination. She takes help of indirect speech act and questions Ranjan that why he enjoys superior status over her. This implication could be taken as generalized voice of all the wives suppressed under hypocritical customs and code of conduct laid down only for women.

Ranjan doesn’t answer Maya and in order to avoid the situation he diverts the conversation. He employs indirect speech acts to imply that he doesn’t have any answer or doesn’t need to answer Maya. This shows that he is not accountable to his wife.

### 3.9 Expressing Contempt

Expressing contempt is one of the most negative emotions. People hate things, places, people and situations which they don’t like. The strong aversion or contempt is an integral part of human psychology. There cannot be a framework which may explicate the reasons for hatred. One cannot display ones aversion for something overtly. Doing so will put the person in a category of
people of narrow mindedness. People express their contempt indirectly. Indirect Speech Act gets to the front to save the speaker from being very blunt or insensitive. The utterances like, ‘How mean’, ‘unbelievable’, are used to imply the degree of contempt or hatred.

The characters of the novels under study are not exception to the expression of contempt as they represent real life social figures. In Second Thoughts Maya faces a situation where she is looked down upon with contempt. Maya and Ranjan attend a party thrown for the staff. There Maya encounters Ranjan’s female colleague. Maya notices that the lady is getting very cosy with Ranjan. Maya doesn’t like it. She decides to make the woman aware of her presence. Maya introduces herself to the lady,

“Hello-I’m Mrs. Malik. Ranjan’s wife.”

(P. No.263)

Maya deliberately gives introduction as the wife of Ranjan. This utterance of Maya is an attempt to convey the woman that Ranjan is a married man and she should behave herself. Maya wishes to warn the woman not to get very close with his husband. Maya gets successful in conveying her message indirectly.

To this the lady remarks very meanly through Indirect Speech Act.

She turned to look at me-no, examine me, curiously. Her eyes expertly surveyed my body.
She parted her lips, teeth gleaming and held out her hand.

‘Oh….Maya…the girl from Calcutta.’ (2)
This utterance (2) of the lady is equally important for it is being connotative. The woman suggests that she knows about Maya and identifies Maya to be a girl from Calcutta. It is implied that Ranjan has already talked about Maya in the office and he mentioned her as a girl form Calcutta.

The woman also conveys that Maya to be a typical Calcutta girl who is unfit for Ranjan and a life in Bombay as well. She deliberately mentions Maya to be a Calcutta girl which implies her contempt. Maya is hated as she is not stylish, modern and smart woman. Ranjan doesn’t deserve her. It also implies that Office staff knows Maya to be a typical Indian girl. Maya also entails that Ranjan must have introduced Maya to be a typical Indian girl and complete mismatch for him.

The above conversation also throws light on Ranjan’s thoughts about Maya. At home Ranjan wants Maya to be an obedient wife and not like Bombay girls who are immoral, but at the office he makes fun of her and calls her to be unfit for a life in Bombay. Ranjan’s hypocrite nature comes forth the readers.

Without spoiling the mood of the party both Maya and the women share a talk and convey themselves with the help of Indirect Speech Acts. Both convey more than words could convey.

In *The God of Small Things* Baby Kochamma makes skilful use of Indirect Speech Acts to display her contempt. Baby Kochamma hates Velutha for being an untouchable.
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In the next room Baby Kochamma heard the noise and came to find out what it was all about. She saw Grief and Trouble ahead, and secretly, in her hearts of hearts, she exulted.

She said (among other things)-How could she stand the smell? Haven’t you noticed, they have a particular smell, these Paravans?

(P. No.78)

The above utterance comes from Baby Kochamma. When Baby Kochamma learns that Ammu has an affair with Velutha she cannot take it. She has utmost contempt for Velutha as he belongs to the lower cast. She cannot imagine Ammu having a love affair with him. Baby Kochamma doesn’t understand how Ammu can fall for such man. Baby Kochamma takes help of Indirect Speech Act in order to exhibit the greatness of sin Ammu has committed by having a love affair with an untouchable.

The utterance also implies that Baby Kochamma never liked these Paravans for their lower cast and specially their smell. On Locutionary level Baby Kochammas utterance seems to be seeking an answer, but the Illocutionary meaning implies Ammu’s immoral character. She condemns Ammu for having an affair with Velutha. This also implies contemporary communal hatred.

‘Ammu look! Adoor Basi’s dropping his things!’
Estha said.

‘He can’t even carry his things!’
‘He’s doing it deliberately,’ Baby Kochamma said in a strange new British accent. ‘Just ignore him.’

Baby Kochamma and the kids share above mentioned conversation. At the airport Estha locates a movie actor, Adoor Basi. Estha tries to attract attention of the family to the actor. Baby Kochamma doesn’t like the attention of the family to be taken off Margaret and Sophie. Baby Kochamma implies her contempt for Adoor Basi indirectly. In order to prove the actor unworthy of the attention Baby Kochamma says, ‘He’s doing it deliberately,’ ‘Just ignore him.’ This implies that Baby Kochamma has no interest in movies or the actor, Adoor Basi. She neither pays any attention to the actor nor shows any excitement. Baby Kochamma conveys indirectly that these things are not important to her. The basic motive of Baby Kochamma for employment of Indirect Speech Act is to exhibit her contempt for Adoor Basi.

In *Fasting, Feasting* Uma’s parents convey their disdain for Rammu who is an unwanted guest for them. Uma’s parents nonverbally exhibit their dislike for Ramu by not welcoming him warmly. Uma’s father indirectly shows that he doesn’t like Rammu to stay at his house. When Uma plans to cook some sweet for Rammu her father doesn’t like the idea.

Uma is hurrying back with a refilled pot. She is humming. ‘I’ve told cook to heat some bath water,’ she cries, ‘and he is going to make puris for breakfast.’
‘Puris for breakfast?’ Papa exclaims, breaking his silence. ‘Puris? Did you say Puris? The words explode from him with both excitement and horror: it is what they have on special occasions. Uma must be out of her mind if she thinks this is one.

(P. No. 47)

The family is not ready to give Ramu an honour of a guest and proper hospitality. Uma on the other shore is happy with the arrival of Ramu. She is trying her best to provide everything Ramu needs. She plans to make Puris in breakfast to celebrate his visit. This very idea upsets her parents who do not consider Ramu to be a guest deserving Puris in breakfast, as he doesn’t like at all.

Uma’s father gets shocked by the treatment given to Ramu by Uma. He further reminds Uma that Puri is the item that was cooked in the kitchen only on special occasion. Through the use of Indirect Speech Act the father intends to convey Uma that she has been over reacting to Ramu’s arrival. Since Ramu’s arrival is not that special occasion Puri in breakfast is strange for Uma’s father. Use of indirect speech act is made by Uma’s father to express his surprise as well as protest. He becomes successful in saving his face and asserting his feelings at the same time.

3.10 Expressing Anxiety

When things slip away out of control and one cannot do anything, but thinking about the consequences, starts feeling anxiety. Most of the time anxiety is implied and not directly mentioned. Particularly in Indian context women do not enjoy much rights or control over the family members or the family activities. They are
subordinate to their husbands, in-laws or their grown up kids. If a grandmother wants to prevent her grandson from playing with fire she has to employ Indirect Speech Act as she is aware that her grandson won’t listen to her. She says, ‘If you play with fire you would get hurt.’ Instead of saying ‘Don’t play with fire’. Many a times an utterance is commonly used by mothers to warn their kids. ‘let your papa come then see.’ The employment of these Indirect Speech Acts emerges from the anxiety they feel for their kids safety, future and happiness. They cannot take direct control of their life but keep worrying. Kalyani, Sumi, Aru in *A matter of Time*, Ammu, Rahel in *The God of Small Things*; Uma in *Fasting, Feasting*, and Chitra in *Second Thoughts* introduce the reader with such women from the real life.

In *A Matter of Time*, Kalyani and Sumi share following conversation.

‘Aru should be studying, Suni, she should be having fun, she shouldn’t be involved with this—this mustard seed of domestic life.’

‘And at your age, you shouldn’t be burdened with us, either. God knows none of us wants it, but there it is we’re stuck in this situation. So let’s make the best of it.’

‘But Sumi, I don’t like the idea of a child like Aru slogging.’
“Aru’s not a child. And listen, Amma, if we’re going
to stay here, and who knows how long it’s going to be,
you’ll going to be hard on all of us.’

Kalyani is worried about the strange and disturbed state of Aru. Kalyani feels that Aru should not get engaged in the family matters, in fact, she should enjoy her life.

Kalyani uses Metaphor, a figure of speech. In Metaphor comparison is made between two things representing different class or category. Kalyani refers to the family issue as a mustard seed. She intends to convey that Gopala’s abandoning Sumi and his daughters is not a very grave issue and could be resolved easily. Kalyani uses Indirect Speech Act to convince Sumi to give away the burden and lead a normal life. However, Kalyani herself has failed to do so.

Sumi understands the anxiety and inferred message of Kalyani and asks Kalyani to give up the worries as none of them wants it to happen with them. She indirectly persuades Kalyani not to burden herself with Aru and Sumi’s worries.

In the last part of the conversation Sumi says, ‘who knows how long it’s going to be, you’ll going to be hard on all of us.’ This implies that Sumi has lost her hopes for her reunion with her husband. She is not clear how long this will go on. Indirectly she also informs Kalyani that since it’s going to be a long run issue Kalyani should not be thinking about it a lot and learn to accept the reality.
In the same novel Kalyani expresses her concern and anxiety for her daughter Sumi’s disturbed married life. She visits Goapala, her son-in-law and puts her worry forth Gopala.

‘When Sumi married you, she was too young; but I was not anxious for her, you were older, you were sensible and you cared for her, yes you did. I can still remember how you scolded me for being angry with her when she refused to nurse Seema. She can’t help it, Amma, you said to me, she isn’t depriving the baby of milk on purpose. How can you change so much, Gopala?’

(P. No. 46)

The above cited piece of the conversation takes place between Kalyani and her son-in-law, Gopala. Kalyani visits Gopala and tries to induce him. Since the relation between Kalyani and her son-in-law is very delicate, Kalyani takes utmost care not to be harsh and condemning in her words for Gopala’s deeds. From the Indian perspective, this has a great significance.

Kalyani indirectly asks Gopala to introspect and reminds him how deep in love he was with Sumi. Kalyani says that she did not worry about Sumi when she married him. It clearly implies that the reason was she considered Gopala more mature and sensible and Suni to be in safe hands. But Gopala’s decision to be Sanyasi was a shock to Kalyani. Kalyani indirectly says that the act of Gopala was utterly insensible. In order not to hurt Gopala and make the situation worse Kalyani employs Indirect Speech Act.

At the end, Kalyani asks Gopala a question, ‘How can you change so much, Gopala?’
Through this question Kalyani asks Gopala for the clarification for what he did. She also brings to the notice of Gopala that he had broken her heart and her faith in him has been shattered. The use of Indirect Speech Act for saving the faces and taking care of delicate relationships is very common. The above conversation is a fine example of the same. Kalyani becomes successful in opening her feelings to Gopala and at the same time she tries to persuade Gopala to change his decision and return home.

Sumi in *A Matter of Time* when feels helpless that she cannot do anything to get her happy married life, expresses her concern, fear indirectly. She is anxious for her daughter’s future.

‘We’re a cursed family, Gopal. I’m frightened for our children.’

‘They’ll be all right, you’ve got to believe that.’

(P. No. 137)

The above cited dialogue occurs between Sumi and Gopala. Sumi is worried about her daughters as she believes that her family is cursed family. When Sumi says she is frightened for their children, she implies that women of her family do not lead a normal life. The same has happened with Sumi since Gopala has walked out on her. Sumi is under stress as she feels that same will happen to her daughters as well. She indirectly conveys that Gopala should consider the future of their daughter and change his mind at least for the sake of their daughters.

Gopala assures Sumi that everything will be fine. This turns out to be an irony after Gopala, himself, is being responsible for
Sumi’s present condition. Gopala has no right to assure Sumi of anything good to happen to her.

In *Fasting, Feasting*, Mrs. Patton is worried for her daughter’s health. She is concerned with Melanie’s eating habits.

‘Melanie!’ Mrs. Patton is scandalized. “All I’m doing is asking you to eat a little scrambled egg-

‘I won’t eat anything you cook. You can give it to the cat. Give it to him!’ She points dramatically at Arun.

‘I’m not going to eat any of that poison. Everything you cook is poison!’ She howls, and blunders out of the room, leaving her mother white with amazement.

The above conversation takes place between Mrs. Patton and her daughter Melanie. Melanie is obsessed with slim and zero figure and gives up eating healthy food. Mrs. Patton who has fond of cooking and serving delicious food to family members gets worried because of Melanie’s stand. When Mrs. Patton advocates eating good food and tries to convince Melanie gets humiliated. Melanie says, ‘You think we all are garbage bags you keep stuffing and stuffing.’ This utterance implies about the upbringing of Melanie and her lack of respect for her mother. The utterance also implies that Melanie doesn’t like her mother’s craze of cooking.

Melanie’s utterance implies the relation between Melanie and her mother. When Melanie says, ‘I won’t eat anything you cook. You can give it to the cat. Give it to him!’ This utterance on Illocutionary level implies that, the food cooked by mother is not
worthy of eating and she can give it to a cat. Melanie further implies that the food can be given to Arun. Here Melanie indirectly compares Arun with a cat, who according to Melanie presents himself to be an obedient boy. Melanie blames Arun to be a fiddle to her mother.

Melanie with the help of Indirect Speech Act conveys her anger and dislike for her mother and Arun.

3.11 Conclusion

This chapter discusses various Speech Acts employed with different intentions by the lead characters of the selected novels. Different negative emotions and illocutionary forces like blaming, accusing, expressing anger, frustration, anxiety and complaining were revealed through the employment of Indirect Speech Acts. Use of Indirect Speech Acts is more effective than using Direct Speech Acts or other plain forms. Much more can be conveyed, informed and suggested by the speaker without directly touching the topic. This gives speaker an opportunity to take chances and convey what cannot be conveyed directly for the fear of worsening the situations or spoiling the relationships. One can deal with negative emotions and express them implicitly.

The selection of form and its function mainly depends on the various factors like the relationships of speaker and listener, education, maturity and social obligations. Context plays very important role in the utterance scale of meanings. Particularly in Indian context women are not given complete right of expression. The clutch of Indian customs and traditions doesn't allow women
expresses themselves freely. In such situations Indirect Speech Acts rescue her feelings and let it come out.

The characters of the selected novels make skilful use of Indirect Speech Acts. Expressing negative emotions by making their effect diluted are the interesting issues to discuss from Indirect Speech Acts' point of view. This gives an insight to the readers of these novels to understand the characters in better way and enjoy the communicative creativity of the writers.