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4.1 Preliminaries

Indirect Speech Acts take a piece of conversation to a certain level of strategic interaction where speaker executes certain acts through his/her utterances. Speaker conveys more than words could convey by making a blunt proposition. People insinuate their intents indirectly. This phenomenon of language use helps to understand the people, their intentions and the world around the speaker and listener.

This present thesis endeavours to study the Indirect Speech Acts especially selected from the novels under consideration. In the previous chapter analysis of expressions of different emotions through Indirect Speech Acts has been made. The present chapter focuses on Sarcasm, Irony and various illocutionary forces used to perform certain Speech Acts.

4.2 Sarcasm and Irony

Sarcasm and Irony has been a powerful and effective tool in the world of discourse and literature, where speaker remarks on something in a contrast or opposite manner. Sarcasm or irony can be seen where a speaker says something which is not as per the expectations of the context. The Sarcasm or irony could not be produced without the skillful use of Indirect Speech Acts, as the
listener has to understand the hidden message of the utterance. The purpose of Sarcasm or Irony is not to hurt anyone but to disclose some unpleasant or unwanted aspect of the context. Irony is indispensable part of Indirect Speech Acts as whatever Irony states the listener infers opposite to that. For example if a father says to his son,

‘Since you are taking your own decisions, I guess you got more mature and knowledgeable than me.’

The father is not praising his son, but he is pointing out his son’s blunder of not consulting his father before taking his decisions. The above utterance could be understood if studies in the light of Speech Act theory and the irony could be enjoyed by the reader. In the same way Irony can be seen in the following example,

‘How’s study going on?’(1)

‘Oh, great! I don’t realize when I get asleep while reading.’(2)

In the above mentioned utterance (2) Indirect Speech Act is employed along with irony. The speaker wishes to mention the unpleasant part of his study. It is assumed that the study is not going as it should be. But the speaker mentions it to be going great. Which is followed by another utterance, ‘I don’t realize when I get asleep while reading.’(2) This insinuates that he gets asleep whenever he attempts to read or study. The speaker implies that his study is not being good at all.

The novels selected for the study make ample use of irony to convey more than intended or clearly seen.
Fasting, Feasting, the title of the novel itself is very ironic and suggestive. The Novel deals with two families having different background. The novels points out the society with different issues to face in day to day life. The title attracts our attention to the food rituals and eating habits and parental attitudes of the two different families. The title Fasting, Feasting can be related to Uma the major character of the novel representing Fasting as she has been deprived of educational, intellectual, social and personal freedom. She is not fed as per her needs for the development of her conscience. She has no life of her own and at the age of forty-three she is living with her parents. On the other hand, Arun stands for the word ‘Feasting’ gets everything needed for his life.

Uma is always looked down upon and made fun of all the time. The following conversation takes place between Aruna, Uma’s sister and Uma.

When Aruna said to her, laughing, ‘Uma why don’t you cut your hair short? Like Lila Aunty? It will suit you, you know.’

She retorted “tchh! What silly ideas you have.’ and was not only annoyed but hurt as well:

(P. No. 87)

Aruna, sister of Uma has been living in Bombay and considers herself enough smart to cope up with modern lifestyles. She always looks down upon Uma for her unfashionable sense of dressing and bodily makeup. In order to make fun of Uma, one day Aruna very sarcastically suggests a new hair style to Uma same like Lila aunty. On the Locutionary level, she seems to be
suggesting a good thing for Uma, but the use of Indirect Speech employed by Aruna conveys a lot than she actually meant.

Aruna has always been making fun of Uma. She never wants Uma to be a good looking girl and get superior to her. She deliberately suggests Uma a hairstyle which may not suit Uma. Aruna’s suggestion connotes her wrong intentions.

Uma senses Aruna’s intentions and says, ‘tchh! What silly ideas you have.’ This utterance of Uma implies that she did not accept Aruna’s suggestion. Both the sisters use Indirect Speech Act to get their respective communication goals achieved.

In *A Matter of Time* characters can be seen making use of Irony to express unpleasant things is contradictory ways.

Rohit relaxes and forgets to look at his watch, though his eyes keep stealing to Aru’s face every now and then. When he gets up to go finally, he seems reluctant to leave.

‘Come again, Rohit.’

‘There you are, Rohit! Forgiven for being Narasikaka’s descendant.’

The girls laugh at Kalyani, they don’t realize that for her, and for Goda too, the ancient feud still lives on.

(P. No. 128)

Rohit is in deep love with Aru. Rohit unaware of the past between his family and Aru’s family keeps visiting the family to see Aru. The family of Rohit and the family of Kalyani had not shared a
good past and were almost hostile to each other. Kalyani feels that Rohit is a descendant of an enemy. The Above mentioned conversation takes place in the presence of Goda, Kalyani, Charu, Aru and Rohit. After having a good time Rohit gets up to leave, Kalyani says to him, *'Come again, Rohit.'* Though Kalyani doesn’t like the family Rohit belongs to Kalyani invites him.

The Girls knowing what Kalyani thinks of Rohit’s family surprised by Kalyani’s invitation. Charu responds quickly and says, ‘There you are, Rohit! Forgiven for being Narasikaka’s descendant.’ She indirectly conveys Amma and Rohit at the same time that Kalyani has forgiven him for belonging to a hostile family. She says that he has been forgiven for being Narsikaka’s descendant. Here Charu’s declaration is an example of the verdicative force of illocutionary act. The declaration by Charu is followed by a laugh because except Rohit everyone gets to know the irony in Kalyani’s invitation and what Kalyani had been thinking of him. Amma’s unspoken declaration is also important for the development of relationship between Aru and Rohit.

In the same novel Sumi employs Irony through her Indirect Speech Act to express her dislike when she finds her mother Kalyani and aunt, Goda are talking about Sumi’s failed marriage.

‘Don’t stop,’ She says crossly. ‘Go on, you can speak of Gopal and me, I don’t mind.’

‘Actually, we were speaking of Devi. Has she rung you up? She told me she would.’

(P. No. 102)
Sumi believes that her relationship with Gopala is passing through a black, dark tunnel. She doesn’t like anyone discussing about it in the family. Kalyani and Goda out of love for Uma are worried and keep discussing to find a way out. When Sumi finds these women talking about Gopala and Sumi she utters above utterance ‘Don’t stop,’ Go on, you can speak of Gopal and me, I don’t mind.’ This utterance implies Sumi’s dislike of her marriage’s talk. But she doesn’t mention so and says she won’t mind it. This contrast presentation of her feelings can be seen irony employed as an Indirect Speech Act.

Kalyani’s reply also an example of Indirect Speech Act when she says they were discussing Devi and not Sumi. This is an attempt to convince Sumi that her married life was not being discussed so she should not feel in a wrong way.

The characters of Second Thoughts as well make ironic statements to convey more than intended. The presentation of thoughts in a contrary way to get the desired effect and put across the feeling seems very effective.

A Salesman makes several ironic remarks on the society, knowledge and human behaviours in the following conversation

I burst laughing. ‘Where did you pick up all this wisdom?’

He pointed skywards. ‘Knowledge comes from God...only God. Books provide you with facts, they teach you nothing else.’
I stared at his threadbare dhoti, his stained shirt.
‘Why does anybody come to Bombay? To live. To survive, To fill my belly.’ and then he paused before adding slyly, ‘..... and to enjoy life. Bombay is the only place worth living in in India, memsaab, you will agree, I know.’
I smiled, ‘How can you say that? It’s overcrowded, filthy, harsh.’

He lit a beedi. ‘Yes. But it is also human and compassionate. People don’t kick you here when you are sleeping on the pavement. A man like me who is willing to work hard, work at anything, does not have to starve here. Nobody cares, true. But nobody harms you either. I live my life as I want to....as I choose to. No questions asked. But back home in my village? A man cannot go to the fields to relieve himself without the entire population finding out—that is the difference.’

(P. No. 24)

The above mentioned piece of conversation takes place between Maya and the salesman. Maya gets curious about salesman coming so far from his native place to Bombay. She wishes to know more about him and his intentions. Maya has been warned by her husband not to engage in communication with strangers. Maya can’t control herself and continues the conversation with the salesman.
Maya’s utterance, ‘Where did you pick up all this wisdom?’ carries multiple meanings. Her question on the Locutionary level seeks an answer, but at the same time it conveys her appreciation of Salesman’s knowledge and communication skills. She approves the salesman to be wise.

The reply given by the salesman is also important in the context which makes indirect remarks. The salesman says, ‘Knowledge comes from God...only God. Books provide you with facts, they teach you nothing else.’ This utterance of the salesman connotes that he received the practical knowledge from the situations he had been through. He ironically remarks that the knowledge the best knowledge comes from the experience the God outs you in and not from the books. Maya represents the people who are so called scholars by education but are not able to take the decisions of their own lives. He also remarks that books provide you nothing else but the facts. This implies that education cannot teach you everything. The bookish knowledge is not enough to survive in this practical world. This utterance of the salesman makes us to compare Maya, an educated girl, who is not able to take her own decisions and the barely educated salesman has travelled a long way to Bombay.

The salesman further comments on the life in small villages and tells Maya that, he came to Bombay to earn livelihood, and the most important reason was to live his own life and to enjoy. He implies that he could not enjoy his life in his small town.

The salesman advocates the good life Bombay offers to his own native place. He indirectly conveys his beliefs about a life in a village. He says that at his village there is no privacy. The so called society keeps an eye on you all the time and one cannot
choose his professions freely for his livelihood. Bombay people don't care about you until you are working hard and being useful to others. The strong hold of society in small towns and villages over all the activities of the villagers could be sensed in the explanation given by the salesman.

The salesman without making straight forward remarks on society with the help of Indirect Speech Act expresses his views.

In another situation when Ranjan says

'**It doesn't look nice for a wife to criticize her husband's city.**

(P. No. 268)

He makes an ironical statement which gives all the rights to husbands to make fun of their wives. Ranjan's statement claims it to be ok. But when a wife starts talking about husband it doesn’t look nice.

The perfect blend of Indirect Speech Acts, Irony and Sarcasm can be observed in *The God of Small things*. Chako's father doesn’t like the ideology of Communism and Marx. He also doesn’t like his son Chacko following it blindly. He ironically remarks on it.

'So, Karl Marx!' Pappachi would sneer when Chako came to the table. 'What shall we do with these bloody students now?

The stupid goons are agitating against our People's Government. Shall we annihilate them? Surely students aren’t People anymore?'

(Page No.67)
Pappachi makes above remarks at the breakfast table. Pappachi doesn’t like Chacko’s enthusiasm as a Marxist. Papachi calls Chacko to be the Karl Marx. This ironically highlights Papachi’s dislike. Pappachi comments indirectly on how the students without understanding Marxism get into politics and ruin the system. The remarks made by Pappachi seem to be a general statement, but its implied meaning is very important. Pappachi comments on Chacko’s behaviour. The comment also exhibits Pappachi’s disapproval of Chacko’s stand on Marxism.

Chacko and Pappachi do not share a very healthy relation, which compels Pappachi to use Indirect Speech Act to express his feelings for his own son. This helps both the characters to communicate without involving in a direct communication.

In the same novel in one more situation, Ammu passes ironic comments on Chacko’s communism.

Another balled fist slammed down on it, and the bonnet closed. Chacko rolled down his window and called out to the man who had done it.

‘Thanks, keto!’ he said. ‘Valarey thanks!’

‘Don’t be so ingratiable, comrade,’ Ammu said. ‘It was an accident. He didn’t really mean to help. How could he possibly know that in this old car there beats a truly Marxist heart?’

‘Ammu’ Chacko said, his voice steady and deliberately casual, ‘is it at all possible for you to prevent your washed-up cynicism from completely colouring everything?’

(P. No.70)
The above conversation takes place between Chacko and Ammu. Chacko is a strong supporter of Marxism and calls himself to be a Marxist. One day Chacko, Ammu and kids get stuck in a car on the street amid a procession called by the Communist party. The people, part of the procession, get over excited and start mocking people on the road. Some men bang the bonnet of the car and scare the family in the Car. Since Chacko is a supporter of Marxism, he cannot protest, but to save his face he thanks the person who banged the bonnet.

Ammu realizing the situations of Cahcko, indirectly conveys him that she is aware of the fact that Chacko is in an uncomfortable situation. She tells Chacko that the men did not help to close the bonnet but deliberately banged it. This implies that the men did not recognize Chacko as a supporter of Marxism. Ammu’s motive to use Indirect Speech Act is to make fun of Chacko’s stand on Marxism. Chacko replies with a question to Ammu. The question doesn’t seek an answer, but implies Ammu to shut her mouth. Both the characters get successful in communication with the help of Indirect Speech Act.

A Communist Party calls for a march in support of poor and lower cast people. The following utterance is of a protestor from the march.

A man with a red flag and a face like a knot opened Rahel’s door because it wasn’t locked. The door way was full of men who’d stared at her.
‘Feeling hot, baby? The man like a knot asked Rahel kindly in Malayalam. Then unkindly, ‘Ask your daddy to buy you an Air Condition!’ and he hooted with delight at his own wit and timing. Rahel smiled back at him, pleased to have Chacko mistaken for her father. Like a normal family.

(P. No. 79)

Ammu with her kids gets stuck in a car and cannot move further because of the march. One of the protestors comes to the window of the car and utters above mentioned utterance. The utterance, ‘Feeling hot, baby?’ seems to be a kind inquiry, but is fully of sarcasm. It implies his hatred for rich people. When he further says ‘Ask your daddy to buy you an Air Condition!’ he makes fun of rich people and their attitude which believes that money can be everything. The utterance remarks on rich people’s belief to make everything in their favour with the help of money, but there are some things that cannot be purchased by money. The protestor indirectly points out the limitations of money and helplessness of rich people. The motive of the protestor is to make fun of Ammu representing rich family and gives vent to his hatred.

Similarly, a shopkeeper makes fun of Estha’s grandmother and displays his dark side.

‘I asked you where you lived,’ he said, spinning his nasty web.
‘Ayemenem,’ Estha said, ‘I live in Ayemenem. My grandmother owns Paradise Pickles & Preserves. She’s the sleeping Partner.’
‘Is she, now?’ the Orange drink Lemon drink Man said
‘And who does she sleep with?’ He laughed a nasty
laugh that Estha couldn’t understand. ‘Never mind.
You wouldn’t understand’

(P. No.102)

Estha and a cold drink seller at the cinema hall are the parts of the
above conversation. The seller asks Estha, which place he belongs
to. Estha replies the seller that he lives in Ayemenem and tells
about his grandmother being ‘a sleeping partner’ in Paradise
Pickles & Preserves.

The seller cracks a joke on the word ‘Sleeping partner’. The seller
asks a question, ‘Is she, now?’ and laughs. The question asked by
the seller implies his wicked nature and fun made of Estha’s
grandmother. Though Estha doesn’t understand his implications,
but the reader gets the Illocutionary part of the utterance. The
seller presents himself to be a pervert through the implications.

4.3 Rhetorical Questions
Rhetorical questions are often used to different intentions,
emotions under communication strategies. The structure of a
Rhetorical question is suitable to accommodate Indirect Speech
Acts. Rhetorical questions do not conform to its structure.
Though Rhetorical questions have a form of an interrogative
sentence, it does not seek any answer. Rhetorical questions are
asked to seek confirmation or express emotions like anger,
frustration, etc. If a father says to his son,
Now, this utterance doesn’t need any answer or this is not an attempt to seek information. In fact the speaker wants to highlight that it is he who pays off all the bills of his son. To highlight his importance and the hard work he takes for his son the father employs Indirect Speech Act worked out through Rhetorical question. Such arrangement seems to be more effective than a plain straightforward statement.

The speaker uses Rhetorical questions with diverse purposes to assert different emotions. The characters from the novels selected for the study employ Rhetorical questions to imply different messages. The purpose of using Rhetorical question may vary situation to situation.

The use of Rhetorical questions can be seen for expressing negative emotions like anger. In Fasting, Feasting we can see use of following Rhetorical questions.

‘Now you want me to write a letter? When I am busy packing a parcel for Arun?’

(P.No. 4)

The above Rhetorical question is uttered by Uma to express her anger over constant hammering by her mother. Uma says she is already busy with other work and she cannot take one more order from her mother. She uses Indirect Speech Act to express her anger. In one more situation, Uma’s Papa employs Indirect Speech Act through Rhetorical question. The following Rhetorical question is uttered by Uma’s Papa to his driver. He says,
Faster now—Stop! Don’t you see the bus in front of you? All right now, quick. Faster. Oof, so slow, so slow!’

(P.No. 13)

Uma’s Papa is in a hurry and keeps giving multiple instructions to the driver. He also expresses his anger over the driver’s careless driving.

‘And have you seen Joshi’s son? He is already playing cricket’

(P.No. 32)

The above utterance comes from Uma’s father. He expresses his anger and disappointment over improper the care taken of Arun. He says that Joshi’s son is more active and physically stronger than Arun. He also blames that it's because of Arun’s mother, who is not taking proper care of Arun.

Ramu uses Rhetorical questions to show his anger for not allowing to take Uma out for dinner. He says,

‘Can’t I take my cousin out for dinner? Didn’t you once send me to fetch her the time she ran away?’

(P.No. 49)

Ramu says that he helped the family when Uma was missing. Uma’s parents did not object to seek Ramu’s help then, but now they are not allowing to take Uma out. Ramu expresses his rage indirectly through Rhetorical question.

‘Who told you to come here?’

(P.No. 63)
Meera Masi expresses her dislike and anger when Ramu comes to take Uma home. Meera Masi doesn’t like it and asks above Rhetorical question which employs that Ramu needn’t come to take Uma.

In one more situation in the same novel Meera Masi uses following Rhetorical question to lodge her anger over Ramu’s arrival.

‘Don’t you see your old cousin’s about to collapse?
And silence that brother of yours, will you?’

(P.No. 64)

Meera Masi through the above utterance asks Uma to get some water for Ramu.

Uma’s mother utters following sentence to show her anger to Mrs. Joshi for recommending a wrong family for Uma’s marriage. Uma’s mother exhibits her anger and unpleasant emotions to Mrs. Joshi and says,

‘Why did you send such people to us? Such people!’

(P.No. 80)

Uma’s father expresses his anger when Uma gets an invitation to a coffee party by her teacher. He says that her teacher has some wrong plans for Uma and that’s why she keeps calling her. Uma’s father says,

‘Why does she keep telephoning you?’

(P.No. 116)
Uma’s father is not happy with the convent school that Uma attends. One day Uma’s father asks her to write something, but Uma commits mistakes. Uma’s father says,

‘What did they teach you at the convent?’

(P. No. 128)

Uma’s father expresses his anger through a Rhetorical question. This question doesn’t seek any answer, but implies that Uma did not learn anything at the convent or the convent teacher did not teach her properly.

In *A Matter of Time* characters take help of Rhetorical questions to express themselves indirectly. When Nagi stares at Aru, Aru doesn’t like that and she gets angry with Nagi. Nagi uses counter question to answer Aru that it’s useless to get angry with her because its Aru’s fate she has to go through all the problems. Nagi says,

‘What’s the use of getting angry with me?’

(P. No. 14)

In one more situation, Devaki informs Sumi that she has invited Gopala along with Sumi and some friends. Devaki is aware of the disturbed relationships between Sumi and Gopala. She indirectly gauges Sumi’s reaction. Sumi uses Rhetorical question to answer Devaki’s question and says,

‘Mind? Why should I?’

(P. No. 103)

Sumi with the help of this question avoids answering Devakai completely, but at the same time she expresses her dislike over the situation brought up by Devaki. She implies that she doesn’t
have any relation with Gopala so there is no reason for Sumi to bother if Devaki has invited Gopala.

Rhetorical questions also help characters from the selected novels to express various other emotions like frustration, invitation, denial, Concern, etc.

Sumi returns home after Gopala walks out on her. Premi, Sumi’s sister is worried for Sumi. Premi doesn’t want to talk directly about Sumi’s future plans for her daughter and herself, but she expresses her concern indirectly. Premi says,

‘But, Sumi, What about money? I mean, how will you survive?’

(P. No. 16)

The above utterance which is a Rhetorical question indirectly comments on premise feelings for Sumi. Premi’s concern how Sumi is going to manage is implied through her utterance. Use of Rhetorical question to express concern can be seen. In one more situation, Premi expresses her concern through a Rhetorical question and says,

‘Oh Gopal, What about your children?’

(P. No. 134)

Prime takes help of the Indirect Speech Act to express her concern. The structure and the service of Rhetorical question help Premi to convey her concern to Gopala.

Maya in Second Thoughts as well takes shelter of Rhetorical question to convey her feelings and her wishes to Ranjan and her family members.
Maya utters following Rhetorical questions to express her dislike and frustration. When Maya’s mother, Chitra tries to teach some manners to behave with servants and gives example of Ranjan’s mother, Maya gets angry and she doesn’t like the thought.

‘Why does anybody have to sound so rude?’(1)

(P.No.10)

She asks a counter question (1) which is a Rhetorical question and doesn’t seek answers, but conveys her dislike of Mrs. Malik and her behaviour with her servants. Maya uses Indirect Speech Acts to express herself as in Indian context girls and especially wives are not allowed to do so freely.

‘How can you say that? It’s overcrowded, filthy harsh.’(2)

(P. No.24)

‘Where do I go wearing such expensive clothes? (3)

(P. No. 105)

‘Where is the need to go into flowery speeches?
And who the hell has the time for them anyway? (4)

(P. No. 175)

Maya in the (2) utterance expresses her dislike for the city Bombay. She dislikes when a salesman praises Bombay and Maya puts herself across. In (3) utterance Maya conveys her dislike of her husband’s suggestion to have expensive clothes, sarees. Maya imply that since she is not allowed to go out or have friends then what is the need to buy expensive sarees. In the (4) utterance Maya lodges her dislike about the language spoken in
Bombay. She indirectly conveys how she feels in Bombay and doesn’t like being in Bombay.

Ranjan as well uses interrogative structure to express himself. When Maya in an attempt to attract Ranjan’s attention stands in front of TV, Ranjan says,

‘What are you doing, standing in front of TV?’

(P.No. 54)

Ranjan expresses his objection and dislike for Maya’s deed. He also expresses that he doesn’t have any interest in Maya. He indirectly humiliates Maya by asking her rudely to move away from TV. Ranjan employs Rhetorical question to clear his stand.

When Maya encounters Mrs. Verma in the building passage and asks Verma what she was doing there. Verma uses Indirect Speech Act to convey her dislike over being questioned by Maya. Mrs. Verma says,

‘Why? Is there a new law in the building that gives different timings to different people?’

(P.No. 25)

Mrs. Verma conveys Maya indirectly that, she can stand anywhere and anytime as per her will. Maya has no right to ask her any question. She also expresses that there is no such rule asking people to follow particular time slot to stand in public places.

Rhetorical questions have been used with various intentions and motives such as request, suggestion, humiliation, suggestions
proposal clarifying something, or to invite someone to do something.

Some of the Rhetorical questions from the novels under study are as follows.

‘So? Who says you can’t finish college and then get married?’

Clarification P.No. 3

‘Didn’t you notice?’

Suggestion P.No. 13

‘Why can’t we go out together?’

Proposal P.No. 29

‘And what if she falls sick? Who’ll clean the house, wash the clothes, and scrub the cooking pots?’

Signifying P.No. 50

‘How else will I spend my spare time?’

Intentions P.No. 61

‘Why don’t I cook something for your mother?’

Proposal P.No. 85

‘Why don’t you invite him home to dinner?’

Suggestion P.No. 127

‘Maya, Maya, Maya. Don’t they teach you anything in Calcutta?’

Humiliation P.No. 151

‘Will you get up, please?’

Request P.No. 27

‘Shall we go across and visit the neighbours, Rammu Bhai?’
The Rhetorical question is the perfect structure for the employment of Indirect Speech Acts and to convey beyond the utterance.

4.4 Warning

Illocutionary force can be seen as the intention of the speaker for the production of the specific utterance.

The characters of the selected novels use Indirect Speech Acts to exhibit illocutionary force like warning someone. In *A Matter of Time* Sumi warns Gopala that Aru is consulting a lawyer. This seems Sumi’s indirectly made efforts to warn Gopala of legal actions. The following conversation takes place on under this context.

Sumi can see the effort Gopal makes to speak of something personal.

‘Ramesh told me you’re likely to start a job soon.’

‘Hopefully. Do you know Aru’s thinking of consulting a lawyer?’

‘She told me that.’
‘She was here?’

Yes. She’s on your side, do you know that?’

‘This is not a war, I don’t want the children to take sides, Gopal,’ She flashes out.

‘It’s inevitable. Don’t you remember Yudhishtra’s “we are five Pandavas against a hundred Kauravas. But when an enemy comes, we are a hundred and five against the enemy”? I’m the enemy now.

(P. No. 83)

The above conversation takes place between a husband and a wife, Sumi and Gopala, the lead characters of the novel, A Matter of Time. The above communication takes place when Sumi visits Gopala after he walked out on her. Both characters find themselves in an awkward situation and take the help of Indirect Speech Act to hide their feelings and exchange their thoughts.

Gopala breaks the ice and informs Sumi that Ramesh told him about Sumi’s job. Here Gopala wishes to convey Sumi that he has learned about her efforts to get a job. He employs expositive force of illocutionary act and shows his content over Sumi having a fresh start of her life.

Sumi avoids making any detailed comment on Gopala’s knowledge of her job and she comes to the main point of their meeting. Sumi says, ‘Hopefully. Do you know Aru’s thinking of consulting a lawyer?’

To avoid any unsmooth conversation Sumi indirectly informs Gopala that Aru has been trying to consult a lawyer to sue Gopala
for walking out on the family. Sumi implies that it is Aru who thinks so and she doesn't agree. Sumi also convey that she doesn’t find Gopala guilty for his act and she understands him. On this Gopala replies that Aru has told him that. Now its Gopala who implies that he had a meeting with Aru already and he is aware of the facts. Realizing the indirect meaning conveyed by Gopala Aru learn that Aru and Gopala had a meeting and Aru has met Gopala without the knowledge of Sumi. Sumi’s reply stands for a shock that indicates her ignorance of the facts. Sumi’s utterance ‘She was here?’ is not a question that seeks answers, but her reaction to their meeting.

Gopala’s reply again is an employment of Indirect Speech Act where he makes it clear that Aru is in support of Sumi, and in the opposition of Gopala. Sumi reacts very strongly to him and reminds him that it is not a war. Sumi indirectly conveys him that they are not an enemy of each other, it’s a family and Gopala should not treat it as a war fought for some achievement. She also objects Gopala because in a war someone loses and someone gains, but in their family matter both Gopala and Sumi are going to lose.

The above selected dialogue is a fine example of Indirect Speech Act used to communicate, by the two characters who are no more connected to each other. With the help of Indirect Speech Acts they get successful in conveying their messages.

In the same novel Premi, Sumi’s sister employs Indirect Speech Act to make Gopala aware of Aru’s step of consulting a lawyer.

‘Do you know Aru wrote to Anil asking him for legal advice?’
Gopal sits staring into his palms as if he hadn’t heard her.

‘Aru has to go her own way,’ he says at last. I can’t do anything about it.”

(P. No. 136)

The above piece of dialogue extracted from the novel takes place between Premi and Gopala. Sumi wants to make Gopala aware of Aru’s letter sent to Premi’s husband, Anil, who is a lawyer. She warns Gopala that Aru has been seeking legal advice from Anil to prosecute Gopala. Premi wishes to convey Gopala what has been going in the mind of Aru and how bitterness for Gopala has aroused. Premi employs Indirect Speech Act to achieve the Perlocutionary effect of persuading Gopala to join Sumi again. Premi indirectly conveys that he may be put on a trial for what he has done.

Gopala, aware of Aru’s activities, indirectly implies Premi that he is not going to change his mind and Aru is free to do what she believes. He asserts his firmness by not objecting to Aru’s act of seeking legal advice.

Premi employs Indirect Speech Act to almost threaten Gopala of legal action, since she cannot do so directly and hurt Gopala and worsen the situation. Premi attempts to induce Gopala to change his mind by her indirect speech act.

In one more situation Gopala indirectly conveys Sulekha, a lawyer that law cannot force him to accept any unwanted situation. He uses Indirect Speech Act to make Sulekha aware of it.

‘What does the law consider significant?’
‘That you fulfil your legal responsibility of maintaining your wife and children.’

‘We can’t always live by the rules, can we? Even lawyers know that. There are things like human emotions.’

(P.No. 213)

The above mentioned conversation takes place between Surekha, a lawyer approached by Aru, and Gopala. Surekha visits Gopala at the request of Aru.

Gopala says, ‘What does the law consider significant?’ On the locutionary level this utterance seems to be seeking an answer, but on illocutionary level Gopala conveys Surekha that by the force of law, we cannot make people live together or love each other. Gopala connotes that law cannot compel him to return to his married life. Gopala implies that he cannot lead the life with Sumi just because he has been forced to do so by the law, and such life will not have any significance. Surekha responds to the locutionary meaning of Gopala’s utterance and tells him that the law wants him to take legal responsibility of maintaining his wife and children.

Gopala’s utterance ‘We can’t always live by the rules, can we? Even lawyers know that. There are things like human emotions’, implies that life cannot be led all the time by the rules. Human emotions are very important to lead a family. Gopala indirectly makes it clear that he feels psychologically detached from the family and doesn’t feel anything about his wife and children. Gopala also implies that the law cannot make him to lead the family once again since he doesn’t want to.
Gopala expresses his stand to Surekha without being rude or unsophisticated to her.

In *Second Thoughts* Ranjan uses Indirect Speech Act to warn Maya to keep away from his personal life. Since they are husband and wife Ranjan cannot do so directly.

He had looked up sharply and grabbed the photographs from my hand. 'Give that to me. Where did you find it? Honestly Maya, when will you learn to leave things alone? Tell me, does it really matter to you where this was taken? If I said “Tokyo” or “Timbuctoo” would it make any difference?'

I had shaken my head. Ranjan had exclaimed triumphantly, ‘Then why ask?’

I should have kept quiet at that point, but I couldn’t stop myself from saying softly, “All I was trying to do was...’

Ranjan had held up his hand. ‘Enough. There is nothing to know about my father. And there is no need for you to poke your nose into matters that do not concern you. He isn’t alive. Heart failure. You don’t have to deal with him. You concentrate on getting to know Ma—that should be your job.’

(Page No.64)
Maya could never learn about the Ranjan’s father. Whenever she tried to talk about his father, Ranjan avoided the issue. Maya suddenly comes across some photographs of Ranjan. When she tries to talk about the photographs Ranjan gets angry.

Ranjan says, ‘Where did you find it? Honestly Maya, when will you learn to leave things alone?’ Ranjan warns Maya to mind her own business and keep herself away from his personal life. This implies Ranjan’s anger and fury over the question asked about his father. This also connotes that something wrong has happened in the past which makes Ranjan annoyed on the issue of his father. Ranjan instead of answering Maya’s query indirectly warns Maya to stay away from his stuff. The utterance also implies that Ranjan doesn’t share everything with Maya. Ranjan takes the help of Indirect Speech Act to escape Maya’s question and conveys that Maya will not get any answer from him.

Ranjan clearly rejects Maya any right to learn about his things. He doesn’t want Maya to inquire about his past. This clearly indicates that Ranjan doesn’t want Maya to be a part of his life. He just wants her to be a house maid.

Ranjan also doubts about Maya’s knowledge about the world when he says, ‘Tell me, does it really matter to you where this was taken? If I said ‘Tokyo’ or ‘Timbuctoo’ would it make any difference?’ Ranjan connotes that Maya doesn’t have any knowledge of various places in the world, so she should not keep asking questions about these places.

This entire conversation conveys many messages indirectly. Since they are husband and wife they cannot indulge in a direct communication and hurt each other. At the end of the
conversation the way Ranjan warns Maya to mind her own business and she should not be looking into the matters that are not her concern. He indirectly warns her not try to connect herself with him unnecessarily. The basic motive of Ranjan is to keep Maya in a dark and let not her ask any questions.

In *The God of Small Things* Comrade Pillai takes the help of Indirect speech Act to warn Chacko that he knows everything about him and if Chacko doesn’t follow his instructions it won’t be any good for Chacko.

‘This is small village,’ Comrade Pillai was saying,
‘People talk. I listen to what they say. It’s not as though I don’t know what’s been going on.’

(P. No. 287)

Comrade Pillai and Chacko meet at Pillai’s home and Pillai comes out with above mentioned utterance. This utterance on Locutionary level seems to be stating facts, but on the Illocutionary level the utterance implies a threat and warning to Chacko. Comrade Pillai asks Chacko to send Velutha away from Ayemenem, but Chacko refuses. Comrade Pillai takes the help of Indirect Speech Act to warn Chacko. Pillai conveys Chacko that he has been receiving many complaints about Chacko and his Pickle factory. He warns Chacko that he is aware of it and Chacko will feel sorry for not accepting his advice. Comrade Pillai doesn’t take an open stand against Chacko, but gets successful in threatening Chacko and force Chacko to obey him. Comrade Pillai achieves his communication goal with the help of Indirect Speech Act.
4.5 Boasting

People love talking about themselves, especially good things about themselves. Boasting is what frequently seen in common conversation. People do so to get recognition and appreciation from others. It would look very indecent and inappropriate if one directly mentions oneself to be very fortunate and others not to be, in such situation Indirect Speech Act is employed. Sometimes a speaker uses Indirect Speech Acts to prove himself to be great and more fortunate than the listener.

The Characters in the novels selected for the study employ Indirect Speech Acts to talk tall things about themselves. In *Second Thoughts*, Ranjan represents a typical Indian husband who considers himself to be greater than his wife. Ranjan boasts about his upbringing in a city like Bombay and looks down upon Calcutta which is the town of Maya.

‘Maybe in Calcutta they teach you a different sort of English.’ Ranjan had scoffed, ‘but this is how we speak it in Bombay. Besides, as you well known, I had no language problems in America, no problems at all.’

Tom was casually dressed in jeans and an open necked T-shirt. He punched Ranjan playfully in the ribs and joked, ‘Hey, what’s this? I thought you said this was going to be an informal evening?’

Ranjan’s false smile stretched even further as he laughed exaggeratedly and pulled funny faces. Tom
turned to me, hand outstretched and said, “Hi... my name’s Tom.’

(P. No.140)

Ranjan takes an opportunity to look down upon Maya. He does this by passing indirect remarks about Maya’s standard of the language. Ranjan believes that his English is of international level and he will not have any problems in communication with his American boss invited at home for dinner.

Ranjan says, ‘Besides, as you well known, I had no language problems in America, no problems at all.’ This utterance of Ranjan implies his great command over English language. He deliberately mentions America to connote that he had been to America and lived there which makes him a certified English language expert. Ranjan with the help of Indirect Speech Act boasts of himself.

When Maya wishes to correct Ranjan’s language, he rejects on the clarification that Maya has been taught a different sort of English in Calcutta, which is not the correct one.

This employment of Indirect Speech Act displays a typical husband’s way of treating his wife. This conversation also reveals male dominated Indian society where a husband is supposed to have superiority of knowledge compared to wife. It is not at all accepted any wife to display the superiority of knowledge. She cannot be correct in any arguments that she makes with her husband.

On the arrival Tom, the boss of Ranjan, comments on the clothes of Ranjan as Ranjan was dressed formally. This comment of
Tom is an employment of Indirect Speech Act to assert surprise on Ranjan’s motive of the dinner invitation. Tom believed that the dinner was organized to develop informal understanding between Tom and Ranjan.

In the above communication readers learn about Ranjan’s inability to handle situation and dress accordingly. Maya had suggested Ranjan to dress informally, but was rejected by Ranjan. This conveys the readers that Ranjan claims, to be smart and intelligent than Maya, are void. This also throws light on the unbalanced relationship of Maya and Ranjan. We also learn the reasons for Maya’s emotional and intellectual suffocation in the relationship with Ranjan.

In *The God of Small Things*, comrade Pillai employs Indirect Speech Acts to boast about his son, his success and his overall destiny. He deliberately does so to embarrass Rahel.

‘Mol’s husband?’ he wanted to know.
‘Hasn’t come.’
‘Any photos?’
‘No.’
‘Name?’
‘Larry. Lawrence.’
‘Oower. Lawrence.’ Comrade Pillai nodded as though he agreed with it. As though given a choice, it was the very one he would have picked.
‘Any issues?’
‘No,’ Rahel said.
‘Still in planning stages, I suppose? Or expecting?’
‘No.’
‘One is must. Boy girl. Anyone,’ Comrade Pillai said. ‘two is of course your choice.’
‘We’re divorced.’ Rahel hoped to shock him into silence.
‘Die-vorced?’ His voice rose to such a high register that it cracked on the question mark. He even pronounced the word as though it was a form of death.

(P. No. 130)

Comrade Pillai meets Rahel on the way and the above conversation takes place. Comrade Pillai asks some questions, which on Locutionary seems to be the questions asked to understand Rahel’s wellbeing, but the Illocutionary meaning of the questions is to check whether Rahel is leading a more successful life than his own son.

When Comrade Pillai asks about Rahel’s husband and kids. Rahel informs him of her being a divorcee. Rahel wishes to end the conversation as she realizes Comrade Pillai’s hypocrisy, but cannot do so directly, and she takes the help of Indirect Speech Act.

Comrade Pillai expresses his shock on learning about Rahel’s married life. Comrade Pillai’s utterance ‘Die-vorced?’ uttered with raised voice implies more than a shock. Rahel senses Pillai’s a unique kind of victorious feeling in the utterance. She believes that Comrade Pillai is happy to learn about her unsuccessful married life.
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In one more situation comrade Pillai takes help of Indirect Speech Act.

‘Lenin is in Delhi now,’ Comrade Pillai came out with it finally, unable to hide his pride. ‘Working with foreign embassies. See!’ He handed Rahel the cellophane sachet. They were mostly photographs of Lenin and his family. His wife, his child, his new Bajaj scooter. There was one of Lenin shaking hands with a very well dressed, very pink man.

‘German First Secretary,’ Comrade Pillai said.

(P. No. 131)

Comrade Pillai and Rahel share the above mentioned dialogue. Pillai takes efforts to prove that his son’s happy and successful married life. Comrade Pillai says, ‘Lenin is in Delhi now,’ ‘Working with foreign embassies. See!’ His wife, his child, his new Bajaj scooter.’ All these utterances express more than the facts could be conveyed by these words. Comrade Pillai implies about his success as a father and boasts about how he raised his son, Lenin. This also implies to Rahel that he is a far better parent than Rahel had. Comrade Pillai indirectly points out Ammu’s and Rahel’s father’s failure in giving Rahel a better life.

In the same novel Chacko uses the context and indirectly takes advantage of the situation to boast about himself.
Margaret Kochamma shook her a little for her impertinence.

‘You’re welcome,’ Chacko said. ‘Now let me introduce everybody.’ Then, more for the benefit of onlookers and eavesdroppers, because Margaret Kochamma needed no introduction really, ‘My wife, Margaret.’

Margaret Kochamma smiled and wagged her rose at him. *Ex-wife, Chacko!* Her lips formed the words, though her voice never spoke them.

(P. No. 142)

The above mentioned conversation takes place between Chacko and his ex-wife, Margaret Kochamma. After a long period of separation from Chacko Margaraet Kochamma is invited to Ayemenem. She has been invited to get away from her husband’s death trauma. Chacko with his entire family goes to receive Margaret. When Margaret arrives to the airport Chacko introduces Margaret to be his wife. Actually the introduction was not needed, but Chacko conveys a message through his introduction of Margaret. He wants to convey all that he is the lucky man who had been married to a foreigner and a beautiful lady from England. The basic motive of using Indirect Speech Act is to boast of himself.

At the same time Margaret Kochamma tries to correct Chacko and says, *Ex-wife, Chacko.* This implies Margaret’s weak protest for the way being introduced by Chacko.
Both Chacko and Margaret are meeting after a long time, so both don’t want to hurt each other, in order to save themselves from any uncomfortable situation they take help of Indirect Speech Act.

Margaret Kochamma wishes to boast his knowledge of English literature to Margaraet Kochamma. Baby Kochamma indirectly tries to prove herself great over the other family members.

Baby Kochamm said, ‘Hello, Margaret,’ and ‘Hello, Sphie Mol.’ She said Sophie Mol was so beautiful that she reminded her of a wood-spirit. Of Ariel.

‘D’you know who Ariel was?’ Baby Kochamma asked Sophie Mole. ‘Ariel in The Tempest?’

Sohie Mol said she didn’t.

“‘Where the bee sucks there suck I?” Baby Kochamma said.

Sophie Mol said she didn’t.

‘Shakespeare’s The Tempest?’ Baby Kochamma persisted.

(P. No. 144)

In the above conversation Baby Kochamma and Sophie Mol communicate with each other. Baby Kochamma deliberately mentions Ariel, a wood spirit from ‘The Tempest.’
Baby Kochamma says, ‘D’you know who Ariel was?’ Baby Kochamma asked Sophie mol. ‘Ariel in The Tempest?’ This utterance of Baby Kochamma imply her knowledge of English literature to Sophie Mol and Margaret. She takes the help of Indirect Speech Act to convey the guests that she is as refined as any citizen of England. She tries to put herself above the other family members. She recites some lines from the famous drama of Shakespere. The Locutionary meaning of the lines is to remind Sophie Mol of Ariel, but on the Illocutionary level, she wishes to display her knowledge and interest in English literature. But Sophie Mol fails to recognize the character of Ariel and the drama, which implies that English people may not give the utmost importance to their own literature, but an Indian would do so to flaunt his/her progressive stratum and being from upper class.

In *Fasting, Feasting* Aruna boasts of herself to be a woman of the modern society, educated and highly sophisticated and looks down upon Uma to be a mismatch for the modern society.

On one of these visits home, Uma walked into her room to find Aruna sitting in front of the mirror and applying her make-up. She came over to watch and Aruna showed her:

‘See, this is for the eyelids, and this for the eyelashes, and here is something for outlining the eyes. Then for the cheeks-first this cream, then this lotion finally the powder and just the lightest, lightest touch of rouge-this one, or perhaps that one-’
Uma had a pile of washed, folded nappies in her arms; she watched for a while, grew impatient and said, 'so that’s what you’ve got all over your face. We were wondering.'

Aruna slammed her make-up kit shut. 'Yes, this is what women in Bombay use. They don’t walk around looking like washerwomen unless they are washerwomen,' she told Uma.

The above mentioned conversation is an excellent example of Indirect Speech Act employed by the author to underline how Aruna, sister of Uma, looks down upon Uma all the time. Aruna never misses an opportunity to prove herself more elite, erudite and modern than Uma. Uma enters Aruna’s room and finds Aruna busy in face make-up.

Uma, pointing at the cosmetics on the table, says, 'So that’s what you’ve got all over your face. We were wondering.' Uma asks Aruna was that all she uses to look beautiful. This utterance doesn’t seek an answer, but conveys implied meaning. The Illocutionary meaning of the utterance is Aruna looks better than Uma because of the cosmetics Aruna uses. Uma connotes that Aruna is not more beautiful than Uma, in fact Uma is more beautiful if compared with Aruna without make-up.

Understanding the poignant implied remark made by Uma, Aruna replies Uma in the same way. Aruna says that learnt, and smart women of Bombay use these cosmetics to look good and since
Aruna belongs to modern society, she uses them as well. Aruna indirectly compares Uma with rustic and uneducated class of washerwomen. Aruna also points out that Uma carries herself like a washerwoman and doesn’t understand the manners of the modern society.

4.6 Escapism/Avoiding

Many a times people avoid certain situations as they may get into a trouble. People avoid questions for which they don’t have answers. In this critical situation Indirect Speech Act is used to avoid the circumstances and questions. Since characters from the literary works represents people from real world they are not exceptions to such escapism. Characters from the novels under study use Indirect Speech Acts to avoid certain troublesome situations and questions. They do so to save their face and embarrassment. Sometime characters avoid questions with the help of Indirect Speech Acts to avoid hurting others. In sensitive issues, characters have been observed using Indirect Speech Acts to put themselves across without hurting anyone.

In *Fasting, Feasting* Aruna enquires the progress of the relationship between Uma and her husband after she deserts her husband’s home.

At night, in the dark and the silence, Aruna whispered to her sister,

‘Uma. Uma. Did-did he touch you, Uma? Making Uma bury her head in her pillow and howl ‘No! No!”
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So that Aruna fell back with a little sigh of disappointment.

Next day she reported it to ayah who reported it to Mama. Mama and ayah appeared relieved as if a great weight had been lifted from them.

(P. No. 98)

The above mentioned conversation takes place between Aruna and Uma. Uma returns back from her in-laws’ home realising that her husband is already married and she has been duped. The entire family is shocked and worried about Uma’s future.

Aruna has been asked to console Uma. Aruna in order to open up Uma and get to know more about the affair uses Indirect Speech Acts. Aruna doesn’t want to speak about the issue directly and hurt Uma, so she takes the help of Indirect Speech Act. Aruna asks Uma whether Uma’s husband has touched her. This implies that Aruna is asking if there was any physical relationship between Uma and her husband. Keeping in view Uma’s mental situation, Aruna couldn’t talk about it openly. Arun did not want to hurt Uma. Aruna’s question has implied meanings. It implies that the entire family is worried for Uma. If Uma had any physical relationship with her husband then it would be difficult to get her married off once again. The entire conversation is deeply rooted in typical Indian social context. The issue is very sensitive and cannot be openly talked about. So Aruna can be seen using Indirect Speech Acts to avoid any unwanted situation.

In *A Matter of Time* similar kind of situation arises where Shripati avoid talking about her daughter Sumi when she returns home after her husband walks out on her.
But Kalyani Does not know what has happened; she has not been told that they are coming. Her surprise at seeing them, her open-mouthed stupefaction when she realizes they are staying, speak of her ignorance.

‘But what’s the matter?’

‘We’ll speak of it tomorrow. Right now, we need to sleep.’

Suddenly abandoning her questions, Kalyani throws herself with a frenzy into making arrangements for them to sleep. She pulls out sheets, old saris, pillows, cushions, and flings them about, speaking ceaselessly all the while.

(P. No. 11)

The above conversation takes place between Kalyani and Shripati. The conversation takes place between these two characters of the novel when there is no harmony in their relationships. Shripati’s daughter has returned home after she has been abandoned by her husband, Gopala. Unaware of this fact Kalyani tries to gauge the situation. Being surprised to see her daughter with Shripati, she asks him what the matter was. Kalyani smells the seriousness of the matter and avoids talking about it directly.

Shripati too employs indirect speech act to reply Kalyani. He says ‘We’ll speak of it tomorrow.’ This conveys Kalyani indirectly that something grave has happened and they should talk about it
later. Shripati violates the Cooperative Principle and doesn’t follow the relation maxim to achieve Illocutionary act. The character, Shripati, becomes successful in averting the questions and by providing unexpected information implies not to discuss.

Keeping in view uncordial relationship shared by Kalyani and Shripati, it can be inferred that Shripati doesn’t wish to discuss the same with Kalyani. He is not interested and wants to avoid the situation without mentioning it directly. The author has become successful in giving very subtle aspects of the family environment. Readers start thinking about the reasons of Sumi’s return to her home. Employment of indirect speech acts in the novel can be seen frequently clearing fog over the relationships shared by characters.

In the same novel, the area can be observed employing Indirect Speech Act to avoid Rohit’s company.

She is mortified by her own reaction and when Rohit asks her, ‘Can you give me a lift?’ She is brusque and rude.

‘Where’s your car?’

‘Gone for servicing.’

‘I’m not going your way.’

‘Drop me at the circle. I’ll get a rickshaw from there.’

‘All right, come on, then.’

(P. No. 163)
The above example of conversation takes place between Aru and Rohit. Rohit asks Aru to drop him on her way. Aru is not in her usual mood; hence she wants to avoid giving a lift to Rohit. Aru asks him, ‘Where’s your car?’ This question implies that Rohit has a car which he did not bring it today. Rohit informs Aru that the car has been sent for servicing. Since Aru doesn’t want to drop Rohit anywhere and she wants to be alone, she tries to avoid the situation. Aru cannot do the same directly and hurt Rohit. She takes the help of Indirect Speech Act and says, ‘I’m not going your way.’ She indirectly conveys Rohit that she cannot give him a lift because she is not going by his way, she also implies her inability or disinterest in going his way just to drop him at his place. Aru uses illocutionary act to save her face and avert the situation.

Rohit as well indirectly assures her that she need not go by his way, she just has to drop him at the circle and he would manage from there. Rohit assures her indirectly by asking to drop him at the next circle only. Rohit has fallen for Aru and he doesn’t want to hurt and force her for anything. Rohit is aware of her family troubles. Understanding the situation both the characters go to the shelter of indirect speech acts to express themselves. Aru doesn’t want to be rude by avoiding Rohit directly and Rohit doesn’t want to hurt Aru. The purpose of Aru and Rohit gets fulfilled by expressing indirectly.

Ranjan in *Second Thoughts* takes shelter to Indirect Speech Acts to avoid answering Maya’s questions about his father.

He had looked up sharply and grabbed the photographs from my hand. ‘give that to me. Where did you find it? Honestly Maya, when will
you learn to leave things alone? Tell me, does it really matter to you where this was taken? If I said “Tokyo” or “Timbuctoo” would it make any difference?”

I had shaken my head. Ranjan had exclaimed triumphantly, ‘Then why ask?’

I should have kept quiet at that point, but I couldn’t stop myself from saying softly, “All I was trying to do was…”

Ranjan had held up his hand. ‘Enough. There is nothing to know about my father. And there is no need for you to poke your nose into matters that do not concern you. He isn’t alive. Heart failure. You don’t have to deal with him. You concentrate on getting to know Ma—that should be your job.’

(P. No.64)

Maya could never learn about the Ranjan’s father. Whenever she tried to talk about his father, Ranjan avoided the issue. Maya suddenly comes across some photographs of Ranjan. When she tries to talk about the photographs Ranjan gets angry.

Ranjan says, ‘Where did you find it? Honestly Maya, when will you learn to leave things alone? This implies Ranjan’s anger and fury over the question asked about his father. Ranjan clearly wants to avoid talk about his father and answer any question asked by Maya. This also connotes that something wrong has happened in the past which makes Ranjan annoyed on the issue
of his father. Ranjan instead of answering Maya’s query indirectly warns Maya to stay away from his stuff. The utterance also implies that Ranjan doesn’t share everything with Maya. Ranjan takes the help of Indirect Speech Act to escape Maya’s question and implies that Maya will not get any answer from him.

Ranjan clearly rejects Maya any right to learn about his things. He doesn’t want Maya to inquire about his past. This clearly indicates that Ranjan doesn’t want Maya to be a part of his life. He just wants her to be a house maid.

Ranjan also doubts about Maya’s knowledge about the world when he says, ‘Tell me, does it really matter to you where this was taken? If I said “Tokyo” or “Timbuctoo” would it make any difference?’ Nikhil connotes that Maya doesn’t have any knowledge of various places in the world, so she should not keep asking questions about these places.

This entire conversation conveys many messages indirectly. Since they are husband and wife they cannot indulge in a direct communication on sensitive issues and hurt each other. At the end of the conversation the way Ranjan warns Maya to mind her own business and she should not be looking into the matters that are not her concern. He indirectly warns her not try to connect herself with him unnecessarily. The basic motive of Ranjan is to keep Maya in dark and let her not ask any questions.

Father Mulligan in *The God of Small Things*, wishes to get rid of Baby Kochamma and her love fever, uses Indirect Speech Acts.

Invariably in the middle of their conversation, the unfortunate Sophy child that was being force bathed would manage to slip away, and Father
Mulligan would snap back to his sense and say, ‘Oops! We’d better catch him before a cold does.’ Then he would reopen his umbrella and walk away in chocolate robes and comfortable sandals, like a high stepping camel with an appointment to keep.

(P. No. 24)

The above piece of dialogue takes place between Baby Kochamma and Father Mulligan. Baby Kochamma has fallen for Father Mulligan and deliberately finds situations to meet him and talk to him. One day Baby Kochamma catches Father Mulligen on a street and starts asking her doubts about the meanings in the Bible. Father Mulligan is aware of Baby Kochammas feelings. He tries to avoid her or distract her all the time. Father Mulligen takes help of Indirect Speech Act to save himself from Baby Kochammas obsession. When Baby Kochamma meets Father Mulligen amid a street to avoid the conversation Father Mulligan suggests Baby Kochamma of catching the boy who has just run away from taking bath. This suggestion indirectly conveys Baby Kochamma that they cannot continue their conversation and they better catch the boy first.

The basic motive of Father Mulligan gets completed without hurting Baby Kochammas emotions. He cuts Baby Kochammas talk and escapes the situation.

4.7 Social Obligations

Some character exhibit social obligations and overall social structure, class differences, cast differences and power games
through Indirect Speech Acts. These Indirect Speech Acts imply Indian social customs and rituals. The writers of the novel, selected for the study, have very skillfully utilized the tool of Speech Acts to comment on the Indian and foreign social structure. Their characters comment on social structure of India and expose its phony principles.

In *A Matter of Time* Shankar’s mother comments on what are the duties of a woman, according to Indian culture and the social code of conduct laid down for women. Shankar’s mother believes that Sumi is not observing social guidelines for married women she objects and disapproves Sumi’s behaviour.

> ‘When are you going back to your husband?’ the old woman asks abruptly, ‘You should be with him. Look at his state! It’s all right to stay with your parents for a while, but don’t let them stay long. Go back to your daughters come home, I don’t let them stay long. GO back to your husband, he’s a good man. If you’ve done wrong, he will forgive you. And if he has—women shouldn’t have any pride.’

(P. No. 161)

The above conversation takes place between Sumi and Shankar’s mother. Shankar’s mother is unaware of the facts that are responsible for the parting of Sumi and Gopala. Shankar’s mother gives an advice to Sumi which is a typical advice given in Indian context when a couple goes through some troubles. The advice given here indirectly exposes the Indian mindset to deal with such situations. Shankar’s mother asks Sumi to return to her
husband and forgive him. She doesn’t care whose move was that to get parted. As in Indian context the entire blame for any unsmooth run of family affairs has to be borne by women and she has to forgive her husband in all the situation for the sake of the family. The advice given to Sumi also expects her to consider herself inferior and bear up with all the sufferings.

Shankar’s mother also says that if she had been her the mother she would not have allowed her to stay at her home so long. Indirectly Shankar’s mother doesn’t approve the act of Sumi’s parents’ supporting her.

This small piece of conversational exposes the hypocrisy, bias and the uncultured way of dealing with family matters in the Indian context. It makes a very strong indirect remark on the ways of society and the afflictions a woman goes through in Indian society.

The dominance of husband and his superior status has been highlighted many a times in the novels under study. In Second Thoughts when Maya enquires about photos of Ranjan, he doesn’t bother to answer her and asks her a counter question.

‘Give that to me. Where did you find it?Honestly Maya, when will you learn to leave things alone? Tell me, does it really matter to you where this was taken? If I said “Tokyo” or “Timbuctoo” would it make any difference?’

(P. No.64)

The above utterance is an attempt to avoid Maya’s question and prove his dominance. As Ranjan fears that if Maya learns everything about him she won’t be obedient to him. In fact
Ranjan wants Maya to be ignorant so that he can fool her all the
time. In one more situation Ranjan doesn’t accept his or his
mother’s mistake and tries to prove Maya wrong.

‘What I mean is, you weren’t looking your best that
day. Definitely not…with so much make-up. Who
had told you to apply it? Your mother?’

I had answered quietly, ‘No. Yours.’

‘Really?’ Ranjan had said, ‘I’m surprised. Very
surprised. My mother disapproves of girls who use
make-up. She thinks it looks very artificial. I don’t
like it myself. Hmmm. Must ask her. May be she
thought it would make you look better-improve
your appearance…you know? Some women look
fairer. –much fairer-with make-up.’

I had rushed to the window to look at the
photographs more closely.

‘What’s wrong with my complexion? I like it,’ I
had said defensively.

(P.No.223)

The above mentioned dialogue takes place between Maya and
Ranjan. Both are discussing the unnecessary make up Maya had
put on her face on the day of marriage. Ranjan as usual looks
down upon Maya.

Ranjan blames Maya and her mother for inappropriate make-up
of Maya. When Maya clarifies that it was Ranjan’s mother who
had asked to go for heavy make-up, Ranjan denies the fact
indirectly. In order to save his face he expresses his surprise over
his mother’s advice of heavy make-up. Ranjan’s surprise connotes that his mother cannot be wrong. In an attempt to justify his mother, he explains that his mother might have thought Maya would look at least good with heavy make-up, compared with Ranjan.

Ranjan’s attempt to justify implies multiple messages. Readers come to know that Ranjan is a person with closed minded attitude. He cannot accept the fact that his mother could be wrong. He blindly supports and believes his mother. Ranjan also implies that without make-up or with bare face Maya doesn’t look good. He also comments of Maya’s complexion indirectly.

The entire dialogue is a cluster of Indirect Speech Acts. Both the characters become successful in saving their face and express themselves at the same time.

In Indian context a mother-in-law enjoys more power over her daughter-in-law. Ranjan’s mother seems to be proving her control over Maya. Ranjan’s mother doesn’t want Maya to keep any close relationship with her mother and other family members.

As Mrs Malik had explained tersely, ‘girls can only be moulded if they stop thinking of their parents’ home as their own. Maya will have to learn to live as Ranjan’s wife without running to Calcutta for help all the time. And naturally, it won’t be possible for you to come to Bombay-unless you live with your brother-since Ranjan’s bank flat is not large enough.’

(P. No.244)
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Mrs Malik, Ranjan’s mother takes the help of Illocutionary act to suggest Maya’s mother to have limited contact with Maya and not to visit Maya frequently. Mrs. Malik could not directly prevent Maya’s mother from visiting Maya, so she employs Indirect Speech Act.

With an utterance, ‘Girls can only be moulded if they stop thinking of their parents’, Mrs. Malik advocates that Maya can be a good wife only if she keeps less contact with her family. She also suggests that Maya should not invite her mother to visit her in Bombay and let her mother interfere in their married life.

This implies Mrs. Malik’s utter disbelief in Maya and her mother. Mrs. Malik seems to have bothered with the thought that Maya’s mother would interfere in Ranjan’s married life. A typical mother-in-law is introduced through the employment of Indirect Speech Act by the character.

Phony leaders and deeply rooted cast politics in Indian society can be seen through Comrade Pillai’s utterance.

‘That Paravan is going to trouble for you,’ he said
‘Take it from me... get him a job somewhere else.
Send him off.’

(P. No. 278)

Comrade Pillai and Chacko take part in the above mentioned conversation. Comrade Pillai offers a suggestion to Chacko on Velutha. Comrade Pillai’s above utterance implies multiple meanings. Comrade Pillai is supposed to be well-wisher of Velutha, his part worker, but in the above conversation he indirectly suggests Chacko to send him somewhere else. Comrade Pillai warns Chacko of Velutha and suggests that
Chacko will get in trouble because of Velutha. This utterance also suggests that Comrade Pillai is not a communist by practice, but by theory. Comrade Pillai’s advise to Chacko implies his no objection to any action taken against Velutha despite his closeness with Velutha.

A phony communist leader gets exposed through Comrade Pillai’s utterance when he suggests his spurious intentions.

4.8 Optimism
Optimism is a positive feeling which encourages the person to look the bright side. In basic conversation optimism can be sensed in the utterances of a speaker.

‘Do you know it’s a year since you moved in here?’

It’s strange. She could have said— it’s a year since you left home. Or, since you left us.

(P. No. 2019)

The above Conversation takes place between Gopala and Sumi. Sumi never blamed Gopala for walking out on her. She has always tried to understand him. Readers can understand Sumi’s stand on Gopala’s act of leaving the family implied indirectly when she says to Gopala, ‘it’s a year since you moved in here.’ Even Gopala realizes Sumi’s stand. Sumi uses Indirect Speech Act to express her positive stand and imply Gopala that she still believes that he will rejoin her. Sumi uses interrogative structure to make a statement and clear her optimism.
Sumi doesn’t consider that Gopala has left them; she believes he has taken a long break. The maturity of Sumi and her receptive attitude is conveyed indirectly.

4.9 Indecent Proposals

In a conversation help of Indirect Speech Acts is taken to make any indecent proposals or unexpected offerings. Particularly when it is a taboo in society.

Nikhil had ignored the remarks as he strode into the flat. With his back to me, he has said, ‘My mother wants me to call you “didi”’. I think that’s crazy. Don’t you?’

I had remained silent for a moment, then said, what’s crazy about that? I am your sister’s age... besides, if that’s what your mother would like...’

Nikhil had whirled around. ‘But what would you like? Do you really want me to call you “Didi?”’

I had turned away and crossed over to the telephone. ‘Please-I have to speak to my husband about the carpenter,’ I said abruptly.

Nikhil had watched me dial, and repeated the question. ‘Should I call you “Didi?” I’m waiting for an answer.’

I had put down the phone and said softly, ‘Call me by my name ... it’s short enough. Call me whatever you feel comfortable with.’
‘Thank you. I was hoping you’d say that...Maya,’
Nikhil had replied before striding out briskly.

(P. No. 34)

This is the most effective use of Indirect Speech Act in the novel. The above conversation takes place between Maya and Nikhil. Nikhil is a son of Maya’s neighbour Mrs. Varma.

Nikhil visits Maya and says, ‘My mother wants me to call you “didi”. I think that’s crazy. Don’t you?’ This utterance has a significant implied meaning which helps the novel for further development. Nikhil implies that he doesn’t want to call Maya ‘Didi’. He also says, ‘I think that’s crazy. Don’t you?’ This utterance implies Maya a suggestion to approve him. Nikhil tries to convince to prove his mother wrong. Nikhil indirectly connotes Maya that she should not let him call her ‘Didi’.

In Indian social context, this would be important to note that a girl and a boy can only be brother and sister and not friends. If a girl considers a boy to be his brother they enter into a sacred relationship. The communication goal of Nikhil is to know Maya’s stand on their relation. Nikhil indirectly invites to Maya to be his friend who could further be extended to his girlfriend.

Nikhil doesn’t want to be a brother of Maya. Nikhil has started liking Maya and wants to develop a friendship with her. Nikhil conveys his wish to Maya with the help of Indirect Speech Act. The Perlocutionary effect of the same can be seen when Maya allows Nikhil to call her by her name.

Maya understands the indirect message conveyed by Nikhil. Somewhere Maya also started liking Nikhil. She always dreamt
of a dashing, open minded and loving boy like Nikhil. After getting married to Ranjan she got disappointed. Maya wished Nikhil to be her husband. Maya understands Nikhil’s employment of Indirect Speech Act. Maya indirectly accepts Nikhil’s proposal by giving him permission to call her by her name and not ‘Didi’.

The above conversation is an example of strategic conversation. This connotation could not have been in Direct Speech Act. If Maya had no feelings for Nikhil, she could have asked Nikhil to call her ‘Didi’ strictly. Both, Nikhil and Maya weren’t sure about each other so they took the help of Indirect Speech Act. Communication directly on such issues could have spoiled their images and mutual relationships.

In *The God of Small Things* use of Indirect Speech Acts to send an improper proposal. Mr Hollick in the novel expresses his wicked intentions indirectly.

He allowed the silence to take its toll. He allowed the pitiful man sitting across the table to begin to shake. To weep. Then Hollick spoke again.

‘Well actually there may be an option... perhaps we could work something out. Think positive, is what I always say. Count your blessings,’ Hollick paused to order a pot of coffee.

‘You’re a very lucky man, you know, wonderful family, beautiful children, such an attractive
wife...’ He lit a cigarette and allowed the match to burn until he couldn’t hold it any more.
‘An extremely attractive wife...’

(P. No.41-42)

The above conversation takes place between Mr Hollick, a manager and Ammu’s husband who happens to be Mr. Hollick’s assistant. Mr. Hollick learns about his assistant’s liquor addiction. Mr. Hollick, who is a womanizer, threatens his assistant to fire him. The motive of Mr. Hollick is to win Ammu anyhow. Mr. Hollick says to Ammu’s husband, ‘You’re a very lucky man, you know, wonderful family, beautiful children, such an attractive wife...’ This implies that Mr. Hollick has researched about his assistant’s family already. He also conveys his assistant that he has seen Ammu and mentions her to be an attractive lady. This implies that Mr. Hollick has fallen for Ammu’s beauty and desperately wants her.

Mr. Hollick wishes to have Ammu in his bedroom, but cannot express his motive directly to her husband, so he employs Indirect Speech Act. He indirectly suggests his assistant that if he let his wife sleep with him, he will not sack him from the job.

Mr. Hollick has been offering his assistant something which cannot be accepted by any husband, so to save his face Mr. Hollick takes shelter of Indirect Speech Act. His utterance, ‘Such an attractive wife...’ seems to be a compliment, but on the Illocutionary level exhibits his wicked intentions.
The motive of the employment of Indirect Speech Act is to convey his assistant that he can save his job if his wife agrees to surrender herself.

4.10 Humiliation

Use of Indirect Speech Acts to humiliate someone indirectly can be observed in the novels selected for the study. Especially, people in the delicate relationships cannot afford to use any expressions which may remotely humiliate anyone's feelings. In *The God of Small Things* Baby Kochamma who doesn't like Estha uses Indirect Speech Act to make fun of him.

'And now for the VIPs,' Chacko said (Still using his Reading Aloud voice.)

'My nephew, Esthappen.'

'Elvis Presley,' Baby Kochamma said for revenge.

'I'm afraid we're a little behind the times here.'

Everyone looked at Estha and laughed.

(P. No. 145)

In the above conversation Estha is being introduced to Margaret and Sophie. Chacko mentions Estha to be his nephew. Baby Kochamma, who never liked Rahel and Estha, makes fun of Estha. She mentions the name of Elvis Presley, an American singer and says that Estha is a little behind the times. Baby Kochamma mentions Elvis to connote Estha's shy nature. She indirectly compares Elvis Presley's nature with Estha's nature.
This implies that Estha is a little reserved kind of person and late in adapting things.

In *Fasting, Feasting* Melanie uses Indirect Speech Act to avoid the food cooked by her mother.

‘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.

(P. No. 210)

Melanie cannot go to the extreme extent to humiliate her mother so she declares that she won’t eat the food cooked by her mother. She also humiliates Arun by indirectly calling him to be her mother’s fiddle. Melanie humiliates her mother as well as Arun at the same time.

4.11 Distrust

People express their doubts and distrust in someone indirectly. In family relations people take utmost care to express their distrust. Particularly in the relation of husband and wife it’s an extreme step to do so. In such tricky situation people take help of Indirect Speech Act to express their feelings. Ranjan uses Indirect Speech Act to say that he doesn’t have any trust in Maya.
‘The other day when I got home from work, I thought I smelt cigarette smoke in the house. That fellow smokes, doesn’t he?’

(Page No.253)

‘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

(Page No.254)

‘Does he enter the house in my absence? Come in here, sit down and all that?’

(Page No.255)

All the above mentioned utterances of Ranjan indirectly imply his efforts to express his total distrust in his wife. The use of declarative, interrogative utterances Ranjan conveys that he has no more faith in Maya. Since Maya is his lawfully wedded wife, he cannot easily get rid of her. Ranjan at the same time doesn’t want to spoil his day to day life by directly blaming Maya and bring up a situation where he will have to face Maya’s parents.

4.12 Dominance

The Dominance of the husband in a married life can be denoted from the below given utterances of Ranjan. Ranjan takes all the opportunities to prove himself superior to Maya.
‘Well, he said the dinner was excellent, but that the next time he wanted to sample proper Indian food.’

Ranjan stopped impassively. Ranjan broke into a broad grin. ‘That’s great. Really great. It means he wants to meet me again-informally, casually, at my home. Good, good, good.’

I noted his words a little sadly. ‘I’m’, ‘My home’. As if I had nothing to do with the success of the evening. I could have been a resident cook, or a hired caterer.

(P. No.147)

In the above communication Maya, Ranjan and Tom, share this dialogue. This dialogue is an excellent example of Indirect Speech employed skillfully. After the dinner Tom, indirectly expresses his wish to visit Maya and Ranjan again and enjoy Indian food. He also indirectly comments on the food served at the dinner. Tom expected to Indian food to be served which was Maya’s idea too. But Ranjan changes the menu, believing he knows American people better than Maya.

Ranjan gets happy to learn Tom’s indirect message that he wants to visit them again. Ranjan seems to be very selfish in his indirect remarks on Tom’s desire. Ranjan indirectly claims that it was his hospitality that sought Tom’s favour. He uses self-centric words like ‘I’m’, ‘My’ which indirectly deprives Maya from any credit for the success of the dinner party.

A new fold of Ranjan and Maya’s relationship is unfolded through this Indirect Speech Act. In one more situation Ranjan
dismisses the fact that his mother can be wrong and proves his mother and himself to be unfailing people.

‘What I mean is, you weren’t looking your best that day. Definitely not... with so much make-up. Who had told you to apply it? Your mother?’

I had answered quietly, ‘No. Yours.’

‘Really?’ Ranjan had said, ‘I’m surprised. Very surprised. My mother disapproves of girls who use make-up. She thinks it looks very artificial. I don’t like it myself. Hmmm. Must ask her. May be she thought it would make you look better-improve your appearance... you know? Some women look fairer. -much fairer-with make-up.’

I had rushed to the window to look at the photographs more closely.

‘What’s wrong with my complexion? I like it,’ I had said defensively.

(P. No.223)

The above mentioned dialogue takes place between Maya and Nikhil. Both are discussing the unnecessary make up Maya had put on her face on the day of marriage. Ranjan as usual looks down upon Maya.

He blames Maya and her mother for inappropriate make-up of Maya. When Maya clarifies that it was Ranjan’s mother who had asked to go for heavy make-up, Ranjan denies the fact indirectly. In order to save his face he expresses his surprise over his
mother’s advice of heavy make-up. Ranjan’s surprise connotes that his mother cannot be wrong. In an attempt to justify his mother, he explains that his mother might have thought Maya would look at least good with heavy make-up, compared with Ranjan.

Ranjan’s attempt to justify implies multiple messages. Readers come to know that Ranjan is a person with closed minded attitude. He cannot accept the fact that his mother could be wrong. He blindly supports and believes his mother. Ranjan also implies that without make-up or with bare face Maya doesn’t look good. He also comments of Maya’s complexion indirectly.

The entire dialogue is a cluster of indirect speech acts. Both the characters become successful in saving their face and express themselves at the same time.

4.13 Subjugation Tactics

People use linguistic expressions to overpower others. In Indian Context a husband never accepts his wife to be more in control of the things. Indirectly a husband tries to control his wife. In the novel, Second Thoughts, the character of Ranjan is not an exception to that. It is a kind of verbal subjugation Tactics.

‘Go ahead... go and beg for ice, if you want to... but remember, you’ll be lowering yourself in their eyes. They will say, “See, what a bad housewife she is- she doesn’t even have ice cubes in her home on a
hot day like this?” And then they’ll start speculating about other things.'

‘Like what? I asked, a slight edge to my voice.

‘Oh, you know…things which aren’t their business at all. Personal things. They’ll wonder how our marriage is working out and all that/’

‘Only because I’m defrosting the fridge? Is that really how people’s mind work here?’ I challenged, looking Ranjan straight in the eye.

(P. No.132)

Maya and Ranjan share this piece of dialogue. Ranjan doesn’t want Maya to keep any contact with neighbours and the outer world. Ranjan feels that if Maya keeps contact with the neighbours, she will get spoiled and will not be an obedient wife anymore. He tries to keep Maya away from the neighbours.

One day Maya cleans up the fridge and ice cubes are not available for Ranjan. Maya suggests that she would bring ice cubes from the neighbours. Ranjan gets furious with the idea of borrowing ice cubes from the neighbours. Ranjan feels that if Maya borrows anything from neighbours, she will develop contacts with neighbours. He also feels that borrowing ice cubes from neighbours will lower his prestige in the society.

Ranjan says, ‘Go ahead…go and beg for ice, if you want to…but remember, you’ll be lowering yourself in their eyes. They will say, “See, what a bad housewife she is-she doesn’t even have ice cubes in her home on a hot day like this?”
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Ranjan uses indirect speech act to convince Maya that if she once asks for a favour from neighbours, she will have to bear with unnecessary interfere in their personal life. Ranjan doesn’t make any remark about the neighbours’ interference, but gets successful in conveying his message to Maya.

The main motive of Ranjan’s employment of Indirect Speech Act is to prevent Maya from developing any contact in Bombay. In one more situation Ranjan takes the help of Indirect Speech Act.

‘Maya... you will take some time to get adjusted to Bombay. It’s not your fault. In Calcutta even neighbourliness work differently. In Bombay, the way people think is blunt and harsh. No time to waste. Their first worry is, “what does he or she want from me.” And if you want ice cubes, they will say “aah today she feels free enough to ask for ice cubes. Tomorrow she will ask for something bigger.” Now...if they think they can also get something from you in return, they will smile and give you not just the ice but some ice-cream as well. And after a few days they’ll knock on your door to borrow money-small amounts first, bigger amounts later. This money you will never get back. That’s how it starts. Ask me’

(P.No.132)

In the above conversation with Maya it seems that Ranjan is trying to educate Maya with the modern way of people’s behaviour. Ranjan considers that since Maya belongs to Calcutta, she doesn’t know the quirky ways of people in Bombay. In the
beginning of the conversation Ranajan says that Maya will take some time to understand people's behaviour in Bombay. Ranjan implies that Maya is not capable to handle all these things so she must rely on her husband and be obedient to her instructions.

Ranjan says, ‘This money you will never get back. That’s how it starts. Ask me’ Here, Ranjan indirectly remarks that Maya is not smart enough to deal with Bombay people as she comes from Calcutta. It is an indirect doubt expressed about the abilities of girls belonging to Calcutta. Ranjan’s superiority is also connoted through this utterance.

Ranjan explains the borrow strategy of people in Bombay to indirectly comment on their self-centredness. He also talks about Maya’s ignorance of all these things as she never had been in Bombay before. Ranjan finds indirect speech to comment on all such, especially Maya’s inability to handle people.
4.14 Conclusion

In the present chapter, Irony and Sarcasm, Rhetorical questions and various illocutionary acts have been analysed in detail. The analysis has revealed that irony and sarcasm are used as a means of satire and humour in the novels under consideration. This use gives a certain height to the conversation and brings out the strategic world of discourse. Use of Rhetorical question serves the purpose of Indirect Speech Acts. Through these devices, speaker expresses beyond the limitations of an utterance. Various illocutionary acts like complaining, threatening boasting etc are carried out with the help of Indirect Speech Acts.