CHAPTER THREE
CO-OPERATIVE AND POLITENESS PRINCIPLES IN HARDY’S NOVELS

3.0 PRELIMINARIES

This chapter is devoted to the study of Co-operative Principle as advocated by H. P. Grice and Politeness Principle as put forward by G. N. Leech (henceforth called CP and PP respectively). It is divided into two parts. The first Part highlights the Co-operative Principle and studies its maxims in detail. It offers analysis of some of the marked linguistic interactions segregated from the novels under consideration. The second part is devoted to the study of Politeness Principle and its maxims. In addition, it analyzes the categorically selected examples from the selected novels of Thomas Hardy. The aim of this chapter is to study the significant conversations in the context. An attempt is made to observe the characters of the novels under consideration that follow Grice’s maxims, Brown and Levinson’s model and Leech’s maxims and those who violate them. The reasons of violation of these models by certain characters are also discussed. Through the conversational pieces taken from the respective novels, the linguistic behaviour of the characters is studied and analyzed. The speech situations and speech events of the characters are considered while interpreting the linguistic expressions of the characters. Since Thomas Hardy’s characters summon from the rural background, the study of their conversation throws light on the manners in which they speak. The characters of Hardy either observe or violate certain maxims depending on the speech situation in which they are placed. Therefore, the study of Co-operative Principle and Politeness Principle with respect to the characters’ use of language is the essential point in the chapter.
PART ONE

STUDY OF CO-OPERATIVE PRINCIPLE (CP)

3.1.0 INTRODUCTION

The present part mainly focuses on the concept of CP, its pioneers, definitions and Grice’s maxims, i.e. Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. Grice's cooperative principle is a set of norms expected in a normal conversation. An attempt is made to apply the observance and violation of these maxims to the selected novels of Hardy. The main objective of this part is to study CP with its maxims and show how these maxims are observed by the characters of the novels who obey them or who violate or breach them. It also intends to describe how the characters normally behave in conversations.

Paul Grice (1969) coined the term ‘Co-operative Principle’ to characterize the basic notion that participants in informational exchanges co-operate with one another by contributing appropriately and in a timely manner in the conversation. He advocates that the addressee and addresser share a cooperative principle in an ordinary conversation. Speakers shape their utterances in such a way that addressee understands them. Grice analyzes cooperation with the help of four maxims: quantity, quality, relation and manner. Ss give enough and not too much information: quantity. They are genuine and sincere, speaking "truth" or facts: quality. Utterances are related to the context of the speech: relation. Ss try to present meaning clearly and concisely, avoiding ambiguity: manner.

The work of H.P.Grice has its source in pragmatics which had a strong influence in conversation analysis is that which. Within the Gricean perspective, we may loosely group the work of Leech (1982), Levinson (1979), Brown and Levinson (1978), Lakoff (1977), Serber and Wilson (1986) and others. These analysts make use of the notion of Conversational Principles. Some of these originators of conversational principles, like Brown and Levinson, Leech, Grice, and Lakoff and their theories are
central to the present study. The discussion of Gricean pragmatics is confined to the consideration of the notions of Conversational Principles and maxims as alternative to the notions of conversational rules.

According to Grice, utterance meaning (henceforth referred to as U) is most significant feature of communication. In one of William James lectures that he had delivered at Harvard University in 1969 was on ‘Logic and Conversation’. While discussing on issues in conversation, he coined the term Cooperative Principle’ (CP). He starts his explanation by pointing out, “conversations are not made up of a series of disconnected remarks, rather, they are characteristically rational, co-operative events”. He also adds, “The participants in a conversation will recognize a common aim or set of aims, which may evolve during the conversation and maybe more or less definite”. Grice here claims to regard CP and its maxims as “a fundamental question about the CP and its attendant maxims such as quantity, quality, manner and relation.

3.1.1 DEFINITION OF CO-OPERATIVE PRINCIPLE
CAMBRIDGE ADVANCED LEARNER’S DICTIONARY (2006:275 & 1002) defines Cooperative as:

“willing to help or do what people ask” and the meaning of principle is “approving a moral rule or standard of good behaviour”.

Thus, cooperative principle expects the interlocutors to help one another in the on going conversation of ordinary type. Then, one can say that Cooperative Principle consists of sets of rules, which the S and H have to follow it for the current on going conversation. Grice defines CP as “the collaborative efforts of rational participants in directing conversation towards attaining a common goal”. It is taken for granted that the speaker generally observes the cooperative principle and listener generally assumes that speaker is observing it. Therefore, this principle is intended as a description of how people normally behave in conversation. It is a common
observation that interlocutors are respectful to each other while in a conversation. Thorat, A. (2002:141) states:

“being cooperative means being polite also. The politeness is shown by the speaker maybe sincere, spontaneous, or strategic”.

Therefore, it is necessary to have cooperation in an ordinary conversation. Grice’s contribution to the field of linguistics is significant.

3.1.2 GRICE’S CONTRIBUTION TO CO-OPERATIVE PRINCIPLE

Grice’s contribution to the filed of linguistics is immense. He proposes cooperation in communication. Without cooperation, human interaction would devoid of emotions and counterproductive. Therefore, the Cooperative Principle as advocated by Grice is fundamental in interaction as a whole. The cooperative principle, along with the conversational maxims, partly accounts for conversational implicatures. Participants assume that a speaker is being cooperative, and thus they make conversational implicatures about what is said.

The philosopher H.P.Grice proposes the term ‘Implicature’. He suggests that when people converse with one another they acknowledge a kind of implied or unspoken agreement to co-operate conversationally towards mutual ends. This agreement he calls the Co-operative Principle (CP) when one abides by the rules, or rather Maxims, as Grice calls them. One must be informative, one must tell the truth, and avoid vagueness, and make remarks, which are relevant to the conversation.

Grice’s contribution is very useful for understanding communication and pragmatic aspects of language used. The CP plays a key-role in conversational analysis. It is assumed that Ss are efficient rational users of language and they co-operate with one another towards achieving the communication in terms of maxims of rational communication.
Shaikh, S. (2006:19) states that Grice’s concept ‘be cooperative’ governs all rational communication. It is further specified that the four maxims are guidelines for the interlocutors in conversation.

Grice (1975:49) offers for the observance of CP is significant. He states:

“I would like to be able to show that observance of the CP and maxims is reasonable (rational) along the following lines: that anyone who cares about the goals that are central to conversation or communication such as giving and receiving information, influencing and being influenced by others must be expected to have interest, giving suitable circumstances; in participation in talk exchange that will be profitable only on the assumption that they are conducted in general accordance with the CP and the maxims.”

It is quite clear from the above remark that the CP is not arbitrary convention but a natural rational principle motivated by the goals and requirements of the interlocutors. Many of those who work within the Gricean paradigm, particularly, Leech, Brown and Levinson have assumed the truth of Grice’s rationalist argument. Consequently Taylor and Cameron (1987:83) have stated that Grice’s CP provides pragmatics with a means of working out how it is that Us are often interpreted as meaning more than they actually maybe taken to have said. That is why Grice’s theory assumes an important place in the study of pragmatics. It becomes a powerful tool to interpret literature in general and fiction in particular. A few researchers have applied cooperative principle to interpret conversations of the characters in fictional works. It is difficult for the characters to observe all the maxims. Otherwise, the story will not move.

From the point view of Nozar Naizi (2002:44):
He also adds that ‘one can so often notice the breach of one maxim or more in an U.’ He further states that although we might violate these maxims on the surface of our talks, yet we actually adhere to them at some deeper level of communication. It is appreciation of this fact that leads the H, faced with an apparently irrelevant U to search for relevance at some deeper level or the pragmatic level. The breaking of Grices’ maxims of CP does not mean that there are invariably total breakdowns of communication. Besides, a collapse of communication may not occur even if the L perceives that the S has not been very cooperative with regard to particular U, as the L may have the opportunity to ask for confirmation on elaboration, thus repairing a communicative damage done by the earlier infringement.

According to Watts (2003:57) Grice’s CP consists of a limited set of conversational maxims to which Grice maintains interactants in a conversational exchange should, but frequently do not, remain. Violating any of the maxims leads the addressee to make what Grice calls ‘implicatures’ (or inferences) in order to find out the S’s intended meaning and thus re-establish the CP.

### 3.2.0 GRICE’S MAXIMS

Grice proposes the following maxims:

#### 3.2.1 QUANTITY MAXIM

in which interactants should keep their conversational contributions as informative as is required for the purpose of the conversational exchange, but not more informative.

**Or**

Give the required amount of information – not too much or too little.

**Sub-maxims:**

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purpose of the exchange).
2- Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

3.2.2 QUALITY MAXIM in which interactants should say only what they believe to be true or that for which they have adequate evidence.

Or

Do not pay that for which you lack evidence or which you believe to be false.

Sub-maxims:

1- Do not say what you believe to be false.

2- Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

3.2.3 RELATION MAXIM in which interactants should make their contributions relevant to the purpose of the overall conversational.

Or

Make your contribution relevant to the purpose in hand.

Sub-maxim:

1- Be relevant.

3.2.4 MANNER MAXIM in which interactants should avoid obscurity of expression and ambiguity should not engage in a necessary verbosity and should present their contributions in an orderly manner.

Or

Avoid obscurity, ambiguity and unnecessary prolixity, and be orderly.

Sub-maxims:

1- Avoid obscurity.

2- Avoid ambiguity.

3- Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).

4- Be orderly.

The following diagram no (1) shows more about Grice’s model of Cooperative Principle (CP)
CO-OPERATIVE PRINCIPLE (CP)

GRICE’S MODEL OF (CP)

DIAGRAM NO (1):
(Adopted from Grice, 1975:47)

1-QUANTITY:
a- Make your contribution as
Informative as is required.
b- Do not make your contribu-
tion more informative than is
required.

2-QUALITY:
a- Do not say what you
believe to be false.
b- Do not say that for
which you lack adequate
evidence.

3-RELATION:
a- Be relevant.
b- Make your
contribution relevant
to the purpose in
hand.

4- MANNER:
a- Avoid obscurity of
expression.
b- Avoid ambiguity.
c- Be brief, avoid unnecessary
prolixity.
d- Be orderly.

Grice characterized the CP by four categories of maxims as follows:
The first category is QUANT CATEGORY. He considers that the S should make the strongest claim possible. He/she should be consistent with his / her perception of the facts. He/she should give no more and no less information than is required to make the message clear to the H or Reader complementing this is a principle of interpretation. Given the semantic content of the U and H’s perception of the contextually relevant facts, the strongest inference possible is to be drawn from U.

The second category is QUAL CATEGORY. S should be genuine and sincere. S should state facts only what they believe to be facts. S should make offers and promises only if they intend to carry them out, pronounce judgment is only if they are in a position to judge, and so on.

The third category is REL CATEGORY. U should not be irrelevant in general to the context in which it is uttered, because that makes it difficult for H to comprehend. Sperber and Wilson (1995) argue that relevance is the fundamental principle of language interaction.

The fourth category is called MANN CATEGORY. Where possible, S’s meaning should be presented in a clear and concise manner that avoids ambiguity and avoids misleading or confusing H through stylistic ineptitude.

Here, Grice says, “it is now time to show the connection between the CP and its maxims on the one hand and the conversational implicture on the other.” A participant in a talk exchange may fail to fulfill maxim in various ways, which include the following:
1- He may quietly and unostentatiously “VIOLATE” a maxim, if so, in some cases he will be liable to mislead.

2- He may OPT OUT from the operation both of the maxim and of the CP, he may say, indicate, or allow it to become plain that he is unwilling to cooperate in the way the maxim requires. He may say, for example, ‘I can not say more, my lips are sealed’.

3- He may be faced by a CLASH. For example, he may be unable to fulfill the first maxim of QUANT ‘be as informative as is required without violating the second maxim of QUAL ‘has an adequate evidence for what you say’.

4- He may FLOUT a maxim; that is, he may BLATANTLY fail to fulfill it. On the assumption that the S is able to fulfill the maxim and to do so without violating another maxim (because of a clash), is not opting out, and is not, in view of the blatancy of his performance, trying to mislead. The H is faced with a minor problem: how can his saying what he did say be reconciled with the supposition that he is observing the overall CP? This situation is one that characteristically gives rise to a conversational implicature; and when a conversational implicature is generated in this way. Therefore, one can say that a maxim is being EXPLOITED.

There are different terms used for breaking the maxims. Grice as cited in Salman (2001:72) distinguishes between breaking the maxims secretly by the S which he terms “violation” or “misfiring” and breaking them explicitly for some linguistic effect which he calls “flouting” or “exploitation”. Sometimes, Grice uses “violate” in the same context of “infringe”. One may flout a maxim; he may intentionally fail to fulfill it. Bach and Harnish (1979) also cited in Salman (2001:72) adopt the neutral term “infringement” to refer to any failure to fulfill a maxim and accordingly the CP’s infringement here has two types:

A- ‘Flouting’ which refers to breaking Grice’s maxim intentionally.

B- ‘Violation’, which refers to breaking Grice’s maxims unintentionally.

It is possible to flout a maxim intentionally or unintentionally and thus convey a different meaning than what is literally spoken. Many times in conversation, a speaker
manipulates this flouting to produce a negative pragmatic effect, as in the case of sarcasm or irony.

**ANALYSIS OF COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE**

**3.3.0 THE VIOLATION OF GRICE’S MAXIMS**

The off-record strategies of Politeness violate Gricean maxims in one way and it gives rise to Conversational Implicatures. The S can have possibility to avoid the act of criticizing or accusing through following off-record strategies. They are counted as indirect use of language and they give possibility of showing more than one meaning or have more than one interpretation.

These off-record strategies are as follows:
1. Understatement  
2. Overstatement  
3. Tautology (Quantity Maxim)  
4. Contradiction  
5. Irony  
6. Rhetorical Questions (Quality Maxim)  
7. Hints  
8. Association Clues  
9. Presuppositions (Relation Maxim)  
10. Ambiguity  
11. Vagueness  
12. Overgeneralization (Manner Maxim)  
13. Incompleteness Ellipsis

The above off-record strategies have been applied in the analysis as follows:

**3.3.1.0 THE VIOLATION OF THE QUANTITY MAXIM** (Quant Maxim)

The speaker violates this maxim by deliberately giving less or more information than is required in the situation. Grice states “Make your contribution as informative as is required; do not make your contribution more informative than is required to the purpose of on going conversation”.

These strategies (Understatement, Overstatement, and Tautology) are applied to the Quant maxim and they show that the maxim has been violated.
3.3.1.1 UNDERSTATEMENT (Litotes)

Litotes is a kind of understatement, where the speaker or writer uses a negative word ironically, to mean the opposite. Litotes is to be found in English literature right back to Anglo-Saxon times. It is usually used for criticizing the addressee, and praising the S. It may appear impolite but redress is possible, as illusion of politeness has been created. Understatements are a good way of generating implicatures by stating less than what is usually required to be expressed. Litotes is a rhetorical instrument for understatement, which is used ironically by the use of the negative in a way of flouting Quant maxim, and it invites the H to make inference.

Litotes is also used for purpose of retorting and it is usually expressed through negative statement. Thus, litotes is a figure used to convey a strong expression by means of a weaker one in affirmative by negative of the opposite. The following example is from The RN where Eustacia comments on making her lover, Wildeve to come a mile and half hither, and a mile half back again’. She said, ‘I have showing my power over you’. Wildeve here states in a way to lessen the force of her power by using understatement as follows:

Wildeve: “I know you too well, my Eustacia, I know you too well. There isn’t a note in you which I don’t know; and that hot little bosom couldn’t play such a cold-blooded trunk to save its life”. (RN: 70)

Here, the Us ‘I know you well’ and ‘there isn’t a note’ understate the fact of knowing her very well. Wildeve tries to minimize Eustacia’s power in his coming to her. Repetition of the statement ‘I know you too well’ shows the emphasis on the situation, and the using of colloquial phrase ‘I know you’ is very significant as it gives exchange to her U.

In FMC, Liddy addresses her mistress to have something to wear. Bathsheba does not understand the meaning. She asks her ‘What do you mean?’ Her servant replies ‘mourning’. Liddy here gives less information than what she intends to convey:
Liddy: ‘I was thinking there must be something got
for you to wear?’
Bathsheba: ‘What do you mean?’
Liddy: ‘Mourning’ (FMC: 306)

Thus, Liddy intends indirectly to her mistress to mourn, as her husband is deceased. She uses the understatement to give the H way to infer what the S means.

In The MC, when Susan, Henchard’s wife addresses her husband in a serious tone, warning him to be aware of his talking. Henchard is completely intoxicated due to drinking lot of liquor in the furmity tent. He exhibits his wife for selling. His wife uses understatement here intending to criticize him of his bad behaviour. She tries to prevent him but in futile.

Susan: ‘Mike, Mike’
‘This is getting serious. O! - Too
serious!’ (MC: 17)

The repetition of the words ‘Mike’ and ‘serious’ is redundant in this context, but as Susan intends to compel her husband to withdraw. It is here the breaking of the Quant maxim.

In one of the important scenes in The MC; Henchard warns his daughter Elizabeth-Jane not to meet Farfrae as the latter is the enemy of their house. The litotes here is expressed through the negative statement ‘Nothing to find fault with’. It means that Farfrae has no fault but she has to avoid talking or dancing with him. The litotes here conveys strong expressions in affirmative way. It is considered as away of flouting the Quant maxim:

Henchard: ‘Nothing to find fault with’
‘Only I want to caution you my dear. That man,
Farfrae – it is about him. I’ve seen him talking to
you two or three times – he danced with ‘ee ..... the
least bit beyond sniff and snuff at all?’ (MC: 139)
Henchard’s U ‘I only want to caution you....’ understates the fact of his extreme dislike to his corn-manager. This happens when Henchard hears the people of Casterbridge praising Farfrae as he is clever, has good-natured and better than his master. The U also shows minimizing the effect of his rivalry (Farfrae).

3.3.1.2 OVERSTATEMENT /HYPERBOLE

Hyperbole is an overstatement or exaggerated language that distorts facts by making them much bigger than they are if looked at objectively. The media use it a lot to make stories seem more important or interesting than they really are. It may be used to entertain or more seriously. When the S speaks more than it is necessary, he violates the Quant maxim. Hyperbole is to say more than what is necessary. It is considered as the major way of flouting the Quant maxim. According to Patil, (1994:183) ‘the justification of hyperbole is politeness. The S often tends to overstate polite beliefs.’

Further, hyperbole can convey an apology or an excuse. Hyperbole statements exaggerate for the sake of polite beliefs. The exaggerated elaboration is often meant to enforce agreement on the other side, and more often is used to show hospitality. Overstatements are used in the novel to make the narration more interesting.

Hyperbole can also indicate agreement with the interlocutor. It is useful for making the statement intense and effective in the particular context. Hyperbole can be used to reduce degrees of intensity in the expression. The following example from The MC shows the character Henchard using the exaggeration strategy at the highest rate. It proves useful of making the statement strong and effective in the particular context:

Henchard: ‘Now’ ‘One thing is –necessary to me, as the biggest corn-and-hay-dealer in these parts. The Scotchman, who’s taking the town trades so bold into his hands, must be cut out. D’ye hear? We two can’t live side by side – that’s clear and certain’
Jopp: ‘I’ve seen it all,’
Henchard: ‘By fair competition I mean, of course, ‘But as hard, keen, and unflinching as fair – rather more so. By such a desperate bid against him for the farmers’ custom as well grind him into the ground – starve him out. I’ve capital, mind ye, and I can do it’ (MC: 220)

The above dialogue is between Henchard and Jopp, his new corn-manager. Here, Henchard reveals his greatest hostility to his foe Farfrae who has drawn his status as a Mayor, his love (Lucetta) and also his trade. Henchard intends to crash his business-rival Farfrae into the ground. The expressions ‘the biggest corn-and-hay-dealer in these parts’ ‘the Scotchman, who’s taking the ….cut out’ ‘we two can’t live…’ ‘As hard and keen…….’ and ‘By such desperate…..starve him out’ are highly exaggerated. These exaggerated expressions increase his complaint to his new corn-manager Jopp and reveals his greatest hatred to his former corn-manager, Farfrae. At this time, Henchard speaks more than is necessary; he violates the Quant maxi, which states ‘make your contribution as informative as is required’.

The following U is from The RN by Olly Dowden, which shows her overstatement in describing Wildeve’s proposal to Thomasin. She said ‘A hundred maiden ……….’ This U is highly exaggerated and it is used here for the sake of polite beliefs. It makes the telling interesting and it indicates her approval to the group of turn-cutters who usually gather in the heath and share their conversation. Humphrey’s U is also has a touch of hyperbole as he said ‘Didst ever know a man, neighbour?’ His U also adds to the situation touch of exaggeration and much strengthening to this special context:

Olly Dowden: ‘A hundred maidens would have had him if he’d asked ‘em’
Humphrey: ‘Didst ever know a man, neighbours that no woman at all would marry?’ (RN: 30)
The intensified expressions like ‘A hundred maidens’ and ‘no woman at all would marry’ expose the highest rate of exaggeration in the context. It reveals that Wildeve is smart, good looking and any woman will accept him, contrary of Christian who was refused by many women, and that no woman at all would marry him.

In FMC Troy praises extremely the beauty of Bathsheba. He exaggerates her beauty by saying that she is ‘the most beautiful ever he saw, or may he falls dead that instant’; and he adds that she is ‘a most fascinating woman’. These hyperbolic statements overstate the situation for being polite, and avoiding bad expressions. Troy has a sense of flirting girls and a wonderful power of fluttering them too. It is mainly by his embellished compliments that he created a favourable effect upon the mind of Bathsheba:

Troy: ‘I said you were beautiful, and I’ll say so still, for, by - so you are! The most beautiful ever I saw, or may I fall dead this instant! Why, upon my – ’

Bathsheba: ‘Don’t - don’t! I won’t listen to you – you are so profane!’

Troy: ‘I again say you are a most fascinating woman. There’s nothing remarkable in my saying so, is there?’ (FMC: 165)

At this point, Troy shows his highly manner of captivating women by praising their beauty in an embroidered way. The expressions ‘The most beautiful ever I saw’; ‘may I fall dead this instant’, and ‘the most fascinating woman’ make stronger compliments to Bathsheba, and it violates the Quant maxim, by saying more than it is necessary and repeating such words ‘beautiful’; ‘most’ and ‘I say you are’.

3.3.1.3 USE OF TAUTOLOGY

Tautology is where two close-synonyms are placed consecutively or very close together for effect e.g. free gift. Tautological expressions can be used to convey
criticism, complaint or disapproval too. The H in tautology ought to find the appropriate meaning for U, as he hears a statement which is true only by virtue of its meaning. It represents a kind of unnecessary repetition, a repetition which is semantically empty. This strategy is one way of violating the Quant maxim. The H may feel that nothing has been added to the information he has it already.

Tautology strategy is also a stylistic device whereby the author seeks to explain which is already presented in a word or phrase. Geoffrey Leech says ‘Tautology tell us nothing about the word, but may well tell us something about the language’.

In FMC, the character, Joseph repeats the question ‘what’s the matter? The character, Henery repeats the expressions ‘Baily Pennyways’ and ‘I said so’. These repetitions are semantically empty and they do not add any meaning or information to the text. However, it is the unnecessary use of the information, which is one way of violating the Quant maxim. With reference to Quant maxim Grice states, ‘S should not make his contribution more informative than is required’. However, the S may want to stress on the situation. He may repeat some parts of his words, or perhaps the H repeats some words of the S:

Joseph: ‘O – what’s the matter, what’s the matter, Henery?’

Jackob and Mark: ‘what’s a brewing, Henery?’

Henery: ‘Baily Pennyways – Baily Pennyways – I said so; yes, I said so!’ (FMC: 71)

The speech situation here talks about the event of catching the bailiff who steals some barley from the granary of Bathsheba’s farm. He has been dismissed. The addresser here intends to deepen the effect of the situation, by repeating some information. In The MC, Elizabeth runs to her friend’s house Lucetta to tell her to shut the shutters of the window. She has seen procession advancing to Lucetta’s house on account of revealing the latter’s previous love-affairs with Henchard. The procession shows their
scandal in the form of two effigies. Jopp and his friends organize a skimmity-ride in order to expose her. Elizabeth repeats the phrase ‘let us shut it out’ violating the Quant maxim. She shows her constant worries to in a demand to close the window. However, Lucetta in maddening mood said ‘It’s no use’. The procession proceeds to move around the city. Both the characters violate the Quant maxim, by repeating their Us. Elizabeth repeats ‘Let us shut it out,’ and her friend, Lucetta repeats in despair ‘He will see it’ ‘kill me’ ‘she’s me’ and the word ‘parasol’. Let us study the following piece of conversation:

Lucetta: ‘Tis me!’ ‘A procession – a scandal – an effigy of me, and him!’

Elizabeth: ‘Let us shut it out,’

‘Let us shut it out!’

Lucetta: ‘it is no use!’ ‘He will see it, won’t he? Donald will see it! He will never love me anymore – and O, it will kill me – kill me!’

Elizabeth: ‘o, can’t something be done to stop it?’

‘Is there nobody to do it – not one?’

Lucetta: ‘She’s me – she’s me –even to the parasol – my green parasol!’ (MC: 331)

Here, the excessive repeating of such words and phrases are meaningless, but it has a target in the above speech situations. This target is to stress on the importance of the context and the seriousness of the situation.

In one of the incidents in FMC, Bathsheba talks with her servants in connection with their wages. As it is day of her workers’ wages, she asks Andrew how much she owes him. Being shy and unable to speak fluently, at the time of speaking, he stammers. Hence he repeats the phonetic sound of the word ‘please’ /P/. He repeats the sound ‘p’ nine times, ‘pl’ eight times, and ‘l’ sound four times. In addition, the word ‘please’ is repeated three times. These repetitions are needless, and they are calculated as the
violation of the Quant maxim. It shows the writer’s (Hardy) skill of variations in spelling or devices of typography like using italic or capital letters.

In this context Chapman, R. (1990:130) comments on Hardy’s skill of writing. He says:

‘these extra spacing can show the effect of a name prolonged by calling.’

He also adds:

“Hardy shows more strength in the phonetics. No two voices sound exactly alike, even speaking the same words with shared emphasis and accent”.

Hardy is very sensitive to the individual qualities of voices, particularly those of women. The less romantically speaker is known by his stammer as in Andrew Randle’s U. Study the following dialogue:

_Bathsheba_: ‘Now the Next – Andrew Randle, you are a new man, I hear.

‘How came you to leave your last farm?’

_Andrew_: ‘P-p-p-p-p-pl-pl-pl-pl-l-l-l-lease, ma’am, p-p-p-p-p-pl-pl-pl-please,

ma’am-please’m-please’m – ’

_Henery_: ‘A’s a stammering man’, mem’ ‘and they turned him a way because the only time he never did speak plain he said his soul was his own, ....’

_(FMC: 81)_

In that case the repetitions are semantically anomalous, but they can be interpreted meaningfully.
In The RN, Eustacia expresses her feeling to Clym about his mother’s hatred. She says that Mrs.Yeobright hates her and claims that she is a witch. Eustacia also tells her lover that his mother will stand on their way, and she will prevent them to get married. Eustacia has a very bad mood. She inquires Clym about what his mother told him against her. Clym refuses to tell her the truth. Eustacia bursts shouting to him to go away and obey her. She adds that she will ruin him forever. At this time, Eustacia repeats the word ‘forever’ three times and the phrase ‘go away’ is repeated two times. She violates the maxim of the Quant; by repeating more than it is required. However, she has done it here deliberately as she wants to put emphasis on her decision to say goodbye to her lover forever, if he obeys his mother. It is clear from the following linguistic interaction:

Eustacia: “And she speaks against me?”
Clym: “I will not say”
Eustacia: ‘There, go away! Obey her. I shall ruin you. It is foolish of you to meet me like this. Kiss me, and go away forever, forever – do you hear? – forever!” (RN: 200/1)

The tautology may take place when the addresser suffers from depression and loneliness. As it is happens with Eustacia, she explains her condition through repetition.

There is excessive use of the tautology strategy in The RN. The misunderstanding leads to repetition. Both of the addresser and the addressee share repetition of every part of speech. The character Fairway thinks that Clym will go back to Paris after visiting his mother on Christmas, as he feels unhappy due to staying on the heath without any work. However, Clym mistakes him when he told him ‘you are wrong, it isn’t’. This is because of Clym’s decision to stay on the heath, and to open school there. He thinks that living in Paris is depressing and purposeless:

Fairway: “So ’tis; so ’tis!”
Clym: “No, no – you are wrong; it isn’t.”
Fairway: “Beg your pardon; we thought that was your meaning?”
Clym: “well, as my views changed my course became very depressing.” (RN: 175)

The repetition of the phrase, “So ’tis; so ’tis!” and the negative word ‘no’ are meaningless and they show the breaking of Grice’s Quant maxim. However, it is away of showing clarification to the situation.

3.3.2.0 THE VIOLATION OF THE QUALITY MAXIM (Qual maxim)
The maxim of Qual can be violated through telling lies, making contraction, using irony and by using metaphor strategy. Usually people try to be truthful. However, some situations enforce them to lie. Sometimes, people tell lies for defending themselves. These strategies are telling lies, contradiction, irony, metaphor and rhetorical questions. Let us discuss these strategies with the help of categorically selected examples from the novels under consideration.

3.3.2.1 TELLING LIES
Lying is related to deception in oral or written communication. Generally, people tell lies to avoid embarrassments or accusation situation. Either they tell lies as a habit or self-defense. Sometimes lies are destructive. It can cause some trouble to both the S and H. the Qual maxim is violated if the person does not tell truth. Qual maxim states that S should not say what he believes to be false, and he should not say that for which he lacks adequate evidence. Sometimes, there is a reason or intention beyond lying, like aggravating language. It is not irrational, but it has a social function to do.

In The RN, Eustacia tells a lie when her grandfather asks her about her arrival at home. She replies to him that she promised Johnny a bonfire as it pleases him. The
truth is that the boy is not interested in bonfire. However, she intends to make signal to her lover Wildeve to come to her as she feels lonely:

*Captain Vye:* “When are you coming indoors Eustacia?”

“‘Tis almost bedtime. I have been home…….”

*Eustacia:* “I promised Johnny a bonfire, and it pleases him not to let it go out just yet”, “Grandfather, you go in to bed. I shall follow you……..?”

*Johnny:* “I don’t think I want it any longer” (RN: 64)

Eustacia violates the Qual maxim by telling lies to her grandfather. She does not want to tell that she is waiting for her lover. She avoids embarrassment in this way:

In the novel The MC, one comes across Newson, the real father of Elizabeth-Jane who has come to Casterbridge. On his arrival, he inquired about his wife and his daughter. He was told that his wife was dead but his daughter is still alive. He found Henchard who had once sold his wife, and he asked him about his daughter, ‘But my Elizabeth-Jane – where is she? Henchard told him lies that she was no more a life and buried beside her mother. Here, Henchard violates the Qual maxi, as he tells lies to Newson claiming that his daughter was dead and buried next to her mother. He tells lies intentionally to avoid embarrassments. He wants to keep Elizabeth with him, as he has lost his wife (Susan), his mistress (Lucetta), his friend (Farfrae), his status as the mayor of Casterbridge, and finally his business:

*Newson:* ‘They told me in Falmouth that Susan was dead –But my Elizabeth-Jane – where is she?’

*Henchard:* ‘Dead like arise’ ‘Surely you learnt that too?’

*Newson:* ‘Dead!’ ‘Then what’s the use of my money to me?’
‘Where is she buried?’

Henchard: ‘Beside her mother?’

Newson: ‘When did she die?’

Henchard: ‘A year ago and more’ (MC: 347)

The following conversation is from FMC. Oak tells his mistress Bathsheba that Mr. Boldwood would come to meet her on account of the wedding which her workers told that it was likely to take place between them. Here, Bathsheba denies this by saying that what they had said is not true. She adds ‘no marriage is likely to take place between us’. Bathsheba violates the Qual maxim, because she is untruthful. She promises Boldwood to marry him. However, later on she says that no marriage would be taken place. Here, she lies deliberately. The fact is that she has now a new lover instead of the old farmer Boldwood. It is Troy, whom she was acquainted with later on. But to avoid the embarrassment of the addresser (Oak), she intends to lie and say that what they said is not true:

Oak: ‘I meant on account of the wedding which they say is likely to take place between you and him, miss. Forgive my speaking plainly’

Bathsheba: ‘They say what is not true’ ‘No marriage is likely to take place between us’ (FMC: 181)

Thus, the Qual and Quant maxim are violated when Bathsheba repeats the same part of Oak’s sentence such as ‘is likely to take place between’. It is outstandingly on purpose of avoiding awkwardness from the S. she emphasizes on the act of lying.

3.3.2.2 CONTRADICTION

Contradiction is a statement or fact that is opposite to or different from another. It does not match each other. This strategy is used in poetry and literature. Contradiction can be used for criticizing or complaining or also for some politeness purposes. Here,
the S sometimes makes two contradictory Us and it is the flouting of the Qual maxi. It appears that whatever S says is not true. It is the job of the H to infer the U of the S. In FMC, Troy has deceived Bathsheba and Fanny. Boldwood requests Troy to have conversation with him on the two women who were betrayed by him. In the beginning he reuses. However, later on, he tells him that he would listen to him with pleasure and he adds ‘only speak low, for somebody…..’ Troy here contradicts with himself. In the beginning he criticizes Boldwood but after that, he tells him that he would listen with pleasure. This is the flouting of the Qual maxi in its highest rate:

**Boldwood:** ‘I wish to speak a word with you,’
**Troy:** ‘About what?’

**Boldwood:** ‘About her who lives just a head there – and about a woman you have wronged,’
**Troy:** ‘I wonder at your impertinence,’

**Boldwood:** ‘Now look here,’ ‘wonder or not, you are going to hold a conversation with me’
**Troy:** ‘Very well, I’ll listen with pleasure,’ ‘only speak low for somebody or other may overhear us in the farmhouse, there.’ (FMC: 215)

The following U is taken from The MC. Henchard tells his new corn-manager, Jopp to do fair competition with his enemy Farfrae. However, in the same U he tells him that he wants to grind the latter into the ground and starve him out. This contradiction shows the great level of hostility that Henchard bears to his old manager Farfrae. Moreover, it shows his contradiction between the fair competitions and cutting out. He knocks down his hostile into the ground. It shows here the violation of the Qual maxim:

**Henchard:** ‘By fair competition I mean, of course,’
‘But as hard keen, and unflinching as fair – rather more so.'
By - such a desperate bid against him for the farmers' custom as will grind him into the ground-starve him out. I've capital, mind ye, and I can do it.'

(MC: 220)

The U from The RN is used as a strategy of minimizing the impositive force of a visit, which is not expected. Mrs. Yeobright has come to ask her son’s wife about the money that she has given to Thomasin’s husband, Wildeve in a way of sending her niece’s share. Wildeve does not give his wife, because he has gambled with the reedleman, Diggory; and he loses all that money. Mrs. Yeobright thinks that he has given that money to his old lover (Eustacia). Therefore, Mrs. Yeobright decides to go to her son’s house, and asked his wife about it:

Mrs. Yeobright: “I was coming to see you,”
Eustacia: “Indeed!” “I did not at all expect you,”
Mrs. Yeobright: “I was coming on business only”
“Will you excuse my asking this – Have you received a gift from Thomasin’s husband?”

(RN: 244)

The Us of Mrs. Yeobright shows her contradiction. In the beginning she said ‘I was coming to see you’ while later on she said ‘I was coming on business only’. The addressee (Eustacia) thinks in the beginning that her mother-in-law comes to reconcile with her. However, the second U of Mrs. Yeobright shows that she comes to criticize her son’s wife for receiving money from her old lover, Thomasin’s husband. It shows that the S is not telling the truth. She has come to scold Eustacia, and the relation between these two women comes to an end as it is shown in the end of the novel. This is the flouting of the Qual maxim, by applying the strategy of contradiction to the context.
3.3.2.3 IRONY
The Oxford Word Power Dictionary (Wehmeier, 1993: 341) defines Irony as ‘the way of speaking that shows you are joking or that you mean the opposite of what you say. According to Cutter (1975:156), Irony depends on referentiality of the text, on dialectic between the text and the world. Irony is also a literary device that uses contradictory statements or situation to reveal a reality different from what appears to be true.

Grice uses irony in the context of conversational maxims. Although Qual maxim states, “do not say what you believe to be false”, irony is opposite of that; it states something and means the other. Thus, verbal irony occurs when S says one thing and means the other. Irony can be conveyed in spoken discourse through ‘exaggeration stress, lengthening of stressed syllables and some other intentional cues’. The following example from The RN is an indirect statement from Eustacia to the boy, Johnny, because of keeping the bonfire. The boy inquires his mistress whether she was not much obliged to him for making her bonfire. However; she has given him indirect answer saying that there was nobody there to play with her. Eustacia at this time says something but she intends to mean the other, which means (coming her lover Wildeve). Eustacia violates the Qual maxim in this U:

The boy: “Are you not much obliged to me for making you one?”
Eustacia: “Yes; but there’s nobody here to play wi’me.” (RN: 64)

The U of Henchard in The (MC) tells his daughter-in-law, Elizabeth-Jane that he has compelled her friend Lucetta to promise to marry him as it will be in her advantage (Elizabeth). This happens when Elizabeth told him not to compel her to do things against her will. Her step-father told her indirectly that he intends to do that since Farfrae is free, he will marry her. Henchard suggests making Farfrae to find no alternative to marry Lucetta as she will marry him, and Elizabeth will marry Farfrae.
Here, Henchard violates the Qual maxim, through using irony by saying something and means the other:

Elizabeth: ‘Don’t compel her to do anything against her will!’ ‘I have lived with her, and know that she cannot bear much.’

Henchard: ‘Don’t be a no’thern simpleton!’ ‘This promise will leave him free for you, if you want him, won’t it?’ (MC: 237)

The Irony in Henchard’s U reaches to the level of sarcastic remark, especially when he calls his step-daughter ‘no’thern simpleton’.

The following example is from FMC. Here, Troy praises Bathsheba’s beauty. He asks her is there anybody has noticed it. However, Bathsheba replies that she has never heard anybody praising her beauty and adds that even Liddy says nothing. Troy comments sarcastically and ironically on Liddy that how can a young Liddy live in a buzz of admiration without knowing something about it. He means that her servant does not know anything about beauty and the ways to admire it. He is here violating the Qual maxim being telling something different to what he means. In addition, he tells lies against Liddy as he says that she does not know anything about beauty and its admiration:

Troy: ‘Never tell me that a young lady can live in a buzz of admiration without knowing about it. Ah, well, Miss Everdene, you are – pardon my blunt way – you are rather an injury to our race than otherwise’ (FMC: 166)

The above U shows Troy indirectly criticizes Bathsheba’s servant in an ironical way making his comments on her unknown beauty and the way of admiring. He also exaggerates in describing Bathsheba’s beauty as ‘she injuries the race’, because of her
beauties. The context illustrates the clash between the Quant maxim and the Qual maxim.

### 3.3.2.4 METAPHOR

Lakoff (1973) defines ‘metaphor’ as ‘a general pattern in which one object is conceived in terms of the other. Metaphor strategy is also a kind of violating the Qual maxim.

The Dictionary of Literary Terms (2005: 110) defines metaphor as ‘a figure of speech in which a word or phrase in literary denotes one kind of object or idea is used in place of another to suggest a likeness or analogy between them’. She also adds that ‘metaphors are called implied simile, as they do not use comparative words, ‘like’ and ‘as’.

Here, metaphors make a comparison between two unlike things indirectly, it can be also said that ‘metaphor’ is a way of describing something by comparing it to something else which has the same qualities, but without using the words ‘as’ or ‘like’. The following example from The (MC) illustrates this strategy:

\textit{Henchard: ‘Will any Jack Rag or Tom Straw among ye buy my goods?’}

\textit{Susan: ‘Mike, Mike’ ‘this is getting serious. O! – too serious!’}

\textit{Henchard: ‘Will any body buy her?’ (MC: 17)}

The speech situation is that Henchard exhibits his wife in the auction place. He criticizes his early marriage, and his miserable life, working as turf-cutter. He drinks so much, until he becomes intoxicated and offers his wife to the auctioneer to sell her like goods. The comparison here is between animate and inanimate object. He compares his wife as an inanimate object in a sarcastic way. He violates the Qual maxim.
The following U is from The (RN). Eustacia has met her new lover Clym for the second time, and she confesses her sorrow and depression to him to show sympathy to take her to Paris. She tells him that she cannot tolerate the heath, except its purple season. Eustacia compares the heath with cruel taskmaster. She here compares between the heath as inanimate object to the animate object taskmaster. The heath is a place, object and the taskmaster is human being. She compares the cruelty of the heath with the cruelty of the taskmaster:

Eustacia: “I cannot endure the heath, except in its purple season. The heath is a cruel taskmaster to me”. (RN: 190)

Here, the U draws an indirect comparison between the heath and the taskmaster. It implies criticism of her condition being staying in the heath which kills her later in the end of the novel.

The following U of the character Troy is from the novel FMC. It shows his using an indirect comparison between the pleasure of having ewe-lamb and himself by the protagonist of the novel Bathsheba:

Troy: ‘And yet you take away the one little ewe-lamb of pleasure that I have in this dull life of mine. Well, perhaps generosity is not a woman’s most marked characteristic’ (FMC: 168)

Bathsheba tells him never to speak to her again in an impolite way. He tells her that he is soon going back to his miserable life in the regiment and maybe he will be ordered out soon. Here, he compares himself (being human being) to ewe-lamb (being an animal). He violates the Qual maxim, being not true. However, as the farmer when he owns ewe-lamb, he thinks that his pleasure to keep them is to save them from losing. He also compares himself as ewe-lamb, which Bathsheba shall try to keep him in pleasure like keeping her ewes-lamb in pleasure. It is an indirect way of comparing
himself with an inanimate object. He tries to convince her to forgive his boldness in speaking to her in that manner in a sarcastic way of using metaphor as he thought that things deserve her.

3.3.2.5 RHETORICAL QUESTIONS

According to the Oxford Concise Dictionary of Linguistics ‘rhetorical question’ is the question, which does not require a real answer. In other words, it is a question which is asked by the addressee and does not need to be answered. Rhetorical questions have also a strategy of violating the Qual maxim, being not honest in presenting the question. It is measured as an ambiguous question to the H as it does not need the H to infer it. It is an insincere question.

The following U is from The RN, where Humphrey asks the group of turf-cutters if they know a man that no woman at all would marry him. It is here a rhetorical question is asked which does not need a real answer:

\[Humphrey: \text{"Didst ever know a man, neighbour, that no woman at all would marry?" (RN: 30)}\]

The above question is an indirect criticism to Christian as he proposes to marry many women, but they refuse him. The question itself is ambiguous and it violates the Qual maxim as it is not a normal question and requires non-conventional answer, but it requires a justification when it is used for FTAs.

The other following example, which shows the use of rhetorical question strategy, is from The MC novel. The sailor Newson, the father of Elizabeth-Jane looked for his wife Susan and his daughter in the Casterbridge. In Falmouth, people tell him that his wife is dead, and his daughter is still alive. He finds Henchard the person whom he sold him his wife, and asks him about Elizabeth-Jane. Henchard tells him that she is also dead likewise and is buried beside her mother. Newson asks him in a rhetorical question, ‘Then what’s the use of my money to me?’ it implies that his money is worthless to him as his wife and daughter are dead:
Newson: ‘Then what’s the use of my money to me?’

(MC: 347)

The intention of the S in the above example is not to elicit an answer from the H, because the question is not true. Moreover, it is a kind of consoling himself, as he has done a long journey to ask for his family, but lately he found out that none of them are alive. He utters the rhetorical question in vain.

In FMC, Bathsheba’s servant Liddy asks her mistress in a rhetorical question, saying ‘Did you ever find out, miss who you are going to marry … key?’ It implies that she did not find her future husband. This question is ambiguous and it does not require any answer from the addressee. It is only used for sarcastic remark in this situation:

Liddy: ‘Did you ever find out, miss, who you are going to marry by means of the Bible and Key?’

(FMC: 95)

In fact, the British society in the Victorian period used to play such game of foretelling the future husband to the ladies who were spinsters. It is done by using the way of the Holy Bible and the door key. This kind of question indicates a sarcastic situation, which is expressed indirectly, and it is a kind of violation of the Qual maxim, of being insincere.

3.3.3.0 THE VIOLATION OF THE MANNER MAXIM (Mann maxim)
Manner maxim states that the S should avoid obscurity of expressions, avoid ambiguity and avoid unnecessary prolixity. The addresser should be brief and orderly. Keeping this maxim through brevity and order, it expresses thoughts or conveys the message to the addressee. This maxim also demands the interlocutors to observe the principles of economy, clarity and processability.
The violation of this maxim occurs because the addressee does not in need to reveal a secret or fact to the H as he wants to protect himself from the H’s anger. The following strategies ambiguity, vagueness, overgeneralization and incompleteness or ellipses are ways of violating the Mann maxim.

3.3.3.1 AMBIGUITY

Ambiguity is the possibility of being understood in more than one way or the other. Something can be understood in more than one way. Ambiguity can be occurred in a word or a sentence. When it occurs in a word, it has two meanings and it is called semantic or lexical ambiguity. This ambiguity suggests more than one interpretation to a word, phrase, action or situation, which is accepted. It is used to avoid criticizing or embarrassment of others.

Sometimes, the addressee uses the ambiguity deliberately, this is to avoid saying exactly what one wants to express. The following U is from (FMC) where Bathsheba runs after Gabriel Oak telling him that her mother has done a mistake, and she wants to correct it. Oak misunderstands her, thinking that she has accepted to marry him:

\[
\text{Bathsheba: ‘I didn’t know you had come to ask to have me, or I should have come in from the garden instantly. I ran after you to say - that my aunt made a mistake in sending you away for courting me’}
\]

\[(FMC: 36)\]

Bathsheba’s U indicates that she is not clear in her talking to Oak. The latter supposes that she has come to tell him to court her. For this reason Oak seeks her pardon as he makes her run so fast after him saying ‘wait a bit till you’ve found your breath’. This U shows the violation of the ambiguity strategy.
The following U is from The RN. Eustacia asks Wildeve whether he ‘has he seen anything better than her in his travels’. He replies her in an ambiguous way; he says ‘not even on the shoulders’ also he adds ‘Thomasin is a pleasing ’ Wildeve here intends to avoid embarrassments of Eustacia to know that he is already engaged to Thomasin, and she is more beautiful than she is (Eustacia):

Wildeve: “Not even on the shoulders of Thomasin?”
‘Thomasin is a pleasing and innocent woman”
(RN: 69)

Thus, Wildeve violates the Mann maxim, by using obscure meaning. He deliberately says that to avoid what he exactly wants to say either to avoid criticizing or embarrassing of the addressee.

In The (MC), Henchard requests the Scotchman to be his manager. However, the Scotchman refuses the offer of the Mayor as his plan is fixed to go abroad. Henchard indirectly and in an ambiguous way tells him that he should get a manager … and he adds ‘But it will be long before …. ’ He, here, intends to mention to the Scotchman indirectly to bide him and change his mind from deciding to go abroad:

Henchard: ‘Well, I shall get a manager somewhere, no doubt, ’But it will be long before I see one that would suit me so well!’ (MC: 63)

Here, Henchard gives an indirect appealing to Farfrae, saying that it is for the benefit of the all.

3.3.3.2 VAGUENESS

Vagueness is one way of violating the Mann maxim. In other words, the S is not clear in his expression. It can be used to avoid FTA in a situation; it also can be used as an indirect criticism and attack to the addressee. The term determinacy is considered as the essence of the vagueness. These words are vague by nature, and can be used as a device to vagueness. (Something, someone, another and other)
Vagueness can be verbal or nonverbal. It can be through intention, stress, words, sentences and it can be through rhetorical device as euphemism and punning.

In one of the incidents in the novel The RN, Clym decides to visit his mother. His wife tells him that she does not like his going that night. To this Clym questions her why not at that particular night. She answers vaguely. She says that something might be said which would terribly injuries her. It is in fact that she has done a mistake when Clym’s mother visited them. His mother knocked the door, Eustacia was looking from the window and even her mother-in-law was looking at her, but she did not open the door, as she was busy with her old lover Wildeve. She tells Clym in indirect way to postpone his visit to her.

Clym: “Why not tonight?”
Eustacia: “Something maybe said which will terribly injure me.”
Clym: “My mother is not vindictive,”
Eustacia: “But I wish you would not go,” (RN: 292)

Here, she indirectly expresses her feeling of anxiety that maybe his mother will tell him about his wife’s mistake, and he will not forgive her. She uses the vagueness strategy to avoid the attack of her husband to her.

In The (FMC), the use of the vagueness strategy is in its highest form. Liddy has gone to look for her mistress at her home, but she could not find her. She thought that something was wrong or something cruel had happened. She repeated the indeterminate term ‘something’ two times to indicate strangeness of the situation:

Bathsheba: “I suppose the damp air from that hollow has taken it away. Liddy, don’t question me, mind.”
‘Who sent you – anybody?’
Liddy: ‘Nobody, I thought when I found you were not at home, that something cruel had happened. I fancy I heard his voice late last night; and so, knowing something was wrong’ (FMC: 285)

The above indirect reference by Liddy is to point out the incident of Fanny’s death. She mentions it to her mistress in an indirect and vague way to avoid the embarrassment of Bathsheba. She thinks that if she speaks directly to her mistress, it may injure her. Because she knows that, her husband has a love relation to Fanny.

The following U is from The MC, which shows the violation of the Mann maxim in its highest rate. The vagueness of the situation takes place when the word of the indeterminate ‘other’ occurs in the dialogue. Henchard has come to Lucetta’s house with the purpose renewing her promise to marry him. He threatens her to expose their old relation and intimacy to the common and to ‘other’ men. Lucetta here expresses her feeling of fear and blames him for not pressing to do things against her will. She seeks his mercy:

Henchard: ‘You can not in honour refuse me’ ‘And unless you give me your promise this very night to be my wife, before a witness, I’ll reveal our intimacy – in common fairness to other men!’ (MC: 236)

Here, Henchard refers to Farfrae, Lucetta’s new lover as ‘other’ in an indirect way. He enforces her to give promise to marry him or he will reveal their intimacy. The indirect reference here refers to the vagueness of the context, but it is intended to avoid the disclosing her secrets.

In the same novel The MC, Henchard also mentions in vague way to the applicant for the job of corn-manager. This happens when the new manager Jopp comes to apply for a work with Henchard. However, the latter told him that he was late and the job
was engaged. The word ‘another’ indicates the vagueness of the context and it is the job of the H to infer it:

\[
\text{Henchard: ‘I mentioned Thursday’, ‘and as you didn’t keep your appointment, I have engaged another manager. At first I thought he must be you,’ (MC: 84)}
\]

The undetermined word ‘another’ here refers to the Scotchman, Farfrae who has been appointed to the job of corn-manager by Henchard.

### 3.3.3.3 OVER-GENERALIZATION

Over-generalization is a way of violating the Mann maxim. This is done through criticizing or threatening. This strategy can soften the criticism or threat of the addressee. This device can be used for either advising or warning. Overgeneralization is like euphemism as it relieves the tension of expression to the H. It can be used as self-defense to the H as it degenerates what is said. Overgeneralization is also away of using proverb to convey the message to the H. Although it can be irrelevant to the context but it is the best way of keeping the person from the attack and hesitation of the S.

The following example is from the novel of The (MC). Henchard asks the man who applied for a job of manager to his factory. The job was advertised in the newspaper of Casterbridge. The applicant thought that he would get it as no one had applied for the same. However, he was told that the job was engaged with new manager. The corn factor asked the applicant ‘Do you think I can…..? This question shows the use of overgeneralization strategy. Henchard violates the Mann maxim in this situation by generalizing the situation ‘when business is in question’. He tells the applicant that business is more important than keeping appointment, as no one neglect business when it is questioned:
Henchard: ‘Do you think I can wait when business is in question?’ (MC: 84)

The U here criticizes the applicant of being late in an overgeneralization tone and it also breaks Grice’s Qual maxim when Henchard does not fulfill his promise. Similarly, in the novel The (MC), one comes across the violation of the Mann maxim through the strategy of the over-generalization. Henchard runs all the way to Mellstock telling Farfrae something important. He tells him that something happened wrong in his house and requests him to return. Here, Henchard uses the overgeneralization strategy in his speech situation. He addresses Farfrae in general, avoiding giving the embarrassment to him (H), by using indirect expression:

Henchard: ‘Come back to Casterbridge at once!’
‘There’s something wrong at your house-requiring your return. I’ve run all the way here on purpose to tell ye’ (MC: 339)

Henchard at this juncture violates the Mann maxim, through irrelevant context, and obscure in expression. He can tell Farfrae directly that his wife is sick and needs him strongly, but to avoid criticizing and embarrassing of Farfrae he uses the strategy. This is happens because the latter knows and suspects that Henchard may play a trick against him.

The following is the U by Bathsheba from (FMC). It refers to the use of the strategy of overgeneralization. Mr.Boldwood asks her whether she likes him or does she respect him? Here, Bathsheba avoids direct answer; but she says in general that ‘it is difficult for a woman...’ She indirectly expresses the feeling that all women can not express their feeling to men as it is considered to be bold or direct expression which leads them to embarrassment.

Boldwood; ‘Do you like me, or do you respect me?’
Bathsheba: ‘I don’t know – at least, I cannot tell you. 
It is difficult for a woman to define her feelings in
language which is chiefly made by men to express theirs’ (FMC: 327)

In The RN, Clym asks Eustacia, in their first meeting, ‘Do girls…?’ It shows the use of the overgeneralization strategy. It happens when Eustacia takes the role of the Turkish King in the play, which had been held in Clym’s house on occasion of Christmas. She impersonalizes herself as a Turkish king. Clym remarks her and asks her in oddness ‘Are you a woman ….?’ Eustacia replies him that she is a woman. Then, Clym asks her in an overgeneralization tone ‘Do girls often play..?’ Here, the overgeneralization of Clym happens through using the term ‘girls’ refers to his violation of the Mann maxim. He thus criticizes Eustacia indirectly:

Clym: “Do girls often play as mummers now? They never used to,”
Woman: “They don’t now?” (RN: 150)

In the same novel, Mrs.Yeobright’s U also shows her violation of the Mann maxim, by using ambiguous U. Mr.Wildeve asks her about the man whom Thomasin likes. She tells him that gentle women are not foolish to show their cards to men. This expression shows the use of overgeneralization strategy. She overgeneralizes her expression when she expresses it in general ‘gentle women’. It makes the situation more vague and obscure; and it is the duty of the H to infer the meaning of the situation:

Mrs.Yeobright: ‘The gentlest women are not such fools as to show every card’ (RN: 103)

The purpose of making such overgeneralization here is to criticize Wildeve for his neglecting to renew his proposal to Thomasin. It increases the tone of jealousy on him through reviving his propose of Thomasin from her aunt.
3.3.3.4 INCOMPLETENESS OR ELLIPSIS

The violation of the Mann maxim can take place through incompleteness of expression or ellipsis of the U. Ellipsis can be divided into three kinds; Syntactic ellipsis, Semantic ellipsis, and Pragmatic ellipsis. Here, Pragmatic ellipsis is the main concern of the present study. It is used to avoid clarity in meaning. This strategy can be used also to avoid expressing FTA and it is the device of self-defense. The Face Threaten Acts can be softened through the use of hanging implicature in the air. Sometimes, the interlocutor can use it to indicate something bad or foolish deed. It may be used to show misunderstanding of the message.

The following dialogue is from FMC where the girl asks Oak about the Buck’s Head. He replies her that he does not know any thing about it, and he asks her whether she would go to the Buck’s head to-night’ the girl replies ‘Yes – ‘and goes a way. The novelist Thomas Hardy here comments that ‘there was no necessity for any continuance of speech’ , and he adds that ‘the fact that she did add more seemed to proceed from an unconscious desire to show unconcern by making a remark, which is noticeable in the ingenious when they are acting by stealth:

Oak: ‘I don’t know where the Buck’s Head is, or anything about it. Do you think of going there to-night?’
The girl: “yes –” “you are not a Weatherbury man?”
(FMC: 56)

Here, the girl leaves the U incomplete thinking that the addresser will get the point, and it is a way of avoiding hesitation. Thus, the girl violates the Mann maxim by giving incomplete ellipsis.

The following example is from the novel of The MC that shows the use of the ellipsis. It gives an expression of hesitation to Henchard. The latter has asked the weather-caster to forecast if the weather will be bad or good. The reason beyond that Henchard
bought huge quantities of wheat, thought that the prices will go up on account of bad weather, and he will make a large profit by selling it:

\[ \text{Henchard: “I don’t altogether believe in forecasts, come to second thoughts on such. But I –” (MC: 225)} \]

Henchard violates the Mann maxim by uttering obscure U. His U is incomplete. He expects from the addressee to get the point and complete it by himself. The following U is from The RN, which shows the violation of the Mann maxim. The boy Charley, Eustacia’s servant violates the Mann maxim when he answers that he wishes. The boy’s U is incomplete because he uses ellipsis U. He gives the role to the H to draw his inference from it. The speech situation happens when he wishes Clym to give him some of Eustacia’s part to remember all the time Clym’s wife, as he is interested in her:

\[ \text{Clym: “You rather liked Miss, Eustacia, didn’t you?”} \]
\[ \text{Charley: “Yes, very much. Ah, I wish –”} \]
\[ \text{Clym: ‘Yes?’} \]
\[ \text{Charley: “I wish, Mr Yeobright, you could give me something to kee (RN: 402)} \]

Here, the boy uses ellipsis U deliberately to avoid the embarrassment of Clym. He, first, feels hesitated to talk to her husband in private topic and as he has an inferior status. It makes him to use this kind of strategy. Then Clym understands what the boy means, and he replies in affirmation ‘yes’ to approve his order.

**3.3.4.0 THE VIOLATION OF THE RELATION MAXIM** (Rel maxim)

Violation of this maxim is through stating irrelevant contribution to the context. Observing this maxim is also through making the contribution of the S relevant to the purpose in hand. In any context, both the S and H’s contribution need to be coherent and cohesive. Keeping coherence and cohesion in a text is away of avoiding irrelevant contribution and it is the way of observing Rel maxim. The flouting of this maxim
takes place when the addressee uses hinting, presuppositions and associative clues, which require previous knowledge or some background.

### 3.3.4.1 Hinting

Hint means to say something that one suggests in an indirect way. Sometimes, the Rel maxim has been violated by the S to show his politeness. This may be done through the indirectness when the S tries to hint at particular meaning indirectly. Here, he invites H to find some relation’s background to understand the U. Thus, the S says something, which is not explicitly relevant.

In The MC Henchard announces competition in a trade between himself and his rival Farfrae. He told his new corn-manager (Jopp) indirectly in order to make him to find links from himself to understand his U. He said ‘we two can’t live side by side ……..’ The S, (Henchard) tries to hint his worker Jopp on a particular subject indirectly. He means to crash his rival Farfrae down. They cannot live side by side together, as the latter has taken the business and his mistress (Lucetta). Hinting is at this point in its highest form of hostility between the two old friends:

```
Henchard; ‘We two can’t live side by side – that’s clear and certain’ (MC: 221)
```

Here, Henchard violates the Rel maxim, by telling irrelevant and indirect topic in the context.

In the novel FMC Oak confesses innocently to Bathsheba that he has been thinking to marry a woman with money. His U causes pain to Bathsheba, and she irritably says that she would not marry him at all. Moreover, it is impossible for her to accept his proposal. The addresser here says something that is not explicitly relevant. She says, that he has made an admission then. She violates the Rel maxim. She justifies her refusal that she is richer than him. Bathsheba’s U is irrelevant to the context. She gives chance to the H to infer her U:
Mrs. Yeobright in the RN uses hinting strategy. She talks to her son’s wife in an irrelevant topic:

*Mrs. Yeobright: ‘Will you excuse my asking this – Have you received a gift from Thomasin’s husband?’*  
*(RN: 244)*

Mrs. Yeobright, the mother of Clym and the aunt of Thomasin wants to know about the money she has given Wildeve in order to give his wife. Wildeve has gambled with the reddleman Diggory and lost the money. Mrs. Yeobright inquires her niece about the money whether she receives it or not. However, Thomasin tells her aunt that she has not received any money from him. Then her aunt thinks that Wildeve might have given it to his old mistress, Eustacia. She goes to her and asks her if she has received a gift from Wildeve. She indirectly and irrelevantly asks her about the gift. She uses hint U as it is in the interest of both of them (Eustacia and Wildeve).

The indirectness of this U invites the H (Eustacia) to find some link ideas to understand the U. This hint makes the H to inquire about the gift. Mrs. Yeobright here violates the Rel maxim, by using an indirect U.

### 3.3.4.2 ASSOCIATION CLUES

It is related to implicature, which is obtained through the violation of Rel maxim. In addition, it is associated with the act or expectation from the H. It is also used to conceal expressions like taboo words. Taboo, here, means a religious or social custom that forbids certain actions or words. The S can use these words in a euphemistic expression to avoid articulating what is forbidden.
This strategy can be used to avoid the expressions of death as well. For example, instead of saying ‘die’ one can say ‘is gone’ or ‘pass away’. Sometimes, direct reference to death causes unpleasant and miserable situation. Thus, using of euphemism instead of taboo expression is preferable to keep social feeling safe.

In FMC, Oak expresses his emotion to his sweetheart Bathsheba in an irrelevant way. He said that he is waiting in Boldwood’s farm, caring it and wishing in a thought of getting her some day. The phrase ‘getting her’ is an association clue. Oak uses it indirectly to mean that he wishes to marry her. The strategy of the association clue is used here to avoid directness of expressing love emotions. Bathsheba here does not understand his U and asks him what does he mean? It is now the job of the H to infer the meaning. Gabriel told her in plain British English as he said that he wanted to marry her, and he asked her to forgive his directness on the topic. Here, Oak violates the Rel maxim, being irrelevant to the context. He, first, uses euphemistic expressions to avoid expressing non-articulating U:

Oak: ‘I’m sniffing about her, and waiting for poor Boldwood’s farm, with a thought of getting you someday’
Bathsheba: ‘Getting me! What does that mean?’
Oak: ‘Marrying of ’ee, in plain British. You asked me to tell, so you musn’t blame me’ (FMC: 367)

In The RN, Eustacia requests her servant Charley to keep the fire burning. It is a kind of signal to her lover Wildeve to come to her. The S uses euphemistic expression to address the boy; avoiding articulating non-spoken U. She said, ‘there is nobody to play with her’. Her expression is a way of avoiding shocking words or impudent speech:

Eustacia: “but there’s nobody here to play wi’me”.
"I suppose nobody has come while I’ve been away?"
(RN: 64)

Here, Eustacia violates the Rel maxim as she uses an association clue ‘no body’ in indirect way. She has an intended meaning to mention, but the H cannot understand it. He only comments that ‘nobody except her grandfather.’

In The MC, Henchard expresses his liking for furmity and he says that he has never tasted it before. He enters a refreshment tent with his wife and an infant, orders two basin of furmity (a kind of dish prepared by boiling wheat in milk). He winks the owner of the tent who sells furmity to mix some rum with the furmity. This rum in the tent is unlicensed and its sale is illegal. Here, he avoids telling the name of alcohol or liquor as it is measured as taboo expression in some societies. However, he uses euphemized words like ‘furmity’ and ‘tasted’ to mean drinking alcohol. Under the impact of intoxication, he did a shameful deed, i.e. selling his wife. The violation here is the Rel maxim. The addresser uses an association clue to hide expressing taboo word, which is socially in some societies, are prohibited:

Henchard: ‘I always like furmity; and so does Elizabeth-Jane’, and so will you. It is nourishing after a long hard day’ ‘I’ve never tasted it,’ (MC: 13)

3.3.4.3 PRESUPPOSITION

The maxim of Rel can be violated through presupposition strategy. Using these words ‘another’ or ‘again’ makes the H to backward his memory to find any previous experience related to the context. Thus, it is the job of the H to infer what the S means. In addition, the words ‘even’ and ‘only’ can also indicate indeterminate meaning.
Another way of presupposition is by using contrastive stress. These stress words are ‘nowadays’, emphatic ‘do’ and writing in italics. This indicates that the meaning is implied and needs the H to draw his inference.

In FMC, Gabriel asks the girl (Fanny) the way to Warren’s Malthouse. The girl expresses her surprise as he is not a Weatherbury man. Oak replies that he is only a shepherd and has recently come. The girl, here, repeats Oak’s word ‘shepherd’ and she adds that he looks as a farmer by his ways:

The girl: ‘You are not a Weatherbury man?’
Oak: ‘I am not. I am the new shepherd – just arrived.’
The girl: ‘Only a shepherd – and you seem almost a farmer by your ways.’
Oak: ‘Only a shepherd,’  (FMC: 56)

The girl’s U ‘Only shepherd’ is irrelevant to the context, but it presupposes different meaning and it is the violation of the Rel maxim.

In The MC, Henchard warns his daughter, Elizabeth not to meet or dance with or talk to Farfrae. He tells her that he is an enemy of the house and takes a promise from her not to talk to him. Henchard hates Farfrae as he has taken his business and his mistress Lucetta as well. He hears the people of the Casterbridge praises the Farfrae, and blames him for his ignorant and rash behaviour. This incident increases the hostility and jealousy of Henchard, and makes him to tell his daughter not to talk to him, as he is the enemy. Henchard’s U ‘Only I want to caution you’ presupposes some meaning and only the H can deduce it. The Rel maxim is violated by Henchard’s irrelevant U:

Henchard: ‘Only I want to caution you my dear. That man, Farfrae – it is about him. I’ve seen him talking to you two or three times – he danced with ‘ee ...at all?’
Elizabeth: ‘No. I have promised him nothing.’
Henchard: ‘Good. All’s well that ends well.’ ‘I particularly wish you not to see him again’ (MC: 139)

In The RN, Eustacia asked the boy about the person who visited her place while she was away. The boy told her that no body visited her except her grandfather. She praises him by saying ‘good boy’. Later on, the boy heard some body coming. He told his mistress ‘I think I hear him coming again miss’. The word ‘again’ presupposes such kind of previous experience of the H to let her to infer it. Presupposition is used for checking out such kind of prior memory or experience. The boy here violates the Rel maxim at the level of presupposition. He therefore refers to his earlier explanation to his mistress that he has already told her:

The boy: ‘I think I hear him coming again, miss.’
(RN: 64)

Thus, the violation, here, is at the level of presupposition and it is a way of violation Rel maxim.

**PART TWO**

**STUDY OF POLITENESS PRINCIPLE (PP)**

**3.4.0 PRELIMINARIES**

This part is the most important part in the analysis and it can be called as the main body of the study. It explains the concept of PP and its pioneers. The three models of PP are studied profoundly with its functional role in the conversational analysis. Definitions of PP, models of politeness, i.e. (Brown and Levinson’s model; Leech’s model and Lakoff’s model) are studied in detail. The study aims at discovering the effectiveness of Positive and Negative Politeness and Leech’s maxims in the novels.
Here, one thing is to be made clear that Lakoff’s model to PP is studied only; it is not applied to the novels.

Politeness is the central concept in linguistic and it is the most important model of the study besides CP and SAT. According to Lakoff, Brown and Levinson, and Leech, PP is another level to conversational interaction besides the rules of CP. The origin of the word ‘politeness’ comes from the root of the English lexeme ‘polite’ which lies in the Latin past participle form ‘Politus’ meaning ‘Polished’.

Norbert Elias (1939) as cited in Watts (2003:32) states:

“Civilization is nothing but the long evolutionary process of human beings learning how to control bodily function, speech and attitudes, resulting in effective methods of self-control and social control”.

Thus, PP is based on the observations of Leech’s model (1993) who proposes that the PP accounts for certain conversational behaviour that CP does not adequately explain. He further suggests that while the CP regulates what we say, the PP maintains the social equilibrium and the friendly relations, which make possible to take for granted that our interlocutors are being cooperative.

3.4.1 DEFINITIONS OF POLITENESS PRINCIPLE

The following thinkers define PP in different ways as follows:

Grundy, (1995:127) defines politeness as ‘one manifestation of the wider concept of etiquette, or appropriate behaviour.’

Fraser (1990:233) defines Politeness as ‘a state that one expects to exist in every conversation and that participants rather that the S is violating the conversational construct’.
Politeness is an act or a set of acts, or stretch of behaviour, which is performed by individual in social interaction. (Werkhofer, 1992:155)

According to Lakoff (1990:34), ‘Politeness is a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange’.

Watts (2003:40) states that Klein argues that Shaflesbury (1994:4) located the discourse of politeness in the social circles of the gentry for three reasons:

a- ‘Politeness’ is situated in ‘company’, in the realm of social interaction and exchange, where it governs the relations of the self with others. While allowing for differences among selves, ‘Politeness’ is concerned with coordinating, reconciling or integrating them.

b- It subjects this domain of social life to the norm of ‘pleasing’.

c- ‘Politeness’ involves a grasp of form.

Arndt and Janney (1985:282) see Politeness as ‘interpersonal supportiveness’.

Brown and Levinson (1978) view Politeness as ‘a complex system for softening face-threatening acts’ (FTAs).

Politeness is one of the constraints on human interactions, whose purpose is to consider other’s feelings, establish levels of mutual comfort, and promote rapport’. (Hill et al, (1986:349)

Fraser and Nolen (1981:96) see Politeness as ‘a property associated with a voluntary action’.

Bellegrade’s ideological conceptualization of Politeness as cited in Watts (2003:39) as follows:

1- Politeness is the ideal union between the character of an individual and his external actions (e.g. the language which / that individual uses).
2-Politeness is the ability to please others through one’s external actions (e.g. through one’s language usage).

3-Politeness is the natural attribute of a ‘good’ character.

4-Politeness is socially acquired state of mind that is judged to have reached a state of being ‘polished’ and of thereby being in conformity with a set of society accepted forms of behaviour.

3.5 MODELS OF POLITENESS

Here an attempt is made to study three models of politeness as advocated by Brown and Levinson (1978), Leech (1985) and Lakoff (1979). However, in the analysis of the novels, the two models of politeness i.e. “Brown and Levinson’s model and Leech’s model to Politeness” is applied only. Lakoff’s model is only studied without applying in the analysis.

3.5.1 BROWN AND LEVINSON’S CONTRIBUTION TO PP

The ‘Model Person’ of Brown and Levinson is an attempt to ‘reconstruct systematically the rationality that underlies polite talk.’ It seeks to obscure or hide Grice’s intention. Their model is not an attempt to reconstruct what might be going on in a person’s mind but rather a means to the end of ‘solving a problem’ in linguistic model of pragmatics, and not in psychology or sociology of language. (Werkhofer, 1992:155)

The modern view of politeness seeks to do the opposite of what Grice intended. Whereas Grice was seeking a means to explain how individuals successfully convey their intentions without literally expressing them.

According to Watts (2003:110), Brown and Levinson’s Model Person seeks to obscure or hide those intentions due to the following defects of the Gricean model of pragmatics:

A- Does not adequately explain how addressees derive the implicature they do.

B- Does not account for other implicatures that might also be derived.
C- Ignores the possibility that an address might infer more than one implicature and thus, be faced with a potential dilemma in deciding which of them is most appropriate to the content of the U. the study applies the PP to solve these problems mention above.

Brown and Levinson (1978:16), on the other hand, base their rationalism on Erwing Goffman’s concept of ‘face’. They propose Grice-like principles of politeness that are rationally motivated by the desire to preserve face. Face can be defined as the ‘public self-image’ that every member wants to claim for himself. It consists of two dimensions: ‘Positive Face’ and ‘Negative Face’.

1- **POSITIVE FACE** is linked to the desire to be appreciated and win approval.
2- **NEGATIVE FACE** is concerned with freedom of action and freedom from imposition.

The analogous definitions suggest comparing between positive and negative freedom as follows: Positive Freedom is the freedom to express, to vote, and to select a career; Negative Freedom is to be free from oppression, from threat to safety, political persecution, intellectual domination, etc. some acts that threaten interlocutors. Positive Face as mentioned by Brown and Levinson are criticism, disagreement, irreverence, bringing of bad news, rising of divisive topics, etc. Those that threaten the Negative Face are orders, requests, advice, threats, and warnings.

From the above explanation of ‘Positive Politeness’ and ‘Negative Politeness’ of Brown and Levinson’s model one discovers that the distinction between Positive Politeness Strategies (those that show the closeness, intimacy, and rapport between S and H) and Negative Politeness Strategies (those that indicate the social distance between S and H). The linguistic behaviour can be thoroughly understood through the dialogic discourse employed in plays, novels and short stories. On the other hand, Politeness Strategies (e.g.: greetings, apologies, offerings, suggestions, requests,
complaints, refusals, disagreements, corrections, thanking) can be used as a parameter of analysis.

3.5.2 LEECH’S CONTRIBUTION TO PP

Leech takes a Rhetorical approach to the study of general pragmatics by which he means ‘the effective use of language in its most general sense, applying it primarily to everyday conversation, and only secondarily to more prepared and public uses of language.’

Leech (1983:15) recognizes two systems of Rhetoric:
1-**Textual Rhetoric**; which consists of the following sets of principles: the Processibility Principle, the Clarity Principle, the Economy Principle and the Expressivity Principle.
2-**Interpersonal Rhetoric**; which, among others, consists of the following sets of principles: The Cooperative Principle (i.e. Grice’s CP), the Politeness Principle (PP) and the Irony Principle (IP).

According to Leech, (1983: 82) the function of Pragmatics is being ‘problem-solving’. Consequently, it ‘relates the sense (or grammatical meaning) of an U to its pragmatic force’ by means of inference process made by the H. This is to say that the purpose of the PP according to Leech model is to establish and maintain feelings of comity within the social group. The PP regulates the ‘social equilibrium and the friendly relations which enables us to assume that our interlocutors are being cooperative in the first place’. This, again, is a clear evidence of an evaluative and normative position in spite of claiming the contrary.
INTERPERSONAL RHETORIC

(Cooperative Principle)

1. Maxim of Quantity.
2. Maxim of Quality.
3. Maxim of Relation.
4. Maxim of Manner.

(Politeness Principle)

1. Maxim of Tact.
4. Maxim of Modesty.
5. Maxim of Agreement.
6. Maxim of Sympathy.

(Irony Principle)

1. Understatement (Litotes)
   (Quantity Violation)
2. Exaggeration.
   (Quality Violation)
3. Overstatement (Hyperbole)
   (Quality Violation)

(Adopted from Leech, 1983)
Diagram No: 2
The above diagram no (2) shows that Leech’s Interpersonal Rhetoric consists of Grice’s CP and the PP, which can be useful particularly in the violation of the CP or PP or both. He writes about some other principle, such as Irony Principle (IP). The IP enables a speaker to be impolite but seems to be polite. It is expressed either in Understatement which is a violation of the Quant Maxim or Exaggeration which is a violation of the Qual Maxim. Furthermore, Leech writes about “Hyperbole” or (Overstatement) and “Litotes” or (Understatement) as a violation of the CP. Hyperbole is a violation of the Qual Maxim, and Litotes is the violation of the Quant Maxim. All these principles of the IR can be also used in one’s analysis of humourous writing like novels, dramas and short stories. This study systematically discusses the humours which are found in Hardy’s novels.

The PPs’ pioneers Lakoff (1989), Brown and Levinson (1987) and Leech (1983) have put an emphasis on the PP as it is used ‘to reduce friction in personal interaction’. It is related to how language expresses social distance between the Ss in their different role relationships. Here, Leech views that PP is an abstract quality residing in individual exacting expressions, lexical items or morphemes, without regarding for the particular circumstances that govern their use which is not always true. The social position of the Ss relates to one another may indicate different politeness values.

The central concept in Leech’s model is that of a cost-benefit scale of politeness related to both the S and the H. Politeness, according to Leech, involves minimizing the cost and maximizing the benefit to S/H. The PP, thus, consists of six maxims, all of which are related to the notion of cost and benefit, and related to pair of values. In this part, an attempt is made to deal with the Interpersonal Rhetoric, which contains the CP, as it is shown above in the diagram No (2). Moreover, the PP is discussed in this part. [Part Two]
Leech suggests six maxims to PP, and recounts them to the concept of cost and benefit. Besides these cost and benefit concepts are related to pairs of values as it is shown in the following diagram:

![Diagram of Politeness Principles](image)

Leech (1983:132) suggests six maxims to be taken into consideration by the interlocutors. These maxims are applied to the novels of Hardy under the study. These maxims are:

3.5.2.1 **The TACT MAXIM** is applicable to illocutionary functions and it is classified by Leech as ‘impositive’ e.g. ordering, requesting, commanding, advising, recommending, etc. and commissive: e.g. promising, vowing, offering, etc.

A- Minimizing cost to other.
B- Maximizing benefit to other.

3.5.2.2 The GENEROSITY MAXIM is applicable in impositives and commissives.
   A- Minimizing benefit to self.
   B- Maximizing cost to self.

3.5.2.3 The APPROBATION MAXIM with its functions classified by Leech are ‘expressive’ e.g. thanking, congratulating, pardoning, blaming, praising, condoling, etc. and ‘assertive’ e.g. stating, boasting, complaining, claiming, reporting, etc.
   A- Minimizing dispraise of other.
   B- Maximizing praise of other.

3.5.2.4 The MODESTY MAXIM is applicable to expressive and assertive.
   A- Minimizing praise of self.
   B- Maximizing praise of other.

3.5.2.5 The AGREEMENT MAXIM is only applicable to assertive.
   A- Minimizing disagreement between self and other.
   B- Maximizing agreement between self and other.

3.5.2.6 The SYMPATHY MAXIM is only applicable in assertive.
   A- Minimizing antipathy between self and other.
   B- Maximizing sympathy between self and other.

3.5.3 LAKOFF’S CONTRIBUTION TO PP
Lakoff (1979) distinguishes three kinds of Politeness from behavioural points of view.
The following types of Politeness as introduced by Lakoff are:
1-Polite Behaviour, which is clear when interlocutors follow the politeness rules,
whether expected or not.
2-Non-Polite Behaviour, which indicates to non-conforming with politeness rules where conformity is not expected.

3-Rude Behaviour, where politeness is not transferred even though it is expected.

Watts (2003:103) states:

“Lakoff’s models and Leech’s models of linguistic politeness are focused on the interpretation of pragmatic meaning, even when it is obvious that linguistic forms which would be classified by native Ss as polite either explicitly or implicitly encode social meaning”.

Lakoff suggested two rules to Pragmatic Competence, both composed of a set of sub rules, namely 1- Be clear; 2- Be polite. The rule no 1 (Be clear) is really the Gricean CP, which he renames the ‘rules of conversation’. The next rule, rule no 2 (Be polite) consists of a subset of three rules, R1: Don’t impose; R2: Give options; and R3: Make (addressee) feel good – be friendly.

Lakoff’s model to Politeness as follows:
LAKOFF’S MODEL OF POLITENESS

Polite Behaviour
(Interlocutors follow the Politeness Rules.)

Non-Polite Behaviour
(Interlocutors do not follow the Politeness Rules.)

Rude Behaviour
(Interlocutors deviate from the Politeness Rules.)

(Adopted from Lakoff, 1979, as cited in Ghanim, 2003:111/12)
According to Kasper (1990:205), the first two types of politeness (polite behaviour, non-polite behaviour, and rude behaviour) are different from the third in that they both are in accordance with polite behaviour. While rudeness is constituted by deviation from whatever counts as polite in a given social context, is inherently confrontational and destroys the social harmony, for instance when someone says: I didn’t mean to be rude.

Here, it shows that he admits having violated rules of polite behaviour. PP have a great effect on language use; they are largely determinates of linguistic behaviour and have universal status and linguistic expressions.

According to Watts (2003:59), Lakoff suggests location of pragmatic rules to complement syntactic and semantic rules and adds a set of ‘rules of Politeness’ to Grice’s CP, which she redefines as the ‘rules of conversation’. Lakoff means that Pragmatic has rules, like ‘Don’t impose’ ‘Give options’ and ‘Make ‘A’ (addressee) ‘feel good’. (Lakoff, 1973) certainly shows an awareness of the need for harmonious social interaction. It is true that Politeness is often aimed to achieve maximum benefits for the S and H at a minimum cost to both parties, and that Politeness relates to the goal of ‘establishing and maintaining comity’.

Lakoff’s Pragmatic Competence has been presented logically in diagram No (6) below:
Lakoff’s Pragmatic Competence (PC)
Rules of Politeness

Be clear.
Rules of Conversation
(=Grice’s CP)

R1: QUANTITY
Be as informative as required. Be no more informative than required

R2: QUALITY
Only say what you believe to be true.

R3: RELEVANCE
Be relevant.

R4: Manner
Be perspicuous. Don’t be ambiguous. Don’t be obscure. Be succinct.

Be Polite.
Rules of Politeness

R1: Don’t impose.

R2: Give options.

R3: Make A feel good. Be friendly.

Diagram No: 5
The three models discussed above have common features but there is still dominance of one model over the other. It is clear that Leech’s model is more practical and comprehensive than the other models. The models of Brown and Levinson; and Leech’s are used in the analysis of Hardy’s selected novels (i.e. (FMC), (RN); and (MC).

**APPLICABLE MODELS TO THE ANALYSIS**

The study applies the two models of politeness principle to the analysis of the selected novels of Hardy. These models are: Brown and Levinson’s model and Leech’s model of (PP). However, Lakkof’s model of PP is mentioned only, not applied to the analysis.

### 3.6.0 APPLICATION OF BROWN AND LEVINSON’S MODEL

Brown and Levinson (1978: 107/136) suggest fifteen strategies which are under the heading ‘Positive Politeness’; the other ten strategies suggest under the heading ‘Negative Politeness’.

Face has two types:

- **Type one:** 1-*Positive Face* is the desire that one’s attributes, achievements, ideas, possessions, goals, and so on should be desirable to others.
- **Type two:** 2-*Negative Face* is one’s desire not to be imposed on by others (Brown and Levinson (1987) as cited in Robert Harnish).

The following diagram will show more about Brown and Levinson’s division of PP into Positive and Negative Politeness; and the analysis of this model to the novels will be followed after the following diagram:
BROWN AND LEVINSON’S MODEL OF (PP)
POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE POLITENESS STRATEGIES

Diagram No: 6
(Adopted from Brown and Levinson’s PP, 1978)

POSITIVE STRATEGIES

1- Notice H’s admirable qualities, possessions, show interest, exaggerate.
2- Use colloquialisms or slang to convey in-group membership.
3- Use ellipsis to communicate understanding.
4- Use first name or endearing term to show familiarity.
5- Claim common view by showing knowledge of H’s wants.
6- Seek agreement, raise or presuppose common ground, engage in small talk or jock.
7- Give reasons, make the activity seem reasonable to H.
8- Use inclusive form ‘we/let’s’.
9- Assert reciprocal exchange.
10- Give sth: desired gifts, sympathy.

NEGATIVE STRATEGIES

1- Be conventionally indirect: inquire into H’s ability/willingness to comply.
2- Use Hedges.
3- Use subjunctive to express pessimism.
4- Use words/phrases minimizing the imposition.
5- Give deference by using honorifics.
6- Use formal word choices.
7- Apologize.
8- Impersonalize.
9- Use the past tense to create distance in time.
10- Nominalize.
3.6.1 BROWN AND LEVINSON’S TYPES OF PP MODEL

According to Brown and Levinson’s model of PP, politeness has two types’ positive politeness and negative politeness. These types are:

**TYPE ONE**

**POSITIVE POLITENESS**

3.7.0 INTRODUCTION

Brown and Levinson (1978:103) state that ‘Positive Politeness’ techniques are usable not only for FTA redress, but in general as a kind of social accelerator. It includes three broad mechanisms, which can be used to achieve Positive Politeness strategies. These mechanisms are:

a- Claim common ground.
b- Convey that S and H are co-operative.
c- Fulfill H’s want for some X.

3.7.1 CLAIM COMMON GROUND

According to Brown and Levinson (1978:66) claim common ground mechanism “is the first mechanism of Positive Politeness which involves the S’s claiming ‘Common Ground’ with H through showing that S and H both belong to some set of persons who share special wants including goals and values”. This mechanism has eight strategies and the last of them have other sub-strategies.

There are three ways of achieving the Claim of Common Ground.

1- By conveying common want, goal, and object liked by S and H.
2- By stressing common membership in a group, but S and H.
3- By showing common perspective with H although S is not in-group member.
The above ways of stressing, conveying and showing common ground has eight positive politeness strategies applied by Brown and Levinson as follows:

### 3.7.1.1 Notice; attend to H (his/her interests, wants, needs, goods)

S should note and approve H’s interest, wants, possession, goods and things that interest him. Also, notice any remarkable changes and noticeable possessions. Greeting may also be a mechanism to achieve this strategy.

This is an example from FMC, where Bathsheba asks Mrs.Coggan about Boldwood who is the gentleman. Mrs.Coggan replies that it is Mr.Boldwood, and she continues describing him to her mistress; praising him by saying that he is a gentleman-farmer at Little Weatherbury. She also adds that he is forty, very handsome, rather stern-looking, rich and not married:

*Bathsheba: ‘Who is Mr.Boldwood?’*

*Mrs.Coggan: ‘A gentleman - farmer at Little Weatherbury’*

*Bathsheba: ‘Married?’*

*Coggan: ‘No, Miss’*

*Bathsheba: ‘How old is he?’*

*Coggan: ‘Forty, I should say – very handsome – rather stern-looking – and rich’ (FMC: 77)*

The use of compliments here is strategic. Coggan tries to establish solidarity between her mistress and Boldwood. When Bathsheba hears these details about Mr.Boldwood, she feels sorry that she has not been in a position to meet him personally as she is not properly dressed and therefore, she orders Mrs.Coggan to go and tell him that she can not see him. Coggan’s compliment to Boldwood includes his appearance (gentleman,
handsome and stern-looking) and the addressee’s material possessions like (rich and farmer) are remarkable.

In The MC, Newson compliments his wife Susan. He praises her in front of her old husband Henchard who has sold her to him. He says that ‘she is a warm-hearted, home-spun woman, simple-minded, guiltiness and like a saint:

Mr.Newson: ‘She was a warm-hearted, home-spun woman. She was not what they call shrewd or sharp at all – better she had been’ ‘she was simple-minded enough to think that the sale was in away binding. She was as guiltless o’wrong-doing in that particular as a saint in the clouds.’ (MC: 346)

Here, Newson’s intension is to compliment her old husband. He has done it to clarify his views to Henchard.

This example is from The RN, where Mrs.Yeobright asks her niece about her husband Mr.Wildeve, whether he treats her well or not. Thomasin replies that he is ‘pretty fairly’. It happened when the latter one asks the former one to give her some money. Mrs.Yeobright thinks that Wildeve treats her niece badly as she is in need of money, and he does not give her. However, Thomasin praises her husband by saying that he is pretty fair:

Mrs.Yeobright: “Is he kind to you, Thomasin?”

Thomasin: “Pretty fairly”

Mrs.Yeobright: “Is that honestly said?”

Thomasin: “Yes, Aunt. I would tell you if he were unkind.” (RN: 215)
Here, Thomasin praises her husband to show the H (Mrs.Yeobright) that he is not a bad man. She adds that if he is unkind, she will complain him to her.

3.7.1.2 Exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with H

This is done with exaggerated intention, stress and other aspect of prosodies with intensifying modifiers (very, too etc.) or exaggerative words or particles like: sure, really, exactly, absolutely, indeed, surely. It uses the element of prosodic as intention and stress.

In FMC Mr. Gabriel Oak tries to claim common ground with Bathsheba by showing his pleasure when she runs after him to clarify her aunt’s mistake, as she has given him wrong information, that some of young men have courted her. The exaggeration words, which Oak used, are ‘Really’ and ‘truly’ show his interest in and approval to her:

\[ \text{Bathsheba: ‘- It was quite a mistake – aunt’s telling you I had a youngman already,’ ‘I haven’t a sweetheart at all .........it was such a pity to send you away thinking that I had several.’} \]

\[ \text{Oak: ‘Really and truly I am glad to her that!’} \]

\[ (FMC: 36) \]

The above example shows the exaggerating approval strategy from the S to the H in its highest rate.

Another best example is from The RN in which the Reddleman Diggory Venn exaggerates in describing Eustacia’s power and influence to folk men. He says that he needs her help to use that power to convince Wildeve to marry her instead of Thomasin. As he is interested in Thomasin and he wants to marry her, but Wildeve is standing in his way. Eustacia uses intensifying words ‘too much’, and ‘indeed’ which give the context intensification. She emphasizes on the situation by using the intensification words as she
could not believe that the people of the heath believe in her influence over folk men to do that:

Reddleman: “As the only lady on the heath I think you might,”

Eustacia: “You think too much of my influence over men folk indeed, reddleman. If I had such a power as you imagine I would go straight and use it for the good of anybody who has been kind to me.’

(RN: 95)

In The MC, the situation of exaggeration is a kind of sarcasm and it gives a sense of sympathy to the weak woman Susan who has been exhibited in the auction to be sold with her daughter. Henchard, her husband, becomes extremely intoxicated and starts to talk recklessly selling his wife for the person who will pay five guineas. He says ‘the ruin of promising young men is by early and thoughtless marriages’. When the auctioneer offers Henchard’s wife with three guineas and nobody accepts the offer, he surprisingly and exaggeratedly says:

Henchard: ‘Good Lord, why she’s cost me fifty times the money, if a penny. Go on.’ (MC: 18)

The use of the phrase ‘Good Lord’ is an exaggeration and the situation makes the reader to sympathize with his wife.

3.7.1.3 Intensify interest to the H in the S’s contribution

The S, sometimes, refers to some event in the past, which he/she cannot forget it because of its greatest effect. It is by making a good story. Its function is to pull the H right into the middle of the event being discussed, and consequently increasing intrinsic interest in him.
The following U by Eustacia to Wildeve in The RN, where the S (Eustacia) tries to pull the H (Wildeve) into the middle event, by discussing their old love affairs relation and refreshes it by intensifying her intrinsic interest in him. She says:

_Eustacia: “I have had no word with you since you – you chose her, and walked about her, and deserted me....’

‘Don’t begin speaking to me as you did, Damon; you will drive me to say words.’ “I would not to say to you...”

_Wildeve: “Eustacia! Could I forget that last autumn at this same day of the month, and at the same place you lighted...?” (RN: 67)"

The event, here, shows that Eustacia wants to draw her lover Wildeve to the middle of the dialogue by reminding him their previous relationship and love-affairs in Budmouth. Wildeve here recollects his thoughts and expresses his feelings about the last autumn meeting with her in the same day of the month and at the same place.

Similarly, in The RN, the reddleman’s U ‘that is Mr.Wildeve who passed, miss’ to Eustacia intensifies his intention to vex her and bringing her into the dialogue. Eustacia says ‘Yes, I saw him coming up the hill’ and she inquires surprisingly ‘Why should you tell me that?’ Her inquiry increases the vagueness of the situation. It gives her a chance to suspect that perhaps the reddleman knows her secrets with Wildeve. Eustacia’s question gives the reddleman a chance to pull her into the event. He says ‘he is glad to hear that you can ask it’ and adds ‘and; now I think of it, it agrees with what I saw last night.’ Let us have a cursory glance at the following conversation between reddleman and Eustacia:
Reddleman: “That was Mr. Wildeve who passed, miss.”

Eustacia: “Yes, I saw him coming up the hill,” “why should you tell me that?”

Reddleman: “I am glad to hear that you can ask it”

“And, now I think of it, it agrees with what I saw last night”

Eustacia: “Ah – what was that?” (RN: 155)

The above example shows how the Reddleman draws Eustacia to the middle of the event to discuss the matter with her and to increase the interest and intention of the H to the situation.

In The MC novel, Mr. Henchard, the Mayor of Casterbridge asks his former corn-manager Mr. Farfrae about his old story, the second woman who suffers from the thoughtless intimacy with him. He begins his conversation with the question ‘Do you remember’ and it is repeated three times, to show his stress on hearing Farfrae’s opinion. Here, Henchard tries to draw Farfrae to the dialogue, as he knows that Lucetta has left him and becomes his own. Henchard uses Wessex dialect in his speech to Farfrae and makes him to share his anxiety and bad feeling. Study the following conversation:

Henchard: ‘Farfrae!’

‘Do you remember,’

‘do you remember my story of that second woman – who suffered for her thoughtless intimacy with me?’

Farfrae: ‘I do.’

Henchard: ‘Do you remember my telling ‘ee how it all began and how it ended?’

Farfrae: ‘yes’
Henchen: ‘Well, I have offered to marry her now that I can; but she won’t marry me. Now what would you think of her – I put it to you?’

Farfrae: ‘Well, ye owe her nothing more now,’

(MC: 216)

The above dialogue shows how much the S (Henchen) contributes to intensify the H’s interest (Farfrae). Hardy, the novelist comments on this situation by saying: “as if it were the presence of the thought and not of the man which made him speak”.

The following example is the finest example to show the intensity of interest to the H in the S’s contribution. In FMC, Oak intends to know the name of the girl who has saved him from the fire, which broke out in his hut. He thanks her and says, ‘I believe you saved my life, Miss – I don’t know your name. I know your aunt’s ….’ the girl refuses to declare her name by saying ‘she would just as soon not tell it –…’ Oak’s Us show his intension to pull the H (Bathsheba) in a talk, when he asks her about her name, and she persists to say that he knows her aunt’s name not hers. He intends to drag her into a dialogue:

Oak: ‘I wonder if I should have died?’

The girl: ‘O no!’

Oak: ‘I believe you saved my life, Miss – I don’t know your name. I know your aunt’s, but not yours’

The girl: ‘I would just as soon not tell it – rather …’

Oak: ‘Still I should like to know’ (FMC: 31)

The S’s contribution, here, shows his extremist interest to the H (Bathsheba) as it is shown through the use of the intensification strategy.
3.7.1.4 Use in-group identity markers in speech

It involves the S who can claim common ground with the H by using various ways of conveying in-group identity markers. These include:

(a) Address forms like the second person
(b) Use of jargon or slang
(c) Contraction and ellipsis

In addition, there are some other ways of using in-group identity markers, which are slang or abusive terms, diminutives, endearment terms and fictive kinship terms.

In The MC, Susan addresses her daughter by using endearment terms. She says ‘my dear Elizabeth-Jane’. This is used to show her intimate moment between the mother and her daughter:

*Elizabeth:* ‘Why did we hinder our time by coming in here?’ ‘I thought you wished to get onward?’
*Susan:* ‘Yes, my dear Elizabeth-Jane,’ (MC: 29)

The above reference term ‘my dear’ shows in its highest form of using endearment terms that mother addresses her daughter.

Another example from The MC when Henchard, the Mayor of Casterbridge addresses the Scotchman Mr.Farfrae ‘my lad’ appealing him to stay and becomes his corn-manger:

*Henchard:* ‘Ah, my lad,’

‘you should have been a wise man, and have stayed with me.’ (MC: 75)

The use of the endearment term ‘my lad’ is a manner from Henchard to persuade Farfrae to work with him. It also shows that the person is from close circle of the family.
In the RN, Cym addresses his sweetheart Eustacia as ‘my Eustacia’. The use of the endearment here, shows how great the relationship between the lovers develops in less than three months and brings them together. In addition, Eustacia addresses her lover as ‘Cym, dearest’. It is a good strategy used as an identity marker:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Cym: } & \text{“My Eustacia!”} \\
\text{Eustacia: } & \text{“Cym, dearest!”} \quad (RN: 199)
\end{align*}
\]

The above endearment expression speaks volumes about the intensity of the interlocutors’ emotional attachment. Hardy in this context comments ‘no language could reach the level of their condition as they remained long without a single utterance as their use of endearment expressions.

The following example from FMC offers a very good speech event using endearment expressions, which gives the context a touch of pathos. The conversation is between the two lovers, Troy and Fanny. Fanny is in love with the soldier Troy who has previously promised her for marriage. She comes to his regiment and requests him to fulfill his promise. She calls him to come down to meet her but he says ‘the barrack gates are closed, and he has no leave’. Here, Troy addresses Fanny in an endearment tone ‘my dear Fan’. Let us study the following linguistic exchange:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Fanny: } & \text{‘Can you – come to me?’} \\
\text{Troy: } & \text{‘My dear Fan, no! The bugle has sounded, the barrack gates are closed, and I have no leave’} \quad (FMC: 89)
\end{align*}
\]

There is another most excellent example shows using sincere endearment terms from the novel FMC. In the end of the novel, Oak the hero of the novel, tells his mistress with sincere endearment expression ‘My own dear’, by adding sense of belonging. The following conversation is worth studying:
Bathsheba: ‘Because you never ask’

Gabriel: ‘Oh – oh!’

‘My own dear - ’ (FMC: 367)

It is fine example of using endearment expression. Bathsheba, here, tells Oak that he does not ask her for marriage. It happened when Oak decides to leave her service, she comes to him to bring together their relation, and they decide to marry.

3.7.1.5 Seek agreement in safe topics

This is used to satisfy H’s desires to be right or to be agreeing with in his opinion and this happens by repeating part of what the preceding S says. The common ground can be claimed by raising safe topics such as, current happenings, complaints and so on.

The following dialogue is between Boldwood and Troy in FMC which shows the repetition of the full part of Boldwood’s U from the H’s side. It shows the support of the H (Troy) to the S (Boldwood):

Boldwood: ‘Sergeant Troy?’

Troy: Yes – I am sergeant Troy’

Boldwood: ‘Just arrived from up the country, I think?’

Troy: ‘Just arrived from Bath’ (FMC: 215)

This is a sign of positive politeness in seeking agreement with such safe topics. The repetition of the full phrase of Boldwood’s U shows greater desire of the H (Troy) to listen and to please him in the conversation. The above dialogue is the first dialogue and meeting between these two rival characters (Boldwood and Troy).

The following Us between Joseph and Bathsheba are from FMC. Bathsheba seeks agreement from Joseph when she says ‘Whose sweetheart, did you say, Joseph?’ and
Joseph says ‘I don’t know ma’am’. Bathsheba again wants to assure him when she says ‘Are you quite sure?’ he replies her ‘yes’ and repeats the same U of his mistress saying ‘quite sure’. This happens when Bathsheba begin to suspect of her husband’s infidelity, as he has love affairs with her servant Fanny. Joseph’s reply is in an affirmative way to satisfy the H’s wants:

\[
\text{Bathsheba: ‘Whose sweetheart did you say, Joseph?’} \\
\text{Joseph: ‘I don’t know, ma’am’} \\
\text{Bathsheba: ‘Are you quite sure?’} \\
\text{Joseph: ‘Yes, ma’am, quite sure’ (FMC: 261)}
\]

The following conversation between Wildeve and Eustacia is from The RN. It shows the development of the relationship between these lovers after this meeting. Wildeve’s U to Eustacia ‘I have seen your bonfire all the evening’ shows that he is attracted because of the message of the H. Eustacia’s reply to him shows her total agreement to the S and she repeats some part of the addresser’s U on purpose of satisfying the S’s wants. The response of the lover (Wildeve) to her desire is done through accepting the sign and his coming to see her:

\[
\text{Wildeve: “I have seen your bonfire all the evening.”} \\
\text{Eustacia: “Of course you have seen my fire,”} \\
\text{(RN: 67)}
\]

The following conversation is between Henchard and his daughter (Elizabeth-Jane) from The MC. The mother of the latter, Susan has sent her with a letter to her stepfather telling him that she has returned after a long time absence. Henchard has sold Susan with her daughter to the sailor (Newson), Elizabeth’s real father with five guineas. Susan was told that her second husband was drowned in the sea. She has come back to Casterbridge looking for her first husband (Henchard). Henchard asks Susan’s daughter ‘Are you her daughter?’ thinking her that she is his daughter whom once he sold her with her mother.
Elizabeth replies ‘Yes sir – her only daughter’. Here, Elizabeth repeats some part of Henchard’s words. The repetition illustrates her agreement to his question from the H’s side and from the S’s side the H satisfies his desires:

Henchard: ‘Are you her daughter?’
Elizabeth: ‘Yes sir – her only daughter’ (MC: 85)

This example is also from the same novel The MC which shows total agreement of the H to the addresser. Elizabeth states that she likes to accompany her friend Lucetta much better than her step-father Mr.Henchard. This happens because of the quarrels which burst with each other, she decides to stay with her friend. Lucetta expresses to Elizabeth her total contentment and agreement to her staying with her. She repeats the word ‘yes’ to show her agreement:

Elizabeth: ‘I like your company much!’
Lucetta: ‘Yes, yes – so do I yours!’ (MC: 188)

The linguistic expressions of Lucetta show her good impression to Elizabeth as she accepts her to stay in her home.

3.7.1.6 Avoid disagreement

Here, the interlocutors are expected to avoid confrontation to maintain social relationships. Sometimes, the disagreement threatens the interlocutors. The token agreement, pseudo agreement and white lies are useful for redress.

The following example is from The RN, which shows application of the strategy of avoiding disagreement. Eustacia expresses her agreement with the boy Johnny when the latter blames her for not being obliged to him as he keeps the bonfire light. However,
indirectly she tells the boy to keep it as ‘there is nobody to play with her there’, and she adds ‘that nobody has come while she has been away.’ Her intension is to mention indirectly to Mr.Wildeve whether he comes or not:

*The boy:* “Are you not much obliged to me for making you one?”

*Eustacia:* “Yes, but there’s no body here to play wi’me.”

“I suppose nobody has come while I’ve been away?”

*(RN: 64)*

Here, Eustacia’s reply to the boy shows the use of token agreement strategy. This agreement appears to be half-hearted because she directly says ‘that nobody has come’ so this agreement is strategic.

The following example is from The MC. Susan proves her agreement with her daughter Elizabeth-Jane when the latter asks her mother the reason of encumbering their time to come to Casterbridge. Susan wants to send an indirect message to her daughter by saying ‘she has a fancy for looking up here’, which is in fact a technique of refreshing her memory to remember the day of Henchard’s selling and the sailor’s purchasing her. She indirectly says to Elizabeth that she looks for their relative:

*The maiden:* ‘Why did we hinder our time by coming in here?’ ‘I thought you wished to get onward?’

*Susan:* ‘Yes. My dear Elizabeth-Jane,’ ‘But I had a fancy for looking up here,’ *(MC: 29)*

Thus, the agreement of the mother to her daughter is to keep the social relationship and to avoid the confrontation with her. She expresses her token agreement with her daughter with half-heartedness because of her passing with miserable time. The use of endearment
phrase ‘my dear Elizabeth-Jane’ is striking to show an intimacy between Susan and her daughter.

Another example which shows avoidance of the S’s disagreement with the addressee is from FMC. Bathsheba and her servant Laban Tall share the dialogue about William Smallbury whom Bathsheba sent him to Casterbridge to bring the news about Fanny. Bathsheba asks Laban Tall ‘Hasn’t William Smallbury been to Casterbridge?’ Laban’s reply shows her avoidance of disagreement with her mistress. She says ‘Yes, ma’am, but he’s not yet come home…’ This kind of strategy is called token agreement. Laban does not want to argue with her mistress directly, but she tries to avoid her disagreement by using contradiction. She says ‘yes’ and justifies his postponing as ‘he promises to go back by six’. Here, the servant avoids displeasing her mistress:

Bathsheba: ‘Hasn’t William Smallbury been to Casterbridge?’
Laban Tall: ‘Yes, ma’am, but he’s not yet come home.
He promised to be back by six.’ (FMC: 80)

3.7.1.7 Presuppose, raise, and assert common ground
This is used by talking for a while about unrelated topics. Also by making S speaks as if H is S; or H’s knowledge were equal to S’s knowledge. The way of claiming common ground with the addressee is to support his/her point of view.

The following example is from The MC where Henchard, the Mayor of Casterbridge, is requested to have a talk with Elizabeth, not in business. The latter is sent with letter from her mother, to inform the former that she (Susan) Elizabeth-Jane’s mother has come back to him. Moreover, if he is interested to see her, she is available in the Three Mariners Inn. Thus, Elizabeth’s request to Henchard to talk in unrelated topics fulfills the strategy in its highest rate:
Elizabeth-Jane: ‘Can I speak to you – not in business, sir?’

Henchard: ‘Yes – I suppose’

Elizabeth-Jane: ‘I am sent to tell you. sir’ ‘that a distant relative of yours by marriage, Susan Newson, a sailor’s widow, is in the town ; and to ask whether you would wish to see her’

Henchard: ‘Oh – Susan is – still a live?’

Elizabeth: ‘Yes, sir’ (MC: 85)

Here, Henchard supports the common ground of the addressee (Elizabeth). He hearkens to her and goes on conversing with her.

In FMC, Gabriel once takes a walk-in his way to his cottage. He meets his mistress Bathsheba and tells her that there are some bad characters. He advises her to be careful of them, but Bathsheba tells him that she has never met any bad character. Here, the common ground is not supported from the H (Bathsheba). Although Oak asserts his talking about bad characters, she does not pay attention to any one of such type. The topic, which he discusses with her, is irrelevant. However, he expresses his jealousy with his enemy Troy who has taken her from him:

Bathsheba: ‘Oh, is it Gabriel?’ ‘You are taking a walk too- Goodnight.’

Oak: ‘I thought I would come to meet you, as it is rather late.’

Bathsheba: ‘Thank you, indeed, but I am not very fearful.’

Oak: ‘O no, but there are bad characters about.’

Bathsheba: ‘I never met them.’ (FMC: 181)
In The RN, Eustacia supports and asserts common ground of Clym. It is when the latter remembered his past time when he was young, his longing to Paris, as Eustacia’s longing now. He has gone to Paris and he has worked there for five years. Eustacia wishes to go there to have perfect cure as her lover did. Eustacia asserts and supports the common ground of the S by saying ‘Heaven send me such a cure’. Study the following conversation:

*Clym:* “I remember when I had the same longing for town bustle. Five years of a great city would be a perfect cure for that.”

*Eustacia:* “Heaven send me such a cure!” (RN: 191)

Thus, it is amply clear from the above discussion that presupposing, raising and asserting common ground are some of the vital linguistic tools in the interpretation of Thomas Hardy’s novels.

**3.7.1.8 Use of Jokes to put the H at ease**

Joking is a basic positive politeness technique that is to put H ‘at ease’. It can create loveable atmosphere between the S and the H. Exchanging jokes help to share background knowledge or common situation. Jokes also can be minimized a FTA of requesting.

In another speech situation, the novel FMC, Gabriel Oak proposes to Bathsheba to marry him. He tells her that he loves her deeply and would make her happy. He promises her to buy a piano and a ten-pound gig for going to the market, and continues telling her his future plans, which he will achieve them for her sake. These wishes are expressed in a humorous atmosphere.
Oak, here, creates amiable atmosphere to the addressee (Bathsheba). The change of jokes also creates mutual background knowledge. The S, here, uses some jokes to satisfy the H’s desires, and the addressee expresses her satisfaction by saying “yes”, and repeating “I should like that” two times. It demonstrates her total agreement with the addressee:

Oak: ‘I can make you happy’ ‘You shall have a piano in a year or two – farmers’ wives are getting to have pianos now – and I’ll practice up the flute right well to play with you in the evenings.’
Bathsheba: ‘Yes; I should like that.’
Oak: ‘And have one of those little ten-pound gigs for market – and nice flowers, and birds – cocks and hens I mean, because they be useful.’
Bathsheba: ‘I should like it very much.’
Oak: ‘And a frame for cucumbers – like a gentleman and lady.’
Bathsheba: ‘Yes.’
Oak: ‘And when the wedding was over, we’d have it put in the newspaper list of marriages.’
Bathsheba: ‘Dearly I should like that!’ (FMC: 37/8)

Here, Bathsheba responds to his futuristic plans to make her happy is indicated by the short utterances in contrast with the utterances of Oak.

3.8.0 CONVEY THAT S and H are CO-OPERATORS
The mutual cooperation between S and H can be shown in three ways:
1- By noticing and caring for H’s wants.
2- By claiming reflexivity.
3- By claiming reciprocity.
Here are six sub-strategies to realize this cooperation linguistically.

3.8.1 Assert or presuppose knowledge of and concern for H’s wants
When S asserts that, he knows about H’s wants and is willing to cooperate with him. It presses him to be cooperative with the H and vice versa.

The following linguistic exchanges are from The RN between Eustacia and her grandfather, which show the use of this strategy. The latter calls the former to come indoors as it is late, and he adds that she has wasted all the fuel which he has kept to Christmas. Eustacia says that she has promised Johnny a bonfire as it pleased him, she requests from her grandfather to precede her, and she will follow him later on. Thus, Captain Vye asserts that he knows about Eustacia’s wants and presents his cooperation with her by allowing her to waste all his precious thorn roots, which he has kept to Christmas:

Captain Vye: “When are you coming indoors, Eustacia?” “’Tis almost bedtime ....you have burnt ’em nearly all!”
Eustacia: ‘I promise Johnny a bonfire, and it pleases him not to let it go out just yet,’ ‘Grand-father, you go in to bed, I shall follow you soon’ (RN: 64)

The details which was given by Captain Vye to Eustacia is a sign of his cooperation with her and telling her to stay a little with the boy.

The following dialogue is from FMC. Gabriel asked Bathsheba if she can allow him to love her, to win her and to marry her after all. Bathsheba replies that he will never know that she loves him and he does not ask her. Here, Bathsheba shows her willingness to be
his wife after all her refusals in the beginning of the novel. The addressee, here, asserts to cooperate with the addresser:

*Gabriel:* ‘If I only knew one thing - whether you would allow me to love you and win you, and marry you after all – If I only knew that!’  
*Bathsheba:* ‘But you never will know,’  
*Gabriel:* ‘Why?’  
*Bathsheba:* ‘Because you never ask.’  
*(FMC: 367)*

Thus, Gabriel’s assertion to marry her was fulfilled through her acceptance to his proposal and shows her total cooperation with him.

In The MC, Henchard’s response to Elizabeth-Jane shows that he is cooperative with her. He has fulfilled the H’s wants. It happens when he says ‘I approve of anything you desire to do’. In the beginning of the novel, Henchard forbids Elizabeth to meet Farfrae or to dance with him whereas in the end of the novel, everything changes. When Farfrae becomes the Mayor as an alternative to Henchard, he satisfies the preceding of Farfrae to his daughter. Consequently, he expresses his total cooperation to her, and approves any step she forwards it. The S, here, asserts his cooperation to the H’s wants and tries to fulfill them:

*Elizabeth:* ‘I am sorry you have decided on this,’ ‘For I thought it probable – possible – that I might marry Mr Farfrae some little time hence, and I did not know that you disapproved of the step!’  
*Henchard:* ‘I approve of anything you desire to do, Izzy’ ‘If I did not approve it would be no matter!’  
*(MC: 369)*
Thus, the above example shows the use of this strategy in its highest form as it shows the total approval of the S’s to the H’s desires.

3.8.2 Offers and Promises

Here, the speaker gives offers, promises even if they are false and offered on purpose to satisfy H’s positive face wants. These offers and promises demonstrate S’s good intentions to satisfy also H’s positive face wants.

The following U is from the novel, The MC. Henchard offers Donald Farfrae a job of corn-manager. When Farfrae hears the traders talking about the bad wheat crop, he sends a note to the mayor Henchard, and informs him how to improve the crop. Henchard then requests Farfrae to work with him. He said ‘If you bide and be my………’ Let us examine the following utterance:

\[
\text{Henchard: ‘If you will bide and be my manager, I will make it worth you while’ (MC: 63)}
\]

In (FMC), Gabriel expresses his gratitude to Miss. Bathsheba Everdene for saving him from the fire. He says ‘I believe you saved my life, Miss’ showing his gratefulness to her. On the next day, he goes to her farm and offers her a lamb gift. He also proposes her from her aunt:

\[
\text{Gabriel: ‘I’ve brought a lamb for Miss Everdene. I thought she might like one to rear; girls do.’ (FMC: 35)}
\]

In The RN, the character Diggory Venn promises Eustacia to keep her secrets, i.e. (her relationship with Wildeve). The fact is that Wildeve proposes to Thomasin, and at the same time he has love affairs with Eustacia. The reddleman has seen them meeting and sharing their love. Here, Diggory asks Eustacia to compel Wildeve to stop talking to Thomasin and lets him to win her. Eustacia understands that Diggory knows everything
about them (Wildeve and Eustacia). She tells him that she has lost her self-respect, as she reveals to the reddleman that. However, the reddleman promises her to keep her secret relations with Wildeve, as there is no one in the Heath who knows their relation and meeting except him:

Eustacia: “But I lose all self-respect in the talking to you. What am I giving way to!”  
Venn: “I can keep secrets,” “You need not fear I am the only man who knows of your meetings with him.”  
(RN: 98)

3.8.3 Be optimistic that the H wants what the S wants

It assures S’s cooperativeness with H. It is done by using expressions such as a little bit, for a second or, just. S should maximize optimism to H’s wants.

The following U is from The MC where the S (Henchard) achieves redress through the expressions of optimism. When Henchard meets his wife Susan after eighteen years of absence, he decides to take a cottage for her and her daughter as Mrs. Newson’s widow, and he will propose her again. This is because of his shameful deed when he had sold her. He wants to avoid Elizabeth-Jane’s feeling and even the people of the Casterbridge from knowing the truth of their relation and his selling to them. Susan, here, shows her hopes to what Henchard wants and offers to help them. They both exchange their cooperation to find suitable solution to their case:

Henchard: ‘I have thought of this plan that you and Elizabeth take a cottage in the town as the widow Mrs Newson and her daughter,
Susan: ‘I am quite in your hands Michael, (MC: 93)
Hence, Henchard confirms his statement to be cooperative with Susan, and the addressee accepts the offer by her total emphasizes when she said ‘I am quite in your hands Michael.’

3.8.4 Include both S and H in the activity

This strategy can be achieved by using the inclusive ‘we’ form. S uses inclusive form ‘we’ instead of ‘you’ and ‘me’. Everyone likes to be included in the message as it suggests solidarity. This strategy of the addressee softens the FTA and it suggests cooperativeness, which indicates politeness.

The following dialogue is from FMC, where Fanny Robin the sweetheart of Sergeant Troy, requests him in a kind manner to marry her through using inclusive form ‘we’. She has done this to avoid losing her self-respect. She uses the first person plural pronoun to indicate that she and Troy are included in the message. She asks Troy ‘When shall we be married, Frank?’ and she adds ‘and we live in two parishes’. Troy’s promise, also includes the inclusive form ‘we’. He says ‘We’ll settle in a few days’. These three Us that contain the inclusive form ‘we’ that removes the embarrassment of Fanny’s request for her favour:

Fanny: ‘When shall we be married, Frank?’
Troy: ‘Oh, I see. Well – you have to get proper clothes.’
Fanny: ‘And we live in two parishes.’
Troy: ‘Do we? What then?’ ‘We’ll settle in a few days’ (FMC: 89/90)

In The MC, Susan and Henchard meet after eighteen years of separation and decide to renew their marriage:
Henchard: ‘Well - we must talk of a plan for keeping her in her present belief, and getting matters straight in spite of it.’

Susan: ‘Yes,

Henchard: ‘We’ll go away at once. I only came to see …’

Susan: ‘I’m quite in your hands, Michael, (MC: 93)

Both the husband and the wife agree to hide the reality of Elizabeth-Jane’s father, and their kin relation from her. Henchard’s U ‘we must talk of a plan.’ indicates that both the S and the H are included in the matter. The use of inclusive form ‘we’ indicates that Susan here is also required in the matter.

In The RN, Clym and Eustacia talk about their plan of getting married. They share their ideas by using the inclusive form ‘we’. They both are included in the activity due to the use of inclusive form ‘we’. Their highest intimacy relation comes into climax. Clym’s Us ‘we will be married at once’, ‘we certainly can both being of full age’ and ‘we can do it at a very little expense’ are notable as far as the use of inclusive form ‘we’ is concerned. These Us show that both the addresser and the addressee are included to fulfill the activity of getting married. Clym’s mother opposes the marriage; she does not attend his wedding:

Clym: “We will be married at once.”
Eustacia: “O Clym!”
Clym: “Do you agree to it?”
Eustacia: “We certainly can, both being of full age ……we can do it at a very little expense.”
Eustacia: “How long shall we have to live in the tiny cottage, Clym?” (RN: 211)
Thus, we see the highest reciprocation of sharing love and agreement between the lovers. The use of inclusive form ‘we’ here makes the message very clear and easy to be conveyed and it shows the prevention of the embarrassment between the S and the H.

3.8.5 Give or ask for reasons, make the activity seem reasonable to H

Asking and giving reason from both the S and H makes the activity more reasonable, especially to the H.

This example is from The RN. The addresser, Mrs. Yeobright, supplies unwanted information when she goes on giving unnecessary details. She really wants to go away from the addressees (Fairway and Olly). However, she cannot directly express her wish to leave. Instead, she gives a number of reasons, which are apparently irrelevant to the topic:

Mrs.Yeobright: “I am sorry to stop the talk,” “But I must be leaving you now. I was passing down the Anglebury Road, towards my niece’s new home, who is returning tonight with her husband; and seeing the bonfire and hearing Olly’s voice among the rest I came up here to learn what was going on. I should like her to talk with me, as her way is mine.”

(RN: 40)

Here, the above U explains that if Mrs.Yeobright has said directly to Fairway and Olly ‘I must be leaving’, this will be a FTA wish, but she softens the situation by giving convincing reasons for her departure.

In the novel FMC, Boldwood asks Troy the reason of deserting Fanny and goes to take Bathsheba. Troy provides reasons for that. He says that he loves Fanny best. However,
Bathsheba had inflamed him and displaced Fanny for a time. Boldwood’s question was replied by Troy in a reasonable way, which made the former satisfied with it. The second question Boldwood asks Troy about the reason for his getting back again as it injures his happiness a lot. Troy answers by giving reasons of his returning in a convincible way as ‘there are weighty reasons’. It is fifty pounds, which is promised by Boldwood to be paid as a financial support for him to marry Fanny:

_Boldwood:_ ‘O, Troy, if you like her best, why then did you step in here and injure my happiness?’

_Troy:_ ‘I love Fanny best now,’ ‘But Bathsheba – Miss Everdene inflamed me, and displaced Fanny for a time. It is over now.’

_Boldwood:_ ‘Why should it be over so soon? And why then did you come here again?’

_Troy:_ ‘There are weighty reasons. Fifty pounds at once, you said!’ (FMC: 217)

In _The MC_, Henchard asks Lucetta the reason of her coming to Casterbridge. She replies him convincingly that she has come to marry him for her conscience’ since he is free. He tells her that he is now ready to marry her and she should fix a date for the purpose. He also asks her ‘Why then don’t you think so now?’ Lucetta indirectly deviates from the topic of the S, on account of avoiding direct embarrassment. She does not want to tell him directly that now she loves another one and wants to marry him, not Henchard. She adds some reasons to justify her refusal to marry him, she says ‘I was a poor girl then; and now my …….’ Let us have a cursory glance at the following conversation:

_Henchard:_ ‘Why did you come here to find me, then?’
Lucetta: ‘I thought I ought to marry you for conscience’ sake, since you were free, even though I – did not like you so well’
Henchard: ‘And why then don’t you think so now?’
Lucetta: ‘I was a poor girl then; and now my circumstances have altered, so I am hardly the same person’  (MC: 235/6)

Here, Lucetta could have frankly talked to Henchard that she was in love with Farfrae and wouldn’t marry him, but this U will have a FTA. She tries to soften the context by giving him convincing reasons as her circumstances have been changed (being rich).

3.9.0 FULFILL H’s WANTS FOR SOME X

3.9.1 Assert reciprocal exchange or tit for tat
It shows the asserting of the reciprocal exchange between the addresser and addressee. Sharing mutual benefits, helping and cooperation between the S and the H is a good way to be polite.

The following conversation is from The MC. It shows the use of the assertion of reciprocal exchange strategy between the addresser (the boy) and the addressee (Henchard). The boy is sent to meet Farfrae to oblige the daughters of a deceased farmer in Durnover. He has met Henchard, not Farfrae, and asks whether Mr. Farfrae will come. Henchard inquires why Mr. Farfrae?’ and he also adds more inquires ‘Why do people always want Mr. Farfrae?’ The boy here praises Farfrae when he says that the people like him because he is cleverer than Mr. Henchard and knows more. Henchard, here, offers him six pence as a fair to tell him more about what people say about Farfrae and against him.
The asserting of Henchard to the boy in giving him reciprocal exchange is fulfilled in this context. As one requests the other to give information and the other gives fair, six pence. It is a way of sharing mutual benefits between the S and the H. Study the following piece of conversation:

The boy: ‘But please will Mr Farfrae come?’
Henchard: ‘I am going that way.....why Mr Farfrae?
‘Why do people always want Mr Farfrae?’
The boy: I suppose because they like him so – that’s what they say.’
Henchard: ‘Oh, there’s more? Of course there’s more! What besides? Come, here’s sixpence for a fairing.’ (MC: 124)

In The RN, Eustacia requests the boy Charley to give her his role in the play, which will be in Mrs.Yeobright’s house on the occasion of Christmas celebration. Charley agrees on condition to join hands with her. Eustacia and Charley assert their reciprocal exchange, the former (Eustacia) to join hands, and the latter (Charley) to give his part as the Turkish Knight in the play:

Eustacia: “Which part do you play, Charley – the Turkish Knight, do you not?”
Charley: “Yes, miss, the Turkish Knight,”
Eustacia: “Would you let me play your part for one night?”
Charley: “Oh, miss. But your woman’s gown – you couldn’t.”
Eustacia: “What must I give you to agree to this?”
Half a crown?”
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Charley: “You know what you forbade me at the Maypoling, miss,”
Eustacia: “Yes’ ‘You wanted to join hands with me in the ring if I recollect?”
Charley: “Half an hour of that, and I’ll agree, miss”
Eustacia: “Make it a quarter of an hour,”
(RN: 130/1)

The above example is the best example of fulfilling the assertion strategy, which states that S and H shall share reciprocal exchange between them.

In FMC, Mr. Boldwood offers five hundred to Troy as a favour to marry Bathsheba as far as possible. He advises him to ‘Love her best, love her tenderly’. He also adds ‘But I wish you to hasten in this marriage…’ This assertion from Boldwood to Troy has a significant meaning. In the beginning, Boldwood tells Troy that he has spoilt his happiness because he has previously proposed to Bathsheba, and she promised to marry him. When Troy appears on the scene she leaves Boldwood and turns to Troy. Here, Boldwood offers him money to marry her and tells him to hasten in that marriage. It is an ironic situation and has some contradiction. The reciprocal exchange is that Boldwood will pay money to Troy, if he hastens his marriage to Bathsheba:

Boldwood: ‘I’ll do anything for you, only don’t desert her; pray don’t desert her, Troy’
Troy: ‘Which, poor Fanny?’
Boldwood: ‘No, Bathsheba Everdene – Love her best!
Love her tenderly!’
Troy: ‘I don’t wish to secure her in any new way’
Boldwood: ‘But I wish you to hasten on this marriage! It will be better for you both, you love each other, and you must let me help you to do it’
Troy: ‘How?’
Boldwood: ‘why, by settling the five hundred on Bathsheba instead of Fanny, to enable you to marry at once’ (FMC: 220)

The interlocutors, in the above conversation, follow the assertion strategy. It is the offer of the money from the S’s side to the H.

3.9.2 Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)
Here, the speaker can satisfy the H’s positive face wants through giving compliments, praises, condolence and these are called emotional gifts, and the material gifts are like flower, money, book etc.
The following U is from The RN, Eustacia tells the boy Charley to keep the bonfire and she will give him six pence:

Eustacia: “Stay a little longer and I will give you a crooked sixpence,” (RN: 64/5)

Here, Eustacia’s gift is in a way that she sympathizes with H (the boy) because of his keeping the fire for a long time without wage. Thus, she has given him six pence as a wage for his staying.

In FMC, the following example shows the use of giving gift strategy. Miss. Bathsheba asks Troy about the time as she has wasted too much time in talking with him. Troy inquires surprisingly by saying ‘what, haven’t you a watch, miss?’ Bathsheba replies that she has not had it at that moment, but she will get a new one.
Troy here takes it as a chance to strengthen his intimacy with her. He hands her his golden watch saying, ‘you shall be given one, a gift’. Thus, the S has given the H a gift as a mean of fulfilling this strategy. From the addresser side the gift represents a manner of interest and offering the cooperation to the addressee:

*Bathsheba: ‘Dear me, I wish I knew what o’clock it is – I am going – I have wasted too much time here already!’*  
*Troy: ‘What haven’t you a watch, miss?’*  
*Bathsheba: ‘I have not just at present – I am about to get a new one’*  
*Troy: ‘No. You shall be given one. Yes – you shall. A gift, Miss Everdene – a gift’ (FMC: 169)*

In The MC, Lucetta expresses her willingness to help her old lover Mr. Henchard in his debt. She offers him a help to pay off his debt. She knows that he is passing through a bad patch in his life, being bankrupt. She thinks to pay his debts to satisfy him so that he will free her to marry his friend, Farfrae. She shows her sympathy to him by supporting him in his bad situation:

*Lucetta: ‘I’ll help you to pay off your debt.’  
(MC: 254)*

Thus, the strategy here fulfills the intension of the speaker. Here, the S (Lucetta) shows sympathy and extends her cooperation to pay the debts of the H (Henchard) as it fulfills his wants.
TYPE TWO
NEGATIVE POLITENESS (NP)

3.10.0 INTRODUCTION
This section explains the meaning of NP and its strategies. These strategies are discussed in detail in the context of the utterances of the characters from the novels. The strategies have two-board mechanisms and ten sub-strategies, which have been addressed to the H’s negative face.

Negative politeness is used for creating social distance, and its orientation towards negative face of the H. Here, Brown and Levinson (1978:134) have stated, ‘Negative Politeness is a redressive action addressed to H’s negative face; his wants to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded.’ The linguistic realization of NP are conventional indirectness, hedges on illocutionary force, polite pessimism (about success or a request, etc.), the emphasis on H’s relative power which includes sub-strategies of NP.

Lakoff (1973:298) states two rules of formality and defense, which indicate the same thing about NP strategies. These two boards of mechanisms are:
1- Communicate S’s wants to be not impinged on H.
2- Redress other wants of H’s.

The following ten sub-strategies addressed to the H’s negative face are:

3.10.1 Be conventionally indirect and don’t presume/ assume
It inquires into H’s ability/willingness to comply. Sometimes, the S experiences a clash between being direct using bold-on record expression and at the same time being indirect using off-record strategy. According to Leech (1983:108):
'Indirect illocutions tend to be more polite as they increase the degree of optionally and also as the more indirect an illocution is, the more diminished and tentative its force tends to be.'

The following example is from The MC. Henchard asks Lucetta in a sarcastic manner but indirectly ‘Can you tell me the time, ma’am?’ His purpose here is to bitter her indirectly:

Henchard: ‘For we humble workmen here feel it a great honour that a lady should look in and take an interest in us,’ ‘can you tell me the time, ma’am?’

Lucetta: ‘Yes,’ ‘half-past four’

Henchard: ‘Thank ‘ee. An hour and a half longer before we are released from work, Ah, ma’am, we of the lower classes know nothing of the gay leisure that such as you enjoy!’ (MC: 282/3)

This indirect question has a sting in the tail. However, Henchard avoids being direct sarcasm. His direct statements and his inquiring about the time is a way of committing others to the situation.

In FMC, Bathsheba’s servant, Liddy asks her mistress about the man whom she plays by the means of Bible and the key to marry. This is a Latin expression, which is used for foretelling the future, by using the Holy book. The interlocutor here (Liddy) avoids indicating the name of the person and asks in an indirectly way. Here, the S is more polite to the H. Study the following utterance:

Liddy: ‘Did you ever find out, miss, who you are going to marry by means of the Bible and key?’ (FMC: 95)
This question is called a rhetorical question which does not need an answer on the part of the hearer. In fact, the answer is hidden in the S’s utterance. Liddy knows the person whom her mistress playing on him and he is Boldwood. Liddy’s U is used here to avoid the directness of addressing the S, her mistress and in order to create a pleasant atmosphere suitable to the speech situation.

In the RN, Clym asks Eustacia whether she is a woman –or he is wrong. This question is asked when Clym has seen a ‘like-woman’ playing the role of the Turkish Knight. He suspects her and avoids asking her a direct question. He asks her indirectly in a way of being conventional, and to avoid the embarrassment of the H. Look at the following question:

\[ Clym: \text{“Are you a woman – or am I wrong?”} \]

\[ (RN: 150) \]

3.10.2 Do not assume willingness to comply

Here, the speaker uses questions and hedges in a conversation. Hedge is a particle word, or a phrase that modifies the degree of membership of a predicate or NP. According to Oxford Dictionary, ‘hedge’ means ‘to avoid giving a direct answer to a question’. According to Lakoff (1973:47) ‘Hedges’ means ‘words whose meaning implicitly involves fuzziness or words whose job is to make things fuzzier or less fuzzy’. ‘Fuzzy’ here means not clear or vague.

There are three kinds of hedges as discussed below:

3.10.2.1 Hedges on illocutionary force

In The RN, the turf-cutter Sam expresses surprisingly to Mrs. Yeobright that he is glad, as her son Clym will visit her at Christmas. Here, he conveys his feeling through an indirect statement, which implicates his strong feeling:
Sam: ‘I am glad to hear that your son Mr.Clym is coming home at Christmas, ma’am,’ ‘What a dog he used to be for bonfires!’ (RN: 39)

In FMC, Mr.Bolwood offers a business transaction with Troy in telling him to give up the idea of marrying Bathsheba and marry Fanny. He also tells him that he will give him money to prepare himself for the marriage:

Boldwood: ‘I intend a business transaction with you.’
Troy: ‘I see,’ ‘suppose we sit down here.’
Boldwood: ‘I was engaged to be married to Miss Everdene’ ‘but you came and –’
Troy: ‘Not engaged,’ (FMC: 216)

Here, Boldwood uses the strategy of hedge to avoid imposing on Troy. Moreover, he softens him through the transaction.

In The MC, Henchard receives a note from Scotchman that tells him the ways of improving corn crop. He asks the waiter who has given the note. The waiter tells him that it is from a stranger who stays at Three Mariners. Henchard meets him there and requests him to work with him as a corn-manager:

Henchard: ‘If you will bide and be my manager, I will make it worth your while’ (MC: 63)

Here, Henchard offers the work to the Scotchman with hope and strong feeling of acceptance of the Scotchman, as he is facing a crucial problem of that season.
3.10.2.2 Hedges addressed to Grice’s Maxims:
1- Quality hedges
2- Quantity hedges
3- Relevance hedges
4- Manner hedges (these hedges are explained in detail in part one)

3.10.2.3 Hedges addressed to politeness strategies and prosodic or kinesics hedges
Hedges are linguistic expressions that enable the S to avoid directness in his/her U such as the raising of eyebrow, the earnest frown and the hesitation which indicates the S’s attitude to what he is saying.

The function of ‘Hedge’ is to protect face-needs and to make the S avoid imposing on people.

3.11.0 Be pessimistic about ability or willingness to comply
Here, the speaker should use the subjunctive terms while addressing to the H. The term ‘subjunctive’ means the form of expressing doubt, possibility or wish. Here, the S should be pessimistic when he is asking the H to offer help. This is the best way to convince the H to accept the S’s demand.

In The MC, Elizabeth-Jane meets Henchard the Mayor of Casterbridge in the beginning of the novel for the first time, ignoring that he is her stepfather. She hands him a message from her mother. She asks him in a pessimistic way ‘Can I speak to you - ……?’ Here, the H shows his readiness to listen to her and opens a dialogue with her:

Elizabeth: ‘Can I speak to you – not on business, sir?’
Here, the S (Elizabeth) uses the subjunctive term ‘can’, hoping that the H will cooperate with her by way of listening and offering help.

In The RN Eustacia asks the reddleman to let her get rest in his van. Her question evokes doubt whether the H will satisfy the S’s wants or not:

\begin{align*}
\text{Eustacia:} & \quad \text{‘Would you allow me to rest a few minutes} \\
& \quad \text{in your van?’} \\
\text{Reddleman:} & \quad \text{‘Certainly, miss; I’ll make a place for you.’} \quad (RN: 155)
\end{align*}

The H (the reddleman) satisfies the demand of the S and offers more help to her as he says ‘I’ll make a place for you’

In FMC, the U of Fanny to her lover, requesting him to marry her, has a pessimistic tone to make the H to comply.

\begin{align*}
\text{Fanny:} & \quad \text{‘When shall we be married, Frank?’} \\
\text{Troy:} & \quad \text{‘Oh, I see. Well – you have to get proper clothes.’ ‘I have money. Will it be by banns or license?’} \quad (FMC: 89)
\end{align*}

The S hopes that the H is willing to respond to her demand but the S is still doubtful. Fanny’s request to her lover is spoken in a bashful tone. As she asks him first, ‘When will it be?’, and the H (Troy) claims that he does not recollect what she means by her question. Then, she feels pessimistic of his possibility to obey her or not. Thus, she plainly asks him to fulfill her demand (marrying her) and he finally presents his inclination to comply.
3.11.1 Minimizing the imposition

Speaker should minimize the obligatory orders or forcing demands. Such use of words and phrases to minimize the imposition are ‘just a little’, ‘a tiny bit’, ‘any’, ‘merely’ etc”. These words and expressions of minimizing the imposition achieve the goal of the speaker.

In FMC, Bathsheba, in her first meeting with the farmer Gabriel Oak, whom she has saved from the fire in his hut, tries to minimize the imposition by telling him her name just in time. She uses the expression ‘just as soon’ to minimize the imposition:

*Oak: ‘I believe you have saved my life, Miss – I don’t know your name. I you’re your aunt’s, but not yours.’
*Bathsheba: ‘I would just as soon not tell it – rather not. There is no reason either why I should, as you probably will never have much to do with me’ *(FMC: 31)*

Here, this expression ‘just as soon’ relieves the H’s tension. The S gives some reasonable reasons as she says ‘you probably will have never reason to do with me’

In The MC, Henchard visits Lucetta with the purpose to renew her promise to marry him. He tells her that he has decided to get married in the next fortnight. He uses the minimizing expression to relieve the awkward situation. Although he tries to press her to marry him, these expressions ‘a little’, ‘just’ and ‘less than’ minimize the imposition:

*Lucetta: ‘if it were anything else,’
Henchard: ‘But it is such a little thing’ ‘Less than you have offered – just the beginning of what you have lately promised’ *(MC: 252)*
The RN has an excellent example offering minimizing expression to minimize the obligatory orders or demands. The character Thomasin addresses Clym Yeobright in a very polite way using minimizing expressions ‘at least’, ‘just a little’ and ‘merely’. She uses most of minimizing expressions. This to assert her willingness to obey the H. she avoids using plain expressions. When Clym requested her to join him in the party ,she kindly pardons him as she is not well and promises him to half plenty of talk. She tries to pull herself from the awkward situation safely by using minimizing expressions such as ‘just a little.’ Let us consider the following linguistic exchange:

Thomasin: ‘I cannot. At least I would rather not. I am not well enough,….holiday.’
Clym: ‘It isn’t nearly so pleasant without you. Are you really ill?’
Thomasin: ‘Just a little, my old cousin – here,’ ‘I merely stepped down, Clym, to ask you –’ (RN: 148)

In the above linguistic exchange, the S is careful in the choice of words while minimizing imposition.

3.11.2.0 Give deference

It is achieved when the S humbles and abases himself by using the honorific expressions like, Sir, Madam, Lady, Miss, etc. The linguistic manifestation of deference politeness can be realized using the following terms:
1- Honorifics, 2- Greetings and compliments, 3- Plural pronouns for singular address, 4- Extended kinship terms, 5- Regular deferential terms, 6- Honorific suffixes and fictive kinship terms, 7- Nonverbal acts.

3.11.2.1 Honorifics

It has three types of honorifics which are:
1- Addressee honorifics (deals with S – addressee axis)
2- Referent honorifics (deals with S – Referent axis)
3- By-stander honorifics (deals with S – By-stander axis)

In FMC Oak addresses Bathsheba by her name without using honorific expression. He says ‘Well, then, Bathsheba!’ as his emotion is to win her and marry her. However, the addressee Bathsheba corrects him and reminds him to call her ‘Miss Everdene’. Here, she comments by adding the phrase, ‘you mean’ ‘Miss Everdene, you mean’. The important use of the honorific expressions is to keep distance between the S and the H. Look at the following conversation:

Oak: ‘Well, then, Bathsheba!’
Bathsheba: ‘Miss Everdene, you mean’ (FMC: 129)

Chapman, R. (1990: 136) comments in this situation by saying:

‘Titles, surnames and forenames from a hierarchy which Hardy conveys through choices of language. The world of (FMC) is particularly marked by subtitles of position. Bathsheba is ‘Miss Everdene’ to Gabriel while he works for her as a shepherd; when his emotion breaks through, the relationship is emphasized’.

It is plain that Oak is merely a worker to Bathsheba, and when he addresses her by indicating her plain name “Bathsheba”, without using the honorific term ‘Miss’. It is a kind of violation of the social norms. Thus, there should be some distance between the servant and the mistress.
In The MC, Henchard, the Mayor of Casterbridge addresses Farfrae, the Scotchman as his lad. Being the Mayor, Henchard calls people who are lower than his status by their names. Here, in the beginning of the novel, Henchard is the Mayor; he calls his worker (Farfrae) as ‘my lad’. However, at the end of the novel the status has been changed. Henchard becomes a worker to Farfrae and he calls him Mr. Farfrae. Study the following utterances:

Henchard: ‘Ah, my lad,’ ‘you should have been a wiseman, and have stayed with me’ (MC: 75)

Henchard: ‘Farfrae – Mr Farfrae!’
Farfrae: ‘Yes?’
Henchard: ‘Come back to Casterbridge at once!’
(MC: 338/9)

In The RN, the boy Johnny addresses his mistress by her plain name as ‘Eustacia’. Here, it irritates her. She says to him ‘Miss Vye, sir’. She wants to show him that he should keep a distance between his mistress and him, as he is from lower status and she is from higher prestigious family. Although the addressee (Eustacia) here enjoins superior social status, she uses deferential mode for an inferior person (Johnny). She addresses him as ‘sir’ to make other to keep the status distance:

Eustacia: “Put in one piece of wood every two or three minutes, ...And if you hear a frog jump into the pond with a flounce like a stone thrown in, be sure you run and tell me, because it is a sign of rain.”
The boy: “Yes, Eustacia.”
Eustacia: “Miss Vye, sir.”
The boy: “Miss Vy–stacia.” (RN: 65)
3.12.0 COMMUNICATE S’s WANTS TO BE NOT IMPINGED ON H

This strategy includes four strategies which are as follows:
1- Apologize, 2- Impersonalize the S and the H, 3- State the FTA as an instance of a general rule, 4- Nominalize to distance the actor and add formality. These strategies are:

3.12.1 Apology

According to Brown and Levinson, apologies can be expressed in three ways: 1- Admit the impingement, 2- Indicate reluctance and 3- Beg forgiveness.

In The MC Farfrae goes to visit Elizabeth-Jane as they show him that she stays up in the hill where Lucetta lives. When he comes and inquires about Elizabeth, he can not find her. Further, he thinks that he has made a mistake. He, therefore, begs forgiveness from the lady and says ‘he is very sorry’, using the high degree of intensity ‘very’. His pardoning is in its highest and he adds some reasons of his coming:

Farfrae: ‘O, I’ve made a mistake!’ ‘But I’m very sorry!’ ‘I can and I inquired for Miss Henchard, and they showed up heere, and in no case could I have caught ye so unmannery if I had known!’

(MC: 191)

Similarly, in the same novel, in one of the speech situation, Henchard asks his daughter-in-law to forgive him for his roughness in the former days. He expresses his reluctance in his communication with Elizabeth-Jane as follows:

Henchard: ‘How will you forgive all my roughness former days? You can not!’

Elizabeth: ‘I have forgotten it. Talk of that no more.’

(MC: 354)
Here, Elizabeth shows her forgiveness and she forgets all the harsh treatments of her stepfather. She also adds ‘talk of that no more’. Elizabeth’s forgiveness shows her good nature and benevolence. She sympathizes with him as he is passing through a bad phase.

In The RN, the character Wildeve offers apology to Eustacia for his neglecting her. He says ‘I am sorry I caused you that pain’. This happens when the latter expresses to him her feelings of despair:

Eustacia: “Must I go on weakly confessing to you things a woman ought to conceal; and own that no words can express how gloomy I have been because of that dreadful belief I held till two hours ago – that you had quite deserted me?”
Wildeve: “I am sorry I caused you that pain.”
(RN: 69)

In FMC, the character Gabriel Oak seeks apology of Bathsheba for terrifying her, as he makes her to run so fast after him. Oak says ‘I am sorry to have you run so fast, my dear’. Here, he uses the endearment term ‘my dear’ with a sense of belonging ‘my’. Gabriel says:

Gabriel: ‘I am sorry to have made you run so fast, my dear,
‘Wait a bit till you’ve found your breath.’ (FMC: 35)

3.12.2 Impersonalize the S and the H
Here, the speaker has to avoid using the pronouns ‘I’ and ‘You’. Both the S and the H have to impersonalize themselves. Impersonalization can be achieved also by
generalizing the addressee; it can be done either by point view of distancing or the use of past request of the modal verb ‘could’.

In The RN, Mrs. Yeobright decides to raise the jealousy of Wildeve when she says that there is someone has proposed to Thomasin two years ago. At that time, she refuses him, but now she may not refuse him twice. Here, she intends from this impersonalization not to name the person who has proposed to Thomasin. Her purpose is to make Wildeve renew his proposal to Thomasin:

\[
\text{Wildeve: “Who is the man?”}
\]
\[
\text{Mrs. Yeobright: ‘One who has been in love with her longer than she was with you. He proposed her two years ago. At that time she refused him.’} \text{ (RN: 103)}
\]

Hence, Mrs. Yeobright wants to pull Mr. Wildeve to propose to Thomasin once again. She speaks with him in an indirect way, avoiding the FTA; also her using generalization pronoun ‘one’ is very remarkable. She here means ‘Diggory Venn’ who has proposed to Thomasin, but she distances him from the immediate effect of the U.

3.12.3 State the FTA as an instance of a general rule

The addresser can state the FTA as an instance of general rule.

In The MC, Henchard states the FTA to Lucetta as an instance of the general rule. He addresses himself by using the first person plural pronoun ‘we’ generalizing the situation. It is an act of face threatening:

\[
\text{Henchard: ‘For we humble work men here feel it – a great honour that a lady should took in and take an interest in us.’}
\]
\[
\text{‘Ah, ma’am, we of the lower classes know nothing of the gay leisure that such as you enjoy!’} \text{ (MC: 282/3)}
\]
The above dialogue has a tone of sarcasm when Henchard faces Lucetta. Henchard falls down from being, the Mayor of Casterbridge to the merely a worker to her husband, Farfrae. The bad fortune of Henchard has made him a worker. All his wealth, his reputation as a Mayor is no more with him. He expresses his dejection and depression to Lucetta.

In The RN, Clym Yeobright asks Eustacia about the reason of her impersonating the role of Turkish Knight in the play. He wonders how can a woman play the role of a man and expresses his strangeness to her. Here, Clym generalizes his U by using ‘girls’ and the plural pronoun ‘they’. Following piece of conversation is worth studying:

\[ \text{Clym: “Do girls often play as mummers now? They never used to.”} \]
\[ \text{Eustacia: “They don’t now.” (RN: 150)} \]

Thus, both the characters use the generalization term. Clym avoids use of particular name; this is to keep the public image saved. Using such generalization makes the addressee expresses FTA.

In FMC, Bathsheba and her husband (Troy) quarrel with each other after knowing that her husband has love relation with her servant, Fanny. She finally knows that her husband cheats her, and feels regrets. He asks her ‘What do you regret?’ She replies ‘That her romances end at marriage’. Here, her husband uses the general tone and says ‘All romances end at marriage’. This is a very good example of showing FTA:

\[ \text{Troy: ‘What do you regret?’} \]
\[ \text{Bathsheba: ‘That my romance has come to an end’} \]
\[ \text{Troy: ‘All romance end at marriage’ (FMC: 254)} \]
3.12.4 Nominalise to distance the actor and add formality

The speaker nominalises uttering U to distance himself, as the actor and adds formality to the message to pass to H. Keeping distance of the actor is a way of face-saving, and it is the way of overcoming of meriting self and giving the addressee nominalising situation. The first person plural pronoun “we” is suitable pronoun to include both the addressee and the addressee to suggest unity.

In FMC, when Gabriel Oak enters the room of his work friends. His friends were talking against their mistress (Bathsheba). He inquires sharply to the rest of the workers in a direct question “What have you been saying about her?” Oak learns that the men have assembled there to talk in a critical tone about his mistress. He warns them, and compelled them not to talk against her in the future. Here, everyone praises his cleverness by saying that he has the skill of discovering the gossip. They adds that he has the skill of telling the time by looking at the stars and the moon. The character Matthew contrasts Oak’s cleverness with Joseph Poorgrass’s foolishness. Joseph also comments on Oak’s cleverness by saying:

*Oak:* ‘I suppose you’ve been speaking against her?’

*Joseph Poorgrass:* “We hear that ye be a extraordinary good and clever man shepherd”. ‘Tis a great thing to be clever, I’m sure,’ (FMC: 108)

The S (Joseph), here, tries to nomanilse distancing the actor (Oak), and he adds formality to his U. The use of the first person plural pronoun is a way of distancing the actor.

There is another example from The RN where Clym requests the hand of help from his sweetheart Eustacia to conduct class of teaching on the Heath. Eustacia expresses her hatred to the Heath and to the people who reside on it. She looks forward to go abroad to the fashion country like Paris. She tells her lover that she is not interested in teaching:
Eustacia: ‘I had not been to church for a long time. And now I shall not go again for ever so long – perhaps never. I cannot face their eyes after this. Don’t you think it dreadfully humiliating? I wished I was dead for hours after, but I don’t mind now.’

Clym: “Would you like to help me by high-class teaching? We might benefit them much”.

(RN: 189/190)

Here, the addresser (Clym) nominalising the dialogue by requesting the addressee politely and distancing the actor (Eustacia) from being facing the FTA.

3.13.0 REDRESS OTHER WANTS OF H’S

This strategy includes one strategy which is:

3.13.1 Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not inebting H

The S can relieve the effect of the FTA by claiming his indebtedness to the H or vice versa.

The following example is from The RN. Charley requests Mr.Clym Yeobright to give him something to keep (once belonged to Eustacia) as Charley is so much romantically attached to her. Clym expresses his happiness and pleasure to the lad (Charley). Here, Clym is willing to give him some of his wife’s particulars:

Charley: “I wish, Mr.Yeobright, you could give me something to keep that once belonged to her – if you don’t mind’

Clym: “I shall be very happy to. It will give me very great pleasure, Charley. (RN: 402)
Thus, Clym, here, goes on recording as an incurring a debt to the H (Charley). He then promises to give him some parts of Eustacia’s.

In FMC, the following U is by Sergeant Troy. He feels grateful to Bathsheba and thanks her for giving him time to see her and praise her beauty. He goes on recording his debt to her for her allowance to free her from entanglement. However, Bathsheba feels shameful, calls him ‘so profane’ person, as it is the first time to hear such a person talks about her beauty and admires her:

*Sergeant Troy: ‘Thank you for the sight of such a beautiful face!’ ‘I am thankful for beauty, even when ’tis thrown to me like a bone to a dog. These moments will be over too soon!’* (FMC: 157)

In The MC Henchard expresses his gratefulness to the Scotchman, Farfrae for the few words he wrote on that paper describing the way of improving the wheat crops. He redresses his wants by saying:

*Henchrad: ‘Then I am truly and sincerely obliged to you for the few words you wrote on that paper’* (MC: 61)

Here, the addresser (Henchard) goes on recording his obligation to the addressee (Farfrae). He expresses his heartfelt feeling by saying ‘I am truly and sincerely obliged to you’.

### 3.14 Leech’s Model of PP

Leech’s model studies social interaction and suitability of social modes of behaviour in accordance with socio-cultural conversations. Politeness, according to him, is found
among what he calls “Interpersonal Rhetoric” i.e. S’s goals rather than his illocutionary goals.

According to Cruse (2000:361), the CP can go some way towards explaining the generation of implicatures. But one class of implicatures which receives no account under this heading concerns implicatures of politeness. To this, Leech proposes an independent pragmatic principle to function alongside with the CP, which he calls the PP.

Leech (1989:132) divides PP into six maxims, each maxim has sub-maxim. The Maxims and Sub-maxims as are shown in the table No. (1)
## LEECH’S MODEL OF PP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF MAXIM</th>
<th>SITUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Tact Maxim</td>
<td>Minimize cost to other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximize benefit to other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(In IMPOSITIVES and COMMISSIVES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Generosity Maxim</td>
<td>Minimize benefit to self.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximize cost to self.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(In IMPOSITIVES and COMMISSIVES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Approbation Maxim</td>
<td>Minimize dispraise of other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximize praise of other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(In EXPRESSIVES and ASSERTIVES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Modesty Maxim</td>
<td>Minimize praise of self.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximize dispraise of self.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(In EXPRESSIVES and ASSERTIVES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Agreement Maxim</td>
<td>Minimize disagreement between self and other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximize agreement between self and other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(In ASSERTIVES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Sympathy Maxim</td>
<td>Minimize antipathy between self and other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximize sympathy between self and other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(In ASSERTIVES)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no (1) (Adopted from Leech, 1983:132)
The most important kind of Politeness in English speaking society is that covered by the function of the Tact Maxim. It applies to Searle’s directive and commissive categories of illocutions and it may be placed on a cost-benefit scale.

Leech adds another scale to keep the same propositional content and more increase the degree of politeness by using more direct kind of illocution. Indirect illocutions or ISAs are more polite than direct ones because the more indirect and illocution is the more lessen.

He also points out that “the different types and degrees of politeness are called the illocutionary functions which maybe classified into the four categories. It was classified according to how they relate to the social goal of establishing and maintaining comity. These illocutionary functions are:

1- **Competitive**; the illocutionary goal competes with the social goal in actions. Such as, ordering, asking, demanding, and begging.

2- **Convivial**; the illocutionary goal coincides with the social goal in actions. Like offering, inviting, greeting, thanking, and congratulating.

3- **Collaborative**; the illocutionary goal shows indifferent to the social goal in actions, as asserting, reporting, annoying, and instructing.

4- **Confictive**; the illocutionary goal conflicts with the social goal in actions. For example, threatening, accusing, cursing, and reprimanding.

The competitive and convivial illocutions are relevant to the discussion of politeness. Here, Leech (1983:105) relates the above categories to Searle’s classification of illocutionary acts and points out that his own categories are based on functions whereas Searle’s classification is based on various categories. He also observes that Searle’s
‘directives’ expresses NP and the ‘commissives’ and ‘expressives’ encode Positive Politeness.

3.15.0 APPLICATION OF LEECH’S MODEL TO THE NOVELS

3.15.1 Exploitation of Tact Maxim (Tact maxim)

This maxim states that S should minimize the cost to other, and maximize benefit to other. Exploitation of tact maxim happens through ordering, requesting and commanding of the addressee (Commissive function). Observing this maxim happens through advising, recommending, promising, vowing, and offering to the addressee (Impositive function). The tact maxim occurs in the impositive and commissives.

In The MC, Henchard, the Mayor of Casterbridge asks the Scotchman about who wrote the paper, which has been given to him by the waiter. Henchard here exploits the Tact maxim when he maximizes the cost to the H (Farfrae) as he asks him directly. This maxim states to minimize the cost to other and maximize the benefit to other:

Henchard: ‘Well, first I should ask, did you write this?’

Scotchman; ‘Yes, I did,’ (MC: 60)

Here the word ‘Well’ is used to show Henchard’s hesitation. In addition, the use of the phatic modal verb ‘should’ is used to indicate the stress of the situation.

The following dialogue takes place between the Mayor and the Scotchman; Henchard tries to observe here the Tact maxim by maximizing the benefit to the Scotchman, when he offers him a job to be his manager and minimizing the cost to him (Farfrae), by not enforcing to work with him. He says that he will make it worthwhile to him if he obeys him in his offer:

Henchard: ‘If you will bide and be my manager, I will make it worth your while’
The above U of Henchard shows that he maximizes the cost to himself by offering a job to the Scotchman and maximizes the benefit to the addressee (Farfrae) to be his manager. There is also a clash here between the Tact maxim and Agr maxim. Farfrae does not agree with Henchard’s offer in the beginning, but later on, he agrees.

In FMC, Fanny Robin goes to see her lover, Sergeant Troy with the intension to remind him of his promise to marry her. She asked him to come and see her at Mrs. Twills, in the North Street.

Here, she minimizes herself by requesting him to visit her and fulfill his promise. Troy renews his promise to her and he says he will go and visit her there. Thus, Troy maximizes the cost to himself by promising her and maximizes the benefit to Fanny:

Fanny: ‘Will you come and see me tomorrow, at Mrs.Twills’s, in North Street?’
Troy: ‘Quite so. I’ll come to you, my dear. Good night’  (FMC: 90)

This example shows that the characters observe the Tact maxim for fulfilling the intentionality of the interlocutors.

Similarly, one comes across another example from the same novel FMC which shows the exploitation of the Tact maxim is in the following linguistic exchange. The farmer Mr.Boldwood tells Mis.Bathsheba that he is happier man when the latter tells him to give her time to think on his proposal. Mr.Boldwood observes the Tact maxim by maximizing the cost to himself to be patient, and maximizing the benefit to Bathsheba by giving her time to think. However, Bathsheba’s reply is negative. She says ‘no – I beg you! Don’t be
happier if happiness only comes from my agreeing, be neutral’. She exploits the Tact maxim, being maximizing the benefit to herself (telling him not to be happy because of her acceptance), and minimizing the benefit to other:

*Boldwood: ‘I am happier now’*
*Bathsheba: ‘No – I beg you! Don’t be happier if happiness only comes from agreeing. Be neutral, Mr.Boldwood!’* (FMC: 126)

The above dialogue shows also the clash between the Tact maxim and the Agr maxim. Bathsheba’s U explains that she has maximized the benefit to herself, and in the same time, she has maximized the disagreement to other (Boldwood). She tells him not to be happy as if the happiness comes from her agreeing to be his wife.

The best example that shows the exploitation of the Tact maxim is from the novel of The RN. The boy Charley asks his mistress Eustacia to give him his payment. It is that he wants to join hand with her in the ring because he has given her his role as the Turkish Knight, which will be played in Clym’s house. Eustacia accepts the demand of her servant. She offers her hand to him but he asks ‘Why, there’s a glove on it!’ The boy here exploits the Tact maxim, by maximizing the cost to Eustacia and maximizing the benefit to himself:

*Charley: “Why, there’s a glove on it!”*
*Eustacia: “I have been walking,”*
*Charley: “But, miss!”*
*Eustacia: “Well – it is hardly fair.”* (RN: 132)

This example explains the clash between the characters in observing and violating Tact maxim. Charley violates it, whereas Eustacia observes it. She removes the glove according to the demand of Charley and extends her hand to him.
Another example from the same novel, The RN illustrates that the S observes the Tact maxim. Eustacia says to the reddleman that she has exposed her secrets to him and thus, she has lost her self-respect in front of him. Diggory knows what is going on between her and her lover, Wildeve. However, he tells her that he will keep her secrets as no one on the Heath knows it except him. Diggory here maximizes the benefit to Eustacia, and maximizes the cost to himself (Being keeping his promise to her). Study the following piece of conversation:

Eustacia: “I lose all self-respect in talking to you what am I giving way to!”

Diggory Ven: “I can keep secrets” “You need not fear. I am the only man who knows of your meeting with him.’ (RN: 98)

3.15.2 Exploitation of Generosity maxim (Gen maxim)

Generosity maxim states that S should minimize benefit to self and maximize cost to self. The situation of the Generosity maxim in which it occurs is in the ‘Impositives’ and ‘Commissives’. The exploitation of this maxim is seen in ordering, requesting and commanding (Commissive function). Observing this maxim is through advising, promising, vowing, offering and recommending (Impositive function). This maxim can be applicable in impositives and commissives as well.

In the RN, Eustacia requests the reddleman to allow her to rest for few minutes in his van. He offers her a place in his van and says’ that is the best I can do for you’. The reddleman here observes the Gen maxim, being generous and helpful. He maximizes the benefit to the addressee (Eustacia) by giving her a place in his van and maximizes the cost to himself as he vacates a place in his van to her:

Eustacia: “Would you allow me to rest a few minute on your van?”
Reddleman: “Certainly, miss; I will make a place for you.” “That is the best I can do for you,” (RN: 155)

Here, the reddleman minimizes the benefit to him by giving his van and also maximizes the cost to himself by preparing a place to the H.

In FMC Bathsheba exploits the Gen maxim by refusing to accept the request of Oak to be his wife; she insults him and asks ‘Why do you come and disturb me?’ She minimizes the benefit to other (Oak) and maximizes the benefits to herself.

As it is mentioned, Gen maxim states that addressee should minimize the benefit to self and maximize the cost to self. Oak, here, tries to be generous by offering her the happiness if she marries him; he says that he will make her happy. Here, he observes the Gen maxim by minimizing the benefit to himself and maximizing the benefit to Bathsheba:

Oak: ‘I can make you happy,’
Bathsheba: ‘Well, then, why did you come and disturb me?’ ‘I can’t do what I think would be – would be –’
‘Right?’(FMC: 37/40)

Thus, the above example explains that one character observes the Gen maxim while the other character exploits it.

Another example of exploiting the Gen maxim is also from the same novel FMC. Fanny visits her lover Troy, and requests him to come down to her. Troy refuses to meet her justifying that the gate is closed and he has not taken permission from his officer. Here, he exploits the Gen maxim as his beloved exhausted herself to come from a long distance walking to see him. However, he refuses to see her. Troy exploits the Gen maxim by
minimizing the benefit to other (Fanny), and maximizing the benefit to himself. Gen
maxim sates that S should minimize the benefit to self and maximize cost to self. Troy
does the opposite of what the Gen maxim states:

Fanny: ‘Can you – come to me?’
Troy: ‘My dear Fan, no! The bugle has sounded, the
barrack gates are closed, and I have no leave. We are
all of us as good as in the county gaol till to-morrow
morning.’
Fanny: ‘Then I shan’t see you till then!’ (FMC: 89)

In The MC, the character Farfrae offers a drink to Mr. Henchard. However, the latter
refuses it. Then, Farfrae tells him that he will not press him. The reason of Henchard’s
refusal is justified as he has committed a sin, i.e. (selling his wife Susan). Because of it,
he swears not to drink. Henchard, here, exploits the Gen maxim by maximizing the
benefit to himself and minimizing the cost to himself:

Farfrae: ‘But will you not drink with me, sir?’ ‘I find
this Casterbridge ale warreming to the stomach’
Henchard: ‘No, no; I fain would, but I can’t.’
(MC: 63)

It is observed that Henchard is honest with his oath, which keeps him avoiding drinking
alcohol. Thus, Gen maxim can be violated when it is going against human’s desire or
oaths.

Another example from the same novel The MC displays the exploitation of the Gen
maxim. Lucetta scolds her old lover Henchard for his late visit in her home. She
expresses her fear by saying “that he has no right to surprise her at that time”. This is
what Lucetta has to say:
Lucetta: ‘How can you frighten me so?’ ‘It is past ten o’clock, and you have no right to surprise me here at such a time’ (MC: 235)

Lucetta exploits the Gen maxim by maximizing the benefit to herself by disagreeing to Henchard’s coming to her home and minimizing the cost to herself by not welcoming him. Nevertheless, she says ‘you have no right...’ Although comes to Casterbridge with an intension to marry him, she refuses to meet him or think to marry him (due to a new lover Farfrae). Sometimes, people break the Gen maxim as it goes against the social norms. Henchard, here, comes in Lucetta’s home late in the night, disturbing and frightening her, particularly when he enters the home without tapping or ringing the doorbell. In Henchard’s manner, Lucetta has a right to scold him and not to be generous to welcome him as he breaks the norms of the society.

3.15.3 Exploitation of Approbation maxim (Appr maxim)

Leech classifies its function as ‘expressive’ and ‘assertive’. Expressives are thanking, congratulating, pardoning, blaming, praising, and condoling. Assertives include stating, boasting, complaining and reporting.

Appr maxim states that addressee should minimize dispraise of other and maximize praise of other. Exploiting of this maxim is done through ‘assertive’ and observing is done through ‘expressive’.

Thomasin in The RN dispraises Eustacia as she says that the latter loves Clym crazily. She minimizes praise to Eustacia and maximizes praise to herself:

Wildeve: ‘I suppose – she was immensely taken with him?’
Thomasin: “She is crazy about him, so their general servant of all work tells me. And that lad Charley that looks after the horse is all in a daze about it. The stun-poll has got fond-like of her.’ (RN: 218)

Thus, Thomasin’s U exploits the Appr maxim by minimizing to praise Eustacia and maximizing praise to herself. This is because of the previous hostility between the two when in the beginning of the novel Eustacia tries to drag her husband, Wildeve to her side.

In another situation, Eustacia dispraises of Thomasin. Eustacia exploits the Appr maxim by dispraising Thomasin when the reddleman said to her that Thomasin had decided to marry her lover Wildeve. She dispraises her by saying to her as ‘an inferior woman.’ Here, Eustacia minimizes praising of Thomasin, and maximizes dispraising of her too. She says:

Eustacia: ‘Nobody has ever been served so! It was going on well - I will not be beaten down – by an inferior woman like her. It is very well for you to come and plead for her, but is she not herself the cause of all her own trouble?’ (RN: 97)

Newson in The MC praises his wife Susan in front of her previous husband Henchard. He says ‘she is a warm-hearted, home-spun woman and kind.’ Here, Newson observes the Appr maxim by maximizing the praise of Susan and minimizing dispraise of herself too:

Newson: ‘She was a warm-hearted, home-spun woman. She was not what they call sharwed or sharp at all – better she had been’ (MC: 346)
Newson observes the Appr maxim by minimizing dispraise and maximizing praise of Susan.

In The MC, the character Henchard exploits the Appr maxim by scolding Lucetta when the latter thanks him for all of what he has done to her in the former days of her staying at Casterbridge when she was poor. However, Henchard does not share her with mutual thanks. He dispraises her by saying ‘you may obliged or not for it’. Here, he minimizes praise to Lucetta and maximizes dispraises to her as well:

\[
\begin{align*}
\textit{Lucetta:} & \quad \text{‘I am greatly obliged to you for all that,’} \\
\textit{Henchard:} & \quad \text{‘You may be obliged or not for’t.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\(\text{(MC: 212)}\)

Henchard, here, exploits the Appr maxim when he minimizes dispraise of himself and maximizing dispraise of Lucetta.

In FMC, Bathsheba asks Mrs. Coggan about Mr. Boldwood. She asks ‘Who is the man?’ Coggan replies that Boldwood who is forty. She also says, ‘I should say – very handsome – rather stern-looking …’ Hence, it is clear that Mrs.Coggan praises Mr. Boldwood. She observes the Appr maxim by minimizing dispraise of Boldwood and maximizing praise of Boldwood:

\[
\begin{align*}
\textit{Bathsheba:} & \quad \text{‘Who is Mr.Boldwood?’} \\
\textit{Mrs. Coggan:} & \quad \text{‘A gentleman-farmer at Little Weatherbury’} \\
\textit{Bathsheba:} & \quad \text{‘How old is he?’} \\
\textit{Mrs. Coggan:} & \quad \text{‘Forty, I should say – very handsome – rather stern-looking – and rich’} \quad \text{(FMC: 77)}
\end{align*}
\]
This example is also from the same novel FMC that views the exploitation of the Appr maxim. Troy in the following U dispraises his wife Bathsheba when he says that she is dull. Bathsheba asks him whether he knows Fanny (whom he loves her). However, he denies that he knows her. His wife suspects that he husband is cheating her and there is something between them (her husband and Fanny). On this occasion, he insults his wife Bathsheba saying that she is dull enough:

\[ \text{Bathsheba: 'You worry me a great deal by these mysterious responsibilities, Frank?' 'I wish you wouldn't talk like that. You grieve me to my soul by smart at my expense.'} \]

\[ \text{Troy: 'You are dull enough at mine.} \]

\[\text{(FMC: 254)}\]

Here, Troy exploits the Appr maxim by minimizing praise of his wife and maximizing praise of himself.

### 3.15.4 Exploitation of Modesty maxim (Mod maxim)

Mod maxim states that interlocutors should minimize praise of self and maximize dispraise of self. The function of Mod maxim is also classified by Leech as in ‘expressives’ and ‘assertives’.

In expressives (thanking, congratulating, pardoning, blaming, praising and condoling) is applicable. Moreover, in assertives (stating, boasting, complaining, claiming and reporting) is applicable.

The exploitation of the Mod maxim is through assertives such as stating, boasting ect. In addition, observing the Mod maxim is through expressives such as thanking, congratulating etc.
In FMC, Fanny seeks pardon ing of her lover Troy when she comes to his regiment without informing him. She humbles herself by saying ‘It was wrong of me to …’ She minimizes praising of herself and maximizes praising of Troy:

*Troy: ‘the fact is, I forgot to ask. Your coming like
this is so sudden and unexpected.’
Fanny: ‘Yes – yes – it is. It was wrong of me to worry
you. I’ll go away now’* (FMC: 90)

Fanny observes the Mod maxim as she maximizes praise of her lover Troy and minimizes dispraise of herself. She, here, blames herself for disturbing her lover in his work.

In another speech situation in the same novel, Gabriel tries to persuade Bathsheba to marry him. However, the latter refuses the offer of the former. She says to him ‘I am better educated than you – and I don’t love you………a woman with money’. Bathsheba shows her higher dignity by boasting to Gabriel, as she is more educated than he is, she has money and larger farm than he has. She maximizes praising of herself and minimizes praising of Gabriel as she boasts against him:

*Bathsheba: ‘I am better educated than you – and I
don’t love you a bit: that’s my side of the case. Now
yours: you are a farmer just beginning, and you ought
in common prudence, if you marry at all (which you
should certainly not think of doing at present) to
marry a woman with money, who would stock a
larger farm for you than you have now’* (FMC: 39)

The above U shows that Bathsheba exploits the Mod maxim by minimizing praise of other (Gabriel) and maximizing praising of herself.
In The RN, Mrs.Yeobright hears the sound of group of workers on the hill of the Heath. She comes and joins them. She looks at Christian and Olly who are indulged in talking about the people of the Heath. They greet her and ask her about her son, as they have heard that he will visit her at Christmas. She expresses her pardoning of interrupting them in humble and modest tone. Saying ‘I’m sorry to stop….’ and she requests their permission to leave, using phatic verb ‘must’, and requests Olly to accompany her on her way:

Mrs.Yeobright: “I’m sorry to stop the talk.”

“But I must be leaving you now. “I was passing the Angle-bury Road, towards my niece’s new home, who is return-ing tonight with her husband; and seeing the bonfire and hearing Olly’s voice among the rest I came up here to learn what was going on. I would like her to walk with me, as her way is mine.”

(RN: 40)

Here, Mrs.Yeobright observes the Mod maxim by pardoning in a modest tone. Being from high status, she addresses the lower class of the heath workers in modesty. She minimizes praising of herself and maximizes praising of others.

Another example from the same novel, The RN illustrates the exploitation of the Mod maxim. Eustacia addresses her lover that he will never forget her and he will love her in any case. She boasts herself, showing her power of making him respond to her bonfire signal, by attracting him to come up to see her as a result of her signal. Eustacia, here, exploits the Mod maxim by minimizing praise of her lover, Wildeve, and maximizing praise of herself. She violates the Mod maxim, which states that addresser should minimize praise of self and maximize dispraise of self. However, Eustacia’s U shows that she exploits the Mod
maxim. She minimizes praising of Wildeve when she boasts upon him, and claims that he will never forget her; and he will jump to marry her:

Wildeve: “Well I can do worse than follow you.’
Eustacia: “Say what you will; try as you may; keep away from me all that you can - you will never forget me. You will love me all your life long. You would jump to marry me!” (RN: 90/1)

In The MC, Henchard visits Lucetta in her home for the sake of renewing his proposal to her. He has seen her living in luxurious house and has precious furniture, which is not such thing available in Casterbridge. He tells her, ‘It looks as if you were living on capital’. Here, he minimizes praising of himself and maximizes praising of Lucetta and her furniture. Henchard observes the Mod maxim by minimizing praise of self and maximizing dispraise of self:

Henchard: ‘Upon my life I didn’t know such furniture as this could be bought in Casterbridge,’
Lucetta: ‘Nor can it be’ ‘Nor will it till fifty years more of civilization have passed over the town. It took waggon and four horses to get it here.’ (MC: 212)

The above dialogue reveals the clash between the characters. One is observing the Mod maxim (Henchard), whereas the other is exploiting the maxim (Lucetta).

Thus, Lucetta exploits the Mod maxim by minimizing praise of Henchard and maximizing praise of herself. She boasts herself and claims that she has furniture, which is not available in Casterbridge and will not be available for fifty years. She maximizes dispraise of her old lover Henchard and maximizes praise of herself by having such capital, furniture and luxurious life.
3.15.5 Exploitation of Agreement maxim (Agr maxim)

Agr maxim states that interlocutors should minimize disagreement between self and other and maximize agreement between self and other. The function of this maxim is seen in ‘assertives’ only. It is applicable to assertives such as stating, boasting, complaining, claiming and reporting. The exploitation of this maxim is achieved when the addressee states, boasts, complains, claims and reports.

In The MC, Farfrae and Elizabeth have a walk together before their marriage. The former asks the latter with polite question, ‘You like walking this way Miss. Henchard – and is it not so? Elizabeth replies, ‘O, yes I have chosen this road latterly’. This example explains that both the addresser and the addressee observe the Agr maxim. They both share the agreement with each other’s point of view.

Here, Farfrae minimizes disagreement with his mistress and himself and maximizes agreement with Elizabeth and himself also:

\[\text{Farfrae: ‘You like walking this way, Miss. Henchard – and is it not so?’}\]
\[\text{Elizabeth: ‘O yes. I have chosen this road latterly. I have no great reason for it.’ (MC: 362)}\]

The above conversation is the best example of observing the Agr maxim. Both the interlocutors / lovers observe this maxim. This example is also extracted from the novel, The MC, in which the exploitation of the Agr maxim is shown in its highest rate. The dialogue is between the two friends, Lucetta and Elizabeth-Jane. Elizabeth states that she will go to her stepfather Henchard and set Lucetta free from him. Henchard enforces Lucetta to promise to marry him. Elizabeth surprisingly asks how her father compels Lucetta to agree to do things against her will. She knows that her friend is in love with Farfrae. However, she promises her stepfather to
marry him. Then, Elizabeth decides to free her friend from him (Henchard). Lucetta disagrees with her, saying ‘No, no – let it all be’

Lucetta, here, exploits the Agr maxim by minimizing agreement between herself and her friend Elizabeth. She maximizes disagreement between herself and Elizabeth:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Elizabeth: } & \text{‘I’ll go to him to release you’} \\
\text{Lucetta: } & \text{‘No, no’} \\
& \text{‘Let it all be’ (MC: 238)}
\end{align*}
\]

In The RN, Wildeve requests his mistress after a long dispute with her to permit him to kiss her hand. Eustacia refuses his demand, as he does not tell her that his wedding with Thomasin is broken. He tells her that he prefers not to speak of her to Eustacia. Thus, she refuses to let him kiss her hand or shake it:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Wildeve: } & \text{‘Perhaps I may kiss your hand?’} \\
\text{Eustacia: } & \text{‘No, you may not.’} \\
\text{Wildeve: } & \text{‘Then I may shake your hand?’} \\
\text{Eustacia: } & \text{‘No.’ (RN: 71)}
\end{align*}
\]

This example shows the total disagreement of Eustacia to her lover to kiss her hand or to shake it. It is the exploitation of the Agr maxim in its highest rate. Eustacia exploits the Agr maxim by minimizing agreement between self and Wildeve and maximizing disagreement between self and other (Wildeve).

In the same novel The RN, the following example shows Eustacia observing the Agr maxim. However, it is the total agreement between Eustacia and her servant Charley. Eustacia requests the boy to give her his role, which he is going to play as the Turkish Knight. The boy agrees with her but with one condition (give him her hand for half an hour). She gives him her hand, for about six or eight minutes. Charley takes her hands in
his both hands with warmth. He tells her to keep the remaining minutes to next time. Eustacia accepts his demand by saying ‘as you like’ in its total agreement tone:

Charley: “I think I won’t use it all up tonight,” “May I have the other few minutes another time?”
Eustacia: “As you like,” (RN: 132/3)

In one of the speech situations in the novel FMC, Bathsheba requests her workers to do anything to save the sheep from death, as the majority of them are afflicted and lying down foaming at the mouth. She becomes sad as she looks at the sheep. Bathsheba asks one of the workers, ‘Can you do? Can I?’ Tall, one of the workers, replies ‘No. ma’am. We can’t, nor you neither’. This U shows the total disagreement of her workers to their mistress. The character Tall, here, minimizes agreement with himself and other (Bathsheba and workers), and maximizes disagreement with himself and other:

Tall: “There is only one way of saving them,’
Bathsheba: ‘What way? Tell me quick!’
Tall: ‘They must be pierced in the side with a thing made on purpose.’
Bathsheba: ‘Can you do it? Can I?’
Tall: ‘No, ma’am. We can’t, nor you neither’
(FMC: 134)

3.15.6 Exploitation of Sympathy maxim (Symp maxim)

This maxim states that S must minimize antipathy between self and other and maximize sympathy between self and other. Its function is classified into ‘assertives’ only. Assertives’ function is like stating, boasting, complaining, claiming and reporting. When the addresser maximizes antipathy of the addressee and minimizes sympathy of the
addressee, he is exploiting the Sym maxim. Observing this maxim is by minimizing antipathy between self and other and maximizing sympathy between self and other.

In FMC, Troy states that he is too poor to marry Fanny Robin. Boldwood agrees to give him money as a help to arrange his marriage. However, when he realizes Miss. Bathsheba loves him much, he changes his offer. He shows his kindness to her and supports her lover Troy. He tells him not to desert her and he will pay him all the expense of his marriage. Boldwood, here, observes the Symp maxim by minimizing antipathy between himself and Troy and maximizing sympathy between himself and others (Troy and Bathsheba) as they love each other:

*Boldwood:* ‘Troy,’ ‘I’ll do anything for you, only don’t desert her; pray don’t desert her, Troy.’
*Troy:* ‘Which, poor Fanny?’
*Boldwood:* ‘No; Bathsheba Everdene. Love her best! Love her tenderly!’ (FMC: 220)

This is an excellent example that displays observance of Symp maxim and makes even the reader to sympathize to Boldwood’s state of mind that he is passing through.

In The MC, Lucetta requests Henchard to take pity on her and be generous when the latter threatens her to reveal their previous love affairs to her husband Farfrae. He says ‘You don’t deserve pity’ and he adds that he has a mind to punish her as she deserves, by saying one word to her husband.

Here, Henchard exploits the Symp maxim by maximizing antipathy between self and other (Lucetta and her Husband Farfrae) and minimizing the sympathy between self and other. In other words, he maximizes antipathy and hostility to Lucetta and her husband Farfrae and minimizes sympathy and pity to them:
Henchard: ‘And now I’ve a mind to punish you as you deserve! One word to this barn-new husband of how you courted me, and your previous happiness is blown to atoms!’

Lucetta: ‘Michael – pity me, and be generous!’

Henchard: ‘You don’t deserve pity! You did; but don’t now.” (MC: 253/4)

The other example is from the same novel, The MC. It shows the observance of the Symp maxim. Elizabeth’s replies to her stepfather’s request to forgive him for all his bad treatments in the former days saying she has forgotten it...’. She tells him also that she has forgiven him and forgotten. She does not want her stepfather to talk on the subject any more. Here, Elizabeth observes the Symp maxim by being generous and sympathizes with her stepfather’s situation, as he has collapsed from being the Mayor of the Casterbridge and lost all his business. Elizabeth minimizes antipathy between self and other (Henchard) and maximizes sympathy between self and other (Henchard) too:

Henchard: ‘How will you forgive all my roughness in formers days? You can not!’

Elizabeth: ‘I have forgotten it, talk of that no more’

(MC: 354)

In FMC, Bathsheba feels sympathy to Mr.Boldwood’s blind love to her. He expresses his love to her, ‘nobody knows-God only knows-how much you are to me’. The writer of the novel (Thomas Hardy) comments on this situation describing Bathsheba’s genuine feeling in these words ‘she is young, and she swells with sympathy for the deep-natured man who speaks so simply’. In addition, Bathsheba here expresses her sympathy to Boldwood by saying, ‘don’t say it: don’t! I cannot bear you to feel so much, and me to feel nothing’. This example shows the highest rate of observing the Symp maxim:
Boldwood: ‘- no body knows – God only knows – how much you are to me!’

Bathsheba: ‘Don’t say it: don’t! I cannot bear you to feel so much, and me to feel nothing’. (FMC: 125/6)

The following example is from FMC that displays the exploitation of the Symp maxim in its highest rate. It explains the raising of the highest antipathy and hostility between the two contenders (Mr. Troy and Mr. Boldwood). Each one wants to win the protagonist of the novel, Bathsheba. Boldwood exploits the Symp maxim by minimizing the Symp maxim between himself and Troy and maximizing the antipathy and hostility between himself and other (Troy). Boldwood shows his extreme hatred and hostility to Troy and decides to kill him, as the latter has destroyed his happiness. He has engaged to Bathsheba earlier, but when Troy comes, he has drawn her to him. Thus, at the end of the novel, Hardy shows how much their hostility comes into climax when Boldwood kills Troy:

Boldwood: ‘Why then did you step in here and injuries my happiness?’

Troy: ‘Give me breath, ’

Boldwood: ‘By Heaven, I’ve a mind to kill you!’

(FMC: 217/9)

In The RN, Eustacia expresses her gloom and despair to her lover (Wildeve) on the heath. She confesses to him that he has deserted her when she hears that he is going to marry Thomasin and leave her. Eustacia, here, raises our pathos to her condition of being gloomy. Wildeve expresses his pardon to her saying ‘I am sorry I caused you that pain’. He keeps the Sym maxim, by minimizing antipathy between self and other (Eustacia) and maximizing sympathy between self and other:
Eustacia: ‘I have been because of that dreadful belief
I held till two hours ago – that you had quite deserted me!’

Wildeve: ‘I am sorry I caused you that pain’ (RN: 69)

The same novel, The RN, shows exploitation of the Sym maxim. Clym knows that his wife Eustacia is responsible for his mother’s death. It all happens when his mother has visited him in his home. She knocks the door but no one responds to open the door. Although Clym’s wife is at home, she is busy with her old lover, Wildeve. His mother decides to go back with feeling of despair. Unfortunately, she was stung by a snake on her way and died. Clym requests his wife to tell him to whom she was busy with during her mother’s knocking the door. His wife refuses to speak a single word. She says that she will hold her tongue like the very death and she will not say anything. Her husband threatens her that he will kill her. However, his wife expresses her wish to be killed. Clym, here, says that if he kills her, he will send her to the Heaven where his mother is but he changes his mind from killing her, and says that he will keep her away from his mother until the universe ends:

Eustacia: “But perhaps you do not wish me to speak
– killing maybe all you mean?”

Clym; “Kill you! Do you expect it?”
Eustacia: “I do.”
Clym: “Why?”
Eustacia: “No less degree of rage against me will match your previous grief for her”
Clym: “Phew – I shall not kill you” “I did think of it; but – I shall not. That would be making a martyr of you, and sending you to where she is; and I would
keep you away from her till the universe come to an end, if I could.” (RN: 326)

This is the highest rate of exploitation of the Symp maxim in this dialogue between the protagonists of the novel. Moreover, it shows that the situation has reached the climax. Clym, here, exploits the Symp maxim by maximizing antipathy to his wife and minimizing symp to her as he wishes her to be cursed until the end of the universe.

3.16 CONCLUSION
The chapter has discussed the CP and the PP theories in linguistics pragmatics and their application to the selected novels of Thomas Hardy. The chapter also has revealed that characters of the novels under the study observe and violate Grice’s maxims and Leech’s maxims with different rates. The main characters more often violate the maxims than ordinary characters i.e. rustic characters. The analysis also has revealed that some characters in the novel were inclined to employ the theories of pragmatics, i.e. CP, PP and SAT in their interactions and this led them to communicate multiple meaning without stating them. Some characters could observe the maxims of CP, PP. However, some others violated using them in their interaction with different rates.

The first part has examined and discussed Grice’s maxims. The chapter has revealed that all Grice’s maxims work strongly in the selected novels of Hardy and their violation rate is different from one character to other.

In the second part of the study, the analysis of PP has been done. It has studied the three models of PP, i.e. Brown and Levinson’s model, Leech’s model and Lakoff’s model. The first two models have been only applied in the analysis of the novels. The analysis has been supported with many quotations from the selected novels. The analysis of this part has revealed that Positive Politeness as discussed in the third chapter is a useful strategy
to minimize or redress a potential threat to the addressee’s public self-image. However, the analysis of Negative politeness tries to avoid a threat to the addressee’s face by assuring him/her that his/her freedom of action will be honoured. Leech’s maxims are observed and violated at the same time by some of the characters.

In the next chapter, the theory of the Speech Act Theory will be applied to the analysis of the novels. The study of direct speech act and indirect speech act will be discussed in detail supported with categorically selected examples from the novels under the study.