CHAPTER FOUR
SPEECH ACTS IN HARDY’S NOVELS

4.0 PRILIMINARIES
The chapter has been divided into two parts. The first part is about Direct Speech Acts (DSAs) and the second part is about Indirect Speech Acts (ISAs). The major task for the theory of SAs is to account for how Ss can succeed in what they do despite the various ways in which linguistic meaning underdetermines the use. Another objective of this chapter is to provide the reader of the language with conceptual setting of the fundamental ideas of SAT, its pioneers, its definitions and its parts direct and indirect speech acts (DSAs & ISAs). Austin and Searle’s contribution to SAT is at the centre of the discussion. The theory of SAT with its parts (DSAT & ISAT) is applied to the analysis of Hardys' selected novels. The highly marked examples from the novels are examined and discussed in detail. In SAs analysis, the effect of Us on the behaviour of S and H in interpersonal communication is discussed by using the three types of the SAs; Locutionary Act, Illocutionary Act and Perlocutionary Act.

4.1 The Concept of Speech Act Theory
SAT has its basic line on the foundation laid by Wittgenstein, Austin and John Searle. Wittgenstein began a line of thought called 'Ordinary Language Philosophy'. He thought that the meaning of language depends on its actual use. Language, as used in ordinary life, is a language game because it consists of rules. In other words, people follow rules to do things with the language.

The concept of SAT is coined by J.L.Austin in the beginning of his lectures entitled ‘How to Do Things with Words’. According to him, Us is either Constative or
Performative. Constative U describes or reports some state of affairs such that one could say its correspondence with the facts is either true or false. However, Performative U does not describe or report or constate anything at all and it is neither true nor false. The uttering of the sentence is part of doing an action, which again would not normally be described as saying something. The point of Austin's lectures was, in fact, that every normal utterance has both a descriptive and an effective aspect: that saying something is also doing something. Marrying, betting, bequeathing, umpiring, passing sentence, christening, knighting, blaming, firing, baptizing, bidding, and so forth involve performatives. In performatives, the attitude of a person performing the linguistic act, his thought, feeling, or intentions is a paramount of importance. Whereas the constative U is true or false, the performative U is felicitous or infelicitous, sincere, or insincere, authentic or inauthentic, well invoked or misinvoked.

Austin divides the linguistic act into three components- **Locutionary Act** is the act of saying something. **Illocutionary Act** is the performance of an act in saying something and the last act is the **Perlocutionary Act**, which means the act of saying something. The last speech act often produces certain consequential effects upon the feelings, thoughts, or actions of the audience (H), of the S, or of other persons.

Another pioneer of the SAT is Searle who has contributed to the concept of SAs. He identifies four basic categories of SAs as Utterances, Propositional Utterances, Illocutionary Utterances, and Perlocutionary Utterances. These are not separated and independent of one another, but they are integrated to each other like blocks of building. **An Utterance** is a spoken word; it has no attention to communicate a meaning or giving particular forethought e.g. ‘The dog is brown sad’. **Propositional U** is a meaningful type of U, which can refer to or describe a real or imaginary object. It is not necessary to be a sentence it can be a phrase. Both of the U and the propositional U are not separated from each other e.g. ‘A brown dog’.
An *Illocutionary* U is spoken with intention of making contact with a L. Illocutionary Us are usually sentences that contain propositional Us, refer to things in the world, but its their intentional nature which is the most important e.g. ‘Please feed the dog while I am gone’.

In *Perlocutionary* Us the S attempts to effect or make change on the H’s mind, unlike the Illocutionary Us which the S can give information, elicit answer to the question, give promise, but not necessary to change the L’s behaviour.

Thus, we can say that the Perlocutionary Us includes propositions, Utterances, and they intend to do interaction with the receiver (H).

The following chart shows more about Searle’s division of SAs to four categories, which are:

---

**Utterances/ words**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prepositional Utterances (Locutionary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illocutionary Utterances</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perlocutionary Utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intention to affect the behaviour of the (H)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Intention to Interact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference to other things</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Words**

**The SAs Model of Searle**

Diagram no (7)
4.2 Definitions of Speech Acts (SAs)

SAs are acts of communication. To communicate is to express a certain attitude, and the type of SAs being performed matches to the type of attitude being expressed. For example, a statement expresses a belief, a request expresses a desire, and an apology expresses regret. As an act of communication, a SA succeeds if the audience identifies, in accordance with the S’s intention, the attitude being expressed. The following definition will clarify more the concept of SAs:

Austin (1962) defines SAs as ‘the act of uttering a certain sentence in a given context for a determined purpose, i.e. an act of communication’.

Searle (1969:16) defines SAs as ‘speaking a language is performing SAs, acts such as making statements, giving commands, asking questions, making promises, and so on’.

Van Dijk, (1976:195) defines SAs as ‘what is usually meant by saying that we do something when we make an U is that we accomplish some specific social acts, e.g. making a promise, a request, giving advice, etc. usually called SAs or more specifically illocutionary acts’.

Here, we can say that SAs are acts performed in or by speaking a language as such they have an act component and a language component. ‘SAs are the smallest units of the set, e.g. orders, jokes, greetings, summonses, compliments, etc. (Adam,J. & Nikolas,C. (1999:26) add that a “SAs may involve more than one move from only one person, e.g. greetings usually involve a sequence of two moves”. SAT, is part of pragmatics, a subfield of linguistics. Linguistics deals with contextual meaning, situational meaning, and SAs.
Gorge Yule (1996:47) defines SAs as ‘actions performed via Us, and in English, are commonly given more specific labels such as apology, complaint, compliment, invitation, promise, or request’.

Here, we come to the definition of SAs by Thorat, A. (2006:33) when he defines it as ‘the smallest of linguistic communication. It is a theory of what the S and the L have to know and to do if the former is to communicate with the later through spoken discourse’.

According to Davison (1979:413), ‘SAs’ are linguistic structures which are used with illocutionary force in specific social and institutional contexts. Since they are very closely linked with social and contextual factors, it is hard to delimit their purely linguistic properties, especially the lexical meaning which remain from context to context and overtime”.

Clark and Carlson (1982:35) as cited in Thorat, A. (2006:33) points out that “SAs can not be fully understood without considering the Hs as well as the Ss. SAs are directed at real people, whose abilities to recognize put limits on what Ss can do with their Us”.

Then the SAs are actions performed via Us in appropriate conditions, actions such as making statements, giving commands, asking questions, making promises, and so on.

Saha, G. (2006:11/38) defines SAs as ‘an act performed by a Speaker; by speaking something in a context with respect to a L’. She has also mentioned various definitions to SAs by some scholars as follows:

1- SAT says that language is used not only to describe things but to do things as well. (Kemson, 2001:433)

2- SAs is a sentence which uttered by a S when the S utters it, he/she performs an act. (Jindal, 1998:129)
3- Every U performs SAs of some kind although this may not be obvious from the surface structure of the sentence concerned. (Fowler, 1981:18)

Linguists see the notion of SAT as the central phenomena that any general pragmatic theory must account for SAT. The theory of SAs aims to do justice to the fact that even though words, phrases and sentences encode information. People do more things with words than convey information and that when people do convey information, they often convey more than their words encode. SAT focuses on Us, especially those made in conversational and other face to face situations.

Thus, it is to sum up that when we speak a language, we are performing SAs; acts such as making statements, giving commands, asking questions, making promises, etc.

4.3 AUSTIN'S CONTRIBUTION TO SAT

It is Austin, J.L (1962) who has done an enormous impact on linguistic philosophy and particularly pragmatic. His thought comes into existence to be known as 'SPEECH ACT THEORY'. He is the originator of "SAT" which has been mentioned in his lectures in William James Series in (1955) and which is delivered in Harved to be published in his book as "How to Do Things with Words" in (1962).

Austin developed the first theory of a U as human actions. He has driven that notion from the basic term that language is used to perform actions. He also considered the concept of 'Saying something is to do something' and he came to the idea that in producing an U a Speaker performs three acts simultaneously: a Locutionary, an Illocutionary and a Perlocutionary.

When a person attempts to express about himself, he does not only produce Us containing pragmatic structures and words, he performs an action via those Us. For
example, when the S utters in a winter season when someone gave him a cup of tea, believing that it has been freshly made, he takes a sip and utters "This tea is really cold!" it is here likely to be interpreted as a complaint. In the same offer when someone handed you in a hot summer season a glass of iced tea, you would say the same U "This tea is really cold!" and it is likely to be interpreted as praise. Thus, if the same Us can be interpreted in two different kinds of speech, then obviously no simple one U to one action correspondence will be possible. It indicates that there are various interpretations to SAs than it is to the U.

Austin classifies three levels of action further than the act of U itself. He distinguished the act of saying something, what one does in saying it, and what one does by saying it, and called these the ‘Locutionary’, the ‘Illocutionary’ and the ‘perlocutionary’ acts respectively.

He observed that by saying something, we do not only communicate ideas, but we also transfer the reality. SAs, which affect such a change through the action of being spoken, are called 'Performative SAs' (or performative). For instance, the act of joining two people in marriage is mostly a performative SAs involving using this U: I now/herby pronounce you husband and wife. For Austin, what the S is doing is a kind of creating social realities within certain social contexts. In this context of wedding by bringing two persons together is to create social reality, as a married couple. This example, in fact, involves certain social and cultural criteria, or fulfills felicity conditions to realize its perlocutionary force. It is clear that an unauthorized person cannot pronounce anyone as husband and wife.

Palmer, F. R. (1981:164) states that "Performatives" cannot be true or false, but they can 'go wrong' or be 'unhappy' or 'infelicitous'. He also adds that saying ‘I name this ship Queen Elizabeth’ will not name the ship if the S has no authority to do so. To bet is not
merely to say 'I bet you five riyals’ and these words would not be taken as a bet AFTER
the relevant race.

Here, Jaworski, A. and Coupland, N. (1976:15/6), state, "the notion of 'Force' is borrowed
directly from Austin's work on SAT, and his three-fold distinction into the Locution SAs
(the actual words used in an U), its Illocution SAs (the force or the intention of the S
behind the U), and its Perlocution SAs (the effect of the U on the listener /H)’.

By studying the effects of the S’s Us on the L or (H) is derived from Austin's view that
language is a form of an action. In addition, Austin describes these three characteristics,
or acts that begin with the building blocks of words, and ending with the effects of those
words on the L/audience. The three types of acts are:
1- Locutionary Acts are roughly equivalent to uttering a certain sentence with a certain
meaning in the traditional sense.

2- Illocutionary Acts is such as informing, ordering, warning, undertaking, etc. That is Us
which have a certain 'conventional' force.

3- Perlocutionary Acts are what we bring about or achieve by saying something, such as
convincing, persuading, deterring, and even, saying surprisingly or misleadingly.

Furthermore, Austin focuses on Illocutionary Acts, maintaining that we might find the
'force' of a statement and demonstrate its performative nature. For example, when
somebody says to his friend 'Don't run with knife', it has the force of warning when it is
spoken in a certain context. On the contrary, if the same U states in performative way as 'I
warn you, don't run with knife', the U here is neither true nor false.

1- Illocutionary Acts can often be successfully performed simply by uttering the right explicit performative sentence with the right intentions and beliefs, and under the right circumstances.

2- Illocutionary Acts (unlike perlocutionary acts) is central to linguistic communication. It is a matter of fact that our normal conversations are composed in large part of statements, suggestions, requests, proposals, greetings, and the like. Besides, when we do perform perlocutionary acts such as persuading or intending or intimidating, we do so by performing illocutionary acts as stating or threatening.

3- Illocutionary Acts (unlike perlocutionary acts) is used to communicate which have the feature that one perform them successfully simply by getting one's illocutionary intentions recognized.

Austin here differentiates 'Perlocutionary Acts' as acts performed by saying something. Some typical examples of perlocutionary acts are inspiring, persuading, impressing, deceiving, embarrassing, misleading, intimidating and initiating.

Austin also suggests some characteristics to 'Perlocutionary Act' which are:
1- Perlocutionary Acts (unlike illocutionary acts) is not performed by uttering explicit performative sentence. For instance, in the utterance ‘I (hereby) convince you that Ahmed can beat Ali’, the speaker does not perform the perlocutionary act of convincing someone that Ahmed can beat Ali by uttering the above sentence.
2- Perlocutionary Acts seem to involve the 'effects' of the U acts and illocutionary acts on the thought, feelings, and actions of the H, whereas illocutionary acts do not present
effects of the H. Hence perlocutionary act can be represented as an illocutionary act of the S in addition to its effect on the H.

e.g. a. S tells + H believes …….. = S persuades H that………..
   b. S tells + H intends …….. = S persuades H to………..

Thus, the 'Perlocutionary Act', is causing of change in the mind or behaviour of the L, so that the act is the effect of the U on the L.

From the point view of Levinson, S. (1983: 237) "the 'Illocutionary Act' is what is directly achieved by the conventional force associated with the issuance of a certain kind of U in accordance with a conventional procedure, and consequently determinates in principle at least. However, a 'Perlocutionary Act' is specific to the circumstances of issuance and is therefore, not conventionally achieved just by uttering that particular U and includes all those effects intended or unintended, often on determinate that some particular U in a particular situation may cause.

Here, when one says the U (beat him!) in an appropriate circumstances, it has the 'illocutionary force' of various actions such as, ordering, urging, advising the addressee (H) to beat him; but the 'perlocutionary effect' of persuading, forcing, or frightening the addressee (H) into killing him. Similarly, the U (you can't do that) may have the illocutionary force of protesting, but the perlocutionary effects of checking the addressee's action, or bringing him to his sense, or simply annoying him.

Akmajan et al, (1995:377) suggests that SAs has four important categories. The first category is Utterance Act, which is an act of shouting, whispering and murmuring. The second category is Illocutionary Act, which is an act of promising, reporting and asking. The third category is Perlocutionary Act, which is an act of intimidating, persuading and
deceiving. The last category is the category of Propositional Act, which is an act of referring and predicting.

He also suggests the following diagram which indicates the four important categories of SAs:

![Diagagram of Speech Acts](image)

Another point is mentioned by Austin i.e. the Performative aspect of the U to be evaluated according to their Felicity or Infelicity. That is to say that the success or failure in achieving the S's intentions depends on the Felicity Conditions, which is proposed by him. He produces a typology of conditions, which performatives must meet if they are to succeed or to be 'happy'. He called these conditions Felicity Conditions and distinguished them with three categories:

1- There must be a conventional procedure having a conventional effect.
2- The circumstances and persons must be appropriate or specified in the procedure. (Preparatory condition) E.g. I baptize you…….

3- The procedure must be executed correctly and completely. (Executive condition) e.g., I bet you six rupees.

4- Often, the persons must have the requisite thoughts, feelings and intentions, as specified in the procedure, and if consequent conduct is specified, and then the relevant parties must do it. (Sincerity condition) E.g. I promise to ……

Austin, in the beginning of his lectures, *How to Do Things with Words* states that the job of a sentence can only be to describe some state of affairs, or to state some facts, which it must do either truly or falsely. Here, he wants to remind us that we perform all sorts of 'speech acts' besides making statements and that there are other ways for them to go wrong or be infelicitous besides not being true.

The utterance that fulfills the above conditions is called felicitous; however, if it fails to fulfill them, it will be called infelicitous. For example, if someone in Muslim community says to his wife three consecutive times 'I hereby divorce you', it becomes felicitous, but if this U is uttered in Hindu community where such state does not exit, it becomes infelicitous. Thus, the first condition is not fulfilled (Conventional Condition). Similarly, if the act of baptizing cannot take place if an ordinary man says it rather than a priest or judge. Here, the act is infelicitous and it violates the second condition (Preparatory Condition). The Next, if someone says 'I bet you 100 Riyals, he will win the race', and he does not pay the amount, he is breaking the third condition (Executive Condition). Finally, if I say 'I promise to visit you tomorrow' without having any intention or believe
to carry out the action of the visit. I, here violate the fourth condition of the act to be successfully performed (Sincerity Condition).

Clarke, D. (1983:124/5) comments on Austin's conditions as 'the performative aspects of the U were to be evaluated according to their Felicity or Infelicity, that is to say, their success or failure is achieving the S's intentions. Those conditions, which had to be fulfilled before a performative is felicitous; and they are called felicity conditions'. Austin also mentions in his book to the second classification, which is related to the five Performative classes as follows:

i. **Verdicatives**, by which judgment is given, e.g. to estimate, reckon or praise.

ii. **Exercitives**, by which powers is used e.g. voting, appointing, ordering, and advising.

iii. **Commissives**, which commit the S to undertake an action e.g. promising, vowing, and undertaking.

iv. **Behavitives**, which incorporate items of social behaviour, congratulating, apologizing and condoling.

v. **Expositives**, which are meta-communicative, explaining the nature of one's action, they show the expression of views, clarifications, arguments, references, etc. e.g. 'I contend; 'I concede'.

### 4.4 SEARLE'S CONTRIBUTION TO SAT

The second scholar of the SAT who contributes in the development of the SAT is John Searle (1965). He elaborates the notion of Speech Performance or Speech Acts. He considers rules (constitutive and regulative) for the use of SAs in particular relation to the act of promising. These are for the success of the SAs, which is used in communicative contexts. These conditions are:
1- **Constitutive conditions**, which create or define new activities or forms of behaviour.

2- **Regulative Conditions**, which are generally in the form of orders or imperatives as they regulate activities or behaviour. (These rules govern types of behaviour that already exist)

Thus, Searle indicates that SAs cannot be true or false, but they can be successful or unsuccessful. The term Constitutive, according to him, defines the social or linguistic world, which has independent existence. For example, the rules of football as a game do not only regulate the game itself but it creates the possibility or defines that activity. The activity of playing football is constituted by playing according to these rules. In other words, football has no existence apart from these rules. The same it is with language, without following its rules, the language has no existence.

Searle, here, observes that when we speak a language, we observe its rule-governed form of behaviour. He also highlights the analysis of language in particular which must concern with the conventions for Illocution as well as Locution with the following analogy: “A theory of language is part of a theory of action, simply because speaking is a rule-governed form of behaviour”. He adds that ‘now, being rule-governed it has formal features that admit of independent study. But study purely of those formal features, without a study of their rule in speech acts, would be like study of the currency and credit systems of economics without studying the role of currency and credit in economic transactions’.

Searle (1969:57/61) also suggests that SAs can be characterized in terms of "Felicity Conditions". These conditions are proposed to assure successful or felicitous Us. The four Felicity conditions are as follows:
1- **Sincerity Conditions**, which require Ss to be in certain psychological state, having certain beliefs, intentions, etc. If a S promises to do something, he must sincerely intend to do so. In other words, the S has to intend to act a promise, for a request; the S wants the H to act; and for an 'assertion', that the S believes what he says.

2- **Propositional Content Conditions**, which are the illocution constrains on the content expressed. They relate to reference and prediction (the propositional act). For an act of promise, for example, the content of U must be about a future event by the S.

3- **Essential Conditions** are related to point to an U, which is called the illocutionary point. The point of promise and vow is to commit the S to do something, and the illocutionary point of a request is to get the H to carry out an action. The S, here, intends that his U will 'count' as a promise, and the H should be informed of that intention.

4- **Preparatory Conditions** are about background circumstances and knowledge about S and H that must hold prior to the performance of the act. The preparatory conditions for a request, for example, should include the fact that the H is able to do the act, and it is not obvious to both the S and H that the latter will do the action in the normal course of events of his own accord. For an 'assertion', the preparatory conditions that the S has evidence for the truth of what he says and that is not obvious to either that the H knows the fact.

Thus, each rule focuses upon different aspects of what is said. The propositional content rule focuses only on the textual content, the preparatory rule focuses on background circumstances, the sincerity rule focuses on S's psychological state, and the essential rule focuses upon the illocutionary point of what is said.

Thorat, A. (2002:59) states:
“Keeping the preparatory condition, the sincerity condition and the essential condition which are known as felicity conditions need to be satisfied in order for a speech act to be sincere”.

Searle (1969:39) assumes that these essential conditions for the performance of various illocutionary acts are “conventions all members of a community share, and he regards the SAs are universal, when they are paired down to the essential conditions”. He argues Austin's classification of SAs, as they do not maintain a clear distinction between illocutionary verbs and acts, or the classifications based on applied principles. Here, Searle relies on his classifications principles to build his categories to the SAs. That is, when we speak or write, we are doing one or more of the following: asserting, directing, commissing, expressing, or declaring. He speculates five illocutionary positions are as follows:

1- **Assertives** are statements that maybe judged true or false because they goal to describe a state of affairs in the world.

Or

**Assertives** are those, which have a truth-value that states what the S believes to be the case, or not. For example, 'Snow is white'; 'His book is not about Yemen'. These are some of the examples of the S presenting the world as he believes it is. In using an assertive, the S makes words fit the world (of belief). Examples of assertives are stating, suggesting, reporting, asserting, concluding, etc.

2- **Directives** are statements that attempt to make the other person's actions fit the propositional content.

Or
Directives are attempts to get H to do something. They express what the S wants. Requesting, ordering, commanding, advising, diminishing, asking, begging, dismissing, requiring, urging, warning are directive SAs. In using a directive, S attempts to make the world fit the worlds via the H. For example: 'Could I borrow your pen, please?', 'Don't touch that' and 'Ali! A cup of coffee'.

3- Commissives are statements, which commit the S to a course of action as described by the propositional content.

Or

Commissives are those, which commit the S to some future course of action. These acts express the intention of the S'. Acts such as promise, pledge, refusal, swear, volunteer, invite, offer, bet, agree, guarantee and threat are of such kind. Statements like 'I'll be back', 'I am going to visit you next time' and 'we will not do that' are commissive acts. In using commissive acts S undertakes to make the world fit the words.

4- Expressives are statements that express the 'Sincerity Condition of the SAs'.

Or

Expressives are those that tell about the feeling of S. They express the psychological state of S in a statement of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy or sorrow. This group includes apologizing, complimenting, deploring, praising, complaining, condoling, congratulating, accepting acknowledge, etc. Statements like, 'I am really sad', 'Congratulations' and 'That's great' are of this kind. In using an expressive, a S makes words fit the world of feeling.

5- Declaratives are statements that attempt to change the world by representing it as having been changed.

Or
Declaratives are those that change the world via their Us. They bring about correspondence between the propositional content and the world. In order to make declarative to be performed felicitously, the S must have a special institutional role in a specific content like the following examples: 'I now pronounce you husband and wife' as uttered by a priest. 'You are out' as uttered by a judge, referee or teacher.

The following typology of Speech Acts or the five functions of SAs is proposed by Searle (1979) and will be applied and analyzed in the second part of this chapter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Acts Type</th>
<th>Direction of Fit</th>
<th>S= Speaker</th>
<th>X= Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Representatives</td>
<td>Make words fit the world</td>
<td>S believes X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Directives</td>
<td>Make words fit the words</td>
<td>S wants X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Commissives</td>
<td>Make words fit the words</td>
<td>S intends X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Expressives</td>
<td>Make words fit the world</td>
<td>S feels X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Declaratives</td>
<td>Make words change the world</td>
<td>S causes X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Searle's typology of Speech Acts**

We conclude this part of introduction of SAT with the statement of Leech and Short in their book "Style in Fiction" (1981:297) as they state:

>'the felicity conditions of SAs may change from society or time to another: a hundred years ago it would have been unreasonable to order someone to fly to Paris. In contrast there have, at least until recently, been societies or parts of societies where it was thought reasonable for fathers to order their daughters to marry’. They also add that 'the concept
of SA becomes more useful when we consider that every SA has its conditions of appropriacy or Felicity Conditions’.

PART ONE
DIRECT SPEECH ACTS (DSAs)

4.5.0 INTRODUCTION
This part is assigned to the use of DSAs in the selected novels of Thomas Hardy. Before the analysis, the definitions of DSAs are highlighted. Some of the quotations from the novels are explained in detail in the analysis part. Some aspects of DSAs are like the use of the three types of the sentences, which conventionally perform three functions: declarative, interrogative and imperative. For example, a declarative is used to make a statement; an interrogative is used to ask a question, and an imperative is used to issue a command or making a request. Whenever there is a direct relationship between a structure and a function, we have a DSA. For example, an interrogative used to ask a question is a DSA, but an interrogative used to make a request or a statement is an ISA. Here, there is no resemblance between form and function, whereas DSAs have only one function. However, ISAs always perform more than one function.

The aim of this part is to analyze some declarative, interrogative and imperative sentences from the novels, which fulfill only one function as stating, asking and ordering.

4.5.1 DEFINITIONS OF DIRECT SPEECH ACTS (DSAs)
DSAs can be defined, as 'Whenever there is a direct relationship between a structure and a function' is a DSA.
Thorat, A. (2006:36/41) defines: 

*DSAs are those expressed by the constructions specifically designed for those acts. For example, an interrogative construction is meant to ask a question, a declarative construction is designed to make a statement, and an imperative construction is reserved for issuing orders*. He also adds that 'DSA is one where there is no attempt to save the face of the addressees. It is a bland, plain, ordinary way of saying things'.

Crystal (1998:121) states that "the most direct way is to use the imperative construction (shut the door), but this would be in appropriate in many everyday situations, too abrupt or rude, perhaps".

As we know that, the English basic sentence has three types, which conventionally perform three functions. These functions are:

1- A declarative is used to make a statement. (E.g. You bring a book)
2- An interrogative is used to ask a question. (E.g. Will you bring a book)
3- An imperative is used to issue a command or making a request. (E.g. Bring a book!)

According to Saha, G. (2006:5) DSAs are “those which have a direct relationship between the structure and function of an U”.

Here is an example, which will clarify more. A declarative used to make a statement is a DSAs as 'The sky is blue' so it is DSAs. If this declarative statement is uttered by a child (to his father) enquiring about the weather, it states the reality. However, if the same statement uttered by a friend to another, it means that he is planning to go out for a
picnic, and it is accounted as a kind of suggestion to have adventure. A declarative, thus, used to make a suggestion is an ISA.

Thus, we conclude that DSAs is the one that has literal meaning, which is adequate to convey its communicative value or force. It is noted that according to social standard those friends, elder people, relatives can afford to be direct in their speech.

In DSAs, there is a one to one relationship between structure and S's intention. Here, S's intention is directly reflected to semantics of the U. For example, an interrogative used to ask question is DSA but when it is used to make a request, it is ISAs. The question 'Can you iron my jacket?' the modal verb 'can' here indicates two functions, the first function is the ability of the L to iron and the second function is requesting the addressee (L) to do the same. When one act is completed to achieve another act is called ISAs.

**4.6 Analysis of Direct Speech Acts from the Selected Novels**

The following examples from the novels under the study show the use of DSAs where there is a relationship between structure and function. It shows the dictionary meaning or explicit meaning. It does not go beyond the words or beyond the implied meaning of the author. It shows the denotative meaning, while ISAs, shows connotative meaning or implied meaning; meaning which has more than one interpretation.

In FMC novel, Oak spends two months away of the town of Casterbridge on the occasion to get the yearly- hiring- fair. He looks pale and his expression becomes sad as he has suffered from his misfortune, being lost his sheep, his farm and now he becomes jobless. He has gone to search for a job. The three farmers notice him, and come forward to him. They ask him:

*Farmers: “Where do you come from?”*  
*Oak: ‘Norcombe,”*
Farmers: “That's a long way.”
Farmers: “Whose farm were you upon last?”
Oak: “My own.” (FMC: 47)

The dialogue illustrates the use of interrogative and declarative speech acts respectively, which occur between Oak and the farmers. It shows plainly the use of DSAs. The farmers asked and Oak answered in an easy way. The interrogative is used to ask question, to ask for information from the addressee, and the addressee provides the asker with the suitable information he required. The answers and the questions show its surface meaning, and it shows the relationship between the structure and the function. The question which start with “Wh-question” requires information to be provided from the side of the H. DSAs requires one structure and one function, whereas ISAs requires one structure, and multiple meanings.

In the same speech situation, this example also shows the use of DSAs, interrogative act. This happens when Oak asks the farmer about how long it takes to go to Shottsford, and the farmer replies ‘ten miles to other side of Weatherbury’. Here, Oak, surprisingly and implicitly discovers that Weatherbury is the place where Bathsheba is, his sweetheart, whom he has met her in Norcombe:

Oak: ‘How far is Shottsford?’
Farmer: ‘Ten miles t’other side of Weatherbury.’
Oak: ‘Weatherbury!’ ‘How far is it to Weatherbury?’
Farmer: ‘Five or six miles.’ (FMC: 47)

From the dialogue above, we can find that DSAs indicates only one function and one structure. The function of the interrogative is to ask for information, the function of the declarative is to make statement, and the function of the imperative is to command or issue orders. These three types of the sentences are all applied in the above two
dialogues, except Oak’s exclamation ‘Weatherbury!’ which indicates ISA, as it implies, that it is the place where Bathsheba lives. Moreover, his journey of his searching for her, found its destination.

The following Us are from the novel FMC in which the mistress, Bathsheba orders or commands one of her servants to go down and keep the guests in the kitchen till she prepares to meet them. Her orders are spoken in its semantic meaning. As she is the owner of the farm, she has the power over her workers to order them to do things for her. Here, she commands Marryan to go down and keep them by using these phrases ‘go down’, ‘keep them’, and ‘show them to me’. These are explicit imperatives. They have only one structure and one meaning each and these are indirect speech acts:

\[
\text{Bathsheba: ‘Oh, very well, Marryan, go down and keep them in the kitchen till I am dressed, and then show them in to me in the hall.’ (FMC: 79)}
\]

The above dialogue took place when Bathsheba hears the tramp of a horse near of her house. The horse-man taps the door, Bathsheba orders Marryan to go and open the door, and keep them in the kitchen, then show them in the hall. Boldwood has come to meet the mistress of the farm, but because she is not ready to meet him, he returns to his farm.

The following dialogue is from the novel The MC; Lucetta meets Elizabeth for the second time. Their relation becomes strong. Here, they share a conversation; one asks and the other answers in a direct way. Lucetta keeps Elizabeth in her home, due to the quarrel between her and her stepfather, Henchard. Lucetta’s aim is to make Henchard meets her legally, when he comes to see and visit his daughter. Lucetta’s question ‘Who are those?’ is away of seeking information from the addressee, Elizabeth. Elizabeth’s answer also shows her directness and she violates Grice’s maxim, the Quant maxi, when she speaks more than it is required:
Lucetta: ‘Who are those?’
Elizabeth: ‘One is my father. He rents that yard and barn’
Lucetta: ‘Did you tell him when you were going to?’
Elizabeth: ‘No’
Lucetta: ‘O- how was that?’
Elizabeth: ‘I thought it safer to get away first – as he is so uncertain in his temper.’ (MC: 176)

Thus, the above dialogue demonstrates that there is only one relation between structure and function. The S asks and the H answers in an explicit manner and this is what it is called DSAs. It indicates denotative, surface and dictionary meaning. It does not need from the reader to discover the implied or author’s intended meaning because of its explicit nature. Here, Lucetta asks her companion, seeking more information from her regarding to her old lover, Henchard. Elizabeth answers her in a plain way. This dialogue is certainly questions-seeking information, which is intended to elicit information from the addressee. It is also called felicitous request from the S’s side to the H’s side, as the addressee sincerely want the addressee to provide her with certain answers. These questions are also called directive questions, because a question is an attempt to get the H to do something, namely providing information to the H or addressee.

In The RN, Mrs.Yeobright asks her son Clym about the man who stands at a distance, by inquiring ‘Who is there?’ using a plain structure and its function is one meaning, i.e. seeking information from the S’s side. The reddleman’s reply is also in plain and clear words. He says, ‘it is him who stands right out of the way’. The two interlocutors do not show much effort in their communication, as they transfer their message in a literal meaning. Moreover, this is the job of DSAs which does not mean more than the words expressed. Clym asks the reddleman ‘Who has given her away?’ to mean the person who
gives Thomasin’s way. The reddleman replies ‘Miss Vye’ gave a way to Thomasin in the marriage. The fact is that the reddleman comes back from the church with news that Thomasin has already got married, and Eustacia has given her a way in her marriage. Here, Clym questions the reddleman about Eustacia by using ‘Wh-question’, which indicates seeking information to be given from the addressee to the addresser. The addressee (the reddleman) provides the addresser (Clym) with adequate information. Clym asks the reddleman about who is the woman? by saying ‘Who’s Miss Vye?’, and the reddleman answers, ‘Captain Vye’s grand….’

Mrs. Yeobright: ‘Who was there?’
The reddleman: ‘Nobody hardly, I stood right out of the way, and she did not see me.’
Clym: ‘Who gave her away?’
The reddleman: ‘Miss Vye’.
Clym: ‘Who’s Miss Vye?’
The reddleman: ‘Captain Vye’s granddaughter, of Mistover Kreep.’ (RN: 168)

Thus, from the above dialogue we conclude that both the S and the H do not do much effort in their conversation to transfer the message. It is clearly DSAs which gives an explicit meaning, and does not need to find out the implication meaning of the Us.

In The MC, Susan, Henchard’s oldwife sent her daughter, Elizabeth with a message to Henchard, informing him that she has come back after eighteen years, to meet him. Elizabeth delivers the message to Henchard, and the dialogue starts between them. Henchard asks some direct questions which indicate his interested to listen to the H. The fact is that Elizabeth does not know the true relation between her mother and this man. She thinks him to be just like a relative to her mother. When the message delivers to him, he feels astonished as his wife’s surprising return:
Henchard: ‘Oh – Susan is – still a live?’

The girl: ‘Yes, sir.’

Henchard: ‘Are you her daughter.’

The girl: ‘Yes sir – her only daughter.’

Henchard: ‘What – do you call yourself – your Christian name?’

The girl: ‘Elizabeth-Jane, sir.’

Henchard: ‘Newson?’

The girl: ‘Elizabeth-Jane Newson.’ (MC: 85)

These questions-answers are direct way of requesting the addressee to provide the addressee with suitable information. The relation between the structure and the function shows only one function, i.e. seeking information from the H’s side, and this is what it is called DSAs.
PART TWO
INDIRECT SPEECH ACTS (ISAs)

4.7.0 INTRODUCTION
In the beginning of this part, an attempt is made to discuss the views of ISAs pioneers and apply them to the analysis of the selected novels of Thomas Hardy. To understand the relationship between the structure and the function due to the importance of the ISAs, here an attempt is made to study the gap between what is said and what is meant. The study takes into account the context of the novels, the background knowledge, the author’s intention and the knowledge of the previous Us. Contexts in ISAs play an important role in the analysis of the linguistic interactions of the characters.

John Searle (1975) introduced the concept of “Indirect Speech Act”. He suggests that in ISAs, the S communicates to the H more than he actually manifests by way of relaying on their mutually shared background information both linguistic and non-linguistic. He also asserts that ISAs have a literal meaning and an inferred meaning and they have more than one meaning or illocutionary force.

ISAs, according to him, “are cases in which one illocutionary act is performed indirectly by way of performing a direct one”. In a simple meaning, ISAs refers to an U in which one says one thing and means something else.

Jacob (2006:113) states Searle’s views on ISA as “a combination of two acts, a primary illocutionary act and a secondary one”. The S performs the secondary illocutionary act by way of uttering a sentence (the literal meaning). However, the primary illocutionary act is not literal.
In ISAs the S conveys his intention via an implicature or unstated meaning. In other words, the intention of the S is being communicated implicitly. The S conveys his indirectness using such reference phrases like, ‘other people’, ‘other things’, ‘they’, ‘someone’ and ‘something’ and they indicate obscurity.

It is observed that ISAs intensify politeness and are used to create strong perlocutionary effect on the H. That is why Searle considered indirect orders as more polite and gentler than direct ones.

4.7.1 DEFINITIONS OF INDIRECT SPEECH ACTS (ISAs)

There are many definitions of ISAs. One of famous definition is that ‘whenever there is an indirect relationship between a structure and a function there is ISA’. It is opposite of DSA which has a direct relation between a structure and a function. For example, a declarative used to make a request is an ISA (e.g. I hereby request you to close the door). The interrogative structure in this sentence (e.g. Do you have to stand in front of the TV?) is not used only as a question, hence it is an ISA. Also, the declarative structure in (e.g. you’re standing in front of the TV) and (e.g. you’d make a better door than a window) are also indirect requests.

ISAs are “speech acts in the performance of which the S performs more than one illocutionary act at the same time” (Haverkate, 1989:75). This is to say that ISAs communicate something more than what they literally mean via implicature, since one act is performed by way of another.

Here, Searle (1975:76) observes:

“Politeness is the most prominent motivation for indirectness in requests and certain forms naturally tend to become the conventionally polite ways of making indirect requests.”
It is apparent that Politeness and indirectness match with Leech’s maxim i.e. (tact strategy). There are many indirect ways of making a polite request.

ISAs have the purpose of getting Hs recognize their intentions, goals and respond accordingly. Indirectness is not only an element of politeness but also an important part in irony. Crystal (1998:121) argues, “The majority of acts in everyday conversation are indirect”.

SAs according to Ashok, T. (2006:36) is “those expected by other constructions”. He also explains that the sentence ‘It is hot in here’ could be used in different situations, to assert that it is hot in the room, to request someone to open the window or to request someone to close the window and also it implies a warning to someone not to enter the room, and so on.

According to Leech (1985:38), “indirectness is a matter of a degree”. He also adds that ISAs are “SAs which are more indirect than others”.

ISAs are generally associated with more politeness than DSAs. Here, Niazi, N. (2006:64) states:

“almost in all cultures people use indirect requests when they want to ask for something”.

This is because indirect requests tend to be more polite than direct request because they minimize the degree of choice to the H. For instance, instead of saying impolite request like ‘Bring me a cup of tea’, which is an imposition on the H and, thus, in many situations might run the risk of refusal. That is why we usually use statements indicating the indirect request. Like the example, ‘Would you like a cup of tea or coffee?’ it is here
more polite for making request as it gives options to the H to choose, and its up to him to reject or accept the offer, by saying ‘Yes, I’d like tea’ or ‘No, thanks’.

Thus, we conclude that an ISA is an attempt made to save the face of the S. it is a kid of circumlocution. Being indirect is more polite than being direct as indirectness provides L(s) options to interpret Us.

4.8.0 Analysis of Indirect Speech Acts (ISAs) from the Selected Novels
The study takes into consideration Searle’s five sub-speech acts of illocutionary acts. Searle classified illocutionary acts into five SAs. The selected novels of Hardy are studied by applying these five illocutionary speech acts, namely assertives, commissives, directives, expressives and declaratives. The aim of the analysis of ISAs is to reveal the hidden intentions of the characters as well as the novelist’s intentions.

4.8.1 The Five Functions of Speech Acts
4.8.1.1 ASSERTIVE SPEECH ACTS
This category as explained and mentioned above in the first part consists of the following acts: stating, suggestion, denying, complaining, etc. All the novels under the study employ the assertives speech acts. For example, in The MC, Susan and her daughter Elizabeth-Jane search for their relative Henchard (her legal husband in reality), after eighteen years, being sold to the sailor Newson. She passes through a very bad state of mind, and it was reported that her second husband was dead at sea. She decides to look for her first husband, Henchard. They come to Casterbridge town. When they arrive to the King’s arms, Elizabeth asks the old man about ‘What’s going on to-night?’ the old man replies in assurance as he finds that the two ladies are not from Casterbridge; they are foreigners:
The old man: ‘Well, ye must be a strange sure,’ ‘tis a great public dinner of the gentle-people and such like leading volk – wi’ the Mayor in the chair…….’

(MC: 43)

The old man’s U indicates his suggestion and predicing acts at the same time. He asserts that these ladies are foreigners, and suggests that they are not from Casterbridge town. The use of the word ‘well’, shows the old man’s hesitation in the beginning, and finally declares with assertion word ‘sure’ that these are strangers. In addition, the use of the modal verb ‘must’ indicates his certainty of the situation. The S (old man) presents an actual state of affairs.

In the same novel, The MC is supplied with the assertive acts. Sometimes, the use of repetition shows disagreement with the S. Here, Susan tries to get her husband Henchard back on his talking of selling. She states in a bitter mood that his talk is serious, too serious. She repeats his title ‘Mike’ two times and the adjective ‘serious’ also two times in a way to emphasize and assert the S’s (Henchard) wrong manner, but in vain:

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

Thus, assertive acts are usually expressed through declarative forms as it is shown in the above U.

In FMC, the character Fanny Robin asked her lover, Troy in a suggestion tone about the time of their marriage. As she is supposed to go to the church ‘All Saints’, but mistakenly she goes to the church ‘All Souls’. Troy waits her. The member of the congregation sits down also waiting for her arrival. He declares them (Troy and Fanny) as wife and husband. Nevertheless, she does not come early as she mistakes the name of the church in
which the declaration of their marriage will be held. Troy calls her a fool, and adds that she makes him a fool in front of the priest and the congregations of the church, being not coming.

Thus, Fanny suggests that he should come for the marriage the next day. However, Troy laughed mockingly and says that he can not go through that experience again for sometime:

\[
\text{Fanny: ‘Shall it be tomorrow, Frank?’}
\]
\[
\text{Troy: ‘Tomorrow!’ ‘I don’t go through that experience again for sometime, I warrant you.’}
\]
\[
(FMC: 114)
\]

Here, the S really presents an actual state of affairs by falling in a mock situation in the church. He also uses the face threatening strategy to the H (Fanny), warning her not to do that again. The suggestion question by Fanny and the assertion answer by Troy show that both of them perform the assertive act.

In The RN, Humphery and Sam work with Captain Vye. Eustacia is indoor the cottage, and she overhears the conversation that is going on between her grandfather and the two workers. They are talking about Clym who work in Paris and decide to visit his mother Mrs. Yeobright. Humphrey states that both Eustacia and Clym will make an excellent couple, if they got married, as both of them like niceties; are educated, and are thinking about high doctrine.

Thus, Humphrey performs an assertive act, when he states some suggestions about Eustacia and Clym. He presents some actual state of affairs which may be true or false:

\[
\text{Humphrey: ‘I say, Sam,’ ‘She and Clym Yeobright would make a very pretty pigeon-pair-hey? If they wouldn’t I’ll be dazed! Both of one mind about}
\]

245
niceties for certain and learned in print, and always thinking about high doctrine – there couldn’t be a better couple if they were made. O, purpose,……..’
(RN: 113)

The S, here, performs the act of assertive through declarative sentences. However, the S states the truth about Clym and Eustacia but it is proved that their marriage was the failure one as it leads all of the characters in the novel to suffer. Clym becomes blind, Eustacia with her old lover Wildeve are drowned, and Clym’s mother Mrs.Yeobright is dead due to the marriage.

4.8.1.2 COMMISSIVE SPEECH ACTS

These acts are those, which commit the S to do some future act. It is very effective act in the selected novels of Hardy. It is more applicable to the novel The (MC). In fact, it is applicable to the character Henchard who commits more and great commissive acts in the novel. The acts, which include swearing, promising, agreeing, threatening, etc., are called commissives acts.

The following example is from FMC where Boldwood and Troy meets for the first time. Boldwood is the former lover to Bathsheba. He has proposed her and she tells him to give her time to think. However, when Troy is on the way, she transfers her love to him. Boldwood decides to meet Troy and offers him money to leave Bathsheba and goes to Fanny, whom he has an intimacy relation. Boldwood here promises Troy to hand him money if he married her:

Boldwood: ‘Come to that, is it!’
Troy: ‘You promised silence,’
Boldwood: ‘I promise again,’ (FMC: 218)
Thus, Boldwood, here, performs an act of promise. This act is for future action to be achieved.

Similarly, in the novel FMC Oak gave a promise not to propose to Bathsheba anymore. Oak offers to marry her. He tells her that he will fulfill every wish she wants for agreeing to his proposal. However, Bathsheba refuses him and told him that she does not love him. Here, he promises not to ask her anymore. He performs an action to be performed in the future. It is clear that if the S fulfills the promise, he manipulates the sincerity condition:

\begin{quote}
Bathsheba: ‘No- no – I cannot. Don’t press me any more – don’t. I don’t love you – so’t would be ridiculous,’
Oak: ‘Very well,’ ‘Then I’ll ask you no more,’
\end{quote}

(FMC: 40)

The perlocutionary act of Bathsheba’s U is persuading him not even to think of her in the next time, and it is fulfilled by the addressee that he will not ask her any more in the future.

In The RN Wildeve’s statements show committing performative act ‘promising and vowing’. Eustacia seduces him to come to meet her by lighting the bonfire. When they argue with each other, due to Wildeve’s proposal to Thomasin, she tells him that she lit the bonfire to get excitement and to see her power over him. This irritates Wildeve and makes him to commit a commissive act by vowing and promising never to meet her again:

\begin{quote}
Wildeve: ‘And yet I declare that until I get here tonight I intended, after this one good-bye, never to meet you again.’ (RN: 69)
\end{quote}
The preparatory condition for a promise, according to Searle, is that the S would like the action to be performed in the future. Here, Wildeve would like the action to be worked, he says good bye to his sweetheart, and promises not to meet her again. However, when we read the entire novel, we notice that the S does not keep his vow or promise as he meets her more times and talks to her. The sincerity condition, here, shows that the S has an intention to do that act truly but Wildeve breaks this condition. The essential act in Wildeve’s U shows that he keeps it by using the words of vowing and promising like ‘declare’, ‘intend’ and the phrase ‘never to meet you again’.

In The MC novel, particularly in its beginning, the character Henchard declares his great solemn oath that he will keep away from drinking all strong liquors. He also swears upon the book of Bible that he will try to keep his oath for twenty-one years or he will be struck dumb, blind and helpless if he breaks his oath. This is an excellent example of showing the commissive act in its climax:

Henchard: ‘I, Michael Henchard, on this morning of the sixteenth of September, do take an oath before God here in this Solemn place that I will avoid all strong liquors for the space of twenty-one years to come, being a year for every year that I have lived. And this I swear upon the book before me; and may I be strook dumb, blind, and helpless, if I break this my oath,’ (MC: 26)

This commissive act ‘oath’ is performed when Henchard commits his shameful deed, i.e. selling his wife for mere five guineas. He wakes up from his drunken situation and realized that he has really sold his wife with her daughter.
Thus, he sincerely performs the commissive act, swearing with strong belief of repentance and blaming himself from such shameful deed. He fulfills the sincerity condition declaring a solemn oath intentionally to punish himself. The propositional content condition is also applied, as he commits a future oath for long space of time ‘twenty one years’, blaming himself and keeping away from liquor drinking. The preparatory condition shows its applicability in the author’s comments (Thomas Hardy) when he states that ‘Henchard reveals to his wife Susan when he meets her by saying, ‘I don’t drink’ ‘you hear, Susan? I don’t drink now – I haven’t since that night’. He means the night, which he has sold her to the sailor Newson. This is a very idiosyncratic oath, which has been kept for twenty-one years. This example fulfills all Searle’s felicity conditions (sincerity, prepositional content, essential, and preparatory conditions).

Another example is also from the same novel The MC, which shows the use of commissive act by the same character, Henchard. He performs a promise act for the corn merchants who come to complain him for the bad wheat that he has supplied them. He tells them that he was deceived when he purchases the wheat and he promises them to be more careful in the future:

_Henchard: ‘I have mended my arrangements on account o’t.’ ‘I have advertised for a through good man as manager of the corn department.’ ‘When I’ve got him you will find these mistakes will no longer occur – matters will be better looked into.’ (MC: 49)_

The S (Henchard), here, commits indirect promise for the future action. This action is to overwhelm the problem of the bad wheat and supply those (corn-merchants) with good wheat. This implies that promise is achieved when Henchard appoints the Scotchman, Farfrae who gives him an appropriate solution to solve the problem of the bad wheat.
The last example is from the same novel, The MC as well, and by the same character, Henchard. Henchard swears to Lucetta that he will return all of her entire love-affairs letters, which she has given him earlier. It happens when the former visits his old friend, Farfrae in his home. He reads him all of Lucetta’s letters but without mentioning her name. She overhears all his reading with bad feeling of revealing her name to her husband, Farfrae. She decides to meet Henchard and requests him to return her letters. She reveals her weakness by saying:

Lucetta: ‘I have no other grief. My happiness would be securing enough but for your threats, O Michael, don’t wreck me like this. When I came here I was a young woman; now I am rapidly becoming an old one.’ (MC: 300)

Here, Henchard’s heart feels pity on hearing her appeals to him. He commits a promise act to return her letters by saying:

Henchard; ‘But you shall have the letters without fail. And your secrets shall be kept. I swear it.’
Lucetta: ‘How good you are! – how shall I get them!’
Henchard: ‘Now don’t doubt me,’ ‘I can keep my word.’ (MC: 300)

It is true that Henchard always keeps his swears or promises when he commits them. Moreover, it is clear from the above examples that he keeps his oaths and swears for long period of time ‘twenty one year’ that he will not drink liquor. Thus, Henchard commits an act of promise and at the same time, he swears to keep all Lucettas’ secrets. The word ‘swear’ and the indirect promise phrase ‘I can keep my word’ are clearly commissive acts.
4.8.1.3 DIRECTIVE SPEECH ACTS

This category contains the acts of question, request, order, command, suggest, etc. These acts are attempts of the H or the addressee to do something to the S or the addressee. They are very workable acts in the selected novels, particularly by these major characters, Henchard, Boldwood and Bathsheba.

In FMC Bathsheba asks her shepherd (Oak) to leave her farm, due to his daring to speak to her in a very bitter manner. He tries to interfere in her life and even criticizes her private conduct. He tells her that she is mistaken when she sent a valentine letter to Mr. Boldwood, telling him to marry her, but she does not marry him. Another situation when he advised her not to be sincere to Mr. Troy, as he is an evil and bad person. Moreover, the last situation is when she promised Mr. Boldwood to marry him, and she goes to marry Troy. These two situations irritate the mistress of the farm and she decides to dismiss him from his service. For three times, she repeats her dismissal to him:

\textit{Bathsheba: ‘So you’ll please leave the farm at the end of the week!’ (FMC: 131)}

\textit{Bathsheba: ‘I wish you to go elsewhere,’ ‘Do not remain on this farm any longer’ (FMC: 184)}

The first dismiss act is more polite than the second one. The first dismissal, Bathsheba uses polite words like, ‘please’ while in the second dismissal, she uses direct and very sharp dismissal words such as, ‘go elsewhere’, and ‘do not remain on the farm’. The preparatory condition is fulfilled here as the S performs the act of order or dismissal because the S (Bathsheba) is in a position of authority over the H (Oak).

In The MC, Henchard once overhears Lucetta and Farfrae talk in love tones. He feels upset and decides to go to Lucetta’s house in order to have a frank talk with her. He goes in directly without knocking the door. Lucetta is almost flabbergasted and tells him that he has no right to visit her in the late night. Henchard asks her why she is trying to get rid
of him though she has come to Casterbridge on his account to marry him. Lucetta has now a new lover, Farfrae, so she leaves Henchard and goes to his old manager. Henchard, here, threatens her with an intension to expose her old intimacy with him:

Henchard: ‘Will you, or will you not, marry me?’
Lucetta: ‘If you – wish it. I must agree!’
Henchard: ‘You say yes?’

Thus, Henchard, here, puts his direct question as an order to Lucetta whether she will marry him or not. Lucetta has no choice but to give the promise. However, her promise is stated indirectly as she says ‘if you wish’, and ‘I do’. The addresser here attempts to get the addressee to do an act of promising under the threat and compulsion. The illocutionary act of Henchard’s questions is threatening, and the perlocutionary act of Lucetta’s U is convincing to do the act of promise i.e. marrying him.

This example is from The RN in which Christian tells Clym that his mother has visited him. Clym’s mother mentions to the redlelman that she wants to visit her son and reconciles with him. The redlelman is only the one on the Heath who knows this matter. Mrs. Yeobright was died on her way to Clym’s house. She tells the boy Christian that she is died with a broken-heart and was cast off by her son. This disheartened Clym so much. He inquires the boy about Diggory and he tells him that he has gone away from Egdon Heath for several months.

Here, Clym orders the boy to go and search for him. The reason is that Clym wants to know more about the cause of his mother’s depression. Thus, Clym performs the act of directive, by asking the boy more questions and seeking information from him. He even orders him not to come back without bringing the redlelman Diggory with him:
Clym: ‘I must see Venn – I wish I had known it before! I wonder why he was not come to tell me?’

Christian: ‘He went out of Egdon Heath the next day, so would not be likely to know you wanted him.’

Clym: ‘Christian,’ ‘you must go and find Venn. I am otherwise engaged, or I would go myself. Find him at once, and tell him I want to speak to him.’

Christian: ‘I am a good hand at hunting up folk by day,’ ‘but as to right-time, never is such a bad hand a I, Mister Yeobright.’

Clym: ‘Search the heath when you will, so that you bring him soon. ‘Bring him tomorrow, if you can.’ ‘Inquire as much as you can tomorrow without neglecting your work’ ‘Don’t come again till you have found him.’ (RN: 316/7)

The dialogue illustrates the excessive use of directive acts. Clym orders the boy with many commands such as; ‘you must go’, ‘find Venn,’ ‘find him’, ‘tell me’, ‘search the heath’, ‘bring him’ was repeated two times, ‘inquire’ and ‘don’t come’. This is due to the importance of the incident; Clym commits many directive acts, by giving orders to the boy making him to fulfill his requests. All these orders are future actions. The redundant use of these orders break the Grice’s Quant maxi, which states that the S should be informative as is required for the current purpose of communication. Thus, the S violates Quant maxi.

4.8.1.4 EXPRESSIVE SPEECH ACTS

These acts express psychological states such as feelings or attitudes about particular state of affairs. This category includes apologizing, complaining, praising, etc.
In FMC, Oak expresses his love to his mistress in three situations. In the beginning of the novel, it occurs when he is a farmer and has his own farm, and the second time when she asks him to give her advice towards Boldwood who proposes to marry her, though she does not like him, and because of her promise to him. The last feeling occurs towards the end of the novel when all of her workers had left her farm, and Oak also has decided to leave her. She comes to visit him in his cottage. Here, Oak declares his love feelings to her again for the third time, and he is awarded, by Bathsheba’s acceptance to marry him:

> Oak: ‘You know, mistress, that I love you, and shall love you always. I only mention this to bring to your mind that at any rate I could wish to do no harm,…….’ (FMC: 184)

Here, Oak expresses his sincere love to Bathsheba in the beginning in a way to win her love but in vain. The illocutionary act of his U is to request his mistress to think upon his feelings of love to her. The perlocutionary act is the S expects from the H to agree but it is not fulfilled here as she tells him that she does not like him.

In The MC, Henchard saves Lucetta from the bull chase. She feels very grateful to him for having saved her life. She then makes an offer to help him by paying all his debts. However, he refuses her help as he is not ready to accept any charity from any woman but he needs her to fulfill her promise to marry him. Here, Lucetta’s U has a tone of bitterness. She is afraid of him as she has already married his old friend Farfrae. She is also frightened because of her old intimacy with Henchard and expects that he will disclose her past to her husband. Here, she expresses her helplessness and seeks Henchard’s pity upon her by saying:

> Lucetta: ‘don’t – don’t be cruel! I loved him so much, and I thought you might tell him of the past – and that
grieved me!’ ‘Michael – pity me, and be generous!’

(MC: 253/4)

The addresser, here, puts her feelings of depression, grievances and fear in the above words. She states what she feels. She performs the act of expressive. She feels distressed and painful due to Henchard’s cruelty and threatening to reveal her past to her husband and destroy her happiness. The S, here, makes the words fit the world of feeling and expect from the H to have a pity to forgive her and keep her secrets hidden.

In The RN Eustacia seeks her husband’s mercy, Clym. She confesses that she does not open the door to his mother when she knocks the door. Clym speaks in an angry voice and tells her that she has killed his mother, because of keeping the door closed, and let his mother to be bitten by the snake on her returning to her home. Clym insists to his wife that she should name the man who was with her when his mother was knocking the door. Here, Eustacia expresses her feelings of sorrow and pain because of her husband’s cruelty and mercilessness towards her:

Eustacia: ‘O, O, O!’ ‘O, will you have done! O, you are too relentless – there’s a limit to the cruelty of savages! I have held out long – but you crush me down. I beg for mercy – I cannot bear this any longer – it is inhuman to go further with this! If I had – killed you – mother with my own hand – I should not deserve such …… – I beg you to stay your hand in pity! ….. I confess that I – willfully did not undo the door the first time she knocked – but – I …….’

(RN: 330)
Undoubtedly, this is a very touch of great sadness and despair, which Eustacia passed. It gives us a tone of pity and mercy. This is considered as the greatest tragic novel of Hardy as the heroine (Eustacia) drowned with her lover, Mrs.Yeobright was bitten by the snake and died, Wildeve also died with his old lover Eustacia and Clym became blind.

4.8.1.5 DECLARATIVE SPEECH ACTS

The declarative speech acts are acts, which involve change in the world via the words. It rarely occurs in the selected novels of Hardy. Those who have legal institutions and power generally use these speech acts to change the world through their declarations. The declarative speech acts are applying, nominating, naming, sentencing and appointing. It mostly occurs in the novels: The MC and The RN while it rarely occurs in FMC.

In FMC, Oak engages in a conversation with his mistress, Bathsheba about Boldwood’s proposal to marry her. Bathsheba has sent a valentine letter to Boldwood; he falls in love with her instantly. Bathsheba does not mean to make him to love her. She only plays pranks upon him. However, the man really falls in love with her. Oak blames her doing that. However, Bathsheba looses her temper as he criticizes her private conduct. She says that she will not let anybody criticize her manners. She therefore, dismisses him from her service in the farm and tells him to leave it at the end of the week:

Bathsheba: ‘I cannot allow any man to – to criticize my private conduct!’ ‘Nor will I for a minute. So you’ll please leave the farm at the end of the week!’

(FMC: 131)

Here, she declares her dismissing indirectly to her worker Oak. The act brings change in the world through her U. The mistress of the farm performs it. It is valid as she has legal institution and authority to do the act. The addressee, here, also interacts with this declarative act ‘dismissal’. Oak prepares himself to leave the farm.
In The RN Mrs.Yeobright’s niece, Thomasin wants to marry Wildeve, who works as an innkeeper. However, her aunt has forbidden the marriage in the beginning. She declares her opposition to the marriage in the church. The forbidding can be conducted only when the addresser has a power to do that. Here, Mrs.Yeobright has a power over her niece. She banned the marriage and the marriage is stopped:

_Mrs.Yeobright: ‘I forbid the banns’ (RN: 27)_

Thus, forbidding the ban has brought changes in the world through Mrs.Yeobright’s U. The change, which has occurred in the world, is that there is no marriage. Because of that power and authority of Mrs.Yeobright over Thomasin, the marriage does not take place. She stops the priest to declare the marriage and the act is fulfilled.

In The MC, Henchard, the Mayor of Casterbridge feels jealous of Farfrae’s increasing popularity. His corn-manager becomes even more popular than he is. Farfrae has a good nature and efficiency to manage the corn and hay business in a systematic way. When Henchard spends lots of money to arrange a show to entertain the people of Casterbridge, his arrangements are broken down because of unexpected rain. However, Farfrae’s arrangements are successful for the show takes place in a sheltered place and all the people of the town go to see his show. Here, Henchard hears the people praise his corn-manager, and it makes him feel injured by these comments. In the second speech situation, Henchard finds his stepdaughter Elizabeth dancing with him during the show. It enlightens him so much and decides to take a decision in an indirect way. He dismisses him from his job by saying:

_Henchard: ‘Mr.Farfrae’s time as my manager is drawing to a close – isn’t it, Farfrae?’ (MC: 132)_
Thus, Henchard’s act of declaration changed the world through his U. His manager decided to leave his work with Henchard and started to open a small business. The S, here, has a legal institution to perform the act of declarative upon the H, being the Mayor of the town and the owner of the corn factory. The perlocutionary act of Henchard’s U is that Farfrae left his job and began his own business and the illocutionary act of the U is being considered as an act of warning to him to prepare to leave the work.

In another speech situation from the same novel, The MC Mrs. Henchard Susan leaves a letter with restriction note, it says ‘not to be opened until Elizabeth-Jane’s marriage’. Susan, here, declares that Elizabeth is not Henchard’s daughter but Newson’s. The decision of this reality changes the world of Henchard via his wife’s letter, in particular her U ‘I christened her by the same name…..’ this act makes Henchard’s world becomes indifferent to Elizabeth, and even unkind to her as he knows afterward that she is not his real daughter, but Newson’s:

Susan: ‘Don’t curse me, Mike – think of for how I was situated. I can hardly write it, but here it is. Elizabeth-Jane is not your Elizabeth-Jane- the child who was in my arms when you sold me. No, she died three months after that, and this living one is my other husband’s. I christened her by the same name we had given to the first……’ (MC: 153)

Thus, her mother in the church christens Elizabeth. This act makes change in the world that Elizabeth is the property of Newson, not Henchard. The illocutionary act of Susan’s U is exercising the power at the same time to perform the act. She names her daughter Elizabeth-Jane Newson and the name is fixed. This is what Searle calls an act of ‘Excercitive’.
4.9 CONCLUSION

This chapter has analyzed the two types of SAT. These types are DSAs and ISAs. The first type DSAs show explicitly direct use of Us without mentioning any implications in the context. However, the analysis of ISAs shows the use of declarative, imperative and expressive speech acts. The first two acts declaratives and imperatives executed via fulfilling complaining, criticizing, rejecting, warning, expressing likes and dislikes, threatening and promising or vowing.

The previous chapter also reveals that the characters of the three selected novels of the study are mostly intended to apply ISAS in their interactions and in their conversations among each other, except the characters Henchard in The MC, Boldwood in FMC and Clym in The RN.

The chapter has proved the effectiveness use of the SAT to study literary texts and the important use of linguistic subfield pragmatics to find out the implied meanings of the author in the text. The analysis of ISAs proves that the demand of using the five functions of speech acts to illocutionary acts in the novels like assertives acts, directives acts, expressives acts, commissives acts and directives acts is fulfilled. The dominant directive acts in the selected novels have also proved that the characters Henchard, Bathsheba and Clym are remarkable as far as their linguistic behaviour is concerned.

It is also noted that in the analysis of DSAs in the novels, the characters do not convey more than what they say. However, in the analysis of ISAs, the pragmatic meaning of the characters’ Us convey more than what they say. They convey that more than one interpretation is possible to the text.