

Chapter - One

Introduction

1.1 General Background

Language is a unique feature of human beings which is used to express their ideas, thoughts, feelings and emotions. It is a versatile tool that people use to fulfill their needs. Language can be defined as both personal and social phenomena, which reflect the culture and civilization. It plays an important role in development, maintenance and transmission of human civilizations. All human beings are blessed with language and it is the property of only human beings. There are several languages which are used in day to day communication. Linguists are not unanimous on the exact number of languages which exist in the universe.

Language is a means of communication it is extremely complex and highly versatile code used for human communication. It is a dynamic and open system that allows humans to communicate their thoughts, feelings, desires, emotions, experience and ideas. Jespersen (1904, p.4) defined language as "an end in itselfit is a way of connection between souls, means of communication and regarding the function of language in general". Thus to define language function, we can say that what language does is its function.

According to Richard et al (1999): Broadly speaking, language serves two functions grammatical function and communicative function. Grammatical function is the relationship that a constituent in a sentence has with the other constituents. On the other hand, communicative function is the extent to which a language is used in a community. It means communicative function refers to the ways in which a language is used in a community (P. 162)

Language Functions

The present century has remained very innovative in the field of linguistics and language pedagogy. Several approaches and methods were proposed and practiced in the past. These were based on the assumptions in which language was viewed by their proponents. Chomsky's criticisms on Skinner's verbal Behaviour a new insight into the creativity aspect of language came into practice. But Chomsky's notion of language acquisition limited to the formal aspect of it i.e. to the acquisition of linguistic competence only. As such, Dell Hymes proposed that, in addition to the linguistic competence which is the ability not only to apply the grammatical rules of a language in order to form grammatically correct sentences but also to know when and where to use these sentences and to whom' -Richard et. al., 1999 p49). It also includes the knowledge of grammar and vocabulary, rules of speaking, responding different types of speech acts, and the appropriate use of language.

Language is a system of communication and its function is to establish social relationship. The term function can be used in two different senses: first, grammatical sense (grammatical function), i.e. the relation between different constituents in a larger constructions e.g. subject, complements adverbials and so on; second, the communicative sense communicative function i.e the role of an utterance to fulfill some purpose in communication such as greeting, ordering requesting etc.

Communicative function refers to the purpose for which message is sent or transmitted language is used to communicate ideas, attitudes information's etc between two or more persons. Language utterances can be used to serve different communicative intents or social purposes; some languages such as Sanskrit, Pali, Latin etc. are used for specific purposes only while others are used for all communicative needs in a community, e.g. requesting, introducing, expressing hopes and so on.

Prague school linguists believed that the phonological, grammatical and semantic structures of a language are determined by functions they have to perform in the societies in which they operate.

Wilkins (1976:44) classifies language functions in six types e.g. judgment and evaluation, suasion, argument, rational enquire and exposition personal emotions and emotional relations. Van EK (1975) has presented six main categories of language function, these are:

- a) Imparting and seeking factual information. (identifying, reporting, correcting asking etc).
- b) Expressing and finding out intellectual information. (Expressing and inquiring about agreement and disagreement, accepting or denying an offer or invitation, etc.)
- c) Expressing and finding out emotional attitudes (pleasure or displeasure, surprise, hope, intention, etc.)
- d) Expressing and finding out moral attitudes (apologizing, expressing approval or disapproval, etc)
- e) Getting things done (Suasion) (Suggesting a course of action, advising, warning, etc)
- f) Socializing (greeting and leaving people, attracting attention, proposing a toast)

(11)

"Expressing and finding out intellectual attitudes' is one of the category of Van Ek. Asking for permission comes under it. Permission refers to the act of allowing some body to do some thing. It is used to establish social relationship. In order to establish social relationship we should make a choice of appropriate forms of asking permission as the relationship, context and the place where conversation takes place.

The selection of exponents of asking for permission largely depends on the linguistic competence of the speaker and the situation he/she encounters. It depends upon the personalities involved in speaking and the degree of formality to be observed. So, the appropriate exponent of formality to be observed. So, the appropriate exponent of asking for accepting and denying permission should be chosen by the speaker keeping in mind all the things mentioned above.

An Introduction to the Maithili Language.

The Maithili language is the second most widely used language spoken in Nepal. It is spoken by about thirty million people mainly residing in the eastern part of Nepalese Terai region and Bihar in India. It is the sweetest language spoken in nine Terai districts namely Sirah , Saptari, Udaypur, Morang, Sunsari, Sarlahi, Dhanusha, Mohattari and Rauthat.

Maithili has its own script, Tirhuta or Maithilakshar however, it is written in Devangari script nowadays. Maithili is being used in primary schools as a medium of instruction in Maithili dominated area of Nepal. This is also taught as an optional first paper at the secondary level of education in Nepal. It is recognized as district language and taught in different universities as a specialization subject like T.U. and Calcutta university, Bhagalpur university, India.

Maithili has a long and rich tradition of literature in both Nepal and India. Vidaya pati Thakur is the most celebrated poet of Mithila. He is the immortal singer of beauty, youth and vigour. He is a poet of mirth and merriment. Maithili literature has a very long tradition of oral story telling oral literature reigned in almost all genres of Maithili before the printing facility come into existence. Shree Krishna Thakur, Baidnath Mishra, Kali Kumar Das are some renowned story writers in Maithili.

Maithili in past

It is difficult to pinpoint the fixed date of the origin of Maithili. However, Jha (1980), mentions 1000 A.D. as the landmark in the development of the Maithili language.

On the basis of chronology and linguistic development, Maithili document can be classified under three heads viz.

- a. old Maithili
- b. Middle Maithili
- c. Modern Maithili

a. Old Maithili

It involves the period from 1000 A.D to 1300 A.D. The language of the Caryas, Sarvananda, Saying of Daka. Some of the pieces of Prakrita palingala, Puratan Prabandha, Sangrah represent the old Maithili.

b. Middle Maithili

It includes the period from 1300 A.D. to 1700 A.D. from Varnavatnakava by Jyotirisvar Thakur to Krishnojanma by Manabudha presents the specimens of middle Maithili. The great poet Bidhyapati survived in this period.

c. Modern Maithili

It starts from 18th century especially with the Krishna janma of Manabotha. Modern period involves the period from 18th century A.D. to the present time. In the early phase of the modern period we find the Ramayan and Padavali of Chandra Jha and his translation of Bidhyapati's Parusapariksha, Hersantha Jha's vasah ran, Jivana Jha's Madhavananda and so on. Maithili exercised a great influence on the literature of Nepal in Malla period. The poets of this land imitated this language in their compositions and grew up the Sukumara, Sahitya or belles- letters. Maithili was one

of the languages of the pandits of Nepal durbar and they wrote several Sanskrit dramas with songs in Maithili. The famous poet of Maithili is Mah kave Vidyapati, Govinda Das and Ribindra Nath Tagore. It also flourished as court language in Kathmandu valley in Malla period several literary works and inscriptions in Maithili are still preserved at the national Archives in Kathmandu. In the recent context there have been literary writing in all literary genres, especially poetry plays and fiction from both Indian and Nepali writers. Apart from literature, Maithili writers have also been contributing to other fields like linguists, history, culture, journalism and so on. The prominent Nepalese linguists working in the Maithili language are namely Y.P Yadav. R. yadav and S. Jha other famous names in the field of literature are Mahendra Malangia, Dr Rajendra Bimal, Dhireswar Jha, Dhirendra premarshi, kuber Ghimire and so on.

Different Views on Politeness

Different linguistic express different views on politeness. According to Grundy (2000, p.140) "politeness phenomena are one manifestation of wider concept of etiquette or appropriate behaviour". He further views that politeness affects the speaker differently because polite utterances encode the relationship between the speaker and the hearer.

Yule (1993) states that

Politeness can be accomplished in situation of social distance and closeness showing awareness for another person's face what that other seems socially distant is often described in terms of respect of difference. Shown equivalent awareness when the other is socially close is often described in terms of friendliness. This means to say that politeness is showing to the social or closeness. To be more specific,

the person who is familiar is addressed less politely, whereas the person who is addressed very politely. (p 60)

Goody (1978) views that "the linguistic realizations of positive politeness are in respects, simply representative of the normal linguistic behaviour between intimacy where interest and approval of each other's personality, presupposition indicating shared wants and shared knowledge". In positive politeness, the speaker should take notice of addresses positive face, his wants and desire Generally in ordinary language use, politeness refers to proper social conduct and tactful consideration of other language is used differently by different group of people . So the speaker should have the proper knowledge of language use according to the social context to be encountered, degree of formality to be observed and the social relationship between the speaker and the hearer. Furthermore, who is speaking to whom, when, where and it what manner is the most important fact to be kept in mind by the speaker. The proper use of language express the appropriate social behavior between the interlocutors. If the speaker is the most polite with the addressee it brings cordial relationship between them. (p.108)

Similarly, for Fraser (1980, p.13) politeness is a " Property associated with an utterance in which , according to the hearer, the speaker has neither exceeded any rights nor failed to fulfill any obligations". To put the same thing in another way, politeness is a property of utterances not of sentences. So in the case of seeking permission, the politeness according to Fraser is simply doing what is socially expected and acceptable. The proper use of linguistic forms maintains politeness between the speaker and the hearer and it should be suitable according to particular occasion and situation as it is one of the most important social factors to be kept in mind by the successful conversationalist.

From the above opinion researcher classifies the three different ranks of politeness Viz, formal forms, temperate forms and informal forms.

Pragmatics

Pragmatics has relatively been a new discipline. However, its importance was felt when Chomsky (1965) incorporated semantic component in his theory of transformational generative grammar. Hymes (1972) proposed that "a normal child does not only acquire sentences as grammatical but also as appropriate". This view clearly presents the peculiar relationship between content and use of language. The former refers to the characteristics of language, where as the latter the use of it.

Language is not used in a vacuum. There are participants who use it and there should be some kinds of situations in which it is used. The language which we use should be appropriate according to the context. pragmatics studies the relationship between linguistic forms and their uses. The similar view is presented by Yule (1996, p 127) who says when we read or hear pieces of language. We normally try to understand not only what the words mean, by what the writer or speaker of those words intended to convey. The study of intended speaker meaning is called pragmatics. Additionally, "Pragmatics is the study ofcontextual meaning, how more gets communicated that is said, and the expression of relative distance" (ibid p.3). Thus, pragmatics is "the study of invisible meaning" (ibid p 127) or meaning that derives not only from the words and structures used, but also from the situation of the utterance and how that affects what the speaker means. Moreover, pragmatics takes account of the context (speaker, hearer, situation, topic and so on) to understand language usage. The meaning of an utterance or a piece of conversation cannot be clear until and unless we take account of the context where it takes place.

Trask (1997) defines pragmatics as "the branch of linguistics which studies those aspects of meaning which derive from the context of an utterance, rather than being intrinsic, to the linguistic material itself"

Likewise, Levinson (1983 p.24) states that "Pragmatics is the study of the ability of language users to pair the sentences with the contexts in which they would be appropriate". The first two definitions emphasize the fact that pragmatics studies meaning but it is concerned not with the word or sentence meaning and it takes account of context in which the sentence or utterance is produced. The third definition of Pragmatics focuses on the notion of appropriateness. So a good language user should have the ability to use the language which is grammatically correct as well as contextually appropriate.

Leech (1983) defines,

The pragmatics as general pragmatics and socio-pragmatics is culture specific. General pragmatics studies meaning in relation to speech situation but socio-pragmatics is the sociological interface of pragmatics.....He states that in sociological pragmatics the politeness principle operates variably in different cultures or language communities, in different social situations, among different social classes, so on. (p10)

So, politeness differs from language to language. It obviously depends on the social situations and social classes of the people. Politeness is an essential factor to establish a very good relationship between the speaker and the hearer. It affects positively while seeking permission with other people.

1.2 Statement of problem

The problem leads us to make understand of the topic asking for accepting and denying permission minutely. Asking for accepting and denying permission in

English and Maithili has been done in surface level but it has not been defined yet properly. Asking for accepting and denying permission in English and Maithili from one language to another language. Thus, the problem of study for accepting and denying permission in English and Maithili.

The problems are mentioned below:

To point out whether the function of asking for accepting and denying permission in English is similar to the function of Maithili or they are differ to each other.

Are the asking for accepting and denying permission in English equivalent to asking for accepting and denying permission in Maithili ?

1.3 Hypothesis of the study

Since Maithili is a separate and unique language in itself, it has something very specific with uniqueness in itself like other languages. Thus the researchers have a great respect and sense of acquisition and so they investigate various kinds of researchers. Varieties of researchers have been done on various aspects of the Maithili language but still there are some Jacks. In case of Asking for accepting and denying permission in English and Maithili, some grammarians have under taken the researches but still there is some vagueness in addition, no researcher has ever studied the asking for accepting and denying permission comparatively between English and Maithili. To move the researches forward smoothly, the ideas that there are both in the area of similarities and differences between English and Maithili language and denying permission in English and Maithili, will be accepted as hypothesis.

1.4 Objectives of the Research

The major objectives of this research is to give focus on the asking for accepting and denying permission in Maithili language in comparison with that of

English language. However, following are some of the main objective of this investigation.

- ~ To identify different forms of asking for permission used by native speakers of Maithili.
- ~ To identify different forms of accepting and denying permission used by native speakers of Maithili.
- ~ To compare and contrast those forms with the forms used in English.

1.5 Limitation of the study

This research paper, prepared for the partial fulfillment to the requirements of the master's degree in English is bound to have a number of limitations. Some of which are described below:-

It can't be taken as universal one. For this research deals with only the English and the Maithili languages.

Its major focuses on asking for accepting denying permission in English and Maithili other elements of language except asking for accepting and denying permission is not dealt with too large extent

It ignores the regional and social variation in the words, phrases and sentences. It is based upon only the standard written and spoken languages.

1.6 Significance of the study

Basically, the research will be beneficial for those who prepare English texts books and teachers guide as second language. This will be the first research on asking for accepting and denying permission in Maithili in the central department of English. So, it will be valuable for the department. Similarly, this research will be beneficial for the Maithili native speakers, language planners, syllabus designers, textbook writers, linguists and the person who are involved in this field directly and indirectly.

1.7 Review of Literature (Languages)

Several scholars have contributed on various topics of English and Maithili, but asking for accepting and denying permission have not been dealt properly. Some modern grammarians share the similar view of asking for accepting and denying permission in English and Maithili. The view of related language or literature up to this period can be summarized as follow:-

A Reference Grammar of Maithili by Yadav is a standard grammar of the Maithili language which describes the rules and various grammatical aspects of the Maithili language. He describes the case, number, honorific, gender, markers, preposition etc in Maithili language. Though this grammar is supposed to be a standard grammar, it is not so. The researcher, in course of this research, found some of the draw backs in it. He doesn't talk about asking for accepting and denying permission. However, this grammar helped a lot to discuss asking for accepting and denying permission in Maithili which is great help for this dissertation.

University grammar of English by R. Quirk and S Green banon. A communicative grammar of English by G. Leech and L Svartivek, A practical Guide to English Grammar by Thakur, K.P. etc have been reviewed to bring on some information regarding asking for accepting and denying permission in English language.

Similarly, meaning into words for Grade XI and XIII. Intermediate Grammar of Raymod Murphy have been bring out the clear cut information regarding asking for accepting and denying permission in English.

The scholars like Yule, Goody, Fraser Holmes and Levinson are cited to get the basic information of asking for accepting and denying permission in English. Advance Lerner dictionary (2001) is another source to cite the definition of language.

Other different resources have also been reviewed to discuss the historical background of both the language and their status. Some history books are cited to get the information regarding development of English in Nepal.

The present study is to fill up the gap regarding the similarities and differences between English and Maithili in respect to asking for accepting and denying permission in broader sense which was neglected by the previous researchers.

1.8 Research Methodology

This dissertation is mainly textual and descriptive one. It is based on the data available in the library and the suggestions provided through the consultation with different renowned intellectuals, scholars of the related topic. To this purpose, information are collected by visiting the libraries like the central Library of T.U. Kirtipur, the Library of C.D. of English T.U. Kirtipur, the Library of Royal Nepal Academy, Kathmandu.

This research has used both the sources of data: primary and secondary for details. Asking for accepting and denying permission in both languages are analyzed based on secondary data collected from standard English and Maithili grammars, especially from Leech and Svartvik (1975), Van EK (1976), Martryek (1983), Finnocchiaro and Brumfit (1983) Wardhaugh (1986) and Blundeil, Higgs and Middlermiss (2001), The other different books, Journals, Magazines' etc have also been used as the secondary sources to analyze the background information of the two language. Yadava and some others have contributed a lot in the field of Maithili language regarding its origin. Some of the data are also collected from census report of 2001 to know the position of Maithili language. Besides the native speakers of Maithili language of different districts and especially Dhanusha are the primary source of data. By visiting the different natives of the Maithili language from different

district. Besides, the researcher being a Maithili speaker is himself major source of data.

Regarding the sampling procedure, the researcher has used stratified Random sampling based on 50 Maithili speakers of different age, sex and educational background to sample the population and also for the primary source of data for asking for accepting and denying permission in Maithili.

Population Studies

District	People
Sirah	14
Dhanusha	16
Mahotari	10
Saptari	10
Total	50

To discuss about the tools for data collection, the researcher has developed a set of questionnaire with the help of the suggestion provided by the intellectual scholars for the data collection in order to analyze asking for accepting and denying permission in Maithili and prove fact given by the scholarly grammarians, but in the English are analyzed completely based on the secondary data.

Besides, this research has also used the method of comparison and contrast which discovered the major similarities and differences regarding asking for accepting and denying permission which are major objectives of this thesis. In addition, the methodologies like analysis, exposition, definition and other including the suggestions and guidelines of the respected lectures, professors and the senior students are also included.

1.9 Organization of the Study

This study has been basically organized into six chapters. Chapter one deals with the background of the study, statement of the problem, review of literature (languages). Significance of study, research methodology, limitation of the study and organization of the study. Chapter two focuses on asking for permission in English. Chapter three focuses on asking for permission in Maithili. Chapter four sheds light on similarities and differences of asking for accepting and denying permission between English and Maithili languages chapter five and six shed light on pedagogical implication and summary and conclusion respectively.

Chapter -Two

2.1 Asking for permission in English

Asking for permission is one of the major communicative functions that is used to express and find out intellectual attitudes. It is used to establish appropriate forms or exponents. A good language user should have the language competence to use the language, which is grammatically correct as well as contextually appropriate. There are some rules and norms to be followed for the use of speech in a speech event.

Politeness is concerned with how language expresses the social distance between speakers and their different role relationships, and how they work in a speech community language differs in how the speakers express politeness.

According to Holmes (1992). The following components influence the right choice of language in asking for permission.

a. Social factors

- i. The participants : who is speaking and who are they speaking to ?
- ii. The setting or social context of the interaction: where are they speaking ?
- iii. The topic: what is being talked about ?
- iv. The function : why are they speaking ?

b. Social dimensions

There are four different social dimensions which are related to the social factors,

They are:

1. A social distance scale concerned with participants relationship.
2. A status scale concerned with participant relationships
3. A formality scale relating to the setting or types of introduction.

4. Two functional scales relating to the purposes or topic of interaction.

i. The solidarity - social distance scale

Intimate - Distant

High solidarity - low solidarity

The scale is useful in emphasizing as to how well we know some one is relevant in linguistic choice.

ii. The status scale

superior High status

Sub-ordinate low status

This scale points to the relevance of relative status in some linguistic choices.

iii. The formality scale

Formal High formality

Informal Low formality

This scale is useful in assessing the influence of the social setting and the language choice in interaction. The language is influenced by the formality of the setting and the degree of formality is largely determined by solidarity and status or power of the relationship of speakers.

iv) The referential and affective function scales

Referential

High low

Information ————— information

Content content

Affective

Low high

Affective ————— affective

Content content

Though language serves many functions the two identified in these scales are particularly pervasive and basic. Language can convey objective information of a referential kind; and it can also express how some one is feeling. In general the more referentially oriented an interaction is, the less it tends to express the feelings of the speaker (11-14).

Similarly, talking between neighbours over the fence at the weekend about the weather, is more likely to be mainly affective in function, and intended to convey good will towards the neighbour rather than important new information. In fact, the specific content of the conversation is rarely important. So the speaker has to choose appropriate exponent of asking for the permission considering all the things mentioned above.

According to Levinson (1983)

Accepting and denying permission are the initial consideration of paired utterances like questions and answers, offers and acceptances (or rejections), greeting and greeting in response, and so on, that motivates the sequencing rules approach. But not only is conversation not basically constituted by such pairs but the rules that bind them are not of a quasi syntactic nature for example question can be happily followed by partial answers, rejections of the presuppositions of the question, statements of ignorance, denials of the relevance of the question and so on.

Conversation is not structural product in the same way that a sentence is, it is rather the outcome of the interaction of two or more independent, goal directed individuals with often divergent interests.

The term silence is sometimes used in this technical sense, while the term pause is used as a general cover term for these various kinds of period of non-speech. Other usages will be clear from the context (Levinson 294).

Accepting and denying are general patterns; in contrast to the simple and immediate nature of preferred/dispreferred are delayed and contain additional complex components, and certain kinds of requests, rejections refusals of offers, disagreement after evaluative assessments etc. are systematically marked as dispreferreds.

A structural characterization of preferred and dispreferred turns we can then correlate the content and the sequential position of such turns with the tendency to produce them in a preferred or dispreferred format. The table indicates the sort of consistent match between formal and content found across a number of adjacency pairs seconds:

First part:

Request offer/invite assessment question blame.

Second parts:

Preferred: acceptance, agreement expected answer denial

Dispreferred: refusal, disagreement, unexpected answer admission

(ibid p 336)

2.2 Examples

- Asking for Permission

Can I close the window ?

Please let me have the car tonight.

May I close the window ?

Do you mind if I smoke ?

Is it ok if I use your typewriter ?

Would you mind if I went with her ?

Permit me to borrow your pen a minute ?

May I have your permission to marry our daughter ?

Giving permission

Sure go ahead.

It's ok with me

Fine with me

No I don't mind

Why not ?

You have my permission .

I won't stop you

Denying permission

No, you may not.

You can not.

Yes, I do mind.

I don't think so.

You do not have my permission

I will not permit you to I absolutely forbid you.

I absolutely forbid you.

2.3 Models

i) A boy is asking his mother for permission to go to the movies.

B. Mom, Can I go to the movies with Tom and the guys tonight ?

M: No, you may not. You have been to two movies this week.

B: Please MOM. Please let me go.

Tonight's the last nig ... I will do anything you want me to ...

M: Will you clean the garage this afternoon before you go ?

B: Uhmmm... o.k. How about half today and half tomorrow ?

M: O.K. it's a deal. You can go.

(Walter Matreyek,1983)

ii) A man is visiting an acquaintance's home for the first time.

M: This is really a nice apartment you have.

A: Thank you. I felt lucky to find it.

M: By the way, do you mind if I smoke.

A: No. I don't. Go ahead. I will get an ashtray for you.

iii) Two strangers are sitting next to eachother on a bus.

S₁: Excuse me, but I'm a little warm. Is it ok. If I open the window ?

S₂: Fine with me. I'm a little warm also.

S₁: Thanks, Ah, that better.

Chapter -Three

3.1 Asking for Accepting and Denying Permission in Maithili

Asking for permission is one of the major communicative functions in order to establish low and order in Maithili society. It also maintains high low honority in the society. People ask for permissions from the elder guests, strangers or friends in order to know their attitudes. Either the respondents accept or deny the permission but they respond in highly formal, formal, moderate formal and informal language according to the person who asks for the permission.

Person and Honorability in the Maithili language.

A few of the chief characteristics of the Maithili personal pronouns are noted below (Yadav, 1996).

- i. The first person and the second person mid-honorific as well as the non-honorific pronouns do not make pronominal distinction between honorific and non honorific forms.
- ii. In the absence of distinct pronoun forms of the honorific and the non-honorific, the verbal inflections make up for this, as it were, by marking the honorific distinction clearly.
- iii. The second person has a fourfold distinction, i.e. High honorific (HH), Honorific (H), Mid-honorific (MH) temperate and non-honorific (NH).

'Apne' the pronoun of the highest conceivable honor and respect is used for persons of high rank usually (but not universally) coupled with old age and for the in-laws. It is also found in formal circumstances. There is a growing tendency to substitute 'apne' (2HH) for ah (1H). ah is the safest as well as the most frequently used pronoun in Maithili. It is used for persons to whom the speaker wants to pay

respect or should pay respect under social obligations. There is a growing tendency on the part of (educated) elders and superior to use 'ah ' even for younger children.

To (NH) is viewed as uncouth and impolite; the user is viewed as 'having fouled his own mouth' so it is regarded as non-honorific (NH) forms (P. 105)

Similarly, the other components like social factors and social dimensions influence the right choice of language in asking for permission in Maithili community

Social factors

- i. The participants who is speaking and who are they speaking to ?
- ii. The setting or social context of the interaction: where are they speaking ?
- iii. The topic: what is being talked about ?
- iv. The function why are they speaking ?

Social Dimensions

- i. A social distance scale concerned with participant relationship.
- ii. A status scale concerned with participants relationship.
- iii. A formality scale relating to the setting or types of introduction.
- iv. Two functional scales relating to the purposes or topic of interaction.

3.2 Asking for Permission in Maithili

- B b ji! Ham akhan j u?
- M i ham philm dekha j u?
- K ki ji! Apan kod ri duta ta?
- Sathi ! ah kanik uthu ta?
- Mah saya ! kanik khidki lag del sa apneke kono dukh?
- Bh iji ! kanik ah apan kitab diya ta?
- D ktar saheb ! ham renuke bhet ka sakai chi?
- R m! Ham tohar ekta khali kotha prayog karu ki?

- Mehman ji ! ham ah ke ch t la j sakai chi?

In asking for permission Maithili speaker use almost highly formal and formal types of language

In asking for permission Maithili speaker use almost highly formal and formal types of language. Maithili speakers use very respectful language in order to ask for permission so, in the above examples, the word is found general which is very peculiar for the other language users. 'Ji' is regarded as the honorable word in the Maithili language

3.3 Accepting for Permission in Maithili

- Koi haraj nai jāu .
- Ach mahis ke p in piyake jo.
- Thik chai laj u.
- Liya uith geli.
- Koi bat nai lagaliya.
- Acha la le tebul par oitham r khal chau.
- Nifiker vaka vet karu.
- Koi harj nai ka le.
- Thik chai la j u.

3.4 Denying for Permission in Maithili

- Nai kanik der me j i hai.
- Nai ghar par bahut k m aich
- Hamar apne kam aich.
- Kiyak ah ka kono dhuk, hum thakal chi.
- Ji! Ha hamar haw ch hi
- Ham apne parai chi

- Nai kanik der me karab
- Hai hamar apne mehaman chai
- Ham apne akhan jai chi

3.5 Forms of Asking for Accepting and Denying Permission Used with Doctors in Maithili

- D ktarji ! ham akhan bir mi ke bhet ka sakai chi ?
- Daktar saheb ! ba ham Renuke bhet ka sakai chi ?
- Namste daktar s b! ji akhan bir mi sa bhet sakai chi, ham ?

Forms of Accepting Permission used by Doctors

- Ji ! ha j u bhetu.
- Ji ! ha nirdhak bhetu
- Operesan bhelai jake ah bhet ka sakaichi.
- Absya j u bhet karu.
- Koi harja nai, Jake bharos diyau

Forms of Denying Permission used by Doctor

- Ji ! akhan ah bhet nai ka sakai chi.
- Ji, hunk adh ghant ar m kara diyau.
- M ph karu akhan apne hunk nai bhet ka sakai chi.

3.6 Forms of Asking for Accepting and Denying Permission used with Teachers in Maithili.

- Sar ham kal s me ib sakaichi ?
- Ji ! sar/m dam hamar kal sme bake anumati aicha ?

Forms of Denying Permission used by Teachers

- u - lekin dosar dinse let hai ib.
- u - mud bahut ber bhagel .

- ha jaldi.

Forms of Accepting Permission used by Teachers in Maithili.

- Nai, akhan ah nai ib sakai chi
- Nai, yi ghantike b dame ib.
- Nai, akham hake bad let bhagel.

Chapter -Four

Asking for Accepting and Denying Permission in English and Maithili: A

Comparative Study

4.1 Contrastive Analyses (CA)

Contrastive analysis is a branch of applied linguistics. There are several languages in the world, some of which are genetically related and others are not. The language which are genetically unrelated may resemble each other in some features while genetically related language may be quite different in the same features. The credit of finding out the common and uncommon features between the language goes to CA. CA compares two or more languages in orders to find out their similarities and differences and then to predict the areas of ease and difficulty in learning them. The comparison is done on phonological, morphological, syntactic, discourse and others level as well as.

The comparison may be of two type

a. Inter lingual Comparison

The comparison between two languages like English and Maithili is called inter lingual comparison.

b. Intra lingual Comparison

The comparison between the two dialects like the standard Maithili and southern Eastern Maithili of the same language viz. Maithili is called Intra lingual comparison.

CA is based on the behaviouristic theory of learning according to this theory, an L₂ learner tends to transfer the system of his L₁ to the L₂ therefore. The L₁ and the L₂ needs to be compared to find out their similarities and difference. These are the sources of ease and difficulty in learning an L₂. Transfer may be either positive or

negative. If the past learning facilitates the present learning the transfer may be positive. It is called facilitation on the contrary, transfer may be negative if the past learning interferes the present learning. It is called interference. The ease or difficulty in learning L_2 depends on whether it is similar to L_1 or different from it, it will be easy to learn L_2 if both the L_1 and L_2 are similar. On the contrary, it will be difficult to learn an L_2 if both L_1 and L_2 are different and there will be more chances of committing errors.

Lado (1957) wrote a book entitled "*Linguistic across culture*" which disseminated the work initiated by Fries. Lado provided the following three underlying assumptions of CA which have significant role in language teaching.

- a. Individuals tend to transfer the forms and meaning and distribution of forms and meaning of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture. Both productively when attempting to speak the language and respectively when attempting to grasp and understand the language
- b. In the comparison between native and foreign language lies the key to ease or difficulty in foreign language learning.
- c. The teacher who has made a comparison of the foreign language with the native language of the student will know better what the real learning problem and can better provide for teaching them.

In nutshell, the more similarities between the two languages the more easy to learn and the more differences between the two languages the more difficult to learn. We can say that greater the similarities greater the ease and the ease lesser the chances of errors and greater the differences greater the difficulty and greater the difficulty greater the chances of error. CA has its great importance in language teaching it has

mainly two functions, firstly, it predicts the tentative errors to be committed by the L2 learner and secondly, it explains the sources and reasons of the L2 learner error. So language teacher should have knowledge of CA to treat the learners psychologically and academically. Unless a language teacher knows the sources and types of the errors that learners commit. S/he cannot impart knowledge to the learners. James (1980) points out three traditional pedagogical applications of CA. according to him, CA has application in predicting and diagnosing a proportion of the L2 errors committed by learners with a common L1 and in design of testing instruments for such learners.

4.2 The Comparison of forms of Asking for Permission, Accepting Permission and Denying Permission used by English and Maithili Native Speakers.

It includes the comparison of forms of asking for permission, accepting permission and denying permission used by English and Maithili native speakers. The similarities dissimilarities has been presented on the basis of highly formal/forms, formal forms, temperate forms and quite informal forms. The categories have been prepared on the basis of the relationship and interactions carried out with family, office friends, neighbours, guest, strangers and bosses.

Forms of Asking for Accepting and Denying Permission used with Grandfather

Forms of Asking for Permission

Maithili	English
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ji ham akhan c enal badail sakai chi? ▪ B b ji! ham dosar c enal badalu? ▪ B b ji! ham yi prach r ke samaya me c enal badalu? ▪ B b ! dosar c neal badal l sa apneke kono dukh? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May/can I change the next channel ? ▪ Would it be all right if I switch over the news ? ▪ Do you mind if I change the band? ▪ It is ok if I change the next channel ?

Forms of Accepting Permission

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Badail - le-rau ▪ Absya badal ▪ Bad prac r dait aich ▪ Koi hurga nai badail le 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sure go ahead . ▪ It' s ok with me . ▪ No I don't mind . ▪ I won't stop you.
---	---

Forms of Denying Permission

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Na, nai badal ▪ Na, sab sam car sunak aicha ▪ Na, nai rimot cal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No, you may not. ▪ You can not. ▪ I don't think so. ▪ Yes, I do mind.
---	--

Here the respondents have used highly formal forms of language while asking for permission with grandfather than those of the English language, on the contrary the accepting and denying permission is quite in formal then the English language. In Maithili language grandfather accepted or denied by giving further instruction

Forms of Asking for Accepting and Denying Permission used with aunts

Forms of Asking for Permission

Maithili	English
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kaki ji ham ah ke chata laka iskul ju sakai chi ? ▪ C ci ji ah apan ch t kani iskul j il debai ? ▪ Ham ah ke ch t lak iskul j u c ci ? ▪ Ah ke ch t sa iskul gel me kono dukh ki ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Could you please give me your umbrella ? ▪ May/can I take your umbrella? ▪ Is it ok if I use you umbrella ? ▪ Please let me have the umbrella to go to the school ?

Forms of Accepting Permission

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ji, absya la j u ▪ Ji, la jau, bauwa/daiya ▪ Ha ah la j sakai chi ▪ koi harj nai 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fine with me ▪ I won't stop you ▪ Sure go ahead
---	---

Forms of Denying Permission

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ji nai hamar khet je b k aicha ▪ Ji hamar ekego ch t aicha ▪ Nai ham yi ch t nai da sakai chi 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I don't think so, I'm afraid you can't use ▪ I am afraid not ▪ I absolutey forbid you
---	---

(Source, Blundell, Higgins and middle miss 1982, p. 121)

Both in Maithili and English nice and nephew used formal language while asking for permission with their aunt. On the contrary, Maithili aunt used highly formal forms of accepting permission than the English aunt . Because in Maithili culture nice and nephew are regarded as seniors but English aunt does not regard them as seniors.

Forms of Asking for Accepting and Denying Permission used with Elder Brothers

Forms of Asking Permission

Maithili	English
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bh iyaji ! ham apne ke b ik sa kalega j u ki ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would it be possible to go college to your bike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ji ham ah ke b ik sa kaleg ja sakai chi ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Can I use your bike please?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ah ke b ik sa kaleg j u bh iya ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do you mind if I use your motorbike?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please let me have the motorbike today.

Forms of Accepting Permission

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ J u ! bh i ja sakai chi ▪ Thik aich lag u ▪ Tu lag sakai chi ▪ Absya prayog karu ▪ Aime puchai bal b at ki aicha 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, that's fine. ▪ Yes, certainly you can. ▪ No, I don't mind. ▪ Please, don't hesitate to use my bike today. ▪ I can see no objection.
--	--

Forms of Denying Permission

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nai hamr b ik bigaral aicha ▪ Nai, hamro baj r jeb kai chai ▪ Nai rau bauwa..... 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I'm afraid it is not possible today. ▪ No, you can not. ▪ Yes, I do mind. ▪ I don't do think so.
--	---

Maithili and English both speakers use formal language while asking for permission with elders. There is also a similarity in accepting permission. But Maithili speakers deny directly by putting words 'nai' and giving by further explanation instruction to their younger brother.

Forms of Asking for Accepting and Denying Permission used Between Friends

Forms of Asking for Permission

Maithili	English
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sathi ! ham ah ke botal me p in pib sakai chi ? ▪ You sathi ! hamar yi p in piyake anumati aicha ? ▪ Yau ! ham ah ke p in pib liu ? ▪ Ham yi tohar botl me p in pibla sakono dukh ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do you mind if I drink your water ? ▪ May/can I have some of your water. ▪ Is it ok if I drink your water ? ▪ Is it all right if I drink your water?

Forms of Accepting Permission

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Koi bat nai pib liya sangi . ▪ Thik aicha pibliya sathi. ▪ Ah absya pib sakai chi. ▪ Ha pib liya. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why not. ▪ No I don't mind at all. ▪ Certainly you may/can. ▪ It's ok with me. ▪ No reason, why not.
--	--

(Leech and Svartvik 1975)

Forms of Denying Permission

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nai kame aicha s thi ▪ Nai kaniye aicha sagi ▪ Sathi hamro pyas lagal aicha ▪ Ham ah ke yi p in nai aæb 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes I do mind . ▪ I don't think so ▪ I' d like to but water is not much in bottle ▪ No way.
--	--

The above table clearly shows that the majority of the English respondents use temperate forms while seeking permission to their friend. In the context of Maithili most of the native speakers use informal language while seeking permission. There are some other exponents where the respondents show a very close intimacy with

their friends then they use quite informal language in both languages according to leech and svartvik (1982, p126) the overall degree of respectfulness for a given speech situation depends largely on relatively permanent factors of status age and degree of intimacy. So politeness is found less between two intimate friends in both the language.

Forms of Asking for Accepting and Denying Permission used with Neighbors

Forms of Asking for Permission

Maithili	English
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ji ham ah ke khali koth prayog ka sakai chi ? ▪ Jay ! ham tohar ekta khali kotha prayog karuki ? ▪ Ji! kono dukh jab ham yi kh li koth prayog karu ta ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would you mind giving me a room for today ? ▪ Excuses me may/can I use your vacant room? ▪ Please let me have the room for a day?

Form of Accepting Permission

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ji, ka saki chi. ▪ Ji, abasya karu. ▪ Kay k ne prayog ka sakai chi. ▪ Ji ! ha aime puchai bal b t ki. aicha. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fine with me. ▪ No I don't mind at all. ▪ It is ok with me sure, go ahead.
---	--

Forms of Denying Permission

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ji, nai aime dikt aicha ▪ Ji, nai hamro pahun aicha ▪ Ji, hamr apne dikta aicha 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sorry I am afraid. ▪ I don't think so. ▪ I'd like to but I've own guests in the room. ▪ I'm afraid I can't let you the vacant room.
---	--

The above comparative table shows that both Maithili and English respondents have used formal forms while asking for permission. But the denying examples show that the number of highly formal forms of asking for denying permission in Maithili is far greater than English.

Forms of Asking for Accepting and Denying Permission used with Strangers

Forms of Asking for Permission

Maithili	English
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ji ham yi khidki ke sis banda karu ki ? ▪ Sar ! hamra khidki band karke anumati aciha? ▪ Siriman ji ham kani khidki band karu ? ▪ Ji bahut thanda acich, jhayal band karu ki ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Excuse me, can/may close the window? ▪ Please, let me close the window? ▪ Would you mind, if I close the window? ▪ Is it ok if I close the window ?

Forms of Accepting Permission

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ji band kaliya. ▪ Ji lag liya. ▪ Koi harj nai lagau. ▪ Thik aicha band ka liya. ▪ Nirdhak band karu. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, you can/may. ▪ Please, don't hesitate to close the window. ▪ I can't see any objection. ▪ No, I don't mind at all. ▪ It's ok with me.
--	--

Forms of Denying Permission

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nai sar hamar ta haw c hi. ▪ Hamar akhan thand nai lagait aicha. ▪ Nai hamar bajarke dirisya dekhak aicha. ▪ Kani der me band karab. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No, you can't. ▪ I'd like to but I'm feeling too hot. ▪ I'm afraid we can't. ▪ Yes, I do mind. ▪ I don't think so.
---	--

The important point in this table is that the Maithili people use less number of temperate forms compared to English people while accepting permission to strangers.

Forms of Asking for Accepting and Denying Permission used with Guests

Forms of Asking for Permission

Maithili	English
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mehm n ji ! ham ah ke tarc prayog kasakai chi ? ▪ Ji ! hamar ah ke tarc upyog karake anumati aicha ? ▪ Sar, ham apneke bati sa k j ka sakai chi? ▪ Ji ! bati gel sa bahut apthero bhagelai apene ke tarc? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would you mind giving me a torch? ▪ Excuse me, may/can I use your torch? ▪ Would it be possible to use your torch light? ▪ Do you have any objection if I use your torch ?

Forms of Accepting Permission

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ji ! liy k j karu ▪ Ji ! koi b t nai yi tarc liya ▪ Ji ! absya prayog karu ▪ Kono harj nai ah prayog ka sakai chi ▪ Ha liya 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No, I dont mind at all ▪ Yes, you can ▪ I can't see any objection to use the torch ▪ Certainly you can
---	---

Forms of Denying Permission

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ji ! aime baitri c rj nai aich ▪ Ji! hamro k m aicha tarc ke. ▪ Ji! nai ah lel dikat aicha ▪ Ji! humr apne k m prait rah it aicha 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes I do mind ▪ I don't think so ▪ I like to but battery is low ▪ I'm afraid you can't use my torch
--	--

Form the above table, the researcher found that Mehman Ji is very common to address their guests in Maithili; on the contrary, the address term is not used in English language. Form the denying table, the researcher concluded that English people deny by using the temperate forms, but in Maithili respondents use quite formal forms to deny the permission.

Forms of Asking for Accepting and Denying Permission used with Officers/Bosses Forms of Asking for permission

Maithili	English
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Aphisar s hab! Ham aiya baith sakai chi? ▪ Ji hamar aiya baitha ke anumathi aichi? ▪ Sar, ham yata baith sakai chi? ▪ Mah say ham aith m baith sakai chi? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Excuse me, may I sit here? ▪ May we sit in here? ▪ Are we allowed to sit in here? ▪ Excuse me, is it ok if I sit here ?

Forms of Accepting permission

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ji! absya baithal j u. ▪ Ji! ha apne baith sakai chi ▪ Absya baithu kono harj nai ▪ Baisu, ki k m aicha? ▪ Ha yau kiyak ne baithab 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, you can sit ▪ It's ok with me. ▪ No I don't mind to sit here. ▪ Yes you can ▪ Yes that's fine
--	--

Forms of Denying Permission

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nai aime apne nai baith sakai chi ▪ Ji yi pramukh sar ke kursi aicha. ▪ Ji nai k m ke b t karu b har ja ke baithab 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I'm afraid you cannot sit her ▪ I don't think so ▪ I would like to but it is secretary's chair ▪ You are not really supposed to sit here ▪ I'm afraid, no one is allowed to sit here
--	--

The above comparative table shows that Maithili people use less number of highly formal forms of asking for permission with officer compared to English people. Maithili people use more temperate forms while asking for permission to their boss.

Chapter -Five

Pedagogical implication

The researcher has attempted to forward some suggestions for teaching the forms of asking for permission and accepting and denying permission which would be beneficial for teachers, students and the learners of English and Maithili as second languages. They are listed below.

1. The teacher should have the knowledge of address terms of different people i.e. the particles 'Ji' that create formal with name and 'ah ' temperate forms and 'to' create informal form while asking for permission in Maithili.
2. The learners should know the role of the lexical items 'Ji', 'yau', 'to', 'rau' and 'gai' while asking for accepting or denying permission in the Maithili language.
3. The teacher can create dialogues that require the expression of asking for permission and accepting and denying permission and perform them in the situation.
4. Students can listen to what people say around them during the situations that require exponents of asking for accepting permission and denying permission and note how people accept and deny permission to the other people on the basis of their social relationship with them in different contexts.
5. Maithili native speakers are habituated to use informal formed by family members except aunt but, in the case of English, formal forms are used for the same purpose. So the teacher should inform the Maithili learners' about it.
6. Learners can also watch English/Maithili films and make notes and as to how people ask for accepting and denying permission in different situations using different forms.

7. Text book writers should write books that the learners can be encouraged to use the forms of asking for permission in their conversation in different context with different people.
8. This research is a comparative study comparison of two languages Maithili and English. The researcher hopes this research makes a significant contribution for those teachers who are teaching English as a second language, because a comparative study help the teachers to predict the areas of difficulty that learners face and possible errors that learners commit.
9. While teaching language, a teacher should see what sorts of difficulties that the learners are facing due to their mother tongue.
10. The syllabus designers and text book writers should be more conscious about the differences between two languages in terms of the forms of asking for accepting and denying permission help designing the syllabus and writing the text books of the English for the Maithili learners who are learning English as a second language.

Chapter -Six

6.1 Summary and conclusion

The first chapter is introductory in nature. It includes general back ground and origin of the English and Maithili language, language functions, different views of politeness, pragmatics, statement of problem, hypothesis, objective of the research, limitation of the study, review of literature or language and organization of the study. The second chapter deals with the study of asking for accepting and denying permission in English. This chapter analyzes asking for accepting and denying permission mainly based on secondary data.

The third chapter which is one of the focal points of this dissertation has presented the asking for accepting and denying permission in Maithili. This chapter analyzes asking for accepting and denying permission on the basis of both primary and secondary data the fourth chapter which is main focal point of this thesis has found out some similarities and differences in English and Maithili language in terms of asking for accepting and denying permission.

The fifth chapter includes some pedagogical implication and the sixth chapter is the summary and conclusion of the whole dissertation.

6.2 Conclusions

It is said that all human beings are distant relatives. That means, we all are born out of a single couple but the evolution theory of science by Charles Darwin has proved that it is the time and the environment that bring continuous changes as well. Hence, we are children of a single parent, if the time and the environment that brought differences among us as well. But the fact is that not all the features get changed. Thus we can say that there are both the points of similarities and differences among us. Similar is the case with the language as well. All the languages of the world are

distant relatives but it is the time span of thousands of years that brought differences. Thus, there are both the points of similarities and differences among the languages of the world. In the same way, if we move to the next phase of asking for accepting and denying permission there too, we can discover the points of similarities and differences among asking for accepting and denying permission in English and Maithili language.

I have tried my best to consult the well known books, articles, journals, well known writers to get information related to the topic. The discoveries are based on my own intellect and the information obtained from different grammars, articles, books, journals etc. which, I believe, will be a very useful to the Maithili native speakers who are interested in knowing about asking for accepting and denying permission in Maithili and the points of similarities and differences among the English and the Maithili regarding asking for accepting and denying permission. It will also be useful to the language teachers or learners who are interested in learning or teaching these two languages comparatively.

Works Cited

- Blundell, J. I., Higgins and N. Middelmiss. *Function of English*. London : Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Celce, Murcia, M. and Larsen Freeman, D. *The Grammar Book*. London : Newbury House, 1983.
- Chomsky, N. *Aspects of theory of Syntax*. MIT : Cambridge Press, 1965.
- Crystal, D. *The English language*. London : Harmondsworth, 1978.
- Finnocchiaro, M., and Brumfit, C. *The functional notional Approach : From theory to practice*. New York OUP, 1983.
- Fraser, B. *On apologizing. In F Columns*. Conversation Routine The Hague, 1980.
- Goody, N. F. *Question and Politeness*. Cambridge. CUP, 1978.
- Grierson, G.A. *An Introduction to the Maithili languages of North Bihar, Part 1, Grammar*. Calcutta : Asiatic society Bengal, 1881.
- Holiday, MAK. *Exploration in the functions of language*. London : Edward Arnold, 1973.
- Holmes, J. *Introduction to social linguistics*. London : Longman, 1992.
- Hymes. *Language in culture and society*. New York : Harper and Row publisher, 1964.
- James, C. *Contrastive analysis*. London : Longman, 1980.
- Jespersen. *How to teach foreign Language*. London : George, Allon And Unwin Ltd, 1904.
- Jha, C. *The formation of the Maithili language*. London : Luzac and Communities Co Ltd, 1980.
- Leech, G. and J and J. Svartvik. *A communicative Grammar of English*. Burnt Mill : Harlow house, 1975.

- Leech, L. *Principle of pragmatics*. London : Longman, 1983
- Levinson, S.C. *Pragmatics*. London : Cambridge University Press, 1983
- Matreyek, W. *Communicative in English : Functions*. New York : Pergamon Press, 1983.
- Quirk, R. et al. *A University Grammar of English*. London : Longman, 1973.
- Richards et al. *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. London : Longman, 1999.
- Roger, T. B. *Socio Linguistics*. London : Longman, 1970.
- Trask, R.L. *A Students dictionary of language and linguistics*. 1997.
- Van Ek, J.A. *The threshold level*. Strasbourg : Council of Europe, 1976.
- Wilkins, D.A. *Linguistics in Language Teaching*. London : Edward Arnold, 1972
- Yadav, R. *A reference grammar of Maithili*. Barlin and New York : Montori Democratic Gruyter, 1996.
- Yadav, Y.P. *Reading in Maithili Language Literature and Culture*. Kathmandu : Royal Nepal Academy, 1999.
- Yule, G. *Pragmatics*. New York : Oxford University Press, 1993.