

# **SPEECH ACTS IN THARU AND ENGLISH**

**SPEECH ACTS IN THARU AND ENGLISH**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Education  
in Partial Fulfilment for the Master of Education in English**

**987**

**KAMAL KANT CHAUDHARY, 2010**

**Submitted by  
Kamal Kant Chaudhary**

**Faculty of Education  
Tribhuvan University  
Kathmandu, Nepal**

**2010**

# **SPEECH ACTS IN THARU AND ENGLISH**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Education  
in Partial Fulfilment for the Master of Education in English**

**Submitted by  
Kamal Kant Chaudhary  
Faculty of Education  
Tribhuvan University  
Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal  
2010**

**T.U. Regd. No. : 9-3-28-2006**

**Campus Roll No. : 458/2065**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Year Exam Roll No. 280348**

**Date of Approval of the Thesis**

**Proposal: 2066-12-30**

**Date of Submission: 2066-02-12**

## **DECLARATION**

I hereby declare that to the best of my knowledge this thesis is original, no part of it was earlier submitted for the candidature of research degree to any university.

Date: 2066-02-07

Kamal Kant Chaudhary

## RECOMMENDATION FOR ACCEPTANCE

This is to certify that Kamal Kant Chaudhary has prepared the thesis entitled “**Speech Acts in Tharu and English**” under my guidance and supervision.

I recommend the thesis for acceptance.

Date:

.....

**Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi**

Professor,

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur

## RECOMMENDATION FOR EVALUATION

This thesis has been recommended for evaluation by the following ‘Research Guidance Committee’:

**Signature**

**Dr. Chandreshwar Mishra**

Professor and Head  
Department of English Education  
T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu

---

Chairperson

**Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi (Guide)**

Professor,  
Department of English Education  
T.U., Kirtipur

---

Member

**Dr. Anjana Bhattarai**

Reader,  
Department of English Education  
Faculty of Education  
T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu

---

Member

Date:

## EVALUATION AND APPROVAL

This thesis has been evaluated and approved by the following ‘Thesis Evaluation Committee’:

### Signature

**Dr. Chandreshwar Mishra**

Professor and Head  
Department of English Education  
T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu

---

Chairperson

**Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi (Guide)**

Professor,  
Department of English Education  
Chairperson,  
English and Other Foreign Languages  
Education Subject Committee

---

Member

**Dr. Anjana Bhattarai**

Reader,  
Department of English Education  
T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu

---

Member

Date:

# DEDICATION

Dedicated

to my parents

who incessantly jostled

for grooming

to the person

that I am today.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to highly respected guru and thesis supervisor **Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi**, Professor at the Department of English Education and Chairperson of English and Other Foreign Languages Education Subject Committee. He is the person who encouraged me to undertake research on such a relatively less explored field, i.e. student behaviour which is highly poignant in the domain of language teaching in the present context. He revealed his unending curiosity to know being explored something new which inspired me to delve deep into the area of my study. He also extended his ever memorable love incessantly. Furthermore, his scholarly guidance and supervision enabled me to bring this present work in this form.

I am immensely thankful to **Dr. Chandreswar Mishra**, Professor and Head of the Department of English Education for his co-operation to bring research study in this final form.

Similarly, I would also like to express my thankfulness to my guruma and member of thesis evaluation and approval committee **Dr. Anjana Bhattarai**, Reader at the Department of English Education. I am, indeed, indebted to her because she showed her patient to go thoroughly through my research proposal and draft of my thesis and provided me constructive and positive suggestions.

I am extremely grateful to **Prof. Dr. Govinda Raj Bhattarai, Prof. Dr. Tirth Raj Khaniya, Prof. Dr. Anju Giri, Dr. Laxmi Bahadur Maharjan, Mr. Vishnu Singh Rai, Mrs. Tapashi Bhatracharya, Dr. Balmukunda Bhandari, Mr. Prem Bahadur Phyak, Mr. Bhesh Raj Pokhrel, Mrs. Saraswati Dawadi, Mrs. Madhu Neupane and Mrs.**

**Hima Rawal** for their direct and indirect invaluable suggestions to accomplish this work in time.

Similarly, I would like to extend my gratitude to **Mrs. Madhavi Khanal**, Librarian, Department of English Education for kind co-operation extended to me by providing resource books.

In the same way, my special thanks go to my friends **Mahesh Prasad Chaudhary, Santosh Kumar Chaudhary, Niraj Chaudhary, Surendra Chaudhary, Amit Chaudhary, Deokant Chaudhary, Pulkit Chaudhary** and sister **Sushma Chaudhary** for their support in each aspect during the preparation of this work, and to other family members as well.

Finally, I would like to thank **Nabin Babu** and **Rajan Chaudhary** for their help in computer typing.

**Kamal Kant Chaudhary**

## **ABSTRACT**

This study aimed to identify and compare the exponents of speech acts in Tharu and English used by the Tharu speakers and native English. For this study, the researcher took sample population consisting of 80 native speakers from the Saptari district. The study was entirely based on both primary and secondary data. The responses from the native Tharu speakers were collected through questionnaire. However, the secondary sources were used for collecting data for speech acts in English. The responses given by them were coded for analysis and interpretation. On the basis of analysis and interpretation, the researcher came to the conclusion that English speakers were more formal than their Tharu counterparts while expressing speech acts whereas the Tharu native speakers used more temperate forms than the native English speakers while expressing the under taken exponents.

The study is divided into four chapters. Chapter one is an introducing chapter. It includes general background, review of the related literature, objectives of the study and significance of the study. Chapter two deals with the methodology applied to carry out the research under which sources of data, sampling procedure, tools for data collection, process of data collection and limitations of the study are presented. Chapter three presents the analysis and interpretation of the data. In this section both statistical as well as descriptive approaches are used. Chapter four incorporates findings and recommendations of the research. The references and appendices from the concluding part of the thesis.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Declaration</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Recommendation for Acceptance</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Recommendation for Evaluation</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Evaluation and Approval</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Dedication</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>vi-vii</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>ix-x</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>xii</b>
<b>CHAPTER - ONE: INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1-23</b>
1.1 General Background	1
1.1.1 The English Language	2
1.1.2 The Tharu Language	3
1.1.3 Introduction to Pragmatics	4
1.1.4 Language Functions	6
1.1.5 Speech Acts: Language as Action	8
1.1.6 Speech Act Theory – An Overview	10
1.1.7 Speech Acts and Pragmatics	12
1.1.8 Communicative Speech Acts and Intentions	13
1.1.9 Classification of Speech Acts	16
1.1.10 Classification of Acts	18
1.2 Review of Related Literature	22
1.3 Objectives of the Study	23
1.4 Significance of the Study	23
<b>CHAPTER – TWO: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>24-25</b>
2.1 Sources of Data	24
2.1.1 Primary Sources	24
2.1.2 Secondary Sources	24
2.2 Population of the Study	24

2.3	Sampling Procedure	24
2.4	Tools for Data Collection	24
2.5	Process of Data Collection	25
2.6	Limitations of the Study	25
<b>CHAPTER - THREE: ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION</b>		<b>26-35</b>
3.1	Analysis of Speech Acts	26
3.1.1	Assertive Forms	26
3.1.2	Directive Forms	27
3.1.3	Commissive Forms	28
3.1.4	Expressive Forms	29
3.1.5	Declarative Forms	30
3.1.6	Comparison Between the Speech Acts in Tharu and English Languages	32
3.2.6.1	Similarities Between the Speech Act in Tharu and English	32
3.2.6.2	Differences Between the Speech Act in Tharu and English	33
<b>CHAPTER - FOUR: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		<b>36-37</b>
4.1	Findings	36
4.1.1	Speech Acts of the Tharu Language	36
4.1.2	Similarities and Differences Between Tharu and English Speech Acts	36
4.1.2.1	Similarities	36
4.1.2.2	Differences	37
4.2	Recommendations	37

## **REFERENCES**

## **APPENDICES**

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table No. 1	Searle's Different Classification of Speech Act	22
-------------	---	----

## ABBREVIATIONS

C	–	Context
CBS	–	Central Bureau of Statistics
Dr.	–	Doctor
e.g.	–	For example
et. al.	–	and others
etc.	–	Etcetera
H	–	Hearer
i.e.	–	that is
P.	–	Page
Prof.	–	Professor
S	–	Speaker
T.U.	–	Tribhuvan University
U	–	Utterance

# CHAPTER - ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 General Background

Language is a system of communication widely used as the means of expressing ideas, thoughts, feelings and emotions of human beings. So, it is 'species-specific' and 'species-uniform' possession of man. It is a dynamic and open system that makes human beings communicate their expression language is common to all human beings. It is the most unique gift to mankind that sets apart from the rest of living beings the possession of language makes us dominant to the rest of the creatures. Language is used to express different functions in our day to day communication. It is an abstract phenomenon as complex as human relationship in a society. It is a medium through which religion, history, literature, philosophy, politics, psychology and several other subjects are created and transmitted to the upcoming generations. It has played a great role to preserve the human civilization. One cannot think any social and academic activities going on without language.

According to Sapir (1921, p.8), "Language is a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions and desires by means of voluntarily produced symbols." Similarly, Hall (1968, p.158) defines language as "The institution whereby human communicate and interact with each other by means of habitually used oral, auditory and arbitrary symbols." In the same way, Chomsky (1957, p.13) defines, "Language is a set (finite or infinite) of sentences, each finite in length constructed out of a finite set of elements." Likewise, Bloch and Trager (1942, p.5) defines, "A language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols by means of which a social group co-operates."

In the same way, Finocchiaro (1964) defines language as "A symbol of arbitrary vocal symbols which permit all people in a given culture, or other people who have learned the system of that culture, to communicate or to

interact.” Doff (1995, p.21) states language as “The principal system of communication used by particular group of human being within the particular linguistic community of which they are members.”

From the above definitions, we can say that language is a set of sentences used by human beings for certain functions in their society for their daily life communication. In other words, it is human phenomenon specially meant for communication with its own system and produced voluntarily through vocal apparatus. Though language we can not transfer our knowledge and experience, the whole universe can be studied and described. Thus, language has seen the most powerful and the best means of communication.

### **1.1.1 The English Language**

English is one of the most widely used and dominant language in the world, which comes under the West-German sub branch of Indo-European family of language. It is the means of international communication and is recognized as global international language having achieved a world wide status. It is a genuine lingua franca, used widely for communication among the international speech communities. Most of the significant deals in any discipline of the world are found in English. It has the largest body of the vocabulary and richest body of literature. Most of the books and articles are written and published in the English language. The craze of using the English language can be seen in every body’s eyes today. The use of the English language in different fields i.e. philosophy, politics, literature, medicine, trade and commerce, science and technology etc. make it more significant in our day to day life. Thus, English is not only a principal language for international communication but also a gateway to the world body of knowledge.

It is said that language is as old as human origin. Languages came into existence simultaneously with human civilization. According to Crystal (2002, p.3), “Most reference books published since the 1980s give a figure of between 6000 and 7000, but estimates have varied in recent decades between 3000 and

10,000.” Among them, English is the most widely used; the most highlighted and therefore, the most dominant language in the world. It is an international language, which is used in most of the places abroad, as lingua franca. About fourteen percent of people in the world can speak English. It is the most highly used language in the world because more than half of the books are written in English. Similarly, two third of the books of science are written in English. In e-mails, and postal mails also it is very common. Nowadays, most of the countries in the world practice and use the English language in one form or the other. It means, it is being popular day by day and glowing as the rising sun.

It is the treasure house of knowledge. The craze of using the English language can be seen in everybody’s eyes today. Though English is the second language of most Nepali people, it has a prestigious reputation here. It is prestigious in the sense that has occupied an important place even in the educational system of Nepal. Here, it is taught as a compulsory subject up to bachelor level from Grade-1. Now, it is enjoying the status of a prestigious language in Nepal where most of the youths have shown their keen interest not only in it but also in English culture.

### **1.1.2 The Tharu Language**

Nepal is a multiracial, multilingual, multireligious, multicultural and multi-ethnic nation. Nepal is small in area but very rich in terms of languages spoken here, as well as culture and religion. According to the Population Census Report 2001, there are 92 identified languages spoken in Nepal. Many of them do not have their written script but they are only used in day to day communication.

In Nepal, more than hundred groups of ethnic people live in different parts; those indigenous people have their own languages, religions and culture. Among them, the Tharu indigenous people of Nepal who live from the east to the west are highly populated ethnic group found in almost all the districts of the Terai , the southern part of Nepal. The majority of Tharu speakers are found in Dang, Banke, Bardiya, Kailali, Kanchanpur, Chitwan, Nawalparasi, Saptari,

Udaypur, Sunsari and Morang districts. A very few Tharu speaking people live in the hill and even fewer of them live in the high mountains (CBS, 2001). They have their own language and the way of life.

Tharu is an Indo-Aryan language written in Devanagari script. Though it has a long history, it does not have its own script. Language is a personal and social phenomenon. So, it is greatly affected by social and geographical dialects. This is also the case in the Tharu language. Because of geographical barriers, there is variation in the Tharu language which causes limits in their travel and communication and identity are named geographically as Morangiya, Saptariya, Mahotariya, Chitwaniya, Dangoriya and Deukhuriya, Kathariya and Rana dialects.

### **1.1.3 Introduction to Pragmatics**

Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It has consequently more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning.

This type of study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said. It requires a consideration of how speakers organize what they want to say in accordance with whom they are talking to, where when and under what circumstances. Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning.

This approach also necessarily explores how listeners can make inferences about what is said in order to arrive at an interpretation of the speaker's intended meaning. This type of study explores how a great deal of what is unsaid is recognized as part of what is communicated. We might say that it is the investigation of invisible meaning. Pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said.

This perspective then raises the question of what determines the choice between the said and unsaid. The basic answer is tied to the notion of distance. Closeness, whether it is physical, social or conceptual, implies shared experience. On the assumption of how close or distant the listener is, speakers determine how much need to be said. Thus pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance.

In the same way, pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and the users of those forms. In this three-part distinction, only pragmatics allows humans into the analysis. The advantage of studying languages via pragmatics is that one can talk about people's intended meaning, their assumptions, their purposes or goals, and kinds of actions (for example requests) that they are performing when they speak. The big disadvantage is that all these very human concepts are extremely difficult to analyze in a consistent and objective way. Two friends having a conversation may imply some things and infer some others without providing any clear linguistic evidence that we can point to as the explicit source of 'the meaning' of what was communicated. Example [1] is just such a problematic case. I heard the speakers, I knew what they said, but I had no idea what was communicated.

[1] Her: So - did you?

Him: Hey - who wouldn't?

Thus, pragmatics is appealing because it is about how people make sense of each other linguistically, but it can be a frustrating area of study because it requires us to make sense of people and what they have in mind.

Similarly, pragmatics is the study of the ability of natural language speakers to communicate more than that which is explicitly stated. The ability to understand another speaker's intended meaning is called pragmatics. Speech acts is in one of the domains of pragmatics. Speech acts is an utterance that serves as a function in communication. Speech acts include real life interactions and requires not only knowledge of the language but also

appropriate use of that language within a given culture. Structural knowledge of language is not enough but pragmatic knowledge as to how to use structural knowledge in particular situations is also equally important. Pragmatics is the study of those principles that will account why a certain set of sentences are anomalous, or not possible utterances. It is the study of relations between language and contexts in what they would be appropriate. Thus, a good language user should have the ability to use the language which is grammatically correct as contextually appropriate. The successful learners must know not only which apologies can be used for the performance of a particular illocutionary act, but also the kinds of context whereas such acts can be appropriately performed.

#### **1.1.4 Language Functions**

Language function is defined as the purpose for which an utterance or a unit of language is used to establish social relationship. In other words, what we can do through the use of language is its function. We can communicate through the use of language; therefore, communication is the overall global function of language promote the constructive interaction between linguistics and such neighbouring disciplines as sociology, cultural studies, psychology, ethology, communication studies, translation theory and education linguistics. Language function can be broadly classified as grammatical and communicative functions. Grammatical functions deals with the relationship that a constituent has with constituents (Richards et. al. 1999, p. 126). The main function of language is its communicative functions what specific communicative need the language is used for in a community. Sarignon (1983) describes language function as “The use to which language is put the purpose of an utterance rather than the grammatical form an utterance takes; to fulfil the specific purpose therefore, making meaning more meaningful.”

Austin (1962), for example, classified language function into connotative and performative; whereas Searle classified into five categories: representative,

directive, commissive, expressive and declarative. Corder classifies language function into six types: personal, directive, referential, phatic, metalinguistic, imaginative; whereas Wilkins (1973) classifies it into six categories: judgemental and evaluation, suasion, argument, rational inquiry and exposition, personal emotions and emotional relations. Van Ek (1975) distinguishes six main types of communicative functions. They are as follows:

- i) Importing and seeking factual information: identifying, reporting, correcting, asking etc.
- ii) Expressing and finding out intellectual attitude: expressing agreement and disagreement, denying something, accepting an offer or invitation, offering to do something, expressing capability and incapability, giving and seeking permission.
- iii) Expressing and finding out emotional attitudes: expressing pleasure/displeasure, expressive interest or lack of interest, expressing hope, expressing satisfaction or dissatisfaction, expressing inquiring, wants, desires etc.
- iv) Getting things done (Suasion): suggesting, requesting, inviting, offering assistance, advising, warning, instructing or directing etc.
- v) Expressing and finding out moral attitude: apologizing, granting, forgiveness, expressing approval or disapproval, expressing appreciation, expressing regret etc.
- vi) Socializing: greeting, taking leave, attracting attention, congratulating, thanking, proposing toaster, introducing people etc.

Language is an instrument that is used to furnish our life style in the society through different functions. Our life style somehow depends upon what types of language we use. Further more, to fulfil our basic need and meet our necessities, we must use the language property. Therefore, language plays different roles in the society. The same language structure can express different functions and same function can be expressed through different structures. So,

language function plays a very important role in our daily life communication. All languages are used for communication needs in a community, e.g. requesting, introducing, expressing hopes, congratulating, welcoming, thanking etc.

### **1.1.5 Speech Acts: Language as Action**

The term speech is one of the most significant facets of the general theory of language use (i.e. Pragmatics). According to Grundy (2000: p. 68), “Speech acts might be seen as a prototypically pragmatic phenomenon in the sense that they challenge the notion that there is a one to one correspondence between a form and its function”. Likewise, to quote Yule (1993: p. 47), “In attempting to express themselves, people do not only produce utterances containing grammatical structures and words, they perform actions via those utterances which are generally called speech acts”. When we communicate, we express our thoughts and emotions through a number of utterances that have a particular speech act in English, they are commonly given more specific labels, such as invitation, apology, promise, request and so on.

These descriptive terms for different kinds of speech acts apply to the speaker’s communicative intention in producing an utterance. The speaker normally expects that his or her communicative intention will be recognized by the hearer. Both speaker and hearer are usually helped in this process by the circumstances surrounding the utterance which is also known as speech event. The role of speech event is very crucial in communication or conversation because it determines the interpretation of an utterance as performing a particular speech act.

A speech act is an act that a speaker performs when making an utterance. To understand language one must understand the speaker’s intention. Since, language is intentional behaviour, it should be related like a form of action. The speech act is the basic unit of language used to express meaning, an utterance that expresses an intention. Normally the speech act is a sentence, but it can be

a word or phrase as long as it follows the rules necessary to accomplish the intention. When one speaks, one performs an act. In other words, an utterance which conveys one communicative function is a speech act. Speech is not just used to state something, it actually does something speech act stresses the intent of the act as the whole. Therefore, understanding the speaker's intention is essential to capture the meaning. Without the speaker's intention, it is impossible to understand the words as a speech act.

In this way, a speech act is a communicative activity that fulfills some purpose in communication (i.e. communicative function). To put it in another way, the speech act can be viewed as a functional unit in communication. According to Austin (1962), "A speech act is said to convey two types of meaning", which are given below:

### **i) Propositional Meaning**

It is also known as locutionary meaning. This is the direct or basic literal meaning of the utterance which is conveyed by the particular words and structures which the utterance contains. This is the propositional content of the sentence. For example in, 'I am hungry' the propositional meaning is what the utterance says about the speaker's physical state.

### **ii) Illocutionary Meaning**

It is also known as illocutionary force this is the particular intention in making the utterance (illocutionary force). This is the communicative force the utterance has on the listener. For example, in the above stated utterance, 'I am hungry' the illocutionary meaning is the intention of the speaker to get something to eat from the listener. Thus, the utterance may be intended as a request for something to eat.

## **1.1.6 Speech Act Theory – An Overview**

A speech act is created when speaker/writer S makes an utterance U to hearer/reader H in context C. Speech acts are a part of social interactive

behaviour and must be interpreted as an act of social interaction labor and Fanshel (1977, p.30). In the words of Habermas (1979, p. 2), S utters something understandably; gives H something to understand; makes him/herself thereby understandable; and comes to an understanding with another person. Habermas indicates further requirements on S: that S should believe the truth of what is said, so that H can share S's knowledge Grice (1975); S should 'express' his/her intentions in such a way that the linguistic expression presents what is intended (so that [H] can trust [S])' – compare Grice's maxims of quantity and manner; S should 'perform the speech act in such a way that it conforms to recognized norms or to accepted self-images (so that [H] can be the accord with [S] in shared value orientations) (1979, p.29). Additionally, S and H can reciprocally motivate one another to recognize validity claims because the content of [S's]. Engagement is determined by a specific reference to a thematically stressed validity claim, whereby [S], in a obligations to provide grounds [,] with a rightness claim, obligations, to provide justification, and with a truthfulness claim obligations to prove trustworthy' Habermas (1979, p. 65).

Austin (1962) insisted on a distinction between what he called constatives, which have truth values, and performatives which (according to him) do not. The distinction between truth-bearing and non-truth-bearing sentences have a long history. Aristotle noted that 'Not all sentences are statements only such as have in them either truth or falsity. Thus, a prayer is a sentence, but neither true nor false (therefore, a prayer is not a statement). Later, the stoics distinguished a judgement or proposition as either true or false whereas none of an interrogation, inquiry, imperative, adjurative, optative, hypothetical, nor vocative has a truth value. Diogenes Laertius (1925, p. 65-68). For more than two millennia, logicians and language philosophers concentrated their energies on statements and the valid inferences to be drawn from them to the virtual exclusion of other propositional types (questions, commands, etc.) Austin was reacting to this tradition.

Austin's point is that in making such utterances under the right conditions, S performs, respectively, an act of naming, an act of apologizing, an act of welcoming, and an act of advising (it has become usual to speak of 'acts' rather than 'actions'). Performatives have 'felicity conditions' in place of truth values. Thus according to Austin (1) has no truth value but is felicitous if there is a cat such that S has the ability and intention to put it out, and infelicitous – but not false – otherwise:

I promise to put the cat out. (1)

This contrasts with (2), which is either true if S has put the cat out, or false if not:

I've put the cat out. (2)

Austin's claim that performatives do not have truth values has been challenged from the start, and he seems to be wrong. Roughly speaking, their truth value is less communicatively significant than what Austin called the 'illocutionary force' of U. He observed that utterances without performative verbs also perform speech acts, for example, (3) can be used to make a promise:

I'll put the cat out. (3)

Austin would say that (1) and (3) have the same illocutionary force of promising; the function of the performative verb in (1) is to name the 'illocutionary act' being performed. In the later lectures of Austin (1962), he identified two other components of a speech act: locution and perlocution. Linguists recognize three acts which Austin conflates into his locutionary act.

### **1.1.7 Speech Acts and Pragmatics**

At the beginning of *How to Do Things with Words*, J.L. Austin bemoaned the common philosophical pretense that "the business of a [sentence] can only be to 'describe' some state of affairs, or to 'state some fact', which it must do either truly or falsely" (1962, p. 1). He observed that there are many

uses of language which have the linguistic appearance of fact-stating but are really quite different. Explicit performatives like “You’re fired” and “I quit” are not used to make mere statements. And the Wittgenstein of the *Philosophical Investigations*, rebelling against his former self, swapped the picture metaphor for the tool metaphor and came to think of language not as a system of representation but as a system of devices for engaging in various sorts of social activity; hence, “the meaning of a word is its use in the language” (1953, p. 20).

Here Wittgenstein went too far, for there is good reason to separate the theory of linguistic meaning (semantics) from the theory of language use (pragmatics), not that they are unconnected. We can distinguish sentences, considered in abstraction from their use, and the acts that speakers (or writers) perform in using them. We can distinguish what sentences mean from what speakers mean in using them. Whereas Wittgenstein (1953) adopted a decidedly anti-theoretical stance toward the whole subject, Austin (1962) developed a systematic, though largely taxonomic, theory of language use. And Grice (1989) developed a conception of meaning which, though tied to use, enforced a distinction between what linguistic expressions mean and what speakers mean in using them.

An early but excellent illustration of the importance of this distinction is provided by Moore’s paradox (so-called by Wittgenstein, 1953, p. 190). If you say, “Tomatoes are fruits but I don’t believe it,” you are denying that you believe what you are asserting. This contradiction is puzzling because it is not an outright logical inconsistency. That tomatoes are fruits does not entail your believing it, nor vice versa, and there’s no contradiction in my saying, “Tomatoes are fruits but you don’t believe it.” Your inconsistency arises not from what you are claiming but from the fact that you are claiming it. That’s what makes it a pragmatic contradiction.

Like pragmatic contradictions, pragmatic phenomena in general involve information that is generated by, or at least made relevant by, acts of using language. It is not to be confused with semantic information, which is carried by linguistic items themselves. This distinction should be kept in mind as we examine the nature of speech acts (including Austin's explicit performatives), the intentions involved in communicating, and the ways in which what a speaker means can differ from what his words mean.

### **1.1.8 Communicative Speech Acts and Intentions**

People commonly think of communicating, linguistically or otherwise, as acts of expressing oneself. This rather vague idea can be made more precise if we get more specific about what is expressed. Take the case of an apology. If you say, "[I'm] sorry I forgot your birthday" and intend this as an apology, you are expressing regret for something, in this case for forgetting the person's birthday. An apology just is the act of (verbally) expressing regret for, and thereby acknowledging, something one did that might have harmed or at least bothered the hearer. It is communicative because it is intended to be taken as expressing a certain attitude, in this case regret. It succeeds as such if it is so taken, in which case one has made oneself understood. Using a special device such as the performative "I apologize" may of course facilitate understanding - understanding is correlative with communicating - but in general this is unnecessary. Communicative success is achieved if the speaker chooses his words in such a way that the hearer will, under the circumstances of utterance, recognize his communicative intention. So, for example, if you spill some beer on someone and say "Oops" in the right way, your utterance will be taken as an apology.

Grice (1957) discovered that there is something highly distinctive about communicative intentions: they are reflexive in character. In communicating a speaker intends his utterance "to produce some effect in an audience by means of the recognition of this intention". Consider that, in general, the

success of an act has nothing to do with anyone's recognizing the intention with which it is performed. You won't succeed in standing on your head because someone recognizes your intention to do so. But an act of communication is special in this respect. It is successful if the intention with which it is performed is recognized by the audience, partly on the basis that it is intended to be recognized. The intention includes, as part of its content, that the audience recognize this very intention by taking into account the fact that they are intended to recognize it. A communicative intention is thus self-referential, or reflexive. An act of communication is successful if whoever it is directed to recognizes the intention with which it is performed. In short, its fulfillment consists in its recognition.

To appreciate the idea of reflexive intentions and what their fulfillment involves, consider the following games, which involve something like linguistic communication. In the game of Charades, one player uses gestures and other bodily movements to help the other guess what she has in mind. Something like the reflexive intention involved in communication operates here, for part of what the first player intends the second player to take into account is the very fact that the first player intends her gestures etc. to enable him to guess what she has in mind (nothing like this goes on in the game of 20 Questions, where the second player uses answers to yes-or-no questions to narrow down the possibilities of what the first player has in mind). Or consider the following game of tacit coordination: the first player selects and records an item in a certain specified category, such as a letter of the alphabet, a liquid, or a city; the second player has one chance to guess what it is. Each player wins if and only if the second player guesses right without any help. Now what counts as guessing right depends entirely on what the first player has in mind, and that depends entirely on what she thinks the second player, taking into account that she wants him to guess right, will think she wants him to think. The second player guesses whatever he thinks she wants him to think. Experience has shown that when players use the

above categories, they almost always both pick the letter A, water, and the city in which they are located. It is not obvious what all these “correct” choices have in common: each one stands out in a certain way from other members of the same category, but not in the same way. For example, being first (among letters of the alphabet), being the most common (among liquids), and being local are quite different ways of standing out. It is still not clear, in the many years since the question was first raised, just what makes something uniquely salient in such situations. One suggestion is that it is the first item in the category that comes to mind, but this won’t always be right, since what first comes to the mind of one player may not be what first comes to the mind of the other.

Whatever the correct explanation of the meeting of the minds in successful communication, the basic insight underlying Grice’s idea of reflexive intentions is that communication is like a game of tacit coordination: the speaker intends the hearer to reason in a certain way partly on the basis of being so intended. That is, the hearer is to take into account that he is intended to figure out the speaker’s communicative intention. The meaning of the words uttered provides the input to this inference, but what they mean does not determine what the speaker means (even if he means precisely what his words means, they don’t determine that he is speaking literally). What is loosely called ‘context’, i.e., a set of mutual contextual beliefs (Bach and Harnish, 1979, p. 5), encompasses whatever other considerations the hearer is to take into account in ascertaining the speaker’s intention, partly on the basis that he is intended to do so.

When Grice characterized meaning something as intending one’s utterance “to produce some effect in an audience by means of the recognition of this intention,” he wasn’t very specific about the kind of effect to be produced. But since meaning something (in Grice’s sense) is communicating, the relevant effect is, as both Strawson (1964) and Searle (1969) recognized, understanding on the part of the audience. Moreover, an act of communication, as an

essentially overt act, just is the act of expressing an attitude, which the speaker may or may not actually possess. Since the condition on its success is that one's audience infer the attitude from the utterance, it is clear why the intention to be performing such an act should have the reflexive character pinpointed by Grice. Considered as an act of communication rather than anything more, it is an attempt simply to get one's audience to recognize, partly on the basis of being so intended, that a certain attitude is being expressed. One is as it were putting a certain attitude on the table. The success of any further act has as its prerequisite that the audience recognize this attitude. Communication aims at a meeting of the minds not in the sense that the audience is to think what the speaker thinks but only in the sense that a certain attitude toward a certain proposition is to be recognized as being put forward for consideration. What happens beyond that is more than communication.

### **1.1.9 Classification of Speech Acts**

One general classification system lists five types of general functions performed by speech acts, which are described below:

#### **(i) Declarations**

Declarations are those kinds of speech acts that change the world via their utterance. The speaker has to have a special institutional role, in a specific context, in order to perform a declaration appropriately.

- a. Priest: I now pronounce you husband and wife
- b. Referee: You're out!
- c. Jury foreman: We find the defendant guilty.

In using a declaration, the speaker changes the world via words.

#### **(ii) Representatives**

Representatives are those kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker believes to be the case or not. Statements of fact, assertions, conclusions, and

descriptions, are all examples of the speaker representing the world as he or she believes it is.

- a. The earth is flat.
- b. Chomsky didn't write about peanuts.
- c. It was a warm sunny day.

In using a representative, the speaker makes words fit the world (of belief).

### **(iii) Expressive**

Expressive are those kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker feels. They express psychological states and can be statements of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy, or sorrow. They can be caused by something the speaker does the hearer does, but they are about the speaker's experience.

- a. I'm really sorry!
- b. Congratulations!
- c. Oh, yes, great, mmmm, ssahh!

In using an expressive, the speaker makes words fit the world (of feeling).

### **(iv) Directives**

Directives are those kinds of speech acts that speaker use to get someone else to do something. They express what the speaker wants. They are commands orders, requests, suggestions, and they can be positive or negative.

- a. Gimme a cup of coffee. Make it black.
- b. Could you lend me a pen, please?
- c. Don't touch that.

In using a directive, the speaker attempts to make the world fit the words.

### **(v) Commissives**

Commissives are those kinds of speech acts that speakers use to commit themselves to some future action. They express what the speaker intends. They

are promises, threats, refusals, pledges, they can be performed by the speaker alone, or by the speaker as a member of a group:

- a. I'll be back.
- b. I'm going to get it right next time.
- c. We will not do that.

In using a commissive, the speaker undertakes to make the world fit the words.

The present research is based on the following classification of Searle's Speech Acts:

#### **1.1.10 Classification of Acts**

Searle (1975) lists 12 differences between speech acts that can serve as bases for classification:

- a) The point of the illocution: for example a requests attempts to get H to do something, a descriptive is a representation of how something is, a promise is the undertaking of an obligation that S do something.
- b) Direction of fit between the words uttered and the world they relate to: for example, statements have a words- to –world fit because truth value is assigned on the basis of whether or not the words describe things as they are in the world spoken of; requests have a world – to words fit because the world must be changed to fulfill S's request.
- c) Expressed psychological states: for example; a statement that P expresses S's belief that is a promise expresses S' intention to do something; a request expresses S's desire that H should do something.
- d) The strength with which the illocutionary point is presented: for example, insist that ..... is stranger than I suggest that .....
- e) Relevance of the relative status of S and H : some illocutions, like commanding, are sensitive to participant status; others, like stating, are not.

- f) Orientation: for example, boasts and laments are S- oriented  
congratulations and condolences are H- oriented.
- g) Questions and answers are adjacency pair parts; Commands are not.
- h) Propositional content: for example, H to do A (i.e. perform some act) for  
a request, S to do A for a promise.
- i) Promising can only be performed as a speech act; classifying can be  
performed in other ways.
- j) Baptizing and excommunicating require institutional conditions to be  
satisfied; but stating does not.
- k) Not all illocutionary verbs are per formative verbs, for example, boast  
and threaten are not.
- l) Style of performing the illocutionary act: for example, the difference  
between announcing and confiding.

To these can be added another:

m) differences in the criteria that H will bring in evaluating speech act, for  
example, judging whether or not a statement is credible; judging invitational in  
terms of whether S really wants A to be done and, if so, whether H is both able  
and willing to do A.

Searle (1975) uses only four criteria to establish five classes of speech acts:  
representatives (called ‘assertives’ in Searle 1979), directives, commissives,  
expressive, and declarations. The first criterion is illocutionary point ((a)  
above):

In addition, he uses: (b) direction of fit: (c) S’s psychological state; and (h)  
propositional content.

Representatives/assertives have a truth value, show words- to world fit, and  
express S’s wish or desire that H do A. commissives commit S to some future  
course of action, so they show world-to- words fit, and S expresses the  
intention that S do A. expressives express S’s attitude to a certain state of

affairs specified (if at all) in the propositional content (e.g., the portion of I apologize for stepping on your toe). There is no direction of fit; a variety of different psychological states; and propositional content 'must ... be related to S or H'. Declarations bring about correspondence between the propositional content and world, thus direction of fit is both words- to world and world –to – words. Searle (1975) recognizes no psychological state for declarations.

Bach and Harnish (1979, p.42-51) employ all of Searle's criteria except direction of fit, giving predominant emphasis to S', psychological state- which they refer to as S's attitude. They identify six classes: constatives express a belief, together with the intention that H form (or continue to hold) a like belief; directives express, S's attitude toward some act that H should carry out; commissives express S's undertaking to do A; acknowledgements (Searle's expressives) express, perfunctorily if not genuinely, certain feelings toward the hearer.

Searle's 'declarations' are all 'conventional illocutionary acts' in Bach and Harnish, but split into effectives, which effect changes in institutional states of affairs, and verdictives, which have official binding import in the context in the institution for which they are made.

Searle's 'declarations' and Bach and Harnish's 'conventional illocutionary acts' are different from the other classes of acts- assertives, directives, commissives. Expressives which are interpersonal. Interpersonal acts are typically directed at individuals. To take effect, they require H to react to S's illocution- mere understanding of the illocutionary point is insufficient: it is pointless for S to tell H it is raining, warn H of danger, or offer H condolences, if H fails to react appropriately to what S says. Declarations, on the other hand, are typically broadcast within a social group and rely for their success on S being sanctioned by the community, institution, committee, or even a single person within the group to perform such acts under stipulated conditions; H's reaction as an individual is irrelevant to the effectiveness of being baptized, disqualified from driving, fired, or any other declaration, provided that

stipulated conditions are met. It is the reaction of the group which sanctions S that is significant for declarations. Compare the interpersonal 'Opine that p' (e.g., I think history is bunk) with the declaration 'declare the verdict p' (e.g., S, umpiring a game at the US Open Tennis Tournament, declares the ball Out!). Because declarations rely for their success on S being sanctioned by the community, etc; it may be necessary to safeguard society's interest with an executive condition which requires some watchdog other than S to ensure that clauses (b-e) of the preparatory condition hold.

Speech acts can be grouped into four classes if H's evaluations are used as criteria. Statements (including denials, reports, predictions, promises, and offers) can all be judged in terms of the question 'Is p credible?' These are principally expressions of S's belief about the way the world was, is or will be, and are most typically formulated with a declarative clause. Invitational are a proper subset of Searle's directives, and include requests exhortations, suggestions, warning etc. They have acceptability values: 'Does S really want A to be done and, if so, is H both able and willing to do it?' These principally invite H's participation, and many are formulated in an interrogative clause. Authoritative includes the rest of Searle's 'directives' and his 'declarations' (i.e., commands, permissions, legal judgment, baptisms, etc), for which H must consider the question 'Does S have the authority to utter U in the given context?' These principally have S 'laying down the law'; many of them are formulated in an imperative clause, the rest in a declarative. Expressives (greetings, thanks, apologies, congratulations, etc.) have social- interactive appropriateness values: Has something occurred which warrants S expressing such a reaction to it? These principally express social interaction with H; many are idiomatic, the rest are in the default declarative clause format.

It is notable that all classes of speech acts can be conveyed using a declarative clause; but interrogatives typically indicate invitational, imperatives authoritative and idioms expressives.

**Table No. 1**

**Searle's Different Classification of Speech Act**

<b>Speech Act Type</b>	<b>Direction of Fit</b>	<b>S = Speaker X = Situation</b>
Declarations	Words change the world	S causes X
Representatives	Make words fit the world	S believes X
Expressives	Make words fit the world	S feels X
Directives	Make the world fit words	S wants X
Commissives	Make the world fit words	S intends X

Table 1 shows the five general functions of speech acts (following Searle 1979, p. 55). On which my study is based.

## **1.2 Review of Related Literature**

Some research works have been done to compare some aspects of the English and Tharu languages. However, the researches existing in the Department of English Education are not directly related to this topic. However, some researches on comparative study are reviewed as follows:

Mahato (2001) carried out research on “A Comparative Study of the Subject-Verb Agreement in the English and Tharu Languages” and he found that in English, the second and third person pronouns do not change for honorific forms whereas they do in the Tharu language spoken in Parsa.

Khanal (2004) carried out a research work on “Comparative Study on the Forms of Address of Tharu and English Language”. His research shows that Tharu native speakers use a lot of addressing terms than the English native speakers. English native speakers use the first name frequently to address someone but it is so less in Tharu native speakers.

Chaudhary (2005) has carried out a research on “Pronominals in English and Tharu Languages: A Comparative Study”. He found that both Tharu and English have more or less similar number of pronouns, except for a few more

words in the Tharu language. It is because of the existence of alternative words in the Tharu language. In the same way, Chaudhary (2008) carried out a survey research entitled “Verbal Affixation in Tharu and English Languages: A Comparative Study”. He found Saptaria dialect of Tharu has more verbal affixes in comparison to English.

Similarly, Chaudhary (2009) carried out a research entitled “Request Forms in the English and Tharu Languages: A Comparative Study”. He found that the English people were found to be more polite among all the relations compared to Tharu.

No single research has been conducted on “Speech Acts in Tharu and English”. As I am from the Tharu community, I have felt it my responsibility of working on this topic. I selected Searle’s different kinds of speech acts for my study.

### **1.3 Objectives of the Study**

The objectives of the study were as follows:

- a. To find out different 'speech acts' used by the Tharu native speakers.
- b. To compare 'speech acts' in Tharu and English.
- c. To suggest some pedagogical implications based on the findings of the study.

### **1.4 Significance of the Study**

This study was beneficial to all those who are interested in the English and Tharu languages. It is equally important to researchers and students who are teaching and learning English as a foreign language at schools where Tharu native speakers appear as students. It is also helpful to syllabus designers, linguists, language planners and those people who are involved in this field directly or indirectly.

## **CHAPTER – TWO**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **2.1 Sources of Data**

The researcher used both primary and secondary sources of data for this study.

##### **2.1.1 Primary Sources**

The native speakers of the Tharu language of Saptari district were the primary sources of data from whom the researcher collected the required data for the research.

##### **2.1.2 Secondary Sources**

The secondary sources of this research were the ones like Leech (1983), Yule (1993) and Levinson (1994) etc. Other reference materials such as related theses, and internet were also used.

#### **2.2 Population of the Study**

The population of the study was the Tharu native speakers of Fattepur VDC of Saptari district.

#### **2.3 Sampling Procedure**

To carry out this research, the researcher selected one district i.e. Saptari using purposive sampling procedure. He selected one VDC of Saptari to collect the data and used judgemental non random sampling procedure. Eighty native speakers of the Tharu language from Saptari district were selected using the same sampling procedure. The researcher presented questionnaire and interview for literate and illiterate informants respectively.

#### **2.4 Tools for Data Collection**

The researcher used interview schedule and questionnaire for the illiterate and literate informants respectively as the research tools to collect the required data

for this study. The interview schedule and questionnaire were based on Searle's classification of speech act. (See Appendix I)

## **2.5 Process of Data Collection**

After preparing the questionnaire and interview schedule, the research visited the sampled population, the Tharu native speakers of Saptari district. He individually met the informants and established rapport with them. He explained the purpose of the study. He conducted interview with uneducated population according to the prepared interview schedule and wrote their responses in the sheets of interview schedules. Educated population was given the sheets of questionnaire to translate English or Tharu situations into their native or mother tongue equivalence. The researcher also explained the questionnaire, if necessary.

## **2.6 Limitations of the Study**

The study had the following limitations:

- i) The study was confined to 80 native speakers of the Tharu language.
- ii) The study was limited to the interview schedule and questionnaire.
- iii) The study was based on Searle's different classification of speech acts.
- iv) The study was based on the Tharu language spoken in Fattepur VDC of Saptari district.

## **CHAPTER - THREE**

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the collected data. Similarly, it includes the comparison of speech acts in the Tharu and English languages. The analysis and interpretation have been presented on the basis of Searle's Speech Act Theory.

#### **3.1 Analysis of Speech Acts**

According to Searle, there are just five kinds of action that one can perform in speaking by means of the following five types of utterances.

##### **3.1.1 Assertive Forms**

The different kinds of assertive forms are: prediction, complaining, denying.

- The informants used 'suggestion' form to put forward an idea or plan for consideration, e.g.
  - Hamar yi sallah chhauki aapnaurke raitke gadime chalu.
  - Tora kitab dekhe partau.
- The native speakers of the Tharu language used 'prediction' form to say that something will happen in the future, e.g.
  - Nepal yesian kirket kapme jittai.
  - Nepal 2010 me biksit desh hetai.
- Similarly the informants used "complaining" to say that they are dissatisfied or unhappy about somebody/something, e.g.
  - Ham dukh mania chiyauki tohar master kharab chhau.
  - Hamara taklip chhai, ham mahasus nai karbai.
- Likewise, Tharu people expressed 'denying' form to say that something is not true or refuse to give something asked for or needed by somebody. They used 'nai', 'ahan' while expressing e.g.
  - Hamara Shanka chhai, ham bazaar nai yebai.
  - Yi jaruri nai chhai.

### 3.1.2 Directive Forms

The different kinds of directive forms are: requesting, questioning, ordering, commanding, begging, etc.

- The respondents have used ‘requesting’ while acting of politely asking for something, e.g.
  - Ham yi jhyal khoil sakai chiyai?
  - Tu maiyake muh dekhaike din nai yebhi?
- Similarly, the Tharu native speakers expressed ‘questioning’ to ask somebody questions about something, especially officially or to express their ideas about something, e.g.
  - Tu ghar jebahi?
  - Babu paisa nai debahi?
- In the same way, the native speakers of the Tharu language have expressed ‘ordering’ to state that exists when people obey laws, rules or authority, e.g.
  - Kripya yahan nai bolu!
  - Bidi churot nai liyau!
- The native speakers of the Tharu language used ‘commanding’ while ordering somebody to do something. And they used to control authority over a situation or a group of people, e.g.
  - Sidhe jo.
  - Konme jyake ghumbai.
- The Tharu informants have used ‘begging’ to ask somebody for something anxiously because they want or need it very much, e.g.
  - Kanhik non laib dene.
  - Hamara chhama karu.
  - Ek chhin hamar sange baithune.

### 3.1.3 Commissive Forms

The different kinds of commissive forms are: promising, threatening, guaranteeing, offering, etc.

- The native speakers of the Tharu language used ‘promising’ to tell somebody that they definitely do or not do something. They also used to make something seem likely to happen. They used ‘sanche’ and ‘kasam’ as promising, e.g.
  - Tohar paisa kail vya jetau sanche.
  - Ham bachan daichiyauki ham turante yebau.
- In the same way, the Tharu people expressed ‘threatening’ while someone is cheating or doing mistake. They did not use polite terms as the sentences were expressed in non-honorific terms to some extent. Generally, senior people of the Tharu community expressed such expressions in case of unpleasant situations, e.g.
  - Jhuth nai bolai.
  - Bahut nai janai.
- The respondents have used ‘guaranteeing’ to promise that they will do something or that something will happen. Tharu native speakers used written promise given by a company that something they buy will be repaired without payment if it goes wrong, e.g.
  - Yi saman bahut baniya chhai.
  - Jama dui baras tiktau.
- The native speakers used ‘offering’ act while willing to do something for somebody or give something to somebody, e.g.
  - Skulme kam karbi?.
  - Le gharme ya.
  - Santola khone.

### 3.1.4 Expressive Forms

The different kinds of expressive forms are: thanking, apologizing, welcoming, congratulating, compliment.

- Here, the native speakers of the Tharu language expressed ‘thanks’ to people to tell them that they are grateful to something. Tharu speakers used ‘dhanyabad’ and ‘thikchhai’ if somebody helps someone in the Tharu society, e.g.
  - Le thik chhai.
  - Bahut bahut dhanyabad.
- Similarly, the respondents used ‘apologizing’ form while people are sorry for having done wrong and hurt somebody’s feeling, e.g.
  - Galti bhelai!
  - Aai dinse sabere yebai.
  - Maf karu!
  - Ham ofis saib din samayme yebai.
- The native speakers of the Tharu language have expressed ‘welcoming’ form to greet somebody in a friendly way when they arrive at somewhere. In the same way, they expressed to say that they are very happy for somebody to do something, if they want, e.g.
  - Kalasme swagat chhai.
  - Hamar gaunme ahanke ekdam swagat chhai.
  - Yar tohar aabajke mane partau.
- The native speakers of the Tharu language expressed ‘congratulations’ form when they want to tell somebody that they are happy about their luck or success. In getting success e.g. they congratulate their friends if they pass their exams. In the same way, informants also expressed the term when someone brings new surprise, e.g.
  - Tora badhai chhau nik divijan lablihi.
  - Le thik chhai nik karlihi.
  - Jagir bhelau le badhai chhau.

- Pahine beta bhelau badhai chhau tora.
- Similarly, the informants have used ‘compliment’ form to tell somebody that they like or admire something that they have done, e.g.
  - Yi park kathek nik chhau.
  - Aai dekhaile badi nik lagaichichi.
  - Bade bhaladmi chihi.

### 3.1.5 Declarative Forms

The different kinds of declarative forms are: dismissing, declaring.

- The informants have used ‘dismissing’ form to decide that something is not important and not worth thinking about, e.g.
  - Tu jhuth bajaichihi.
  - Tora nokarise ham nikail deliyau.
  - Nai bhelai, apan jhola apne lya jebai.
- The native speakers of the Tharu language used ‘declaring’ form while stating something firmly and clearly, e.g.
  - Rasta daihaine!
  - Ham kaihaichiyau torauke dunu prani chihi.
  - Aaise dashaun padme niyukti daichiyau.
- Similarly, declaration speech acts were used by native speakers of the Tharu to state something. The subject of the sentence usually comes before the verb, e.g.
  - Ham jaichiyau.
  - Tu ghar jo.
  - Nisa ya.
  - Nabin kho.
  - Niraj bat kar.
- In the same way, interrogative sentences were used by the Tharu native speakers to seek information on a specific point. The auxiliary verb or the wh-word is placed in the beginning of a sentence, e.g.

- Kathile gelhi?
  - Kon kitab?
  - Koithna yebau?
  - Ke chiyai?
  - Kaihiya hetau?
- In the same way, imperative sentences were used by the Tharu speakers for instructing somebody to do something. Verb is used in the beginning of the sentence, e.g.
- Kho bhat.
  - Jo bazaar.
  - Baith gharme.
  - Likh kapime.
- The Tharu native speakers used declaratives forms for expressing some impression or emotion of the speaker. There was a mark of exclamation at the end of the sentence, e.g.
- Tu pass velhi!
  - Kam bigair gelai!
  - Labka baris yelai!
  - U ghar aabaichhai!
- However, there were other types of utterances that function like a sentence. Syntactically, they were not sentences but semantically they were functioning like a sentence. The following were the examples of non-sentences:
- Ne kam, ne paisa.
  - Murukh!
  - Churot!
  - Ki chhai!
  - Galti bhelai!
  - Badhai chhau!

### 3.1.6 Comparison Between the Speech Acts in Tharu and English Languages

During this study, the researcher did not find any books on speech acts in Tharu language. Only the data collected 80 native speakers of the Tharu language were the sole source of speech acts in the language in question. The researcher collected speech acts from Yule (1993) and Matreyek (1983). In this sub-unit, the speech acts of the Tharu language are compared with those in English.

Comparison of speech acts both the Tharu and English languages have five fold speech acts which are compared with those of English and similarities and differences are listed below with examples.

#### 3.2.6.1 Similarities Between the Speech Act in Tharu and English

##### (a) Assertives

Tharu	English
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Hamar sallah yaha chhauki aapnauke rautka basme chalu.</li> <li>– Nepal esiya kirket kapme jittai.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– You ought to read this book.</li> <li>– Cure for cancer will be discovered in 2015.</li> </ul>

Above table shows that the relation of assertive forms are both in Tharu and English, there is used proposition expression.

##### (b) Directives

Tharu	English
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Jo sidhe.</li> <li>– Ghum, konme jyake.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Can you help me with this?</li> <li>– Be quiet!</li> <li>– Would you mind waiting here?</li> </ul>

Both languages attempt to get the hearer to carry out a future course of action.

### (c) Commissives

<b>Tharu</b>	<b>English</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Tora bihan paisa vya jetau.</li><li>– Ham kiriya khaichiyau toharse paihne hebou.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– I give you my word on it.</li><li>– Mind your head!</li><li>– I promise I will buy you one.</li></ul>

The examples of commissive sentences show the similarities of guaranteeing and promising in both languages.

### (d) Directives

<b>Tharu</b>	<b>English</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Hamara maf karu.</li><li>– Galti bhelai</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– I must apologize for my sons' rudeness.</li><li>– I beg your pardon.</li></ul>

Above examples show that some psychological state, feelings or attitudes are in both the Tharu and English languages.

### (e) Declaratives

<b>Tharu</b>	<b>English</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Ham tora jagirse nikail deliyau.</li><li>– Hamara bat de!</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Would you like me to pick you up at eight?</li><li>– Be ready at morning.</li></ul>

## 3.2.6.2 Differences Between the Speech Act in Tharu and English

### (a) Assertives

<b>Tharu</b>	<b>English</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Ham bazar nai aabaile sakbai.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– I object, I can't.</li><li>– No thanks, I am full.</li><li>– It's not possible.</li></ul>

Above example shows the difference in expression such as I'm afraid, I can't, I object etc. in English but Tharu has no such expressions.

**(b) Directives**

<b>Tharu</b>	<b>English</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Kanhik non dene.</li> <li>- Tu chup rahne.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- My I please have a glass of water?</li> <li>- Would you mind closing the window?</li> </ul>

From above table, the researcher found that the English speaker has request forms like, will you, would you please but the Tharu has not many request forms.

**(c) Commissives**

<b>Tharu</b>	<b>English</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sabdhan.</li> <li>- Ham pahine hebai.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Don't dare telling lies.</li> <li>- I swear that I'll pick up your suit on the way home..</li> </ul>

In commissive the English has many commit words. I promise, take care etc but the Tharu has no more commit words.

**(d) Expressives**

<b>Tharu</b>	<b>English</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maf kairde.</li> <li>- Badhai chhau.</li> <li>- Kalasme suwagat chhai.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please, forgive me for having thrown your book away.</li> <li>- Congratulation on your new son.</li> <li>- I am proud to welcome you in this beautiful city.</li> </ul>

From above table the researcher found that English speakers have many expressive words like congratulations, welcome, so sorry, excuse me etc. On

the other hand, Tharu speakers have no. (Note: Due to influence the different environment and technologies, media, cross cultural even in Tharu community, nowadays they use excuse me, sorry, congratulations, welcome etc. properly.)

**(e) Declaratives**

<b>Tharu</b>	<b>English</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Torauke dunu prani chihi.</li> <li>- Bat de!</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I don't want to ever come back here again.</li> <li>- Smoking is prohibited here.</li> </ul>

## **CHAPTER - FOUR**

### **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **4.1 Findings**

On the basis of the analysis and interpretation of collected data, the major findings of the present study are summarized in the following points:

##### **4.1.1 Speech Acts of the Tharu Language**

- a) Assertives: Tharu native speakers have expressed ham bajar nai abaile sakbau, u jaruri nai chhai.
- b) Directives: The native speakers of the Tharu language used bahar jo, konme jyake bama kata ghumbai.
- c) Commissives: They have used ham ek daib dant jachaile chahaichiyai, sabdhan rah.
- d) Expressives: The Tharu informants have used tohar aabajke mane partau yaar, aagau! hamar tangme lat delhi.
- e) Declaratives: They expressed ham aapan jhola apne lya jebai, ham tora jagirse hatailiyau.

##### **4.1.2 Similarities and Differences Between Tharu and English Speech Acts**

###### **4.1.2.1 Similarities**

The researcher found such similarities:

- a) Both languages carry out a future course of action in of 'directive' forms.
- b) In 'commissive' forms there is used guarantying and promising in both languages.
- c) Both languages state some psychological state, feelings and attitudes.

#### **4.1.2.2 Differences**

The researcher found some differences they are:

- a) English has many expressions but Tharu has not many expressions.
- b) English has many request forms i.e. will you, would you mind, please etc. whereas Tharu speakers have no such request forms example, while addressing once own father a Tharu child uses 'tu' form.
- c) English speakers have expressive words whereas the Tharu speakers have limited.

#### **4.2 Recommendations**

On the basis of findings obtained from the analysis of the collected data, the recommendations have been made as below:

- i) Speech acts in Saptaria dialect of the Tharu are more or less different than those of English. So language teachers who are teaching the Tharu as a second language should be aware of this fact.
- ii) The main aim of this study was to find out different speech acts of the Tharu with those of English. There are similarities in commissive and directive speech act. The teachers should pay more attention to others speech acts while teaching them.
- iii) The Tharu teacher can create dialogues that require the questions of speech acts and make them perform such speech acts.
- iv) Teachers should create many situations on the basis of speech acts.
- v) Make the students know all the speech acts in English and the Tharu language. Then list out the speech acts in those languages which are functionally similar.
- vi) Find out the speech acts which are different from one to another language and make the students learn in the given situations.

## REFERENCES

- Asher, R.E. (1994). *The Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Oxford: Penguin Press, vol. 8.
- Austin (1962). *How to do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bach, K. (1987). *On Communicative Intentions: A Reply to Recanati: Mind and Language*.
- Bach, K. and Harnish R.M. (1979). *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge: MLT Press.
- CBS, (2002). Population census 2001, Kathmandu, National Report.
- Chaudhary, B. (2005). *Pronominals in Tharu and English languages: A comparative study*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Tribhuvan University.
- Chaudhary, D. (2008). *Sentence types in Tharu and English*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur, Kathmandu.
- Chaudhary, R. (2008). *Verbal affixation in Tharu and English languages: A comparative study*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur.
- Chaudhary, R. (2009). *Requests forms in Tharu and English: A Comparative Study*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur, Kathmandu.
- Cherry, C. (1957). *On Human Communication*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Downer, W. (1998). *Language and Society*. Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, H.P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

- Grice, P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.)  
Semantics 3: Speech Acts Academic Press.
- Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics*.
- Gumperz, J.J. & Hymes, D.H. (1972). *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The  
Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Wintston.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1970). *Language Structure and Language Function*. In  
Lyons.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1973). *Explorations in the Functions of Language*.  
London: Arnold.
- [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Speech\\_act](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Speech_act).
- Kumar, R. (1999). *Research methodology*. New Delhi: Sage publication.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principals of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Leech, J. & S. Vartvik. (2002). *A Communicative Grammar of English*. New  
York: Feurom Education Press.
- Levinson, S.C. (1995). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Mahato, R. (2001). *S-V agreement in Tharu and English languages: A  
comparative study*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Tribhuvan  
University, Kirtipur, Kathmandu.
- Matreyek, W. (1983). *Communicating in English*. England: Pergemon Press.
- Rai, V.S. (2001). *Semantics and Pragmatics*. Kathmandu: New Hira Books  
Enterprises.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. UK:  
Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1975). *A Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts*. In Gunderson K. (ed.)  
Language, Mind and Knowledge. University of Minnesota Press,  
Minneapolis, M. N.

- Searle, J.R. (1975). *Indirect Speech Acts*. In P. Cole and J. Morgan (Ed.)  
Syntax.
- Searle, J.R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge  
University Press.
- Searle, J.R. (1989). *How Performative Work*. Linguistics and Philosophy.
- Strawson, P.F. (1964). *Intention and Convention in Speech Acts*. Philosophical  
Review.
- Yule, G. (1995). *The study of language*. Cambridge: CUP.

## APPENDIX

### INTERVIEW/QUESTIONNAIRE

This interview/questionnaire has been prepared in order to accomplish a research work entitled “Speech Acts in Tharu and English Languages”. This research is being carried out under the guidance of Prof. Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi, Department of English Education, T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu. It is hoped that your kind cooperation will be a great contribution in the accomplishment of this valuable research.

#### Researcher

Kamal Kant Chaudhary  
Department of English Education  
T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Name (नाम) : ..... Sex (लिंग) : .....

District (जिल्ला) : .....

Academic Qualification (शैक्षिक योग्यता) : .....

How do you say the following expressions in Tharu?

#### a) Assertives:

1. I suggest we take the night bus.  
.....
2. You might have a look at this book.  
.....
3. Let's enjoy ourselves.  
.....
4. Nepal will win the Asian cricket cup.  
.....
5. Nepal will become developed country in 2015.  
.....
6. I'm afraid I can't come to market.  
.....
7. That's not necessary.  
.....

- 8. I'm sorry to say this but your teacher is bad.  
.....
- 9. I'm so sorry. I did not realize.  
.....
- 10. I'm sorry to say this but your condition is bad.  
.....

**b) Directives:**

- 1. May I open this window?  
.....
- 2. Would you please pass the salt?  
.....
- 3. Couldn't you possibly come mother's day?  
.....
- 4. I order you to get out!  
.....
- 5. Will you please stop talking!  
.....
- 6. Do you mind stop smoking!  
.....
- 7. Would you mind waiting here!  
.....
- 8. Go straight.  
.....
- 9. Turn left on the corner.  
.....
- 10. Pass the temple; you will see the campus building.  
.....

**c) Commissives:**

- 1. I promise I will be quick.  
.....
- 2. I won't loose money, I promise.  
.....
- 3. You shall have the money tomorrow.  
.....

- 4. Be careful.  
.....
- 5. Don't dare tell lies.  
.....
- 6. You dare touch me.  
.....
- 7. Don't more!  
.....
- 8. I promised to help your sister.  
.....
- 9. I'd like to make an appointment for dental check up.  
.....
- 10. Mind your language.  
.....

**d) Expressives:**

- 1. I apologize.  
.....
- 2. I beg your pardon.  
.....
- 3. Excuse me.  
.....
- 4. I'm ever so sorry.  
.....
- 5. Welcome back to class!  
.....
- 6. Very warm welcome to you.  
.....
- 7. I'm proud to welcome you in this beautiful city.  
.....
- 8. Ouch! You stepped on my toe.  
.....
- 9. I love the sound of your voices.  
.....

10. Congratulations!  
.....

11. He makes me sick.  
.....

**e) Declaratives:**

1. We find the defendant guilty  
.....

2. You are fired, I swear, I beg you.  
.....

3. I now pronounce you husband and wife.  
.....

4. Move you of the way!  
.....

5. I hereby appoint you on the post of X.  
.....

6. I warn you not to jump off the roof.  
.....

7. No thanks, I can take care of my suitcase.  
.....

8. I accuse you of lying.  
.....

9. I dismissed you from the job.  
.....

10. The government has declared a state of emergency.  
.....