

# CHAPTER - ONE

## 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 fulfil 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 are in exist in this 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 itself ...it 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 Richards 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)

### **1.1.1 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, we need to acquire communicative 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' (Richards et.al., 1999:p 49). 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, informations

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.

Prauge 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, p. 44) classifies language functions in six types e.g. judgment and evaluation, suasion, argument, rational enquiry and exposition, personal emotions and emotional relations. Richards et al. (1999) classify them in the groups: descriptive, expressive and social. In the same way, Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983, p.5) have classified language functions in six different categories: personal, interpersonal, directive, referential, metalinguistic and imaginative.

Similarly, Van Ek (1975, p. 11-14) 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 attitudes (expressing and inquiring about agreement and disagreement, accepting or declining 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, etc)

“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 somebody to do something. 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 asking for and accepting and denying permission should be chosen by the speaker keeping in mind all the things mentioned above.

### **1.1.2 Languages in Nepal**

Nepal is a multilingual, multi-cultural and secular country. As a result, different languages are spoken in Nepal. Most of the languages do not have their own written scripts, they have only spoken forms, the popularity of languages have been determined by the majority of the population. The languages spoken in Nepal are divided as follows (Jha, 1998)

#### **a. Indo-Aryan Group**

This group includes the following languages:

Nepali	Awadi	Darai	Hindi-Urdu
Maithili	Tharu	Manjhi	Bengali
Kumal	Rajbanshi	Bhote	Chureti Laugage

Bhojpuri                      Magahi                      Danuwar                      Marawadi

**b. Tibeto-Burman Group**

Under this group the following Language come

Limbu	Thakali	Bahing
Kaika	Ghale	Sangpang
Chepang	Gurung	Hayu Baya
Sunuwar	Tamang	Chamling
Newar		

**c. Dravidian Group**

Jhangad is the only one language of Dravidian family which is spoken in the realm of the Koshi River in the eastern part of the Nepal.

**d. Austro-Asiatic Group**

Satar is the only one language in this family which is spoken in the eastern part of Nepal (especially Jhapa district).

**1.1.3 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 Siraha, Saptra, Udaypur, Morang, Sunasri, Sarlahi, Dhanusa, Mahottari and Rauthat.

Maithili has its own written script Tirhuta or Mithilakshar, 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 a distinct 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 written literature in both Nepal and India. Vidayapati 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 came into existence. Shree Krishna Thakur, Baidnath Mishra, Kali Kumar Das are some renowned story writers in Maithili.

#### **1.1.4 Maithili in the 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 Prakritapalingala, Purātana Prabandha Sangraha 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 Bidhayapati survived in this period.

### **c. Modern Maithili**

It starts from the 18<sup>th</sup> century especially with the Krishna Janma of Manabodha. Modern period involves the period from 18<sup>th</sup> 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 Bidhyapti's Parusapariksha, Hersantha Jha's Vasaharan, 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/country imitated this language in their compositions and grew up the Sukum rā Sāhitya or belles- letters. Mailthili was one of the languages of the pandits of Nepal Darbar and they wrote several Sanskrit dramas with songs in Maithili. The famous poet of Maithili is Mahakave Vidyapati, Govida Das and Rabindra Nath Tagore. It also flourished as court language in Kathmanu valley in Malla period. Several literary works and incriptions in Mailthili 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 linguistics, history culture, journalism and so on. The prominent Nepalese linguists working in the Maithili language are namely Y.P. Yadava, R. Yadav and S. Jha. Other famous names in the field of literature are Mahendra Malangia, Dr. Rajendra 'Bimal', Dhireswor Jha, Dhirendra Premarshi, Kuber Ghimire and so on.

### 1.1.5 Person and Honorificity 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 distinctions between honorific and 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 superiors to use '*ah*' even for younger children.

'*tō*' (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).



### **1.1.6 Different Views on Politeness**

Different linguists express different views on politeness. According to Grundy (2000, p.146), “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, p. 60) 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.

Goody (1978, p.108) views that “the linguistic realizations of positive politeness are in many 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 addressee’s 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 groups 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 in what manner is the most important factor to be kept in mind by the speaker. The proper use of language expresses the appropriate social behaviour between the interlocutors. If the speaker is the most polite with the addressee, it brings cordial relationship between them.

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.” He stresses on the fact that politeness is a property of act not the act itself. 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 the researcher classifies the three different ranks of politeness. Viz. formal forms, temperate forms and informal forms. The data were analyzed by using the three forms. Formal forms are used for senior person. Generally honorific type of language is used by using formal forms and frozen forms.

Temperate forms are moderate forms which are regarded as neither formal nor informal forms. It is also called mid-honorific form. People generally use causal type of language. Informal forms are regarded as non-honorific forms. People generally use consultative forms of exponents.

### 1.1.7 Asking for Permission

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 participant relationships.
2. A *status* scale concerned with participant relationships.

3. A *formality* scale relating to the setting or type 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 someone is feeling. In general the more referentially oriented an interaction is, the less it tends to express the feelings of the speaker (pp.11 and 14).

Similarly, e.g. talking between neighbors over the fence at the weekend about the weather, is more likely to be mainly affective in function, and intended to convey goodwill 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 the appropriate exponent of asking for 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 greetings 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 a 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 periods of non-speech. Other usages will be clear from the context. (p.294).

Accepting and denying are general patterns: in contrast to the simple and immediate nature of preferred/dispreferred are delayed and contained additional complex components; and certain kinds of requests, rejections, refusals of offers, disagreements 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 format and content found across a number of adjacency pair seconds:

*Correlations of contents and format in adjacency pair seconds.*

---

*First Part:*

*Request offer/ invite assessment question blame*

*Second Parts:*

*Preferred: acceptance acceptance agreement expected answer denial*

*Dispreferred: refusal refusal disagreement unexpected answer admission*

---

(ibid, p.336)

According to Yule (1993)

The expression of a refusal can be accomplished without actually saying 'no' something that isn't said nevertheless gets communicated in a preface (oh) and a hesitation (ch) the second speaker produces a kind of token acceptance to show appreciation.

The patterns associated with a dispreferred second in English are presented as a series of optional elements:

How to do a dispreferred	Examples
a. Delay/ hesitate	pause; er; em; ah;
b. Preface	well; oh
c. Express doubt	I'm not sure; I don't know
d. Token yes	that's great; I'd love to.
e. Apology	I'm sorry; what a pity.
f. Mention obligation	I must do X; I'm expected in Y.
g. Appeal for understanding	You see; you know.
h. Make it non-personal	everybody else; out there.
i. Give an account	too much work; no time left.
j. Use mitigators	really; mostly sort of; kinda.
k. Hedge the negative	I guess not; not possible.

### 1.1.8 Contrastive Analysis (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 languages 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 order 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 other levels as well. The comparison may be of two types.

**a. Interlingual Comparison**

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

**b. Intralingual Comparison**

The comparison between the two dialects like the standard Maithili and Southern eastern Maithili of the same language viz. Maithili is called intralingual comparison.

CA is based on the behaviouristic theory of learning. According to this theory, an L<sub>2</sub> learner tends to transfer the system of his L<sub>1</sub> to the L<sub>2</sub>. Therefore, the L<sub>1</sub> and the L<sub>2</sub> needs to be compared to find out their similarities and differences. These are the sources of ease and difficulty in learning an L<sub>2</sub>. 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), as cited in Yadav (2007, p. 7) 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 meanings 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 students will know better what the real learning problem and can better provide for teaching them.

In a 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 greater 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  $L_2$  learner and secondly, it explains the sources and reasons of the  $L_2$  learner's error. So, a 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 applications in predicting and diagnosing a proportion of the L<sub>2</sub> errors committed by learners with a common L<sub>1</sub> and in design of testing instruments for such learners.

Sthapit (1978) writes the roles of CA in L<sub>2</sub> teaching in the following way:

When we start learning L<sub>2</sub>, our mind is no longer a clean slate. Our knowledge of L<sub>1</sub> has, as it were, stiffened out linguistically flexible mind. These linguistic habits of L<sub>1</sub> deeply rooted in our mental and verbal activities, do not allow us to learn freely the new linguistic habits to L<sub>2</sub>. That is to say that the interference of the habits of L<sub>1</sub> is a key factor that accounts for the difficulties in learning an L<sub>2</sub>. In other words, L<sub>1</sub> interference stands as a main obstacle on our way to L<sub>2</sub> learning. Learning an L<sub>2</sub> is, therefore, essentially learning to overcome this obstacle. So any attempt to teach an L<sub>2</sub> should be preceded by an explanation of the nature of possible influence of L<sub>1</sub> behaviour on L<sub>2</sub> behaviour. This is precisely what CA does. CA is helpful in identifying the areas of difficulties in learning and errors in performance, determining the area which the learners have to learn with greater emphasis and designing teaching/learning materials for those particular

areas that need more attention. CA not only predicts the likely errors to be committed by L<sub>2</sub> learners but also explains the sources of errors in one's performance. CA is important from pedagogical point of view. The language teachers, testing experts syllabus designers and textbook writers get benefits from the findings of CA.

### 1.1.9 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, whereas 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 of ... contextual meaning, how more gets communicated than 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 can not 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.” To quote Mathews (1997), “Pragmatics is usually conceived as a branch of linguistics concerned with the meanings that sentences have particular context in which they uttered ...?” (as cited in Limbu, 2008).

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 (a) it is concerned not with the word or sentence meaning and (b) 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.

Pragmatics is very familiar in linguistics today. Crystal (1978) believes that our choice of language in social interaction and the effect of our choice is crucial in the study of pragmatics because there are several social as well as cultural constraints that a speaker has to take care of while producing utterances. This discussion leads us to believe that structural knowledge of language is not

enough but pragmatic knowledge as to how to use structural knowledge in particular situation is also equally important.

Likewise, (Leech 1983, p.10) 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.

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 Review of the Related Literature**

Many research works have been carried out comparing various aspects of English and Maithli. None of them have surveyed and carried out to find the similarities and differences between the forms of asking for and denying permission in English and Maithili languages. However, some research works have been carried out on comparing communicative functions between English and other languages like Maithili, Tharu, Limbu, Bhojpuri, etc, in the Department of English Education. Some of these research works have been reviewed below:

Pandey (1997) carried out a research entitled " Apologies between English and Nepali language: A comparative study" He concluded that the native English speakers were more apologetic compared to native Nepali speakers. Similarly, Chapagain, (2002) carried out a research entitled " Request forms in the English and Nepali languages: A comparative Study", she concluded that English people were found more polite among all the relations compared to Nepali.

Chauhan (2006) carried out a research work on "A comparative Study on Asking for permission in English and Nepali Languages". His objectives were to list different forms of asking permission used by the native speakers of English and Nepali language and compare those on the basis of socio-pragmatic approach. He found from his study that English speakers are more polite than Nepali speakers while seeking permission, regarding in the relationship with their relatives. Both are highly formal in the relationship with their teachers rather than with all other relationships.

Language is a very complex psychological and social phenomenon in human life. So, it is common to all and only human being possess it. Language differs according to geographical area, social ethnicity and person. All human beings are born with some capacity to acquire at least one language and probably more than one. That is why, it is clear that linguistic knowledge has significant role in the field of teaching. The teacher, who has the linguistic knowledge of different language, can perform better in language teaching in a multilingual speech community like Nepal because learning a second or foreign language is affected by the mother tongue ( $L_1$ ) of the learners.

The study will be a new venture in the Department of English Education.

### **1.3 Objective of the Study**

The study had the following objectives:

- a. To identify different forms of asking for permission used by the native speakers of Maithili.
- b. To identify different forms of accepting and denying permission used by native speakers of Maithili.
- c. To compare and contrast those forms with the forms used in English.
- d. To suggest some pedagogical implications.

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

This research will be significant for the prospective researchers who want to carry out researches on the Maithili language. It will be useful to the researchers who intend to study indigenous languages. And it will also be beneficial for teachers, course designers, linguists, methodologists and other persons who are directly or indirectly involved in teaching learning activities in those languages.

## **CHAPTER – TWO**

### **METHODOLOGY**

The researcher went through the following methodological strategies to fulfil the above mentioned objectives.

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

The researcher used both primary and secondary sources of data for the elicitation of required information

##### **2.1.1 Primary sources of Data**

The primary data were collected from 80 native speakers of Maithili of Mahadeva Portaha, Sothiyain and Gadha VDC and being a native speaker of Maithili the researcher himself became the primary sources of data.

##### **2.1.2 Secondary Sources of Data**

The study also used information and data from related books, newspapers, journals, documents, dictionaries, articles, grammar and unpublished theses like Pandey (1997), Chauhan (2006),. Main sources of secondary data are: Leech and Svartvik (1975), Van Ek (1976), Matreyek (1983), Finnocchiaro and Brumfit (1983), Wardhaugh (1986) and Blundell, Higgens and Middlermiss (2001)

#### **2.2 Sampling Procedure**

Portaha, Sothiyain and Gadha VDC were selected for the study using judgmental sampling procedure: Eighty native speakers were selected for the



interview, among them forty were old illiterate and forty were young and literate. It was done by using snowball sampling procedure.

### **2.3 Tools for Data Collection**

The data for the study were elicited with the help of interview schedule, questionnaire and participant observation. Being a native speaker of Maithili the researcher also used his own intuition.

### **2.4 Process of Data Collection**

The researcher collected the required data following the stepwise procedure:

- ) The researcher visited the selected study area and developed rapport with the Maithili natives.
- ) He took interview with the native speakers of the Maithili language according to the prepared interview schedule. The researcher wrote the answer of respondents in Roman transliterated form.
- ) He participated in daily conversation and discussed with native Maithili speakers.
- ) He explained the questionnaire in Maithili and requested them to answer in their mother tongue i.e. Maithili
- ) He took forms of asking for permission, accepting permission and denying permission of English from Leech and Svartvik (1975), Van Ek. (1976), Matreyek (1983), Finnocchiaro and Brumfit (1983) and Blundell, Higgens and Middermiss (2001).

### **2.5 Limitations of the Study**

The limitations of the study were as follows:

- ) The study area was confined only to Portaha, Sothityain and Gadha VDC.
- ) The study included only eighty Maithili speakers.

- ) The study based on Purweli Maithili dialect.
- ) The study is primarily concerned with the spoken forms of asking for, accepting and denying permission used by Maithili and English language only.

## CHAPTER - THREE

### ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the collected data. Similarly, it also includes the comparison of forms of asking for permission accepting permission and denying permission used by English and Maithili native speakers. The analysis and interpretation have been presented on the basis of highly formal forms, formal forms, temperate forms and quite informal forms with tabulation. The categories have been prepared on the basis of the relationship and interactions carried out with family, office friends, neighbors, guests, strangers and doctors.

#### 3.1 Total Forms of Asking for Permission Used with Grand-father

Table No. 1

Maithili	English
J Ji! hām akhan cænal badalu sakai chi?	J May / can I change the next channel?
J b b Ji ! hām dosar cænal badalu?	J Would you mind if I switch over the news?
J b b Ji ! hām y prach r ke samaya me cænal badalu?	J Do you mind if I change the band?
J b b ! dosar cænal badal-l sa apne ke kono dukh ?	J It is ok if I change the next channel?

### 3.1.1 Total Forms of Accepting Permission

**Table No. 2**

)] badail-le rau	)] Sure, go ahead
)] absya badal	)] It's o.k. with me.
)] badal bad prac r	)] No, I don't mind.
)] dait aich	)] I won't stop you.
)] koi hurga n i badail-le	

### 3.1.2 Total Forms of Denying Permissions

**Table No. 3**

)] n , n i, badal.	)] No, you may not.
)] n ,, sab s m c r sunak aicha.	)] You can not.
)] n , n i r mot c l .	)] I don't think so.
	)] Yes I do mind

(Matreyek, 1983)

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 informal than the English language. In Maithili language grandfather accepted or denied by giving further instruction.

### 3.2 Forms of Asking for Permission Used with Mother

**Table No. 4**

Maithili	English
᳚ m ! hām philm dekha j u?	᳚ May/can I go to cinema?
᳚ m ji hām apan man pasandak philm dekhake anumati chahai chi ?	᳚ May I have your permission to go to movie today?
᳚ s ! hām akhan sinem dekha j sakai chi?	᳚ Do you mind if I go to movie with my friends.
	᳚ Please, let me go to the movie today?

#### 3.2.1 Forms of Accepting Permission

**Table No. 5**

᳚ j u, koi harj n i.	᳚ Yes, you can.....
᳚ j u, lekin jaide y b.	᳚ You have my permission.
᳚ dekha liya, J u.	᳚ No I don't mind at all.
᳚ j u.....	᳚ I won't stop you.

#### 3.2.2 Forms of Denying Permission

**Table No. 6**

᳚ n i J u bahut sa k m aicha.	᳚ Yes you can .....
᳚ k m aicha.	᳚ You have my permission.
᳚ tu n i j sakai chi.	᳚ Yes, I don't mind.
᳚ yai hapta me dugo film bha jetau.	᳚ I don't stop you.
᳚ ji n i j u dosar din jay b.	
᳚ n i dekhu.	

The table shows that, the forms used by children while asking for permission to go to movie they used formal and sometimes temperate forms in both the Maithili and English languages.

On the other hand, Maithili mother accepted the permission by using temperate forms whereas informal forms are used in English in the similar situation.

### 3.3 Forms of Asking for Permission Used with Aunts

**Table No. 7**

Maithili	English
) k ki ji hām h ke ch t laka iskul j sakai chi?	) Could you please, give me your umbrella?
) chaci ji ! h apan ch t kani iskul j il debai?	) May/can I take your umbrella?
) hām h ke ch t laka iskul j u c ci?	) Is it ok if I use your umbrella?
) h ke ch t sa iskul gel me kono dukh, ki?	) Please let me have the umbrella to go to school?

#### 3.3.1 Forms of Accepting Permission Used by Aunts

**Table No. 8**

) ji, absya laj u.	) Fine with me.
) ji, lajau bauw / daiy .	) I won't stop you.
) h h la j sakai chi.	) It's ok. with me.
) ji, koi harj n i.	) Sure, go ahead.

### 3.3.2 Forms of Denying Permission Used by Aunts

**Table No. 9**

<p>)] ji, n i, hāmr khet jeb k aicha.</p> <p>)] ji, hāmr ekego ch t aicha.</p> <p>)] n i, hām yi ch t n i da sakai achi.</p>	<p>)] I don't think so.</p> <p>)] I'm afraid you can't use.</p> <p>)] I'm afraid not</p> <p>)] I absolutely forbid you.</p>
--	---

(Source, Blundell, Higgens and  
Middlermiss 1982, p.121)

Both in Maithili and English niece 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 niece and nephew are regarded as seniors but English aunt does not regard them as seniors.

### 3.4 Forms of Asking for Permission Used with Elder Brothers

**Table No. 10**

Maithili	English
)] bhaiy ji! hām apne ke b ik sa kalega j u ki?	)] Would it be possible to go college to your bike?
)] ji, hām h ke b ik sa kaleg ja sakai chi?	)] Can I use your motorbike, please?
)] h ke b ik sa kaleg j u bhaiy ?	)] Do you mind if I use your motorbike?
)] hāmr apne ke b ik sa kaleg jaike anumati aicha?	)] Please let me have the motorbike today?
	)] Do you have any objection if I use your size today?

### 3.4.1 Forms of Accepting Permission Used by Elder Brothers

**Table No. 11**

) j u bh i ! j sakai chi.	) Yes, that's fine / all right.
) thik aich lag u.	) Yes, certainly you can.
) tu lag sakai chi.	) No, I don't mind.
) absya prayog karu.	) Please, don't hesitate to use my bike today.
) aime puchai b l b t ki aicha.	) I can see no objection

### 3.4.2 Forms of Denying Permission Used by Elder Brothers

**Table No. 12**

) n i hamr b ik bigral aicha.	) I'm afraid, it is not possible today.
) n i hamro b j r jebakai cha.	) No, you can not.
) n i, rau bauw .....	) Yes, I do mind.
) n i, tor yai baik sa kaleg jeb k anumati n i aicha.	) I don't do think so.
	) I'd like to, but I've to go market.

Maithili and English both speakers used formal language while asking for permission with elder brother. There is also a similarity found in accepting permission. But, Maithili speakers denied directly by putting words 'n i' and giving by further explanation / instruction to their younger brother.



### 3.5 Forms of Asking for Permission Used between Friends

**Table No. 13**

Maithili	English
<p>)] s thi ! hām h ke botal mehe p in pib s kai chi?</p>	<p>)] Do you mind if I drink your water?</p>
<p>)] yau s thi ! hām r yi p in piya ke anumati aicha?</p>	<p>)] May/can I have some of your water?</p>
<p>)] yau ! hām h ke pain pib-liu?</p>	<p>)] Is it ok if I drink your water?</p>
<p>)] hām yi tohar botl mehe p in pibl sa kono dukh?</p>	<p>)] Hello? Raj? Any chance of drinking the water?</p> <p>)] Is it all right if I drink your water.</p>

#### 3.5.1 Forms of Accepting Permission Used by Friends

**Table No. 14**

)] koi, b t ne pib liya, sangi.	)] Why not.
)] thik aicha, bib liya s thi	)] No, I don't mind at all.
)] h absya pib sakai chi.	)] Certainly you may / can.
)] h pib liya.	)] It's ok. with me.
	)] No reason, why not.
	)] All right (by me) if.....

(Leech and Svartvik 1975)

### 3.5.2 Forms of Denying Permission

**Table No. 15**

J n i, kame aicha s thi.	J Yes, I do mind.
J n i, kaniye aicha, sangi	J I don't think so.
J s thi ! humro py s lagal aicha.	J I'd like to, but water is not much in
J h m h ke yi p in n i dæb.	the bottle.
	J No way.

The above table clearly shows that the majority of the English respondents used temperate forms while seeking permission to their friend. In the context of Maithili, most of the native speakers used informal language while seeking permission. There were some other exponents where the respondents showed a very close intimacy with their friends, then they used quite informal language in both languages. According to Leech and Svatvik (1982, p.126) "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 languages.

### 3.6 Forms of Asking for Permission Used with Neighbours

Table No. 16

Maithili	English
) Ji! hām h ke kh li kotha proyog ka sakai chi?	) Would you mind giving me a room?
) Ram ! hām tohar ekt khali koth prayogkaru ki?	) Excuse me, may/ can I use your vacant room?
) ji ! hām h ke kh li koth i upyog karu ki?	) Would it be possible to use your a vacant room?
) ji ! kono dukha, jab hām yi kh li koth pryog karu ta?	) Please let me have the room for a day?

#### 3.6.1 Forms of Accepting Permission Used by Neighbours

Table No. 17

) ji, ka sakai chi.	) Fine with me.
) ji / abasya karu.	) No, I don't mind at all.
) kiyak ne prayog ka sakai chi.	) It is ok. with me.
) ji ! h aime puchai b l b t ki aicha.	) Sure, go ahead.

#### 3.6.2 Forms of Denying Permission Used by Neighbours

Table No. 18

) ji, n i aime dikt aicha.	) Sorry, I'm afraid.....
) ji ! n i hamro p hun aicha.	) I don't think so.
) ji ! hām r apne dikta aich.	) 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 table 18 shows that the number of highly formal forms of asking for denying permission in Maithili is far greater than English.

### 3.7 Forms of Asking for Permission Used with Strangers

**Table no. 19**

Maithili	English
) ji! hām yi khidki ke sis band karu ki?	) Excuse me, can/may I close the window?
) sar ! hamr khidki band karke anumati aicha?	) I was wonder if I could close the window?
) siriman ji hām kani khidki band karu?	) Please, let me close the window?
) ji banhut thand aich, jhay l band karu ki?	) Would you mind if I close the window?
	) Is it ok if I close the window?

#### 3.7.1 Forms of Accepting Permission Used by Strangers

**Table No. 20**

Maithili	English
) ji! banda kaliya.	) Yes, you can / may.
) ji ! l g liya.	) Please, don't hesitate to close the window.
) koi harj ne lag u.	) I can't see any objection.
) thik aicha band ka liya.	) No, I don't mind at all.
) nirkhak banda karu.	) It's ok. with me.

### 3.7.2 Forms of Denying Permission Used by Strangers

**Table No. 21**

Maithili	English
)] n i, sar hāmr ta h w ch hi.	)] No, you can't
)] hāmr akhan thand n i lagait aicha.	)] I'd like to but I'm feeling too hot. )] I'm afraid we can't
)] n i hāmr baj r ke dirisya dekhak aicha.	)] Yes, I do mind )] I don't think so.
)] kani der me banda karab.	

The first table shows that a stranger speaking to another stranger was found to be more formal than a friend speaking to another friend. Similarly, another important point that Maithili people used less number of temperate forms compared to English people while accepting permission to strangers.

### 3.8 Forms of Asking for Permission Used with Guests

**Table No. 22**

Maithili	English
)] mehm n ji! hām h ke tarc prayog kasakai chi?	)] Would you mind giving me a touch?
)] ji! hāmr h ke tarc upyog karake anumati aicha?	)] Excuse me, may/can I use your touch?
)] sar, hām apneke bati sa k j ka sakai chi?	)] Would it be possible to use your touch light?
)] ji! bati gel sa bahut apthero bhagelai, apne ke tar ?	)] Do you have any objection if I use your touch?

### 3.8.1 Forms of Accepting Permission Used by Guests

**Table No. 23**

Maithili	English
)] ji! liy k ja karu.	)] No, I don't mind at al.
)] ji! koi b t nai yi tarc liya.	)] Yes, you can . . .
)] ji, absya prayog karu.	)] I can't see any objection to
)] kono harj ne h prayog ka sakai chi.	use the touch.
)] h liya.	)] Certainly you can.

### 3.8.2 Forms of Denying Permission Used by Guests

**Table No. 24**

Maithili	English
)] ji! aime b itri c rj n i aich.	)] Yes, I do mind.
)] ji! hamro k m aicha tarc ke.	)] I don't think so.
)] ji! n i, yi h lel dikat aicha.	)] I' like to but battery is low.
)] ji! humr apne k m prait rahait aicha.	)] I'm afraid you can't use my touch.

From the above table, the researcher found that 'mehm n Ji' is very common to address their guests in Maithili, on the contrary the address term is not used in English languages. From the denying table, the researcher concluded that English people denied by using the temperate forms, but in Maithili respondents used quite formal forms to deny the permission.

### 3.9 Forms of Asking for Permission used with Doctors

**Table No. 25**

Maithili	English
) d ktar ji! hām akhan bir mi ke bhet ka sakai chi?	) Excuse me may I see the relatives?
) 'd ktar s h b! ba hām renuke bhet ka sakai chi?	) Would you mind if I see the relatives?
) namaste d ktar s b! ji akhan bir mi sa bhet ka sakai chi, hām?	) Sir, can I see the relatives? ) Excuse me, it is ok if I see the patients?

#### 3.9.1 Forms of Accepting Permission Used by Doctors

**Table No. 26**

Maithili	English
) ji ! h j u bhetu.	) Yes, you can.
) ji ! h nirdhak bhetu.	) No, I don't mind at all.
) opresan bhelai j ke h bhet ka sakai chi.	) It's ok with me.
) absya j u, bhet karu.	) I can't see any objection
) koi harja n i, j ke bharos diyau.	) Please don't hesitate to meet the patient.

#### 3.9.2 Forms of Denying Permission Used by Doctors

**Table No. 27**

Maithili	English
) ji, akhan h bhet n i ka sakai chi.	) I'm afraid you can't see now.
) ji, hunk dh ghan r m kara diyau.	) I'd like to but after one hour you can meet.
) maph kru, akhan apne hunka n i, bhet ka sakai chi.	) I don't ready think so ) I'm sorry it's not possible for

	you.....
--	----------

The table no. 25, shows that address term for doctor 'd ktar ji / ji' have used while asking for permission in the Maithili language where as, address terms have not been found in the English language.

From the table no. 24 and 25, the researcher found that Maithili doctors used highly formal forms in comparison to English doctor while asking for accepting and denying permission.

### 3.10 Forms of Asking for Permission Used with Officers/Bosses

**Table No. 28**

Maithili	English
) aphisar s h b ! hām aiya baith sakai chi?	) Excuse me, may I sit here?
) ji, hamr aiya baitha ke anumati aichi?	) Would you mind if I sit here?
) sar, hām yata bith sakai chi?	) May we sit in here?
) m h say, hām aith m b ith sakai chi?	) Are we allowed to sit in here?
	) Excuse me, is it ok if I sit here.

#### 3.10.1 Forms of Accepting Permission Used by Bosses/Officers:

**Table No. 29**

Maithili	English
) ji ! abasya, baithal j u.	) Yes, you can sit.
) ji ! h apne baith sakai chi.	) It's ok with me.
) absya baitbu kono harj n i.	) No, I don't mind to sit here.
) baisu, ki k m aicha?	) Yes, you can.



)} h yau kiy k ne, baithu.	)} Yes, that's fine.
----------------------------	----------------------

### 3.10.2 Forms of Denying Permission Used by Bosses/Officers:

**Table No. 30**

Maithili	English
)} ji, n i aime apne n i b ith sakai chi.	)} I'm afraid, you cannot sit here.
)} ji, yi pramukh sar ke kursi aicha.	)} I don't think so.
)} ji, n i k m ke b t karu, b h r j ke baithab.	)} I would like to but it is secretary's chair.
	)} You're not really supposed to sit here.
	)} I'm afraid; no one is allowed to sit here.

The comparative table no. 28 shows that Maithili people used less number of highly formal forms of asking for permission with officer compared to English people. Maithili people used more temperate forms while asking for permission to their boss.

### 3.11 Forms of Asking for Permission Used with Teachers

**Table No. 31**

Maithili	English
----------	---------

<p>) sar/m dam hām kal s me aib sakaichi?</p> <p>) Ji, sar/m dam hām kal s me ba ke anumati aicha?</p> <p>) mahasaya, hām kal s me ib sakai chi?</p> <p>) ji, hām bhitra ib sakai chi, sar?</p>	<p>) May I come in sir, sorry I'm late?</p> <p>) Excuse me, I'm extremely sorry?</p> <p>) Are we permitted to come in sir?</p> <p>) Excuse me, is it ok if I come in?</p>
---	---

### 3.11.1 Forms of Accepting Permission Used by Teachers

**Table No. 32**

Maithili	English
)] u- lekin dosar din se let n i ib.	)] Yes, come in.
)] u- mud bahut ber bhagel.	)] Your are welcome.....
)] a sakai chi.	)] Don't hesitate to come in.
)] h jaldi.	)] Yes, you are permitted to come in.

### 3.11.2 Forms of Denying Permission Used by Teachers

**Table No. 33**

Maithili	English
)] n i, akhan h nai ib sakai chi.	)] No, you may not come in.
)] n i yi ghanti ke b dme ib.	)] No, you can not come in.
)] n i, akhan h ke b d let bhagel.	)] No, you don't.
	)] I'd like to, but it was too late.

There were found a very cordial relationship between a teacher and students in the world. The students are found to be more formal to their teacher while asking for permission. However, the comparative Table No. 31 shows that the native speakers of the English language used the greater number of highly formal forms compared to their Maithili counterparts while asking for permission. Maithili teacher used more temperate forms than English counterparts.

The Table No. 33 shows that Maithili respondents denied indirectly whereas English respondents denied directly by using informal forms of denying permission.

## **CHAPTER - FOUR**

### **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The main objective of this study was to find out the forms of asking for permission, accepting permission and denying permission in Maithili and compare them with the English forms. The researcher analyzed and interpreted the data collected with the help of questionnaire and interview schedule consisting of 27 items that were responded by 80 native speakers and compared them with the forms of asking for, accepting and denying permission used in English taking the information from Leech and Svartvik (1975), Matreyek (1983), Wardhaugh (1986) and Blundell, Higgins and Middlermiss (2001).

#### **4.1 Findings**

The general findings are as follows:

- i. Informal forms are used by intimate friends and temperate forms are used by general friends while asking for and accepting and denying permission in both the languages.
- ii. While asking for permission, children used formal forms and sometimes temperate forms to get to movie in both Maithili and English.
- iii. Both Maithili and English people were found to be highly formal in the relationship with their teacher rather than with all other relationship.
- iv. A stranger speaking to another stranger was found to be more formal in both Maithili and English.
- v. Generally parents, teachers, elder brother and elder sister deny the permission by using negative imperatives. In negative imperatives of Maithili, the negative particle 'n i' is in preverbal position and the verb

is in its imperative form (by giving further instruction) similarly, they accepted the permission by using imperative affixes.

The specific findings are as follows:

- i. Maithili people used less number of highly formal forms of asking for permission with officer compared to English people. The Maithili native speakers used the English form 'sir' to address the teachers and strangers.
- ii. Informal forms are used by intimate friends and temperate forms are used by general friends while asking for permission and accepting and denying permission in both the languages.
- iii. In Maithili, negation is standard indicated by the use of the particle 'n i' while denying permission. The same invariant particle is used in all negative sentences.
- iv. 'n i' and 'āhā', which literally means 'no' conveys disagreement or denying permission in Maithili.
- v. The respondents used the adversative conjunction mud /balki/lekin which conveys a preventive meaning. (While denying permission) in Maithili.
- vi. hā/h , which literally means 'yes' conveys agreement, especially h is accompanied by an affirmative nod.
- vii. English people were found to be more polite in relationship with their staff. On the contrary, Maithili people used temperate forms of asking for permission.
- viii. In English uncle and aunt both use informal language with their niece but in Maithili uncle uses only informal language and aunt uses formal language while accepting and denying permission.

- ix. Address terms are compulsory in Maithili whereas, they are optional in English while accepting and denying permission. e.g. ji, au, rau and so on.
- x. The denying permission marker in English is 'not' which is placed after an auxiliary verb, where as 'n i' is added sentence initially in Maithili.
- xi. The English respondents have used formal forms of language while asking for permission with grandfather in response he accepts or denies the permission used with quite informal forms whereas Maithili respondents used informal forms in a similar situation.
- xii. Maithili mother accepted the permission by using temperate forms whereas informal forms are used in English in the similar situation.
- xiii. In Maithili, elder brother denied directly by using the word “nai” and providing him further explanation/instruction to their younger brother whereas in English he denied indirectly in the similar situation.
- xiv. Maithili doctors used highly formal forms in comparison to English doctors while asking for, accepting and denying permission.

## **4.2 Recommendations**

The researcher on the basis of findings 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 ' h ' temperate forms and 'tõ' create informal form while asking for permission in Maithili.

2. The learners should know the role of the lexical items 'ji' 'yau', 'tō', '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 expressions 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 forms 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/Maithali 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 and accepting and denying permission in their conversation in different contexts 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/ foreign language, because a comparative study helps

the teacher 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 textbook writers should be more conscious about the differences between two languages in terms of the forms of asking for, accepting and denying permission while designing the syllabus and writing the textbooks of the English for the Maithili learners who are learning English as a second language.



## REFERENCES

- Bhattarai, G.R. (2005). *A thematic analysis of research reports*. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.
- Blundell, J., J. Higgins, and N. Mudders. (2001). *Function in English*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M & Larsen Freeman, D. (1983). *The grammar book*. London: Newbury House.
- Chapagain, G. (2002). *Request forms in English and Nepali Languages: A comparative study*, An Unpublished Thesis of M. Ed., T.U., Kathmandu.
- Chauhan, P.B. (2006). *A Comparative study on asking for permission in English and Nepali language*, An Unpublished Thesis of M.Ed., T.U., Kathmandu.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT: Cambridge Press.
- Crystal, D. (1978). *The English language*. London: Harmondsworth.
- Finnocchiaro, M. & Brumfit, C. (1983). *The functional notional Approach: from theory to practice*. New York: OUP.
- Fraser, B. (1980). *On apologizing*. In F columns (ed.) conversation Routines. The Hague:
- Giri, A. (1982). *English and nepali kinship terms: A comparative study*, An Unpublished Thesis of M.Ed., T.U., Kathmandu.
- Goody, N. F. (ed.) (1978). *Questions and politeness*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Grierson, G.A. (1881). *An introduction to the Maithili language of North Bihar, Part I, Grammar*. Calcutta: Asiatic society Bengal.

- Haliday, MAK (1973). *Exploration in the functions of language*. London: Enward Arnold.
- Holmes, J. (1992). *Introduction to sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.
- Hymes. (1964). *Language in culture and society*. New York: Harper and Row Publisher.
- James, C. (1980). *Contrastive analysis*. London: Longman.
- Jespersen, O. (1904). *How to teach a foreign language*. London: Geroge, Allon & Unwin Ltd.
- Jha, C. (1980). *The formation of the Maithili language*. London: Luzac and communities co. Ltd.
- Jha, S. K. (2001). *Maithili: Some aspects of its phonetics and phonology*. Delhi.
- Jones, L. (1981). *Function of English*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Khanal, G.P. (2004). *A comparative study on terms of address of Tharu and English language*, An Unpublished Thesis of M.Ed., T.U., Kathmandu.
- Kumar, R. (1996). *Research methodology*. London: Sage Publication.
- Leech, G. and J. Svartvik. (1975). *A communicative grammar of English*. Burnt Millo: Harlow House.
- Leech, L. (1983). *Principle of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Limbu, S.K. (2008). *Asking for permission in English and limbu: Comparative study*, An Unpublished Thesis of M.Ed. T.U., Kathmandu.
- Matreyek, W. (1983). *Communicative in English: Functions*. New York: Pergamon Press.

- Matthews, P.H. (1997). *Concise dictionary of linguistics*. New York: Oxford university press.
- Pandey, G.P. (1997). *A comparative study of apologies between English and Nepali*, An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, T.U., Kathmandu
- Quirk, R. et al. (1973). *A university grammar of English*. London: Longman.
- Richards et al. (1999). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Roger, T. B. (1970). *Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.
- Sthapit, S.K. (2002). Teaching language for communication. *journal of NELTA*. Vol. 5.1.
- Trask, R.L. (1997). *A student's dictionary of language & linguistics*.
- Van Ek, J.A. (1976). *The threshold level*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe
- Wardhaugh, R. (1986). *An Introducing Textbook of linguistics and phonetics*. Rampur Bagh: student store.
- Wilkins, D.A. (1972). *Linguistics in language teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Yadav, P. K. (2007). *Negative and interrogative transformation in English and Maithili Language*, An Unpublished Thesis of M. Ed. T.U., Kathmandu.
- Yadav, R. (1984). *Maithili phonetics and phonology*. Mainz: Selden and Tamm.
- Yadav, R. (1996). *A reference grammar of Maithili*. Berlin and New York. Mouton democratic Gruyter.
- Yadav, R. (1996). *A reference grammar of Maithili*. New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Yadava, Y.P. (1999). *Reading in Maithili language literature and culture*. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy.
- Yule, G. (1993). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University press.

**APPENDIX - I**  
**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR NATIVE SPEAKERS OF**  
**MAITHILI LANGUAGE**

Name : Sex:  
Address : Age:  
Occupation : Religion:

Please, ask for and accepting & denying permission on the basis of the following situations in Maithili language.

1. You are at your relative's home. You are in the habit of smoking, you want to smoke there.

.....  
.....

2. You are at your uncle's home. You want to use his telephone.

.....

3. It's raining heavily you are going to school. You want to take your anut's umbrella.

.....  
.....

4. You are on winter vacation. You want to ask your father to go on a picnic with your friends.

.....  
.....

5. Your most favorite movie is on in the film hall. You want to ask your mother if you can go to watch the movie.

.....  
.....

6. You are on the bus. You feel very cold, you want to ask the stranger sitting next to you if you can close the window.

.....  
.....

7. You have some works with the boss of office. You want to ask his assistant if you can meet him.

.....  
.....

8. You and your grandfather are watching an interesting programme on T.V. As it is time for the news on the next channel, you want to change it.

.....  
.....

9. You and your grandmother are listening the news on the radio. As it is the time for an interesting programme on the next band, you want to change it.

.....  
.....

10. Your friend calls you in his home for dinner. You want to ask for permission with your elder sister.

.....  
.....

11. You are organizing a party. As you don't have enough rooms, you want to use your neighbor's extra rooms.

.....  
.....

12. You want to buy a pair of shoes. You want to ask a shopkeeper for permission to given it a try.

.....  
.....

13. You are in our boss's office. You want to ask him if you can sit.

.....  
.....

14. While visiting different religious places you reach a famous temple, you want to ask the priest for permission to take a photo of it.

.....  
.....

15. After the operation of your relative at the hospital. You want to ask the concerned doctor for permission to see him/her.

.....  
.....

16. Your motor cycle doesn't work. As you want to use your elder brother's motor cycle to go to college.

.....  
.....

17. You have to play football but you don't have football shoes. As you to use your younger brother's football shoes.

.....  
.....

18. You are very thirsty while walking on the road with your intimate friend. As your water has been finished, you want to drink his water.

.....  
.....

19. Your pen stops writing while taking the exam. You don't have extra pen, you want to use your friend's pen.

.....  
.....

20. You have to go to market to buy vegetables. You want to use your younger sister's bag.

.....  
.....

21. You have got a terrible headache in the school. You want to ask the principal to leave the class early to go to hospital.

.....  
.....

22. You have finished your homework. You want to ask your father if you can play with your friends.

.....  
.....

23. You are a little late for class. You want to go in while the teacher is teaching.

.....  
.....

24. You are at a party organized by your relative. You want to leave the party before finishing.

.....  
.....

25. Guests are at your home. As it is the time of night but you don't have enough lamps, you want to use their torch.

.....  
.....

26. Your guest has a photo album in his bag. You want to see it.

.....  
.....

***Thank you for the Co-operation!***

\*\*\*\*\*

**APPENDIX - II**  
**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR NATIVE SPEAKERS OF**  
**MAITHILI LANGUAGE**

Name : Sex:  
Address : Age:  
Occupation : Religion:

Please, ask for and accepting & denying permission on the basis of the following situations in Maithili language.

1. You are at your relative's home. You are in the habit of smoking, you want to smoke there.

.....  
.....

2. You are at your uncle's home. You want to use his telephone.

.....

3. It's raining heavily you are going to school. You want to take your anut's umbrella.

.....  
.....

4. You are on winter vacation. You want to ask your father to go on a picnic with your friends.

.....  
.....

5. Your most favorite movie is on in the film hall. You want to ask your mother if you can go to watch the movie.

.....  
.....



6. You are on the bus. You feel very cold, you want to ask the stranger sitting next to you if you can close the window.

.....  
.....

7. You have some works with the boss of office. You want to ask his assistant if you can meet him.

.....  
.....

8. You and your grandfather are watching an interesting programme on T.V. As it is time for the news on the next channel, you want to change it.

.....  
.....

9. You and your grandmother are listening the news on the radio. As it is the time for an interesting programme on the next band, you want to change it.

.....  
.....

10. Your friend calls you in his home for dinner. You want to ask for permission with your elder sister.

.....  
.....

11. You are organizing a party. As you don't have enough rooms, you want to use your neighbor's extra rooms.

.....  
.....

12. You want to buy a pair of shoes. You want to ask a shopkeeper for permission to given it a try.

.....  
.....

13. You are in our boss's office. You want to ask him if you can sit.

.....  
.....

14. While visiting different religious places you reach a famous temple, you want to ask the priest for permission to take a photo of it.

.....  
.....

15. After the operation of your relative hospital. You want to ask the concerned doctor for permission to see him/her.

.....  
.....

16. Your motor cycle doesn't work. As you want to use your elder brother's motor cycle to go to college.

.....  
.....

17. You have to play football but you don't have football shoes. As you to use your younger brother's football shoes.

.....  
.....

18. You are very thirsty while walking on the road with your intimate friend. As your water has been finished, you want to drink his water.

.....  
.....

19. Your pen stops writing while taking the exam. You don't have extra pen, you want to use your friend's pen.

.....  
.....

20. You have to go to market to buy vegetables. You want to use your younger sister's bag.

.....

- .....
21. You have got a terrible headache in the school. You want to ask the principal to leave the class early to go to hospital.
- .....
- .....
22. You have finished your homework. You want to ask your father if you can play with your friends.
- .....
- .....
23. You are a little late for class. You want to go in while the teacher is teaching.
- .....
- .....
24. You are at a party organized by your relative. You want to leave the party before finishing.
- .....
- .....
25. Guests are at your home. As it is the time of night but you don't have enough lamps, you want to use their torch.
- .....
- .....
26. Your guest has a photo album in his bag. You want to see it.
- .....
- .....

***Thank you for the Co-operation!***

**\*\*\*\***

**APPENDIX – III**  
**Informants of the Research Study**  
**VDC. Mahadeva Portaha**

S.N.	Name	Sex
1	Dhaneswar Yadav	Male
2	Ladubati Yadav	Female
3	Parmeswar Yadev	Male
4	Champa Devi Yadav	Female
5	Lalita Kumari Yadav	Female
6	Ram Udgar Yadav	Male
7	Sunita Kumari Yadav	Female
8	Satya Narayan Yadav	Male
9	Ajay Kumar Das	Male
10	Birendraq Prasad Gupta	Male
11	Suresh Kumar Gupta	Male
12	Manoj Kumar Sah	Male
13	Madhab Yadav	Male
14	Jugal Prasad Yadav	Male
15	Kishna Kumar Yadav	Male
16	Khusbu Kumari Yadav	Female
17	Raj Kumari Yadav	Female
18	Ram Kumar Yadav	Male
19	Dilip Kumar Yadav	Male
20	Rupesh Kumar Yadav	Male
21	Durga Prasad Yadav	Male
22	Ghanswyam Yadav	Male
23	Sugit Kumar Sah	Male
24	Dinesh Prasad Gupta	Male
25	Lakhan Yadav	Male
26	Yogendra Prasad Yadav	Male
27	Ajay Kumar Yadav	Male
28	Angana Gupta	Female
29	Dharmnath Yadav	Male

### VDC. Sothiyain

1	Shiv Kumar Yadav	Male
2	Mamta Kumari Das	Female
3	Manju Kumari Yadav	Female
4	Indragit Prasad Yadav	Male
5	Sunita Devi Yadav	Female
6	Nitish Kumar Yadav	Male
7	Santosh Kumar Shah	Male
8	Pramod Kumar Yadav	Male
9	Jibach Thakur	Male
10	Bhogendra Prasad Yadav	Male
11	Md. Jiyaul Rahman	Male
12	Mantoon Mandal	Male
13	Dipendra Yadav	Male
14	Kujilal Yadav	Male
15	Rabilal Yadav	Male
16	Ram Swarup Das	Male
17	Jibchi Saday	Male
18	Ram Prasad Yadav	Male
19	Lalit Kumar Yadav	Male
20	Pramod Gupta	Male
21	Pramananda Chaudhary	Male
22	Babita Kumari Yadav	Male
23	Umesh Kumar Yadav	Male
24	Nand Saday	Male
25	Aasaram Chaudhary	Male
26	Kirishna sah	Male
27	Umesh Dahuwar	Male
28	Deochandra Thakur	Male
29	Ram Iswar Jha	Male
30	Abinashi Kumar Yadav	Male

### VDC. Gadha

1	Binod KumarYadav	Male
2	Manoj Kumar Yadav	Male
3	Nirmala Jha	Female
4	Susmita Chaudhary	Female
5	Ranju Kumari Yadav	Female
6	Rekha Kumari Yadav	Female
7	Saroj Kumar Saday	Male
8	Suman Sharma	Male
9	Bindeswar Yadav	Male
10	Bhubneswar Mahato	Male
11	Ram Chandra Sah	Male
12	Pramila Kumari Yadav	Female
13	Sarita Kumari	Female
14	Sunita Devi Mahto	Female
15	Puspa Kumari Yadav	Male
16	Laxmi Yadav	Male
17	Bhola Prasad Yadv	Male
18	Anrud Prasad Yadav	Male
19	Sitli Devi Yadav	Male
20	Shivdayal Mandal	Male