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CHAPTER ONE

A STYLISTIC STUDY OF SYNONYMY IN W. WORDSWORTH'S POETRY

Fareed H. H. Al-Hindawi
Musaab A. Raheem Al-Khazaali

1.1. Introduction

This chapter deals with the role of synonyms in propounding the main themes in Wordsworth's poetry that is considered one of the best representatives of the romantic poets. Thus, his style can be a portrait for this movement.

Wordsworth's poetry generally reacts against the thought and literary practices of the preceding century. His major subject, like most Romanticists, matter is the beauty and satisfactions derive from nature. Romanticists believe in naturalism and realism in the place of morality. They believe that man should not be conformed or stereotyped to one norm of code rather derive pleasure from what he derives from nature (see Abrams, 1953; Moulin, 2005: 1-2). His style, thus, is worth researching because it is a picture of his age.

The hypotheses of this work are built upon the belief that Wordsworth attempts to make his poetry coherent mainly by using synonyms, and this coherence is mainly a thematic one. Verschueren (1999: 135-6) points out that thematic coherence, in certain cases, is called 'relevance'. It is connected with the study of information structure and/or thematic structure. Following van Dijk (1977), this coherence can also be classified into two types: local (which deals with thematic unity at the level of stanza) and global (which deals with that unity at the level of a whole poem).

To test the hypothesis, componential analysis, which is thought, here, to be a useful tool in this regard, is conducted.

Moreover, the work provides a theoretical background on synonymy and the approaches of analyzing it. The selected approach is applied to a number of poems randomly selected to verify or reject the hypothesis adopted. In so doing, the current research attempts to answer the following questions:
a. What is the role of synonymy in creating coherence in Wordsworth's poetry?
b. Is synonymy a stylistic marker in his poetry?
c. Can the componential analysis approach be usefully applied to literary texts?

1.2. Synonymy

When it comes to giving a clear, precise and correct definition of synonymy, many difficulties arise. There are numerous approaches with numerous definitions of synonymy and types of synonyms, because synonyms may differ in many ways.

Thus, it would be imprecise to define synonymy as identity of meaning since there are no two terms with completely identical meaning. Hence, other definitions have emerged. Generally speaking, synonymy denotes the phenomenon of two or more different linguistic forms with the same meaning. Those linguistic forms are called synonyms, e.g. peace and tranquility, or capacity and ability can be substituted for one another in certain contexts (For more details, see Crystal, 2003: s.v. synonymy).

However, for some other scholars, synonymy is the relation that holds between bound morphemes, lexemes, lexical units, phrases, clauses, sentences and propositions. Thus, synonymy can be classified either into lexical and propositional synonymy, or into lexical, phrasal and propositional synonymy. The first division, in which lexical synonymy comprises phrasal synonymy, can be explained in the following manner (see O'Grady et. al., 2005: 55).

1.2.1 Lexical synonymy

Lexical synonymy is concerned with bound morphemes, lexemes, lexical units and phrases. It is a sense relation that holds between two or more lexical units with the same sense in the given contexts in which they are interchangeable (Crystal, 2003: s.v. synonymy).

Cruse (2000:157) asserts that a level of synonymity can be recognized through a scale which consists of absolute synonymy, cognitive synonymy and near-synonymy. Absolute synonymy is set as the complete identity of all meanings of two or more lexemes in all contexts. However, it is unnatural for a language to have absolute synonyms, or lexemes with exactly the same meaning. Firstly, the function or use of one of them would gradually become unnecessary or unmotivated and, as a result, it would soon be abandoned or dropped out. Secondly, their interchangeability in all the contexts can neither be demonstrated nor proved, for, on the one hand, the number of contexts is infinite, and, on the other hand, the exceptions from absolute interchangeability are inevitable.
Therefore, the lexicons of natural languages do not have absolute synonymy as their feature. It is generally accepted that absolute synonymy is impossible or unreal. It is regarded only as a referential point on the alleged scale of synonymity or the initial criterion for the defining of synonymy (Ibid: 157).

As there are no two lexemes with completely the same meaning and no real synonyms, cognitive synonymy is what most semanticists would regard as synonymy. Lyons (1996: 63) claims that many theories of semantics would confine the notion of synonymy to what he calls descriptive or cognitive synonymy, which is the characteristic of descriptive meaning. Near-synonyms are lexemes whose meaning is relatively close or more or less similar (mist/fog, stream/brook, dive/plunge). However, the given definition of near-synonymy is vague, because there isn't a precise correlation between synonymy and semantic similarity. Near-synonymy is associated with overlapping of meaning and senses. The senses of near-synonyms overlap to a great degree, but not completely (Murphy, 2003: 155). Moreover, unlike cognitive synonyms, near-synonyms can contrast in certain contexts:

_He was killed, but I can assure you he was NOT murdered, madam._ (Cruse, 2000: 159)

### 1.2.2 Propositional and Cognitive Synonymy

It deals with clauses, sentences and propositions. It can be explained by means of paraphrase when the propositional contents of sentences are identical:

*Mary fed the cat.*

*The cat was fed by Mary.*

*It was the cat that Mary fed._ (Cann et al., 2009: 9)

Such similar meanings are different only in stylistic syntactic structures. The core content is the same.

Synonymy is a paradigmatic relation that enables lexically simple units to have the same meaning as lexically complex units, and vice versa, e.g. ophthalmologist and eye specialist.

Hurford and Heasley (1983:104) assert that synonymy is possible between words belonging to different parts of speech (as between the verb sleeping and adjective asleep).

To put it in simple terms there exists a synonymy relation between two words if they share the same meaning. We will give an example of what the lexico-semantic resource considers to be synonyms. The (near-) synonymy is represented by means of a so-called synset. Synsets are groupings of synonyms. For example nature, universe, creation, world, cosmos, and macrocosm form one synset. One word can belong to more than one synset, if it
has more than one sense. There is another sense of the word nature, which is part of the synset that comprises nature, wild, natural state, and state of nature.

In literature, there is a debate about the definition of synonymy. A summary of some views in this regard will be introduced in addition to an explanation of which notion accords with the objectives of this.

Cruse (1986) proposes a scale of synonymy. He argues that since the point of semantic identity, i.e. absolute synonymy is well-defined and the other end-point, the notion of zero synonymy, is far more diffuse, a scale of semantic difference is more satisfactory. The definition of absolute synonyms Cruse (Ibid: 30) provides is as follows: “Two lexical units would be absolute synonyms if and only if all their contextual relations (...) were identical.” He then continues with examining an illustrative sample of possible candidates for absolute synonymy. None of the pairs satisfies the criteria. He (Ibid) concludes by stating that “if they exist at all, they are extremely uncommon.” Only in technical domains one can find absolute synonyms, for example bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE), and mad cow diseases are two names for the same thing. Next on the scale are the so-called cognitive synonyms.

Thus, cognitive synonyms must be identical in respect of propositional traits, i.e. they must yield the same truth-value, but they may differ in respect of expressive traits. Examples are father-daddy, cat-pussy, and infant-baby. Cognitive synonyms arise where certain linguistic items are restricted to certain sentences or discourses. Their cognitive counterparts (synonyms) take their place in other sentences and discourses.

Cruse (Ibid: 33) introduces these precincts under two headings: (i) pre-supposed meaning and (ii) evoked meaning. Presupposed meaning refers to the semantic traits of a lexical item that place restrictions on its normal syntagmatic companions. Drink takes for granted an object that has the property of being liquid. Grilling is usually used for raw food such as meat or green peppers, and toasting for bread. In the above example the collocational restriction is systematic. In other cases the restrictions can only be described by listing all collocants. These restrictions are referred to with the term idiosyncratic collocational restrictions. An example is the pair umpire-referee. Evoked meaning is a consequence of different dialects and different registers in a language. Examples of geographical variety are autumn and fall, lift and elevator. Difference in register gives rise to cognitive synonyms such as matrimony and marriage. Both absolute synonyms and plesionyms (near-synonyms) are distinguished from cognitive synonyms by the fact that they yield sentences with different truth-conditions. Two sentences which differ only in respect of plesionyms are not mutually entailing but there
may well be unilateral entailment. Cruse (Ibid) hence categorises hyponyms/hypernyms under the plesionym.

Zgusta (1971) considers absolute synonymy as characteristic of all three basic components of meaning: designatum, connotation, and range of application. The term designatum refers to a referent of a single word in the extralinguistic world. Synonyms should have agreement in designatum. Connotation is a semantic term referring to the feeling or attitudinal value that a lexical element such as pass away distinguishes from dies. The term range of application refers to the fact that certain words are used in certain contexts. If there is a difference in one or more of the components, words are near-synonyms only.


According to Palmer (1981: 89-91), there are no real synonyms, i.e. no two words with the same meaning. Thus, there are five basic ways in which synonyms can be considered as different:

a. Some of the synonyms belong to different dialects of language. Fall, for instance, is used in the U.S.A for the British equivalence autumn.

b. The different words used for the same meaning are due to the change in style. Degrees of formality and colloquiality will affect the use of synonyms. For instance, gentleman is more formal than man.

c. Some words can be said to be distinct in their emotive or evaluative meanings, and their cognitive meaning remains the same. The function of such words is to influence attitudes. For example, the words politician=statesman and the like.

d. Some words, which are similar in meaning, may differ in their collocational contexts. Thus, 'rancid' collocates with butter and bacon, and added with eggs or brains.

e. Some words are regarded as similar by lexicographer and dictionary maker. This is a loose sense of synonymy.

Crystal (2003: 450) summarizes the definition of synonymy as “a term used in semantics to refer to a major type of sense relation between lexical items[…]if items are close enough in their meaning to allow a choice to be made between them in some contexts”.
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1.4. Approaches for Analyzing Synonymy

1.4.1 Traditional Truth-conditional Approach

This approach depends on relating truth-conditional equivalence to mutual entailment. It results in the notion of cognitive synonymy. It is mainly a propositional relationship. Cognitive synonymy can be explained by virtue of relations that hold between sentences or propositions that contain pairs of cognitive synonyms. Cognitive synonyms require truth-conditional equivalence of the sentences which contain them.

Propositions are abstract entities which represent the semantic structure of sentences, and they are characterized by truth values (while sentences are characterized by truth conditions), i.e. they express something true or false. Cognitive synonymy can be described through implication (Lyons, 1996: 63) and entailment (Cruse, 2000: 158). Implication is a logical operation. It is the relation between two assertions that can be true or false. X is the cognitive synonym of Y if, and only if, the proposition containing one of the synonyms X implies the proposition with identical syntactic structure in which X is replaced with Y. As a result, such propositions only differ in the presence of the given synonyms and they are mutually implied, for synonymy itself is a symmetrical relation (if X is synonymous with Y, then Y is synonymous with X, and vice versa). In other words, cognitive synonyms are propositionally equivalent. Given that statesman and politician are cognitive synonyms, a substitution test, which is a diagnostic test for judging synonymy and contextual restrictiveness of lexemes, can be applied. Namely, interchangeability of synonymous pairs is tested by means of substitution of one synonym with another in the same context. Synonyms are interchangeable only in certain environments, so this test can be utilized to illustrate the difficulties in finding the pairs of absolute synonyms. The proposition *The statesman spoke at the conference* implies the proposition *The politician spoke at the conference*. Since the first proposition is true, the second one must necessarily be true, and vice versa.

Entailment is the relation between two sentences or propositions where "the propositional content of one proposition includes that of the other. Mutual entailment is the relation in which the propositional contents of sentences are identical, so the truth of one requires the truth of the other, and vice versa "(Cann et al., 2009: 8). A proposition containing one synonym is mutually entailed by the same proposition containing the other. The following propositions are "mutually entailing: John bought a violin entails and is entailed by John bought a fiddle; I heard him tuning his fiddle entails and is entailed by I heard him tuning his violin; She is going to play a violin concerto entails and
is entailed by She is going to play a fiddle concerto. Notice that fiddle is less normal in the last example, while leaving truth conditions intact, which shows that fiddle and violin are not absolute synonyms." (Cruse, 2000: 158).

In that respect, considering different argumentations, cognitive synonyms might be differentiated on the basis of different registers, styles or dialects they belong to, or by virtue of different connotations, collocations, etc. What they have in common is the same sense.

This approach will not be adopted in this study because of the following reasons:

a. It deals only with the cognitive aspects of the words rather than the stylistic or social aspects.

b. It is basically related to propositions neglecting single lexemes.

c. It relies on the semantic process of ‘entailment’ rather than other linguistic processes.

1.4.2 Componential Analysis and Semantic Features Approach

Lexical meaning is arguably at least as relational as it is referential. A very different theoretical approach to the analysis of lexemes, especially synonyms, developed in linguistics rather than philosophy, exploits the systematic relationships among words by breaking their meaning into distinctive features, and then words can be categorized according to their shared and opposing features. This is the tenet of what is called Componential Analysis (See Curzan & Adams, 2009: 224). The problems of Componential Analysis, which include those of semantic features, are discussed in Lyons (1977: 317-335) and re-examined in Leech (1981: 117-122). The latter argues that Componential Analysis has the goal of explaining word sense, not encyclopedic knowledge, and that prototypic categories should be contained in a psychologically realistic theory of reference. In order to deal with the fuzziness of meaning, he proposes an extension of the analysis of word-meaning which includes Componential Analysis and has three levels:

1. 'Word-sense', as the entire 'conceptual unit'.

2. 'Components or features' by Componential Analysis.

3. On the third level both word senses and features, seen as prototypic categories, are 'broken down into fuzzy sets of attributes' (Ibid:121, cf. 117).

An obvious advantage of semantic feature decomposition approach is that it allows us to group entities into natural classes (much as we do in phonology). Hence, man and boy could be grouped together as [+human, +male] while man and woman could be put in a class
defined by features [+human, +adult] (O'Grady et al., 2005: 207). Thus, this is very useful for the analysis of the deep features shared by synonymous words and expressions.

According to the componential model, Kim (2008: 2) asserts that words display what is called distinctive features (or distinctive semes), which are, in a way, the building blocks that words consist of and can be broken down into. The distinctive features are binary in the sense that they can be either X or not X (indicated by +/-). This applies to all aspects of a word, including its semantic content. Thus, the semantic difference between 'man' and 'boy' is a matter of a couple of semantic components:

'man' 'boy'

+ + male
+ + human
+ - adult
- + child

This is a very useful method of distinguishing members of a lexical set (words that are semantically related such that they overlap): clean pure unadulterated (+ unmixed).

To sum up, componential analysis is “a semantic theory which has developed from a technique for the analysis of kinship vocabulary […] It claims that all lexical items can be analyzed using a finite set of components (or ‘semantic features’), which may, it is felt, be universal” (Crystal, 2003:91). This approach will be adopted for the data analysis of this work because it focuses on the deep features of the words that can be shared by other words in the linguistic system. Moreover, it can be applied to both single lexical items and propositions. The selected model for analysis can be represented in Fig. 1 below.

Fig. (1): A Model for Analysis
1.5. Data Collection, Description and Analysis

1.5.1 Data Collection and Description

The data are collected from various poems written by W. Wordsworth. They are randomly selected to be more representative for the results of the study. The first poem is *The Solitary Reaper*. Wordsworth's preface to the 1800 *Lyrical Ballads* argues that poetry "contains a natural delineation of human passions, human characters, and human incidents." It oughtn’t to be judged by the presence of artificial, poetic diction. Rather, "the language of conversation in the middle and lower classes of society" can be its medium. "The Solitary Reaper" exemplifies these beliefs. Written seven years after *Lyrical Ballads*, it describes a nameless listener's delight in a young woman's melancholy song in an unknown language as, working by herself in a Scottish valley, she swings a sickle, reaping grain. Four eight-line stanzas, each closing with two couplets and all written in octosyllabic lines, have a musical lilt. Short lines deliver the rhymes at a quick pace. Sentences normally need two or more such short lines to complete, so that few lines are strongly end-stopped; most freely enjamb (see McSweeney, 1996: 22).

The other poems are selected from the lyrical *Lucy*. The Lucy poems provoked a lot of speculations about William Wordsworth’s life none of which were made conclusive. The Lucy Poems are elegiac about a person unknown but many critics believe that Lucy was Wordsworth’s sister Dorothy and the poems express his fear of losing her (Cutajar, 2010: 15).

1.5.2 Data Analysis

The following examples are presented to illustrate the results of the analysis conducted in the data via using the "Componential Approach". Some reference to the contextual features and views, however, will be introduced to provide a clear idea about the analysis.

(1)

*The Solitary Reaper*

*Behold her, single in the field,*  
*Yon solitary Highland Lass!*  
*Reaping and singing by herself;*  
*Stop here, or gently pass!*  
*Alone she cuts and binds the grain,*
And sings a melancholy strain;
O listen! for the Vale profound
Is overflowing with the sound.

No Nightingale did ever chaunt
More welcome notes to weary bands
Of travellers in some shady haunt,
Among Arabian sands:
A voice so thrilling ne'er was heard
In spring-time from the Cuckoo-bird,
Breaking the silence of the seas
Among the farthest Hebrides.

Will no one tell me what she sings?--
Perhaps the plaintive numbers flow
For old, unhappy, far-off things,
And battles long ago:
Or is it some more humble lay,
Familiar matter of to-day?
Some natural sorrow, loss, or pain,
That has been, and may be again?

Whate'er the theme, the Maiden sang
As if her song could have no ending;
I saw her singing at her work,
And o'er the sickle bending;--

I listened, motionless and still;

And, as I mounted up the hill,

The music in my heart I bore,

Long after it was heard no more.

In this poem, one can find that the poet attempts to make use of synonymy to show or represent one of his basic themes, i.e., the theme of isolation and loneliness. This theme is one of the recurrent notions in the romantic poetry, in general and W. Wordsworth, in particular (see Preston, 1960).

The lexical definitions of the words that are used to indicate this theme will be given according to Hornby (2007) (see Table (1)).

- **Solitary**: adj. done alone/ enjoying being alone/ alone (person, place, animal…)/ single.
- **By herself**: alone/ without anyone else.
- **Farthest**: at the greatest distance in space, direction or time.
- **Far-off**: distant/ far away/remote.

According to the componential analysis approach, these words can have the mutual features [+ isolation] and [+ loneliness]. These synonyms help building up the thematic coherence of the poem because they are related to one of the main themes of the poem. This proves what Abrams (1953: 23) asserts that “although, Wordsworth sang of joy and love, he did not avert his eyes from anguish or evil, but often represents a ‘dark world’. He (Ibid) mentions that “Wordsworth is pre-eminently the poet of solitude… no poet is more emphatically the poet of community”. Wordsworth, therefore, has an acute sense of his own being that sharpens his awareness of other beings, and his intention is to require us his audience to acknowledge the being of his narrative personae and so to bring them within the range of conscience and of natural sympathy.

Rural loneliness has been described as the proper environment or condition for the right contemplation of nature. The Romantic poets prefer the tranquility and serenity of the rural environment to the contamination and complexity of the city life by implied contrast. The poet, his life in the rural environment makes the poet think deeply and have a right view of life.
Table (1): Componential Analysis of Isolation Items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical item</th>
<th>Number of features</th>
<th>Recurrent features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solitary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[+loneliness]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By herself</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[+isolation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farthest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far-off</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2)

From “Lucy”

Strange fits of passion have I known:
And I will dare to tell,
But in the lover's ear alone,
What once to me befell.

When she I loved look'd every day
Fresh as a rose in June,
I to her cottage bent my way,
Beneath an evening moon.

Upon the moon I fix'd my eye,
All over the wide lea;
With quickening pace my horse drew nigh
Those paths so dear to me.

And now we reach'd the orchard-plot;
And, as we climb'd the hill,
The sinking moon to Lucy's cot
Came near and nearer still.

In one of those sweet dreams I slept,
Kind Nature's gentlest boon!
And all the while my eyes I kept
On the descending moon.
My horse moved on; hoof after hoof
He raised, and never stopp'd:
When down behind the cottage roof,
At once, the bright moon dropp'd.

What fond and wayward thoughts will slide
Into a lover's head!
'O mercy!' to myself I cried,
'If Lucy should be dead!'
'Tis past, that melancholy dream!
Nor will I quit thy shore
A second time; for still I seem
To love thee more and more.

Among the mountains did I feel
The joy of my desire;
And she I cherish'd turn'd her wheel
Beside an English fire.

'Myself will to my darling be
Both law and impulse; and with me
The girl, in rock and plain,

This poem shows the odd processes of human consciousness especially that of lovers; the poem is an intimation of death of a loved one. It explications the fear and grief of losing one’s beloved.

The poem is in a form of a narrative told to the people who know what it means to be in love in a language occasionally stilted with poetic inversions that may be ascribed to the awkwardness of confessing an apparently trivial and neurotic incident. The sudden disappearance of the moon stimulates the thought of a possible more grievous disappearance in the narrator’s mind. The moon is a traditional symbol of change. In the poem the moon is peculiarly fixed in the intensity of the narrator’s gaze while he rides and yet it is also oddly mobile as it descends and drops with uncanny speed which is made mysterious by an optical illusion (see Cutajar, 2010).
Nevertheless, this quirky psychological aberration is given a prophetic meaning in the poem by the fact that the other Lucy poems are epitaphs for someone who has died.

In (2), the poet again uses synonymous expressions and words to emphasize another important theme in the romantic poetry which is ‘love’. The componential analysis of these lexical items depends on The Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2004) as follows (see Table (2)):

a. Passion: love/affection/strong feeling or emotion.
b. Lover: one who loves/ beloved.
c. Loved: did love/ fall in love with.
e. Sweet: darling/lover.
g. Desire: love/affection/fond.
h. Darling: dearly loved/sweet/lover.

As shown in this analysis, the poet does not use these words at random, rather he attempts to motivate the theme of love in the mind of the reader. The componential feature of such expressions is [+love]. Romantic poets incline to love, real love as a rejection for the ugliness of reality. Thus, this poem is unified by this current theme through synonymous words and lexical items expressing ‘love’. See table (2) below.

**Table (2): Componential Analysis of Love Items.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical item</th>
<th>Number of features</th>
<th>Recurrent features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[+love]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lover</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dear</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fond</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3)

**From “Lucy”**

*The floating clouds their state shall lend*

*To her; for her the willow bend;*

*Nor shall she fail to see*

*Even in the motions of the storm*

*Grace that shall mould the maiden's form*

*By silent sympathy.*
'The stars of midnight shall be dear
To her; and she shall lean her ear
In many a secret place
Where rivulets dance their wayward round,
And beauty born of murmuring sound
Shall pass into her face.

'And vital feelings of delight
Shall rear her form to stately height,
Her virgin bosom swell;
Such thoughts to Lucy I will give
While she and I together live
Here in this happy dell.'

Thus Nature spake -- The work was done --
How soon my Lucy's race was run!
She died, and left to me
This heath, this calm and quiet scene;
The memory of what has been,
And never more will be.

A slumber did my spirit seal;
I had no human fears:
She seem'd a thing that could not feel
The touch of earthly years.

No motion has she now, no force;
She neither hears nor sees;
Roll'd round in earth's diurnal course,
With rocks, and stones, and trees.

This poem enacts an aura of mysteriousness by putting together a number of statements that seem to contradict each other suggesting the powerlessness of language to pin down the nature of Lucy’s ethereal existence. The poet’s inability to put his grief into words refers to a
depth of feeling which is beyond expression, beyond poetic means; a feeling that is ineffable and indescribable. This is yet another epitaph for Lucy in which the poet’s words gain peculiar power from contradictions resulting in a pattern of inscrutable ambiguity that delineates the absoluteness of death and our “human fears” (Cutajar, 2010).

In (3), the poet can be noticed to be using other synonymous expressions and items to assert the theme of silence which is related to the global theme of the poem which is ‘death’. The analysis of the words and expressions components depends on Collins Cobuild Advanced Dictionary of American English (2007) (see Table (3)):

d. Quiet: silent/hush/calm/lull.
e. Slumber: sleeping/motionless/quiet/rest.
f. No motion: motionless/quiet/restful/
g. No force: forceless/calm/silent.

Table (3): Componential Analysis of Death Items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical item</th>
<th>Number of features</th>
<th>Recurrent features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[+motionless]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[+silence]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slumber</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No motion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No force</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As one can see, these lexical items and phrases have mutual features such as [+silent] and [+motionless]. Such componential features are related to the themes of silence and death. These themes are one of the distinctive aspects of the romantic poetry, and they represent the focus on passion and individuality in such school of literature. In (3), the poet tries to create or build the theme of Lucy’s death gradually by referring to certain notions related to dying such as silence and quietness. Then, he explicitly points to death using the word ‘died’. Finally, he refers to other expressions associated with death and silence such as ‘no motion’, ‘slumber’ and ‘no force’. This process is used to keep the whole poem parts and stanzas stick to the main topic, leading to ‘thematic coherence’.
1.6 Conclusions

On the bases of the findings arrived at by the analysis, this study has come up with the following results:

1. Wordsworth's poetry depends on synonymy as a means for creating ‘thematic coherence’.
2. Synonymy is a stylistic marker of his poetry.
3. Componential analysis is a useful tool for the analysis of synonymy, when applied to literary texts.
4. Not only is synonymy related to local themes (that are related to certain stanzas) in poems but also to ‘global’ ones.
5. Romantic themes such as death, love, and isolation have different deep semantic features structures, leading to different literary significance.
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CHAPTER TWO

SEMANTIC CLAUSE RELATIONS IN LITERARY DISCOURSE

Akram Nadhum Raheem

2.1. Literature Review
2.1.1 Introduction

Every language has a limited number of expressions and words part of whose function is to make explicit the semantic relationships between units in a discourse. These words and expressions act as signals of those relationships between units which are the basis of the realization of active contextual meanings. Recently, much attention has been given to the role of these words and expressions in signaling not only the relations between clauses and sentences in different kinds of discourse or texts, but also in unfolding the underlying rhetorical organization of these texts and discourses.

As such, highlighting these lexical signals is considered to be the first step towards unfolding the underlying rhetorical and relational organization of texts (Hoey, 1983:85). Therefore, words are no longer viewed as having stable meaning; rather, they have dynamic and creative meaning contextually negotiable between the encoder and the decoder throughout the communication process (ibid: 86).

Therefore, this study aims at identifying vocabulary 3 items in a corpus of a literary text as a means of signalling the clause relations that hold between different parts of the text. This study also aims at classifying these lexically signalled clause relations. It is hypothesized that the different types of clause relations which are used in literary texts help the reader to interpret the message being communicated by the writer about the way in which the literary discourse should be interpreted. The writer is telling his/her reader to interpret the juxtaposition of the parts of his/her discourse in a particular way.

2.1.2 Winter's (1977) Semantic Theory of Clause Relations

Winter's semantic theory of clause relations is based on the notion that adjacent clauses and sentences complement the meaning of each other. That is to say, the semantics of one
sentence is completed by the semantics of another which constitute the contextual significance of both sentences. The process of interpreting one sentence depends to a greater extent on the meaning of the preceding sentence or group of sentences.

According to Winter (1977: 37), clause relations refer to "a system of predictability of context; That is, given a sentence with its preceding context, the lexical selection of the next sentence is frequently predictable". Therefore, the existence of a preceding context of a given sentence is a crucial factor in the process of interpreting that sentence.

Following Winter (1977: 38), these lexical items can be divided according to their clause-relating function into three groups; voc.1, voc.2, and voc.3. The first two groups are grammatical, the third is lexical. The first includes subordinators, the second sentence connectors or conjuncts, the third includes lexical items which Winter calls 'lexical signals'. Winter (1982) rephrases his definition of clause relations as:

“A clause relation is the shared cognitive process whereby we interpret the meaning of a clause or a group of clauses in the light of their adjoining clause or group of clauses." Where the clauses are independent we can speak of 'sentence relation'." (p: 178).

Consequently, Winter's developed definition has resolved the conflation between the sentence and the clause, because independence is the first grammatical requirement of the sentence, in the traditional definition, though not enough for its meaning in a complete utterance unit. And since the sentence in Winter's (ibid.) definition consists of more than one clause grammatically grouped together by subordination, it follows that the clause in its independent form contains inadequate information and requires lexical realization by adjoining clauses to be fully understood.

As an illustration, Winter (ibid:185) asserts that though the clause 'There is a problem' is perfectly grammatical, it remains incomprehensible and needs a lexical realization by the adjoining clauses. He also terms this clause as 'unspecific clause' which requires semantic completeness by answering the question 'What is the problem?', i.e., it must have a lexical realization from the adjoining clauses which he terms as 'specific clauses'.

2.1.2.1 Definition of Clause Relations

Winter's clause relational approach has culminated in a broader definition presented by Hoey & Winter (1986:123) in which they expand Winter's definition (1982) by accounting for the reader/writer communicative interaction. The reader is the decoder or interpreter of
the combination of sentences or clauses in the light of the preceding ones, whereas, the writer, as encoder of the message, makes all the possible choices from lexis, grammar and intonation in the creation of the combination of clauses or sentences in the same discourse. Thus, Hoey & Winter (1986: 123) provide a new definition of clause relation where emphasis is laid on writer-reader communicative interaction:

“A clause relation is the cognitive process, and the product of that process, whereby the reader interprets the meaning of a clause, sentence, or group of sentences in the same discourse. It is also the cognitive process and the product of that process whereby the choices the writer makes from grammar, lexis, and intonation in the creation of a clause, sentence, or group of sentences are made in the context of the other clauses, sentences, or groups of sentences in the discourse."

Therefore, this study adopts the aforementioned definition of clause relation to be the operational definition due to the fact that it bridges the shortcomings in all previous definitions.

As such, the following section aims at providing a general background discussion of the organization and patterning of expository discourse. Thus, it introduces Winter's semantic theory of clause relations, identifying the categories of these relations and ways of their signalling with special emphasis on lexical signalling which is the main concern of this study. The rest of the chapter is devoted to the contributions made by Hoey, Jordan and Crombie to Winter's semantic theory of clause relations. Winter's semantic theory of clause relations has undergone several stages towards a deeper understanding into the semantic and logical relations in language. He starts his investigation in a report about the sentence and the clause in scientific English written in collaboration with Huddleston, Hudson, and Henirici (1968). In a supplementary work, Winter (1971) provides a semantic analysis of clause relations. In his work he distinguishes between outer clause relations (connection between sentences) and inner clause relations (connection by subordination) in scientific and non-scientific material. He also presents his first definition of clause relations: "a clause relation is the way in which the information of one clause is understood in the light of the other clause." (ibid:42).

Winter considers the definition as a broadening to an earlier definition of concessive relation given by Quirk (1954). In his Ph.D work Winter (1974) makes initial reference to vocabulary 1, vocabulary 2 and vocabulary 3 items. These items are found to have a binary value within a larger semantic whole of two basic clause relations: 'logical sequence' and 'matching relations'. In a comprehensive treatment of lexical signalling of clause relations in English, Winter (1977:35) defines clause relations as “a system of predictability of context,
that is, given one sentence within its preceding contexts the lexical selection of the next sentence is frequently predictable." Here, our interest is in prediction or how one part of the sentence (i.e. the clause) is made explicit in advance by some connective or paraphrase of this connective in signalling the clause relations. Winter (ibid:17,49) offers the following three examples to show how the three types of lexical items: 'by-ing', 'thereby' and 'instrumental' are classified as vocabulary 1, 2 and 3 respectively in the signalling of the binary clause relation of instrument-achievement:

Example (1):

(1a) **By appealing** to scientists and technologists to support his party,

(1b) Mr. Wilson won many middle class votes in the election.

Example (2):

(1) Mr. Wilson appealed to scientists and technologists to support his party,

(2) he **thereby** won many middle class votes in the election.

Example (3):

Mr. Wilson's appeals to scientist and technologists to support his party were **instrumental** in winning many middle class votes in the election.

Winter (1982: 178) has rephrased his definition to read "A clause relation is the shared cognitive process whereby we interpret the meaning of a clause or a group of clauses in the light of their adjoining clause or group of clauses." Where the clauses are independent we can speak of 'sentence relation'." According to Winter, this definition has resolved the conflation between the sentence and the clause, because independence is the first grammatical requirement of the sentence, in the traditional definition, though not enough for its meaning in a complete utterance unit. And since the sentence in Winter's definition (ibid:183) consists of more than one clause grammatically grouped together by subordination, it follows that the clause in its independent form contains inadequate information and requires lexical realization by adjoining clauses to be fully understood. As an illustration, Winter (ibid:185) asserts that though the clause 'There is a problem' is perfectly grammatical, it remains incomprehensible and needs a lexical realization by the adjoining clauses. He also terms this clause as 'unspecific clause' which requires semantic completeness by answering the question 'What is the problem?', i.e., it must have a lexical realization from the adjoining clauses which he terms as 'specific clauses'.

Winter's clause relational approach has culminated in a broader definition presented by Hoey & Winter (1986:123) in which they expand Winter's definition (1982) by accounting for the reader/writer communicative interaction. The reader is the decoder or interpreter of
the combination of sentences or clauses in the light of the preceding ones, whereas, the 
writer, as encoder of the message, makes all the possible choices from lexis, grammar and 
tonation in the creation of the combination of clauses or sentences in the same discourse. 
The definition of clause relations final shape is provided by Hoey & Winter (1986: 123) 
where emphasis is laid on writer-reader. To facilitate communicative interaction: 
"A clause relation is the cognitive process, and the product of that process, whereby the 
reader interprets the meaning of a clause, sentence, or group of sentences in the same 
discourse. It is also the cognitive process and the product of that process whereby the choices 
the writer makes from grammar, lexis, and intonation in the creation of a clause, sentence, or 
group of sentences are made in the context of the other clauses, sentences, or groups of 
sentences in the discourse."

According to Winter (1977) there exists a finite number of words, verbs, nouns and 
adjectives, which perform jobs in texts comparable to the grammar words and to which a text 
structuring function is assigned. The list of these words as proposed by Winter (1977) 
includes (108) items such as: addition, affirm, basis, cause, change, compare, concede, 
conclude, contrast, deny, differ, equal, error, example, feature, follow, instance, instrumental, 
kind, lead to, like(iness), mean, means of, opposite, problem, reason, resemble, similar, 
situation, way etc.

According to Winter, these lexical items signal the relations between clauses in a 
text. His theory of clause relations is based on the assumption that a finite number of lexical 
items, which he calls 'voc 3' items, indicate the special relation between adjacent clauses or 
sentences, and how the interpretation of one clause depends in some way on the interpretation 
of the other in the paragraph. In other words, the semantics of one sentence is completed by 
the semantics of the other which constitutes the contextual significance of the two of them.

2.1.2.2. Winter's (1977) Classification of Lexical Items

According to Winter (1977), these lexical items can be divided according to their clause-
relating function into three groups; voc.1, voc.2, and voc.3. The first two groups are 
grammatical, the third is lexical. The first includes subordinators, the second sentence 
connectors or conjuncts, the third include lexical signalling.
2.1.2.2.1 Vocabulary 1: The Subordinators of English

Winter (1977:14-15) lists a set of subordinators which he terms vocabulary 1 items. He considers these items as a closed-system. Then, he divides them up into two groups: the first group is the subordinators of clauses which include: 'after', '(al)though', '(as though)', 'apart from-ing', etc.

In a supplementary work, Winter (1971) provides a semantic analysis of clause relations. In his work he distinguishes between outer clause relations (connection between sentences) and inner clause relations (connection by subordination) in scientific and non-scientific material. He also presents his first definition of clause relations: "a clause relation is the way in which the information of one clause is understood in the light of the other clause." (ibid:42).

Winter considers the definition as a broadening to an earlier definition of concessive relation given by Quirk (1954). In his Ph.D work Winter (1974) makes initial reference to vocabulary 1, vocabulary 2 and vocabulary 3 items. These items are found to have a binary value within a larger semantic whole of two basic clause relations: 'logical sequence' and 'matching relations'. In a comprehensive treatment of lexical signalling of clause relations in English, Winter (1977:35) defines clause relations as "a system of predictability of context, that is, given one sentence within its preceding contexts the lexical selection of the next sentence is frequently predictable." Here, our interest is in prediction or how one part of the sentence (i.e. the clause) is made explicit in advance by some connective or paraphrase of this connective in signalling the clause relations. Winter (ibid:17,49) offers the following three examples to show how the three types of lexical items: 'by-ing', 'thereby' and 'instrumental' are classified as vocabulary 1, 2 and 3 respectively in the signalling of the binary clause relation of instrument-achievement:

Example (1):
(1a) By appealing to scientists and technologists to support his party,
(1b) Mr. Wilson won many middle class votes in the election.

Example (2):
(1) Mr. Wilson appealed to scientists and technologists to support his party,
(2) he thereby won many middle class votes in the election.

Example (3):
Mr. Wilson's appeals to scientist and technologists to support his party were instrumental in winning many middle class votes in the election.
Winter (1982: 178) has rephrased his definition to read “A clause relation is the shared cognitive process whereby we interpret the meaning of a clause or a group of clauses in the light of their adjoining clause or group of clauses." Where the clauses are independent we can speak of 'sentence relation' ." According to Winter, this definition has resolved the conflation between the sentence and the clause, because independence is the first grammatical requirement of the sentence, in the traditional definition, though not enough for its meaning in a complete utterance unit. And since the sentence in Winter's definition (ibid:183) consists of more than one clause grammatically grouped together by subordination, it follows that the clause in its independent form contains inadequate information and requires lexical realization by adjoining clauses to be fully understood. As an illustration, Winter (ibid:185) asserts that though the clause 'There is a problem' is perfectly grammatical, it remains incomprehensible and needs a lexical realization by the adjoining clauses. He also terms this clause as 'unspecific clause' which requires semantic completeness by answering the question 'What is the problem?', i.e., it must have a lexical realization from the adjoining clauses which he terms as 'specific clauses'.

Winter's clause relational approach has culminated in a broader definition presented by Hoey & Winter (1986:123) in which they expand Winter's definition (1982) by accounting for the reader/writer communicative interaction. The reader is the decoder or interpreter of the combination of sentences or clauses in the light of the preceding ones, whereas, the writer, as encoder of the message, makes all the possible choices from lexis, grammar and intonation in the creation of the combination of clauses or sentences in the same discourse. The definition of clause relations final shape is provided by Hoey & Winter (1986: 123) where emphasis is laid on writer-reader to facilitate communicative interaction:
"A clause relation is the cognitive process, and the product of that process, whereby the reader interprets the meaning of a clause, sentence, or group of sentences in the same discourse. It is also the cognitive process and the product of that process whereby the choices the writer makes from grammar, lexis, and intonation in the creation of a clause, sentence, or group of sentences are made in the context of the other clauses, sentences, or groups of sentences in the discourse."

According to Winter (1977) there exists a finite number of words, verbs, nouns and adjectives, which perform jobs in texts comparable to the grammar words and to which a text structuring function is assigned. The list of these words as proposed by Winter (1977) includes (108) items such as: addition, affirm, basis, cause, change, compare, concede, conclude, contrast, deny, differ, equal, error, example, feature, follow, instance, instrumental,
kind, lead to, like(ness), mean, means of, opposite, problem, reason, resemble, similar, situation, way etc.

According to Winter these lexical items signal the relations between clauses in a text. His theory of clause relations is based on the assumption that a finite number of lexical items, which he calls 'voc 3' items, indicate the special relation between adjacent clauses or sentences, and how the interpretation of one clause depends in some way on the interpretation of the other in the paragraph. In other words, the semantics of one sentence is completed by the semantics of the other which constitutes the contextual significance of the two of them.

According to Winter (1977) these lexical items can be divided according to their clause-relating function into three groups; voc.1, voc.2, and voc.3. The first two groups are grammatical, the third is lexical. The first includes subordinators, the second sentence connectors or conjuncts, the third include lexical signalling.

2.1.2.2. Vocabulary 2: The Sentence Connectors of English

Vocabulary 2 represents the second set of the closed-system items in English. Winter calls these items as sentence connectors of English. They are also called as adverbial adjuncts which are classified by Jakobson (1964), Greenbaum (1969) and Quirk et al. (1972) into conjuncts and disjuncts. Halliday & Hasan (1976) call them conjunctions. These have been divided into two groups: The first group includes: 'accordingly', 'in addition', 'also', 'as such', 'as a result', 'at least', 'at the same time', 'basically', 'besides', 'in any case', 'in such circumstances', 'in comparison', 'consequently', 'on the contrary', 'differently', 'equally', 'essentially', 'for example', 'for this reason', 'further more', 'in general', 'however', 'indeed', 'in fact', 'in short', 'in other words', 'in this way', 'instead', 'meanwhile', 'moreover', 'nevertheless', 'otherwise', 'on the other hand', 'therefore', 'thereafter', 'yet', etc. The second group includes the correlatives: 'not only (but) also', 'for one thing..... for another', 'in the first place...in the second', 'on the one hand.... On the other', 'firstly', 'secondly', 'finally', etc.

According to Winter (1977:45) “Vocabulary 2 nearly always signals independence for both of its members. In contextual terms, this means that for vocabulary 2 we have the information of both members being presented as if they were new to the context." Vocabulary 2 items are typically placed in the second member of their clause relation. Thus they make more explicit the clause relation between their matrix clause and the preceding clause or sentence.
2.1.2.3 Vocabulary 3: The Lexical Items of Clause Relations

In his article Winter (1977) shows that there exists a finite number of words, verbs, nouns and adjectives, which perform jobs in texts comparable to the grammar words and to which a text-structuring function is assigned. The list of these words as proposed by Winter (ibid:20) includes (108) items such as: achieve, addition, affirm, basis, cause, change, compare, concede, conclude, contrast, deny, differ, equal, error, example, feature, follow, instance, instrumental, kind, lead to, like(ness), mean, means of, opposite, problem, reason, resemble, similar, situation, way, etc. which perform a pivotal function in texts. They encapsulate information which the writer has encoded in the text and guide the reader into how information is interrelated. According to Hoey (1983:21) the so far mentioned vocabularies 1 and 2 constitute the grammatical system of signalling, whereas, vocabulary 3 items constitute the lexical system of signalling. In the examples (4a, b and c) below the relation is expressed by the vocabulary 3 item 'follows' can be paraphrased by the vocabulary 1 item 'after' as in (4b) or the vocabulary 2 item 'thereafter' as in (4c):

Example (4a):
The rifle clubs have banned the use automatic and semi-automatic weapons. The move follows the police raids.

Example (4b):
After the police raids, the rifle clubs have banned the use of automatic and semi-automatic weapons

Example (4c):
The police raided the rifle clubs. Thereafter, the rifle clubs banned the use of automatic and semi-automatic weapons.

Winter (ibid:23) suggests that what makes vocabulary 3 lexical is that they " are chosen in the same way as other lexical items, namely as nouns, verbs and adjectives in the syntax of subject, verb, object, or complement of the clause." Their lexicality is clearly apparent in their ability to be qualified or premodified like any other open-ended lexical items. For instance, the vocabulary 3 item 'example' can be modified by an open-ended item like 'striking' in order to spell out the relation of 'generalization'. However, vocabulary 3 items are differentiated from other ordinary lexical items by their need to be 'filled out' or lexically realized. The term 'lexical realization' has been employed by Winter (ibid:26) to refer to the open-ended creative lexical choices which extend outside the sentence or clause boundary within the semantic structure of the clause relations. The vocabulary 3 item follows in example (4a) above refers
back to the open-ended lexical choices of the previous sentence and signals the chronological sequence relation. Winter considers lexical realization as a crucial condition for labeling vocabulary 3 items as a closed-system.

Vocabulary 3 items not only signal relations that hold between clauses, but they also have other special connective roles. Winter (ibid:28) identifies three types of these roles: First, Winter draws the attention to what he terms 'items of metastructure' like; **situation, problem, solution, evaluation**. These are found to be the lexical signals which serve a larger clause relational function signalling the organization of the whole text. According to Hoey (1979:32) "It is this extension to the notion of vocabulary 3 to cover whole discourses which enables us to demonstrate the ways in which discourses signal their structure." The second type is represented by certain vocabulary 3 items like 'attitude' which can perform an attitudinal function similar to that performed by vocabulary 2 attitudinal disjuncts such as 'fortunately', 'essentially', etc. These represent the speaker's comment on the truth-value of what he is saying. The third type includes a number of vocabulary 3 items such as 'move' (n.), 'event', 'action' etc. that may function anaphorically or retrospectively providing information about the content of previously mentioned clause or sentence. In example (4a) above the vocabulary 3 'move' in the second sentence connects the two sentences anaphorically to the action taken in the second sentence.

### 2.1.3 The Criteria of Closed-System Semantics

It is quite obvious that these lexical items cannot be defined in dictionary terms as any other words; therefore, Winter (1977) tried to figure out a solution for this difficulty. He proposes four criteria in order to facilitate the identification of the closed-system semantics on the semantic continuum between open-system and closed-system. These four criteria are designed to make the process of distinguishing the vocabulary 3 items from the ordinary lexical items.

#### 2.1.3.1. Criterion 1: The Closed-system Vocabulary

Winter's claim that vocabulary 3 items belong to a closed-system is based on two principles: First, most of the vocabulary 3 items can either directly or indirectly paraphrase the connective semantics of the closed-system vocabularies 1 or 2 or both. The vocabulary 3 item 'reason' is paraphrased by the vocabulary 1 item 'because'. Direct paraphrase happens in two ways, one where a vocabulary 3 item has a correspondences with items in vocabulary 2.
by anaphoric function, for example the item 'contrast' is paraphrased by vocabulary 2 item 'in contrast' or 'in comparison' and so on. The other way where vocabulary 3 is paraphrased by vocabulary 2 and 1 in turn, like the vocabulary 3 item 'concede' which is paraphrased by vocabulary 2 item 'in addition' and vocabulary 1 item 'even though'. On the other hand, indirect paraphrase can be viewed where the lexical items of vocabulary 3 provide an internal part of the semantics made by vocabularies 1 and 2.

The second principle is that some vocabulary 3 items like 'error' which do not directly and indirectly paraphrase vocabularies 1 or 2 may behave in the same way as those which do. In other words, they may perform the same function done by vocabulary 3 items in that they relate clauses and sentences to each other in meaning not covered by vocabularies 1 and 2. This function is typically performed by the vocabulary 3 item 'error' which signals the relation of Error-correction as in the example below:

**Example (5):**

1. Sir, may I indicate an **error** in the photograph caption on page 72 ...?
2. The Graph Zeppelin was not designed for helium, nor did it have ...
3. The Hindenberg was designed for helium ....

The signalling role of vocabulary 3 item 'error' in the above example is that of cataphoric reference.

### 2.1.3.2 Criterion 2: The Characteristic Vocabulary of Questions

In his second criterion, Winter (1977: 42) states that “vocabulary 3 items can have the same lexical selective powers as the closed-system WH-items such as 'what', 'where', 'when', etc." Thus, based on Winter's (ibid.) observation, the relation between WH-items and vocabulary 3 item can be made more explicit by showing what typical questions are elicited by the second member of the relation. Thus, the relation between the first and the second sentence in the following example can be elicited by the WH-question 'What did George.W.Bush achieve by invading Iraq?' The vocabulary 3 item 'achieve' shows the relational signalling of both members as that of Instrument-Achievement. In other words, the vocabulary 3 items may perform a complementary role when there is a need for more precise specification of information, which means that vocabulary 3 items complement the selectional function of WH-items.

In his later analyses of clause relations, Winter (1982: 207) considers the questioning technique as one of the major tools in unfolding the grammar and semantics of the clauses in
adjoining sentences. Therefore, he asserts that "for every clause there must be a question which it is answering" (p: 207).

2.1.3.3 Criterion 3: The Paraphrasing of Clause Relations

One of the defining features of vocabulary 3 items is their ability to paraphrase directly or indirectly the connective semantics of vocabularies 1 and 2 respectively. In his discussion of lexical signalling, Hoey (1986:26) asserts that "paraphrase is crucial evidence for the existence of a third vocabulary serving the same signalling functions as subordinators and conjuncts." In terms of our discussion of Winter's semantic theory, we observe that when a sentence like that in example 3 above can be paraphrased by either example 2 or 1 in the same discourse or context, this means that the vocabulary 3 item, i.e., 'instrumental' in the example must serve the signalling function of the vocabulary 2 item, i.e., 'thereby' or vocabulary 1 item 'by-ing'.

Winter (1977:42) distinguishes between two kinds of semantics involved in the clause relations between vocabularies 1, 2 and 3. The first is the underlying semantics contributed by both members of the relation. The second is the interpretative semantics of the connectives themselves. That is to say, the second kind of semantics is the one involved with the third criterion. Therefore, we may say that all of the vocabulary 3 items share the same feature which is the ability to paraphrase the interpretative semantics of vocabularies 1 and 2.

2.1.3.4 Criterion 4: The Anticipation of the Clause Relation as a Necessary Part of Lexical Realization

Winter (1977:57) states that "the anticipation of the clause relation depends on the organization of the immediate context to come, either within the matrix clause which has the anticipatory feature or within the immediate context of the sentences to come in its paragraph." This anticipatory element is often signaled by a vocabulary 3 item which provides a strong semantic link beyond sentence or clause boundaries. Winter (ibid:59) states the following example:

Example (6):

(1) *There is a significant contrast between the national mood now and in 1964.* (2) *Then, despite the minuteness of Labour’s majority, there was some sense of exhilaration: a feeling that new opportunities were opening up for the country as a whole.* (3) *Now, this is missing.*
The vocabulary 3 item **contrast** in the above example anticipates the compatible lexical realization which follows in the very next sentence. In other words, any vocabulary 3 item has the ability to perform two predictive roles; first, it predicts the order of information in the adjoining sentences or clauses. Second, it organizes our open-ended creative lexical choices on the basis of predictability and compatibility.

2.1.4 Applications of Winter's Semantic Theory of Clause Relations

Winter's semantic theory of clause relations has received much attention by many scholars in the field of semantics and also in the field of discourse analysis in an attempt to bridge the gaps and adapt it in text/discourse analysis. As such, the following sub-sections aim at highlighting some of those attempts in brief.

2.1.4.1 Hoey (1979 & (1983)

Hoey (1979) has been able to develop a new model for discourse analysis derived from Winter's model of clause relations. Hoey (1983) states that "the clause relation is not so called because it relates only clauses. Rather, it is so described because all systems for signalling relations are rooted in the grammar of the clause." This means that clause relations in discourse may be between clauses, groups of clauses, paragraphs, or even whole texts. Hoey (ibid:16) states that "the relation does not respect the syntactic boundaries, though its realization is necessarily rooted in the grammar of the clause." According to Hoey (1983:18) the notions 'clause' and 'sentence' should be treated as conflated, and 'sentence' should be interpreted as also including part of a sentence. Hoey's work concentrates on what he terms the minimal discourse pattern of problem-solution.

2.1.4.2 Jordan's (1984) Contribution to the Theory of Clause Relations

Jordan's application of clause relations represents a further development of Winter (1982). Like Hoey (1979), Jordan presents a comprehensive analysis of the four basic metastructures of information situation-problem-solution-evaluation. Various possible combinations of the items of metastructure which depends on the writer's purpose and the reader's knowledge have been demonstrated. Jordan's work is also complementary in that it covers a greater range of every-day English texts whose signalling items are treated in special indices to facilitate their learning and teaching. For instance, under the index j: key words, Jordan (ibid: 154) introduces a general survey of vocabulary 3 items signalling the four metastructural items.
arranged in alphabetical order. Jordan provides a survey of vocabulary 3 items which, though specific to certain corpus, can apply in most contexts. Jordan's work offers an insight into the structure of everyday English texts and the role of various signalling systems in structuring and organizing these texts.

2.1.4.3 Crombie's Relational Approach (1985)

Crombie's relational approach to syllabus design is inspired by Winter's (1977) clause relational approach in which she finds the notion of vocabularies 1, 2 and 3 is usefully relevant. Crombie has criticized the structural and notional syllabuses because they concentrate on discrete linguistic or semantic items. They do not take adequate account of language as coherent discourse. Instead, she proposes that language syllabuses should not only concentrate on linguistic items but also on coherent spoken and written discourse.

Although she draws attention to the importance of Winter's and Hoey's work on signalling in texts, she disagrees with them on a number of issues. The most important one concerns Hoey's claim that all systems for signalling relations are rooted in the grammar of the clause (Hoey 1983:18). Crombie's disagreement is based on two observations. First, she believes that Hoey's claim contradicts Winter's statement (1982: 7) that intonation is as important as the grammatical devices of signalling. Second, she believes that Winter's notion of vocabulary 3 runs counter to the point Hoey is making, concluding that the problem results here from the attempt to reconcile the term clause relation with the term cognitive process.

2.1.5. Classification of Clause Relations

The linguists Winter, Hoey and Crombie share a general agreement concerning the classification of clause relations. However, they show differences in the terminology and the scope of such relations.

Winter (1977) divides them into two broad classes; the logical-sequence relations and the matching relations. Logical-sequence relations are the relations between successive events or ideas, whether actual or potential, the most basic form of these relations being time sequence, they answer the question of "How does x event connect with y event (in time) ?". They include three types of relations; condition-consequence, instrument-achievement, and cause-consequence. On the other hand, matching relations are the relations where we match things, actions, people, events, etc. for similar and different. They answer the question of
"How does x compare with y in respect of z feature?". They are of two types; contrast and compatibility (comparison).

Hoey (1983) adopts exactly the same division used by Winter (1977) i.e., logical-sequence relations and matching relations for small passages, but for long passages and whole discourses. Hoey uses the term 'discourse patterns' to indicate the rhetorical patterns such as the problem-solution pattern, general particular pattern and so on.

According to Crombie (1985 a, XV), clause relations have a wider scope. Therefore, Crombie (ibid, 15-28) divides clause relations into nine classes:

1. **Temporal Relations**: these relations are concerned with the temporal connection between events, e.g. after he has seized Helen, he will leave Greece.

2. **Matching Relations**: these relations involve comparison of two things, events, or abstractions in terms of some particular in respect of which they are similar (simple comparison, e.g. the prince was afraid and so were his followers.), or different (simple contrast, e.g. the one was good; the other, bad.).

3. **Cause-Effect Relations**: are four different semantic relations, each of which is concerned in some sense with cause and effect. These relations are reason-result, e.g. we're in trouble and his arrival is the reason. Means-result, e.g. his pressing the laver made the handle turn. Means-purpose, e.g. Agamemnon surrendered the girl in order to propitiate Apollo. And condition-consequence, e.g. if some arrives late again, I will tell him what I think of him.

4. **Truth-Validity**: each of the four relations here concerned directly or indirectly with truth and validity. In (statement-affirmation, e.g. (1) all wild animals are dangerous, (2) I agree.) the truth of a statement is affirmed, (in statement-denial, e.g. (1) the Greeks won, (2) they lost.) the truth of a statement is denied, while in (denial-correction, e.g. he wasn't a doctor, he was a teacher.) a denial involving a negated word preceded or followed by a statement in which that word or expression is correlative replaced, in (concession-contraexpectation, denied e.g. although anxious, he appeared calm.) the validity of an inference is directly or indirectly denied.

5. **Alternation Relations**: each one of these relations involves a choice between two things or events. Contrastive alternation involves exclusive (i.e. P or not P) disjunction that is, it is a choice involving a positive/negative opposition, e.g. whether he lives or dies, he will enter history. On the other hand, supplementary alternation involves a choice between two or more things, events or abstractions which are not treated as opposites, e.g. nobody insulted him or hit him.
6. **Bonding Relations**: these relations are additive (i.e. non-elective) non-sequential relations between conjoined or juxtaposed propositions unlike the alternation relations which are elective (i.e. involve choice). There are four types of bonding relations; coupling, e.g. *he was furious and savage*, contrastive coupling, e.g. *he tried to remember what he heard but he failed*. Statement exemplification, e.g. *drinking leads to many consequences, for example addiction*. Statement-exception, e.g. *all the students passed except her*.

7. **Paraphrase Relations**: the paraphrase relation involves restatement without amplification, the same propositional content is stated in different ways in both members of the relation, or it might involve a negated antonym, e.g. *he is not tall, he's short*.

8. **Amplification Relations**: the amplification relation involves the substitution of a specific word or expression for a general one. There are three kinds of such relation; term-specification, e.g. *he was invited: John invited him*. Predicate-specification, e.g. *we knew that Bob was married*. Term-exemplification, e.g. *play useful games for example chess*.

9. **Setting-Conduct Relations**: these relations are of four kinds, each one of them involves an adverbial, they are: event/state location, e.g. *the spy was jumped over the walls of the house*. Event-direction, e.g. the boy entered his room. Event-manner, e.g. *resentfully, David viewed the destruction*.

---

**2.2 The Analytic Framework and Text Analysis**

**2.2.1 Introduction**

This chapter moves around the analysis of the novel under study which is Mark Twain’s “The adventures of Huckleberry Finn” to find out the lexically signalled clause relations. Thus, this chapter sheds light on the analytical framework, explains the obtained results, lists the lexical signals that are used to signal the clause relations in the texts, and classifies the resulting clause relations. The chapter will be supported by figures and tables to backup the discussions.

**2.2.2 The Analytic Framework**

A bottom-up approach will be followed in the analysis of both novels under study, that is the texts will be analyzed to find out the lexically signalled clause relations and the way by which these relations are combined. This will be achieved by identifying the lexical items which highlight such relations.

Hoey (1983) asserts that:
"One of the first steps to analyze any discourse must be the identification of the lexical signalling present in it. Lexical signals are the author's/speakers's signalling of the intended organization and are therefore obviously of primary importance; it is probable that they are one of the main means whereby a reader/listener decodes a discourse correctly" (p: 65).

Within the same context, Crombie (1985:72) maintains that discourse is full of clues and signals and they allow readers or listeners to make relational predictions.

The analytic framework underlying the present work is basically derived from Winter's semantic theory of clause relations (1977) and its subsequent developments proposed by Hoey (1983), Jordan (1984), and Crombie (1985).

### 2.2.3 Text Analysis

The text analysis of both novels under study has revealed that there are ten different types of lexically signalled clause relations holding between clauses, sentences and groups of sentences. These relations are as follows:

2. Term-Specification Relation.
3. Contrast Relation.
4. Preview-Detail Relation.
5. Cause-Consequence Relation.
7. Comparison Relation.
8. Alternation Relation.
10. Generalization-Exception Relation.

For the easiness of reference, a brief discussion for each clause relation with an example from the analyzed texts will be given. Lexical signals explicit in the clause relations are grouped at the end of each relation.

### 2.2.4 Discussion of the Clause Relations

#### 2.2.4.1 Condition-Consequence Relation

a. **Description:** In this relation, the instrument member specifies the means undertaken to achieve a particular intended result or purpose.
b. **Exemplification:** In example (4.1) below, the vocabulary 3 item *so as* in the second clause (1b) signals the consequence of the condition mentioned in the first clause (1a).

Example (4.1):

(1a) *We went tip-toeing along a path amongst the trees back towards the end of the widow's garden,* (1b) *stooping down *so as* the branches wouldn't scrape our heads.*

*The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, Chap. 2, p. 6*

### 2.2.4.2 Term-Specification Relation

a. **Description:** In this relation, the second member specifies or identifies an item or a term introduced in the other member.

b. **Exemplification:** In example (4.3) below, the vocabulary 3 item *'things'* mentioned in S (5) operates as a two way signal. It functions cataphorically and anaphorically by linking what precedes with what follows. It links what's mentioned in Ss (1), (2), (3) and (4) with Ss (6), (7), (8) and (9) by signalling a definition for the term *'robbery'*. Example (4.3):

(1) *Now, says Ben Rogers, 'what's the line of business of this Gang?*' (2) *'Nothing only robbery and murder,' Tom said.* (3) *'But who are we going to rob?* (4) *houses—cattle—or—'Stuff!' (5) stealing cattle and such *things* ain't robbery, it's burglary, says Tom Sawyer.* (6) *We ain't burglars. (7) That ain't no sort of style. (8) We are highwaymen. (9) We stop carriages on the road, with masks on, and kill the people and take their watches and money.'*

(ibid: Chap. 2, p. 9)
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thing(s) (5)

### 2.2.4.3 Contrast Relation

a. **Description:** This relation involves a comparison between two events, things or abstractions in terms of something in respect in which they are different.

b. **Exemplification:** In the example (4.4) below, the vocabulary 3 item *different* mentioned in S (4) operates as an anaphoric and cataphoric signal simultaneously. It anaphorically signals that the relation between S (4) and the following sentences is that of contrast. At the same time, this item cataphorically signals that the relation between S(4) and
the preceding three sentences in the same discourse is that of contrast as well. Thus, it sets up a strong anticipatory role typical of vocabulary 3 items.

Example (4.4):

(1) 'We stop stages and carriages on the road, with masks on, and kill the people and take their watches and money.' (2) 'Must we always kill the people?' (3) Oh, certainly. (4) It's best. (5) Some authorities think different, but mostly it's considered best to kill them. (6) Except some that you bring to the cave here and keep them till they're ransomed.' (7) Ransomed? What's that? (8) I don't know. (10) But that's what they do. (11) I have seen it in the books; and so of course that's what we've got to do.'

(ibid: Chap.2, p9)
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Different (5)

2.2.4.4 Preview-Detail Relation

a. **Description:** The second member in this relation provides enumeration or listing of the concrete details that support information introduced in the first member.

b. **Exemplification:** In example (4.5) below, the vocabulary 3 item two in S(5) predicts that the enumeration of more concrete details will follow in Ss (6) and (7) and its adjoining clauses (7a) and (7b) and S(8).

Example (4.5):

(1) So the hair ball talked to Jim and Jim told it to me. (2) He says: 'Yo' ole father doan' know, yit, what he's a-gwyne to do. (3) Sometime she spec he'll go 'way, en den agin he spec he'll stay. (4) De bes' way is to res' easy en let de ole man take his own way. (5) Des's two angels hoverin' roun' bout him. (6a) One uv 'em is white en shiny, (6b) en 'tother one is black. (7a) De white one gits him to go right, (7b) den de black one sail in en bust it all up. (8) A body can't tell, yit, which one gwyne to fetch him at de las'.

(ibid. Chap4, p:16)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signals of Preview</th>
<th>Signals of Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>two (5). one (6)</td>
<td>white one (7a), black one (7b).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.4.5 Cause-Consequence Relation

a. **Description:** In this relation one member provides the effect of a specific cause stated in the other member.

b. **Exemplification:** In the example (4.6) below, the vocabulary 3 item **bad** mentioned in S(5) cataphorically signals that S(3) and its adjoining clauses is the cause of S(1) and S(2).

Example (4.6):

(1) 'Jim was laid up for four days and nights. (2) Then the swelling was all gone and he was around again. (3a) I made up my mind I wouldn't ever take ahold of a snake-skin again with my hands, (3b) now that I see what had come of it. (4) Jim said he reckoned I would believe him next time. (5) And he said that handling a snake-skin was such awful **bad** luck that maybe we hadn't got to the end of it yet.'

(ibid. Chap 10, p:46)
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**bad** (5)

2.2.4.6 Statement-Assessment

a. **Description:** In this relation, the second member supplies an assessment (positive / negative) of a statement introduced in the first member.

b. **Exemplification:** In example (4.7) below, the vocabulary 3 item **right** mentioned in S (2) provides a positive assessment of what has been stated in S (1). This assessment is supported in S (3) by Huck's observation of the rats.

Example (4.7):

(1a) 'Well, the woman fell to talking about how hard times was,(1b) and how poor they had to live,(1c) and how the rats was free as if they owned the place, and so forth, and so on, and then I got easy again.(2) She was **right** about the rats.(3) You'd see one stick his nose out of a hole in the corner every little while.'

(ibid. Chp11, p:51)

**The Lexical Signals**

**right** (2)

2.2.4.7 Comparison-Relation

a. **Description:** The relation involves a comparison of two things, events or abstractions in terms of some particular in respect of which they are similar.
b. **Exemplification:** In example (4.8) below, the vocabulary 3 item like mentioned in S(4) signals a comparison between Huck's body shaking and the shaking of a leaf.

Example (4.8):

(1) 'Come now—what's your real name?'(2)'Wh-what, mum?'(3)'What's your real name? Is it Bill, or Tom, or Bob?—or what is it?'(4) 'I reckon I shook like a leaf, and I didn't know hardly what to do.'

(ibid. Chp11, p:51)
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Like (4)

### 2.2.4.8 Alternation Relation

*a. Description:* This relation involves a choice between two or more that two events, things or abstractions.

*b. Exemplification:* In example (4.9) below, the vocabulary 3 item correct mentioned in S(4) anaphorically signals that the relation between Ss (1), (2) and (3) is that of alternation.

Example (4.9):

(1) 'Whenever we see anybody coming, we can tie Jim hand and foot with a rope, and lay him in the wigwam and show this handbill and say we captured him in the river, and were too poor to travel on a steamboat, so we got this little raft on credit from our friends and are going down to get the reward.(2) Handcuffs and chains would look still better on Jim, but it wouldn't go well with the story of us being so poor.(3) Too much like jewelry.(4) Ropes are the correct thing—we must preserve the unities, as we say on the boards.'

(ibid. Ch. 20, p: 113)
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Correct (4)

### 2.2.4.9 General-Particular Relation

*a. Description:* In this relation, the second member provides a particular analysis or a classification of an idea, or a topic that is generally stated in the first member of the relation.

*b. Exemplification:* In example (4.9) below, the vocabulary 3 item kind mentioned in the second clause (1b) provides an analysis or a classification for the item sign mentioned in the
first clause (1a) and also for the item whispered mentioned in S(2). Therefore, it operates anaphorically to signal that the relation between S(1) and its adjoining clauses and S(2) is that of General-Particular.

Example (4.9):

(1a) Tom made a sign to me- (1b) kind of a little noise with his mouth-and went creeping away on our hands and knees.(2) When we was ten foot off, Tom whispered to me and wanted to tie Jim to the tree for fun; but I said no; he might wake and make a disturbance, and then they'd find out I warn't in.
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Kind (1b)

2.2.4.10 Generalization-Exception Relation

a. Description: In this relation, the second member specifies an exception to the general statement introduced in the first member.
b. Exemplification: In example (4.10) below, the generalization member is introduced in Ss (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5). The exception member is typically signalled by the vocabulary 3 item except mentioned in S(6).

Example (4.10):

(1) 'We stop stages and carriages on the road, with masks on, and kill the people and take their watches and money.' (2) 'Must we always kill the people?' (3) 'Oh, certainly.' (4) 'It's best.' (5) 'Some authorities think different, but mostly it's considered best to kill them.' (6) 'Except some that you bring to the cave here and keep them till they're ransomed.'

2.3 Conclusions

Drawing upon its findings, this study reaches the following conclusions:

1. The vocabulary 3 items function as exponents of the clause relations of literary discourse, though signalling the relations holding between the clauses, the sentences and groups of sentences. From the analysis of Mark Twain's master piece of “Huckleberry Finn”, it is found that the text contains ten different types of clause relations that are lexically signalled.

2. The vocabulary 3 item has proved to perform syntactic and semantic roles in the sentence simultaneously. The syntactic role comes from the fact that it can act as a subject, verb, object or complement in the sentence, and it is premodified and postmodified as other lexical words such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc. The semantic role comes from its connective
function, in that the presence of the item in a particular sentence anticipates by its predictive effect what kind of information is to be presented in the following sentence or sentences. Thus, the vocabulary item can be regarded as an organizing element of its context, it connects the adjoining sentences of the context to each other by its need for the open-system lexical choices (to which it refers to or signposts) to realize its semantics and to have its proper functional significance as a connector of sentences.

3. Vocabulary items may function anaphorically referring backwards to the preceding context, cataphorically referring to the following context or both as a two-way signal, that is why they are significant in the interpretation of discourse.
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CHAPTER THREE

TOWARDS A MODEL OF LOCAL PRAGMATIC COHERENCE IN D. H. LAWRENCE’S ‘SONS AND LOVERS’

Fareed H. H. Al-Hindawi
Musaab A. Raheem Al-Khazaali

3.1. Introduction

PRAGMATIC COHERENCE can be either local or global. Global PRAGMATIC COHERENCE, which is not the concern of this study, holds the relations of speech acts in a whole conversation, whereas local PRAGMATIC COHERENCE holds the relations between sequential speech acts in that conversation. In this work, the relations and interrelatedness between the utterances of discourse will be investigated in terms of local pragmatic coherence only. This means that the type of relations investigated here will be pragmatic ones. Theoretically, these relations will be differentiated from other types of relations such as semantic or rhetorical relations. Nevertheless, some kind of similarity or overlap will be revealed among such classes of relations. Precisely, the essential aim of this study is to develop a model which can be used for the analysis of data in relation to local PRAGMATIC COHERENCE. The workability of the model will be tested against data taken from D. H. Lawrence's novel *Sons and Lovers*. The data will be represented by conversations randomly selected from this novel.

3.1.1 Pragmatic Relations vs. Semantic Relations

At the level of meaningful coherence, two types of relations have been the focus of discourse analysis: semantic and pragmatic. However, labels vary from one linguist to another: semantic vs. pragmatic (Van Dijk, 1979), contents vs. pragmatic (epistemic/speech act) (Sweetser, 1990), external vs. internal (Martin, 1992), identical vs. interpersonal (Degand, 1998), and the like. What unifies such labels is their division of level according to semanticness and pragmaticness.
Redeker (1991: 1167-8) proposes that semantic relations hold in discourse when uttering discourse units in the given context entails the speaker's commitment to the existence of that relation in the world the discourse describes. Some of these relations are found in temporal, causal, elaborational and contrastive links in discourse. On the other hand, she (ibid) stresses that pragmatic relations (which she calls 'rhetorical structure') are found in discourse when the strongest relation does not hold between the propositions expressed by sentences but holds between the illocutionary intentions they convey. This means that the pragmatic relation is connected with the participants' concept of discourse purpose. Examples of these relations are evidence, justification, conclusion and so forth.

According to Sanders (1997), the two levels of coherence relations – 'semantic / locutionary / propositional' and 'pragmatic / illocutionary / speech-act' – are not always separable; pragmatic relations are in fact not always overtly linked to the real world, although that is what characterizes them. Moreover, he proceeds,

… a pragmatic relation can, but not be [always] based on a connection in the real world. The distinction implies that in the case of a pragmatic relation the level of connection … is the illocutionary level. This connection possibly exists in addition to a locutionary connection, but the relevant level of connection is the illocutionary one. (ibid: 123)(Addition is by researchers)

This propounds the possibility but not the necessity of the relation between the pragmatic relation and the real world.

Similarly, Van Dijk (1977c: 220) emphasizes that certain relation labels between semantic and pragmatic relations may overlap. Moreover, the same connectives that relate sentences, or clauses in the semantic level can relate the speech acts issued by uttering such sentences. However, such insights will be revealed in more detail in the succeeding sections.

3.1.2 Models of Local Pragmatic Coherence

Knott (2001: 129-30) points out that Van Dijk (1977a, 1977c, 1979) and Sweetser (1990) are the most influential models of coherence relations at the local level. Generally speaking, Van Dijk (1977a: 213) introduces his model of coherence as a bipartite distinction, that is, semantic vs. pragmatic. He does not subdivide any of these relations. On the other hand, Sweetser (1990) elaborates on the distinction to be tripartite, that is, semantic vs. pragmatic (speech act vs. epistemic). This means that she subdivides pragmatic relations into speech act and epistemic relations.
3.1.2.1 Van Dijk's Model of Local Pragmatic Coherence

Van Dijk's model can be identified in various publications and articles of his in this field.

Van Dijk (1979: 447) mentions that speech acts usually do not come alone. They are not a mere series of isolated utterances, but they may occur in ordered sequences of speech acts achieved by one speaker (henceforth S) or by subsequent speakers, as it is the case in conversation. Much in the same way as sentences satisfy some constraints such as semantic coherence when they come in sequences; it should be proposed that speech act sequences do not occur at random. They must also satisfy a number of constraints.

One of the most important notions in speech act sequences is that one speech act gives additional felicity conditions to the previous or successive speech act. Hickey (1998: 75) emphasizes this fact stating that "a speech act sequence will fasten on and develop original appropriateness conditions. This means that some acts will be treated as main, others as subordinate".

These felicity conditions are additional and contextual; i.e., they are not inherent in the issuing of a given speech act. For instance, a request can be preceded by a justifying assertion or not, according to the degree of intimacy and power between speaker and hearer (See Ferrara, 1980).

Van Dijk (1977c: 227) indicates that the comprehension of speech act sequences is based on the interpretation of the connectedness between the subsequent speech acts. The most general connection condition is that previous acts establish the context with respect to which a subsequent speech act is evaluated. In other words, there is some kind of conditional relation that holds for successive acts. The weakest form is that of 'enablement', viz: a speech act makes next speech acts more possible. Stronger forms are those of probability and necessity. Such modalities are in their social and interactional sense. They are based on norms or rules determining what may be done in which conditions (See Van Dijk, 1979: 448).

Al-Hindawi (1999: 31) argues that when engaged in rule-governed activities such as debating, teaching in classroom, making a conversation, … etc., speakers resort to accomplish a sequence of speech acts in order to achieve their communicative goals. In spite of the fact that these acts are not of the same status in the flow of the speaker's action, they are related to each other. "The first act provides a good justification for producing the second one which stands as a sub-goal" (ibid).
An illustration for this conditional relatedness between subsequent speech acts is the following:

(1) It is cold in here. Could you please shut the window?

(Van Dijk, 1979: 448)

Here, an assertion is followed by a request. The first speech act can be taken as a 'preparation' for the second; viz: requests are usually made as a consequence of certain wishes and purposes of the speakers. "Especially when addressed to strangers and when the motivation for the request is not obvious, requests may need an 'explication'" (ibid).

Before studying the various pragmatic relations between subsequent speech acts, it is thought that an explanation of the nature of such sequences and their correlations to sentence sequences is necessary. Such a discussion is significant in that it paves the way to a clear-cut framework for determining the nature of the pragmatic relations. This will be the focus of the following section.

3.1.2.1.1 Sentence Sequences and Speech Act Sequences

Van Dijk (1977b: 101-2) argues that when one utters a sequence such as:

(2) I am hungry. Do you have a sandwich for me?

S/he thereby seems to accomplish an assertion followed by a request. A syntactic characteristic of this sequence is that it cannot be simply reduced to one compound sentence, e.g. with the connective 'and'. Here, one can defend a strong hypothesis which assumes that in principle the accomplishment of a speech act requires the utterance of (at least) one sentence, and that there should be another sentence for the accomplishment of a next speech act. Van Dijk (1977a: 213) refers to this hypothesis by mentioning that "sentence boundaries are particularly appropriate to express boundaries between speech acts". Accordingly, one cannot accomplish more than one speech act by uttering one independent sentence. To elaborate, another example is introduced by Van Dijk (1977b: 101):

(3) I am hungry and I am going to take a sandwich.

In this compound sentence, it can be said that one speech act has been performed, that is, the assertion of a compound proposition (i.e. a conjunction).

However, some problems remain with this hypothesis. Firstly, this assumption, as Van Dijk (1977a: 213-4) states, is to be inconsistent with examples in which two speech acts are apparently accomplished by uttering one sentence:

(4) I'll give you the money, but you don't deserve it.
(5) I wouldn't go to Italy at the moment, because the weather is very bad there.

In (4), there is a promise and then an assertive evaluation, whereas in (5), there is a piece of advice followed by an assertion (ibid).

Secondly, Van Dijk (1977b: 101)argues that the case of compounded explicit performative sentences is more problematic(e.g. I promise you …,but I warn you …).

Thirdly, Van Dijk (1977a: 214) presents the problem in many examples where speech acts cannot be successfully accomplished by the utterance of only one sentence:

(6) It is cold in here and please shut the window.

(7) Because I am busy, shut up!

Examples (6, 7) are not acceptable because the connectives used, i.e., 'and' and 'because', have a semantic function which relates denoted facts between propositions. Thus, no such a relation (semantic coherence) is found in these sentences: its being cold and your shutting the window, and my being busy and your shutting up are not directly related. Rather, it should be said that; for instance, its being cold is a 'condition' for making a request. "What is needed, then, are pragmatic sentence initial connectives or simply new sentences" (ibid). The conclusion to be made here is that a change of illocutionary force requires the utterance of a new sentence.

The argument above is intended to suggest that there is no strong parallelism or correlation between sentence boundaries and speech act boundaries.

3.1.2.1.1.1 Sentence Types and Speech Act Sequences

In grammar, the sentence has been classified into two main types: simple and composite; the composite into complex and compound. The simple sentence consists of a single independent clause, e.g. 'I like that'. The composite (multiple) sentence, on the other hand, consists of more than one clause. A complex sentence is like a simple sentence since it has only one main clause, but unlike a simple sentence it has one or more 'subordinate' clause functioning as an element of the sentence, e.g. (I reject her conclusions, although I admire her reasoning). A compound sentence has two or more coordinated main clauses, and these clauses are in a paratactic relationship, viz: they have equivalent function and similar status, e.g. (I admire her reasoning but I reject her conclusions) (See Quirk et al., 1985: 987). Similarly, speech acts are classified into two types: simple, and composite; the composite into complex and compound.
This grammatical classification has been adapted to some extent by the theory of action. Van Dijk (1977a: 214-15), for example, argues that there are single (simple) acts and composite acts, the latter may be either compound, i.e. when they consist of component acts at the same level, or complex, when some act is subordinated or embedded in one of the component main acts, e.g. as an auxiliary act. Moreover, a sequence of actions is interpreted as one action if they are related to the same intention or goal, and on a more general level this action can be a condition or a consequence of other actions. Consequently, the same holds for speech acts. There may be sequences of unrelated speech acts, but some sequences would be understood as one speech act consisting of several component acts or auxiliary acts.

Dik and Hengeveld (1997: 429) emphasize that "speech acts may be combined in higher-level speech act sequences, sequences of two or more speech acts which in some way or another depend on each other". Hence, they focus on the study of complex speech acts in which there is a main speech act and another supporting auxiliary speech act.

Van Dijk (1977a: 215-16) introduces the following example for composite speech acts:

(8) You have done your best. I'll give you a new bike.

The utterance is primarily a promise, not an assertion. Firstly, the hearer already knows that s/he did her/his best, so s/he needs not be told. Accordingly and secondly, the assertion functions as praise and as gratitude for the merits of the hearer, thus establishing a certain obligation with respect to her/him. When this condition is realized, the promise is ready to succeed. As a result, some speech acts "function as a condition, part or basis for another speech act" (ibid).

Although the distinction between component speech acts and auxiliary speech acts is not totally clear-cut, it can be said that when the speech act is an essential part of another speech act in a given context, this former speech act is a component speech act. Thus, in a given context there should be a preparation or a motivation for issuing a certain speech act (See ibid).

To summarize, whether complex or compound, speech acts are pragmatically related. The difference is, then, that complex speech acts contain one or more auxiliary or subsidiary speech acts, and compound speech acts consist of main or component speech acts (sometimes called nucleus acts (See Dik & Hengeveld, 1997: 429)). When speech acts are unrelated or independent from each other, there will be a mere sequence of speech acts, i.e. simple (single) speech acts. This is shown in Figure (1) below.
3.1.2.1.2 A Taxonomy of Speech Act Relations

In this section, the various speech act relations will be investigated according to Van Dijk's point of view. The nature of relation depends on the function achieved by a certain speech act in relation to another speech act. Mostly, this function accompanies the auxiliary speech act and one of the main component acts in compound speech acts.

3.1.2.1.2.1 Justification

Van Dijk (1977b: 101) indicates that some speakers use speech acts as a motivation or a reason for making another speech act more felicitous. In other words, the first speech act so to say functions as a condition for appropriately or effectively carrying out a next speech act. This can be exemplified by the following example:

(9) I am tired. Could you postpone the game?

Similarly, Dik and Hengeveld (1997: 229) stress the fact that some assertions give a motivation for asking questions:

(10) You look so pale. Are you ill?

In (10) the second speech act is a question, and the first is a motivation for that question. Moreover, the relationship between the separate speech acts of a speech act sequence is in many cases similar to what could be expressed by a complex speech act. Thus, (10) can be compared with (11):

(11) Are you ill, because you look so pale?

in which the subordinate clause functions as an illocutionary auxiliary to the main clause.

Ferrara (1980: 240) argues that justifications have an essential extra-conditional role where the subordinate speech act must relate to a state of affairs which counts as an adequate, plausible reason for the performance of the main (component) speech act.
Furtherly, the resort to motivations or justifications for issuing speech acts is usually regarded as a sign of politeness (See Brown and Levinson, 1979: 194, Van Dijk, 1977a: 215). Another example to illustrate justifications is the following:

(12) Peter is in hospital. Harry told me.

(ibid)

Here, it can be said that there is a speech act of assertion consisting of two assertions. That 'Harry told me' is probably of secondary importance. However, assertions, too, need 'justification'. That is, the source of knowledge must be reliable and, if necessary, be specified. Thus, the second assertion provides this source. "The more reliable a given source, the higher the credibility of the assertion based on it" (ibid). It should be, however, pointed out that providing the source of knowledge for H depends on the relation and sincerity between the interlocutors.

To sum up, justification postulates that comprehending the speech act in the subordinate component will increase H's readiness to accept S's right to perform the main act.

3.1.2.1.2.2 Explanation

A converse case of justification is 'explanation' where a statement (or assertion) follows another main speech act as shown in the following examples:

(13) Can you please tell me the time? I forgot my watch.
(14) Keep out of sight. He would kill you!
(15) Please forgive me. I won't do it anymore.

(Van Dijk, 1977b: 102-3)

In (13), the speaker wants to say that s/he stated that s/he forgot the watch, in order to make asking about the time a reasonable act. Similarly, s/he may state the grounds for a warning (14) or advice, or the sincerity of an excuse. In this case, Van Dijk (1980: 61) points out that 'explanations' are not only adding an utterance mentioning a reason or cause, but at the same time may be interpreted as a particular 'act of explaining'. That is, it is one of the postponed speech acts which are intended to represent conditions of previous speech acts. Such speech acts specify why the previous speech acts have been performed.

However, Al-Hindawi (1999: 33) argues that Ferrara (1980) does not mention this type of speech act relations. Moreover, Al-Hindawi (ibid.) considers explanation as a variant of 'justification', believing that the only difference between them is that in justification, "the subordinate act justifies the issuance of the following act", whereas in explanation "it justifies
the initiation of the preceding act". Nevertheless, this type of difference is of value in the study of speech act sequences, and thus, the change of label from 'justification' to 'explanation' is important here as it will be shown in the part of analysis of the present study.

Eventually, Van Dijk (1977a: 222-3) postulates that there are cases of complex or compound sentences which convey 'composite speech act', that is, in the cases where not the facts are interrelated, but a speech act or two.

(16) I'll send you a postcard this summer, because I know that I'm going to Italy.
(17) I'll send you a postcard this summer, because I know that you like postcards.

(ibid)

In these cases the second subordinate clauses give an explanatory assertion for the promising act which is accomplished by the utterance of the first clause. In other words, 'they express necessary conditions for appropriate promising' (ibid). Besides, it is worth to mention that the previous classes of speech act types in (3.2.1.2) depend on separate sentences and not complex or compound sentences. In (16) and (17), it has been illustrated that this classification can be extended to include even multiple sentences.

3.1.2.1.2.3 Addition

Certain speech acts indicate that the speaker wants to add something to the preceding speech act (See Van Dijk, 1977a: 211). Van Dijk (1979: 450) propounds that some speech acts are conjoined to signal what can be termed as 'addition' or 'continuation', as illustrated in the following examples:

(18) Peter was not at the party. And Henry said that he was in hospital because he had had an accident.
(19) Laura ran off to Paris. And she did not even let me know.

Here in (18) and (19), there is an addition of assertions to previous assertions. Furthermore, there are certain devices which indicate a pragmatic relation between subsequent speech acts. Such devices are kinds of what is called 'discourse markers' (See Schiffrin, 1994). These markers are defined as linguistic expressions that are used to signal the relation of an utterance to the immediate context (Cf. Redeker, 1990: 372). One of these markers is clear in 'pragmatic connectives'. A connective is, according to Bussmann et al. (1996, s.v. connective), a linguistic expression with the function of joining sentences/utterances. Conjunctions and conjunctive adverbs belong to the class of connectives. They join either propositions or state of affairs (semantic connective), or
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illocutions (pragmatic connectives). Van Dijk (1979: 449) reveals that 'pragmatic connectives express relations between speech acts, whereas semantic connectives express relations between denoted facts'. Thus, the same expression can be used or can have a semantic and pragmatic function in the same time. Moreover, Van Dijk (ibid) emphasizes that 'pragmatic connectives will often be sentence-initial, followed by a pause and uttered with a specific intonation contour'.

As for 'addition' connectives, the most commonly used pragmatic ones are 'and' and 'moreover'. Van Dijk (1979: 450) introduces the following exemplifications to show the pragmatic and semantic uses of 'and':

(20) Yesterday we went to the movies and afterwards we went to the pub for a beer.
(21) Why didn't Peter show up? And, where were you that night?
(22) Harry has counted me out. And, I even hadn't had a chance!

In (20) 'and' is used in its semantic function, that is, it expresses a relation between two denoted facts which are ordered in time, whereas in (21) it is apparently used to signal the fact that the speaker has another question. Similarly, in (22) the speaker has another assertion. This function can be defined in terms of relations between speech acts at the monological and dialogical levels, i.e., in moves or turns.

Schiffrin (1994: 78) mentions that at the dialogic level there may be another interlocutor's speech act which gives an addition to a preceding one. She terms this function as 'expansion', and exemplifies it in:

(23) a. You want a piece of candy?
   b. No.
   c. She's on a diet.

where (c) is an addition or expansion of (b) (ibid).

### 3.1.2.1.2.4 Conclusion

Van Dijk (1977a: 208) argues that there are certain speech acts which function as a conclusion of other speech acts which function as a premise as exemplified in:

(24) Peter had an accident. So, he is in hospital.

where it does not invoke a factual consequence but also as a conclusion drawn explicitly by the speaker.
Van Dijk (1979: 453) indicates that the pragmatic connective which is used in conclusion is 'so'. The pragmatic nature of this connective is based on the fact that 'drawing a conclusion' or 'concluding' is grasped as a type of act.

This pragmatic use of 'so' is different from its semantic interpretation. Semantically, it expresses a logical consequence (See Swan, 1995: 155). Moreover, the semantic 'so' is considered as a resultant subordinator (See Quirk et al., 1985: 1108). This means that the semantic meaning of 'so' is used to indicate a logical relation between two facts, whereas the pragmatic use shows a relation between an argumentative premise and a conclusion, between two assertions, for instance. Furtherly, Van Dijk (1977a: 210) points out that the connective 'therefore' may be used in the same way as 'so'.

Van Dijk (1979: 453) raises the argument that 'so' which functions pragmatically may also function semantically by introducing the following example:

(25) John is sick. So, let's start.

He (ibid) shows that, indirectly, John's sickness and starting (e.g. playing) are also related as facts (or propositions). Assertions are similarly related, e.g. made by the chairman of the team, and the actual properties of the communicative context, viz the proposal to start playing. That is, if certain information (in an assertion) has been supplied, the communicative context allows the speaker to accomplish a next speech act.

This is some kind of overlap between the two functions. It is not a problematic one because the level of analysis is differentiated.

At the dialogic level (as in conversation), interlocutors may draw conclusions from the other's speech acts (See Van Dijk, 1977a: 209), as in the following instance:

(26) a. I am busy.
    b. So, you are not coming tonight?
    a. I'm sorry.

Here, as Van Dijk (1979: 454) comments, the conclusion is closely related to the underlying 'semantic' consequence between the fact of being busy and not coming. Conversationally, conclusions need not always maintain denoted facts, but may also be drawn with respect to the previous speech act itself, and its conditions:

(27) a. Give me that hammer!
    b. So, you are in charge here?

This example shows that b's ironic conclusion reflects the usual condition that orders are performed by those who are authoritative to issue orders.
3.1.2.1.2.5 Contradiction

Contradictions are functions that may be accompanied by the utterance of a speech act to protest or deny some expectations that may accompany another speech act (Cf. Van Dijk, 1977a: 213). Thus, the same speaker, as Van Dijk (1979: 452) reveals, can concatenate his speech act in order to mark the (non-) satisfaction of illocutionary conditions, or to stress that a previous speech act only becomes felicitous under specific circumstances:

(28) Yes, I'll buy you a mink coat. But, I must first ask my boss for a promotion.

It can be said here that the speech act of promise performed by the first utterance may be qualified by the condition asserted in the second utterance. Accordingly, the second speech act has 'restricted' the first one (ibid).

As noticed above, the pragmatic connective 'but' is used in 'contradiction'. However, Van Dijk (ibid: 450) highlights that the speaker may use 'and' in order to signal a contradiction or protest, e.g. to prevent the hearer from drawing false conclusions from another speech act as in:

(29) Harry has counted me out. And, I even hadn't a chance.

Lakoff (1971) (Cited in Ondera, 2004: 32) points out that 'but' has a pragmatic meaning requiring the hearer to make a presupposition. Thus, 'but' is either a semantic opposition or a denial of expectation. Examples are:

(30) John is tall but Bill is short.

(31) John is tall but he's no good at basketball.

In (30) the contrast in meaning is apparently explicated in the antonyms. In the case of (31), 'but' is used with inconsistency implied between the two conjuncts. Thus, to interpret the contrast, there must be a presupposition: 'if someone is tall, then one would expect him to be good at basketball' (ibid). This presupposition is not as Lakoff (ibid.) thinks it to be. It is still semantic because it relates two denoted facts. Van Dijk (1979: 451) explicates that such uses of 'but' are semantic, not pragmatic, as in:

(32) Harry was ill, but he came to the meeting anyway.

3.1.2.1.2.6 Explication

Explicative speech acts are those acts which are performed by the speaker to show that s/he more explicitly indicates the particular speech act s/he is making. Such explications are at the same time a form of repetition. Thus, in (33) the speaker more explicitly expresses his/her promise:
(33) I'll be there tomorrow. I promise that I'll come.

(Van Dijk, 1980: 61-62)

Another form or way of explication can be found in the case of 'reinforcement'. In (34) there is a positive evaluation in the first speech act, which is reinforced by the more specific compliment accomplished after that evaluation:

(34) That is not bad at all. My compliments. (ibid.)

In sum, it can be concluded that it is possible for speakers to redefine the pragmatic context by becoming more specific and more general with a next speech act.

A particular type of redefinition is apparent in the case of 'correction' which is the concern of the following section.

3.1.2.1.2.7 Correction

Sometimes, speakers perform speech acts that check whether one of the conditions (presuppositions) of a preceding act is satisfied or not. (Van Dijk, 1977b: 103). This type of correction is a momentary suspension of the earlier speech act, as in:

(35) Congratulations. Or, aren't you happy about it?

(Van Dijk, 1980: 62)

The basic pragmatic connective which is used in correction is 'or'. It disjuncts not only denoted facts, as in semantic 'or', but also subsequent speech acts (Van Dijk, 1977a: 211). Moreover, Van Dijk (1979: 452) ascertains that the use of pragmatic 'or' is apparently distinct from that of semantic 'or'. The latter demands that two facts be alternatives in two possible worlds (unknown to the speaker). Typical examples of pragmatic 'or' are the following:

(36) Do you want a sandwich? Or, aren't you hungry?

(37) Give me a hand, will you. Or, don't you want it fixed?

(38) Shut up! Or, don't you see I'm busy?

(ibid)

In the three examples above, the function of the questions introduced by 'or' is to check, make sure or 'correct' conditions of a previous speech act performed by the same speaker. The fact that most of the corrective speech acts are questions is due to the requirement for information to check the necessary presuppositions.

Van Dijk (1980: 62) emphasizes that corrections may be suitable means to redefine a situation in cases where the speaker believes that a speech act is too strong after which he takes back some implication, as in:
(39) He is really stupid. Or well, I don't know. He is also quite clever.

Other pragmatic connectives that are used in correction are 'that is, well, though, in fact, on the contrary', and the like. Besides, 'if' (normally preceded by 'at least') can be used to introduce corrections (Van Dijk, 1980: 62), as in the following example:

(40) I'll send you a postcard this summer. At least, if I go to Italy.

In addition, the resort to corrections may be a sign of politeness, as in:

(41) Could you lend me a hundred guilders? Or, are you short of cash yourself right now?

In this case, Van Dijk (1979: 453) explicates, questioning a condition for a request, at the same time, provides the hearer with a possible excuse for not complying with the performed request.

3.1.2.1.2.8 Condition

Some speech acts are performed to specify certain conditions of a context unknown to the speaker under which a speech act should count (See ibid: 455). These conditions are not inherent in the previous speech act, rather they are momentary or contextual.

The pragmatic connective which is used in conditions is 'if'. The difference between semantic 'if' and pragmatic 'if' is that the former indicates a conditional relation between two facts where the situation in the main (or matrix) clause is contingent with that in the subordinate clause (See Quirk et al., 1985: 1088). Some examples of conditions in their pragmatic sense are the following:

(42) Take that one. If you want my advice.

(43) You look fine. If I may say so.

(Van Dijk, 1979: 454)

The respective advice and compliment, accomplished by the utterance of the first sentences of (42) and (43), respectively, have a number of conditions which are checked after the act by the speaker. Van Dijk (ibid) concentrates on the fact that just for pragmatic 'or' the speaker reassures him/herself of the appropriateness of the speech act. This time, the speaker does not ask for a (negated) condition, but uses a polite, or rhetorical, conditional question. That is, the speech act performed at first is not neglected as it may be the case in 'correction'. Rather, it is still valid, but under the condition of the following speech act.

In sum, the pragmatic relations suggested by Van Dijk can be grouped in Table (1).
Table (1) An Overview of Pragmatic Relations According to Van Dijk's (1977a) Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Relation</th>
<th>Basic Meaning</th>
<th>The Basic Pragmatic Connective</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>SA_a motivates SA_b (SA_a precedes SA_b)</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>SA_a motivates SA_b (SA_a follows SA_b)</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>SA_a continues SA_b and, moreover</td>
<td></td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>SA_a concludes SA_b so</td>
<td></td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradiction</td>
<td>SA_a denies, protests SA_b But, and</td>
<td></td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explication</td>
<td>SA_a repeats, reinforces SA_b</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction</td>
<td>SA_a checks SA_b or, well, in fact</td>
<td></td>
<td>(35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>SA_a checks condition for SA_b</td>
<td>if</td>
<td>(42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.2.2 Sweetser's (1990) Model of Local Pragmatic Coherence

Here, Sweetser's (1990) model will be explained according to its theoretical bases and classifications. It represents a shift of elaborating the division of PRAGMATIC COHERENCE relations that are basically suggested by Van Dijk (1977a) and other sources.

The basic notion in Sweetser's (1990) model is that she divides pragmatic relations into two categories: speech act relations and epistemic relations. In the following sub-sections, The definition of each category will be clarified. Moreover, the relation between Sweetser's model and Van Dijk's model will be highlighted. In addition, some light will be shed on the subsequent developments of Sweetser's model.

3.1.2.2.1 Speech Act vs. Epistemic Relations

At first, Sweetser (1990) differentiates between 'semantic' relations and 'pragmatic' relations; and then, she re-crystallizes the nature and the types of 'pragmatic' relations.
Sweetser (1990) (Cited in Knott, 2001: 129) introduces two examples to show the distinction between 'semantic' relations (44) and 'pragmatic' relations (45):

(44) Bill was starving, so he had a sandwich.

(45) Bill had five sandwiches, so he was/must have been starving.

In (45), the type of relation is said to have an implicit performative. This performative could be made explicit as follows:

(46) Bill had five sandwiches, so I 'conclude' he was starving.

Sweetser (ibid) notes an important underspecification in a gloss such as the one given in instance (46) above. She raises the question whether the implicit act of 'concluding' should be interpreted as a speech act. Sweetser(ibid.) maintains that this should be inappropriate since there are classes of use where causality is between 'premise' and 'conclusion' in the 'speaker's mind', although there is another class of causality where the relation involves the speech act itself. Thus, Sweetser draws a sharp differentiation between the act of drawing a conclusion and the act of stating it. Essentially, what the speaker decides to say and what s/he determines to 'believe' are two quite different things. Consequently, it is impossible to express one in terms of the other. Another observation to be added is that though the epistemic act can be expressed by performatives, this act is a theorem-proving or argumentative act.

As for epistemic relations, Dirven et al. (2004: 194) assert that they show up if one of the two clauses relates to the speaker's judgement, e.g. a first clause describes a 'worldly' event and in a second clause the speaker states what his reasoning is based upon, as in:

(47) Maggie must be eager for promotion. She's worked for three days in a row.

(ibid)

In interpersonal or speech act relations as in (48) the first clause gives a reason for uttering the second one (See ibid):

(48) Since we are on the subject, when was George Washington born?

It seems that Sweetser's definition of pragmatic relations has some degree of dependence on mood as she argues that "if an utterance is imperative or interrogative in form, then it cannot reasonably be causally conjoined to another utterance except at the speech-act level" (1990: 18).

In fact, many scholars are aware of the variation which Sweetser refers to within the class of pragmatic relations. For some of them, (See for example Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 240), the relation in question is

not so much a relationship between speech acts (though it may take this form) … as a relationship between different stages in the unfolding of
a speaker's communication role … his choice of speech role and rhetorical channel, his attitudes, his judgements and the like.

For others, such as Redeker (1990: 369), "they hold between the 'beliefs and intentions' which underlie the two spans". However, they can be identified as "applying between the content of on span [clause or sentence] (added by researcher) and the speaker's (claim/advice/conclusion) about the content of the other" (See Sanders, 1997: 126). Definitions of such relations, as Knott (2004: 132) points out, frequently contain disjunctive elements or appeals to somewhat ill-defined higher-level constructs.

Generally speaking, epistemic and speech act relations are of various types, the most important of which are: disjunctions, conditionals, temporals, and causals. These relations will be tackled in the following subsections.

3.1.2.2.1.1 Disjunctions

Knott (ibid: 133) presents Sweetser's (1990) illustration of the disjunctive relation as follows:

(49) John is home, or somebody is picking up his newspapers.
(50) Would you like to come round tonight? Or, is your car still in the shop?

Sweetser analyzes example (49) as conveying that the alternative propositions presented are the only two possible conclusions that one can reach. On the other hand, she analyzes (50) as consisting of a pair of alternative speech acts, viz: the speaker is asking to be understood by the hearer as performing either one or the other (ibid). Thus, it is inappropriate to interpret (49) in terms of speech act relation, and (50) in terms of epistemic relation.

As illustrated in (3.2.1.2.7), the kind of speech act relation in (50) is considered as 'correction'.

3.1.2.2.1.2 Conditionals

Renkema (2004: 109) defines condition as 'a necessary or possible cause or reason for a possible consequence'. Sweetser (1990) (Cited in Knott, 2004: 133) gives the following examples to exemplify epistemic and speech act conditionals:

(51) If John went to that party, he was trying to infuriate Miriam.
(52) How old are you, if it is not a cheeky question?

Example (51) can be analyzed as expressing an implication relation between the speaker's beliefs. Thus, the speaker is apparently informing the hearer that if I (the speaker) believe
that John went to the party, I believe that he was trying to infuriate Miriam. On the other hand, example (52) is to be interpreted as the conditional performance of a speech act: the speaker only wants to ask about the hearer's age if it is not a cheeky question.

Speech act conditionals in such a kind of treatment can be seen as similar to Van Dijk's pragmatic relation 'condition' (See 3.2.1.2.8).

3.1.2.2.1.3 Temporal Sequences

Sweetser (1990) (Cited in ibid: 134) presents other examples concerning epistemic and speech act temporals:

(53) A: Why don't you want me to take basket weaving this summer?
    B: Well, Mary took basket weaving, and she joined a religious cult.

(54) Go to bed now! And no more backtalk!

In each of these instances, Sweetser stresses, 'and' is to be recognized sequentially. However, while the temporal sequence in example (54) is related to the order in which the speech acts are accomplished, the sequence in (53) concerns the order of events in the epistemic or mental world. Knott (ibid) adds that the idea in the last example is that the two propositions are both to be understood as premises in an argument that 'A should not take the basket weaving, but that their ordering is important'. Moreover, the assumption that sequential conjunctions such as 'to begin with' and 'next' can be used to link or relate multiple premises (postulations) in an argument has often be observed and highlighted, and provides on evidence or rationale for temporal epistemic relations. An example is provided by Halliday and Hasan (1976):

(55) John's unsuitable for the job. To begin with, he is too young. Next, he's too hotheaded. Finally, …

3.1.2.2.1.4 Causals

Sweetser (1990) (Cited in Spooren et al., n.d: 2) introduces the notion of epistemic and speech act causals and provides the following example of epistemic causals for illustration:

(56) I am sure that Jan is not at home, because his car is gone.

Degand (1998: 31-2) uses what he calls 'paraphrasing' as a method to explain the nature of epistemic relation: 'one may conclude this on the basis of the following situation'. Thus, in (56), one may deduce that 'Jan is not at home on the basis that his car is gone'. On the other
hand, Sweetser (1990) (Cited in Kyratzis & Ervin-Tripp, 1999: 1322) emphasizes that this relation can be found at the speech act level, as in:

(57) Can I have that daddo? Because I like him.

Here, the speaker is giving support to his request. Moreover, speech act causals function at the action level of discourse, serving as justifications for various speech acts. Thus, one can argue that Sweetser's notion of speech act causals is similar to Van Dijk's notion of the pragmatic relation 'justification' (See 3.2.1.2.1).

A further observation which should be taken into account is the difference between pragmatic (epistemic and speech act) relations and semantic (volitional and non-volitional) relations.

### 3.1.2.2.1.4.1 Epistemicity vs. Volitionality

To discard the ambiguity of mixing the notions of epistemicity and volitionality, the following theoretical argument is needed.

What epistemicity and volitionality have in common is that both crucially involve an animate subject, a person whose intentionality (or mentality) is conceptualized as the basic source of the causal event, be it an act of reasoning (rationalization) or some 'real-world' activity. This appears to be a fundamental distinction: the one between events that originate from some 'mind', versus events originating from non-intentional causes; or between causes that are crucially located in a subject of consciousness, and those that are located in the inanimate, outer world (Maat & Sanders, 2001: 251).

The notion of subjectivity is useful in accounting for this idea. Spooren et al. (n.d: 2) define subjectivity as "the degree to which the conceptualizer – the person responsible for the causal relation – is present in the utterance". Thus, subjectivity is used here in its philosophical sense as an opposite to objectivity. That is, subjectivity concerns the causal connectivity in the subjective (personal) world, whereas objectivity concerns such relations in the objective (real) world.

Maat and Sanders (2000) put forward a subjectivity scale, one of speaker involvement. This scale is a continuum on which non-volitional content relations are maximally objective, whereas epistemic relations are very subjective, and volitional content relations hold an intermediate position.

A difference between epistemic and volitional relations is that the typical volitional subject of consciousness is explicitly realized, whereas epistemic subjects of consciousness
often remain implicit, i.e., the subject of consciousness is by default assumed to be the speaker (See Maat & Sanders, 2001: 253).

In sum, the causal relations can be ordered from least subjective to most subjective, as follows (See Spooren et al., n.d: 5).

Non-volitional content. Volitional content<Epistemic. Speech act

Examples are:

(58) The house burnt down because it was struck by lightning. (Non-volitional content)

(59) He was home because he was ill. (Volitional content)

(60) He must be on holiday because his car is gone.(Epistemic)

(61) Can you hand me my coffee? I'm busy. (Speech act)

3.1.2.2.1.4.2 The Nature of the Underlying Relation

In causal relations, Degand (1998:32) demonstrates that the underlying meaning reflects the causal inference to be made. This causal reasoning can proceed in three ways: deductively, inductively, or abductively. He also emphasizes that a causal reasoning process consists of three elements: rule (general law), circumstance (specific case), and result (or consequence), as in the following example:

Rule: Every time when it rains (a lot), the river is high.
Circumstance: It has rained a lot.
Result: The river is high.

Deduction is a process of reasoning which moves from the more general to the more specific or particular, e.g. from the general proposition that all trees have leaves and the further proposition that oaks are trees one may draw the 'deductive inference' that oaks have leaves (Matthews, 2007: 94). In Degand's (1998: 33) terms, deduction is reasoning from circumstance and rule to the result. This can be exemplified in:

(62) The river is high because it rained all night.

On the other hand, induction is a method of inference for discovering general rules and principles from particular facts or examples (See Hornby, 2007: s.v. deduction). In other words, induction is reasoning from (several) results and circumstances to a rule: The river is high (and it has rained a lot, and last week when the river was high, it also had rained a lot, …), so when it rains a lot, the river is high (See Degand, 1998: 33).
Finally, abduction is a process of reasoning by which, e.g. from 'All dogs bark' and 'This animal barks', one can draw the conclusion 'This animal is a dog' (Matthews, 2007: 1). Degand (1998: 33) states that abduction is reasoning from result and rule to circumstance: The river is high (and every time when it rains (a lot), the river is high.), so it has been raining a lot. Thus, in a backward abductive causal relation a cause/reason (circumstance) in the first span can be inferred on the basis of a consequence (result) in the second span. This type of inference can only happen if there is a real causal link between the two spans. He adds that there should be some kind of reversibility, that is, the two spans can substitute for one another. This will prove the distinction between abduction from deduction.

Sweetser (1990) (Cited in ibid) illustrates that epistemic relations are with constructed examples of abductive reasoning type because she believes that epistemic relations reflect a reasoning process of cause in the mental space of the speaker, while Degand (ibid) indicates that a deductive reasoning pattern is semantic in nature because it is close to the real cause-consequence process. This can be useful in the analysis of data because it shows the nature of the epistemic relations.

Degand (ibid) claims that epistemic relations include epistemic-deductive and epistemic-abductive, whereas speech act relations are still one category. Pander Maat and Degand (2001: 221-5) present different labels for this distinction. In their terminology 'non-abductive' relations are 'causality-based epistemic relations'; 'abductive' relations are termed 'non-causal epistemic relations'. Nevertheless, the favourite term is abductive, which refers to this class and remains 'causal' in the general sense.

Sanders (1997: 130) notes that "relations which appear to be ambiguous with respect to the semantic-pragmatic distinction turn out not to be ambiguous in context". Accordingly, the utterance in (63b) clearly receives a semantic interpretation as an answer to the question in (64); the reason that Miriam returned home was that she realized her lights were still on. A pragmatic interpretation is preferred if the same utterance serves as an answer to the question in (65). In that case, (63b) can be interpreted as 'I am sure; I saw her lights were still on when I passed her home'.

(63a) Miriam is not at home, because I saw her lights were out.
(63b) Miriam is home again, because her lights were still on.
(64) Why did Miriam return home?
(65) Are you sure Miriam came back home?

Moreover, within the speech act domain, the same subdivision can be made: in the non-abductive example in (66) the argument given in support of asking the question may also be
the real-world cause for Miriam's coming home. By contrast, in the abductive utterance in (67), seeing that the lights were out cannot be taken as the reason for Miriam's being home.

(66) Did Miriam come home? Because her lights were still on.

(67) Is Miriam at home? Because I saw her lights were out.

To summarize this section, Table (2) gives an overview of the different categories of pragmatic relations.

**Table (2): An Overview of Pragmatic Relations According to Sweetser's (1999) Model.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Relation</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Further Subdivision</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>epistemic</td>
<td>non-abductive</td>
<td>abductive</td>
<td>(63b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td></td>
<td>abductive</td>
<td>(63a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speech act</td>
<td>non-abductive</td>
<td></td>
<td>(66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abductive</td>
<td></td>
<td>(67)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.2.3 Dialogic Speech Act Sequences

In the previous sections, the PRAGMATIC COHERENCE relations are used at both the mono-logic and dialogic levels. However, some other scholars have focused on the relations that are only at the dialogic level.

Speech act sequences are not only related (i.e. coherent) at the monologic level, but also at the dialogic level. Thus, taken as moves in the respective turns of a conversation, speech acts may also be categorized functionally. Van Dijk (1980: 63-64) emphasizes that functional properties of speech acts must be defined in terms of the role a speech act has with respect to another, often a previous, speech act. In this case, these roles are defined in terms of interaction categories, such as, the contribution to the realization of a goal of the other speaker (helping, facilitating, approving), or a negative reaction or interference with respect to the intentions or purposes of the speaker (protesting, disapproving, objecting.

What has been discussed in 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 concerns monologic speech act sequences. No attention has been given to dialogic sequences there as they need a separate treatment. Besides, the treatment of more than one turn has been kept to be the basic concern of this section.

A turn, defined a stretch of talk of the same speaker, may not only consist of a single speech act but also of a series (or sequences) of speech acts. When two turns depend on each other for the proper fulfillment of their function, there should be a certain reference to 'adjacency pairs (henceforth APs). ( Dik & Hengeveld, 1997: 429-30). Accordingly, APs
model can be adopted to be an approach to the study of local PRAGMATIC COHERENCE, namely speech act relations at the dialogic level.

3.1.2.3.1 Adjacency Pairs

APs refer to the phenomenon that, in conversation, one utterance has a role in determining the subsequent utterance or at least in providing expectations concerning its contexts. They are pairs of utterances whose parts are regularly produced one after the other although by different speakers (See Taylor & Cameron, 1987: 107-8). A fundamental rule of APs process is: given the production of a first pair part, on its first possible completion its speaker should stop and a next speaker should start and produce a second pair from the pair type the first is recognizably a member of (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973: 239).

APs are, then, two utterances which are mutually dependent. They are dependent in the sense that the first speech act predicates the second (subsequent) act, and the second one presupposes the first (Cf. McCarthy, 1991: 119).

Edmondson (1981: 46) describes APs as having the following features:

- Two utterances length
- Adjacent positioning of component utterances
- Different speaker producing each utterance
- Relative ordering of parts (i.e., first pair part precedes second pair part), and
- Discrimination relations (i.e., the pair type of which a first pair part is a member is relevant to the selection among second pair parts.

(See Levinson, 1983: 303)

APs are probably better understood by an example. Given a compliment, for example, one expects a reply, and if s/he does not receive one, it may be thought that the compliment has been wasted. Similarly, when we greet a friend or an acquaintance, we expect a greeting in turn (See Woods, 206: 105). Another example would be question and answer turns. The asking of question will generally signal a shift of turn and require that the turn should take the form of a reply. The kind of reply will, surely, depend on the kind of question, or it may be a matter of conventional routine (Widdowson, 2007: 37).

The second pair part is usually matched at several levels, or it may be heard as incoherent. If there is a mismatch, the hearer still looks for a match by inferring a link (filling in gaps), or by soliciting the second turn or some account for its non-presence (Ervin-Tripp, 1993: 249).
3.1.2.3.2 The Conditional Relevance Criterion

Some scholars such as Levinson (1983) and Renkema (1993: 113) argue against the strict notion or criterion of adjacency. They introduce the criterion of conditional relevance. This criterion replaces, as Levinson (ibid: 306) points out, the criterion of 'adjacency' which presumes that given a first part of a pair, a second part is immediately expectable and relevant. The criterion of adjacency, thus, is illuminated by the fact that some second parts do not occur, but some new first parts occur to reestablish the conditions for performing the original second part of the former first part. Accordingly, one should not focus on the absence of the expected second part, but on the fact that some expectations should be fulfilled before the performance of the expected second part. Schegloff (1968) (Cited in Burton, 1980: 33) stresses that when we postulate that an answer is conditionally relevant upon a summons,

it is to be understood that the behaviours referred to are not 'casual options' for the persons involved. A member of the society may not naively choose not to answer a summons. The culture provides that a number of strong inferences can be drawn from the fact of the official absence of an answer, and any member who does not answer does so at the peril of those inferences being made.

Sacks (1967) (Cited in Coulthard, 1985: 69) demonstrates that, whereas the absence of a particular item in conversation has initially no significance because there are numbers of things that are similarly absent, in the case of APs the first part provides specifically for the second and therefore the absence of the second is noticeable and noticed. He, thus, observes that participants regularly complain 'you didn't answer me' or 'I said hello, and she just walked past'.

In such cases, it can be said that some participants think that their utterances (e.g.: questions, greetings … etc.) are appropriate and felicitous in the given context of the talk. Hence, when not replied, they will be surprised and upset.

Edmondson (1981: 42-43) introduces the notion of 'conditional relevance' under the label 'sequential relevance'. He thinks that the notion of sequential relevance is interactional – i.e., the constraints on what I can say or do given what you have said and done are social constraints. Accordingly, in 'answering' a 'question', one is responding to a person, and not an utterance. In addition, he introduces the term 'uptake' to represent the hearer's 'acceptance' or 'understanding' of the previous speech activity of the speaker. Acceptance is used non-evaluatively. That is, if I assert a proposition, you may 'accept' that I have asserted that proposition, without accepting that proposition is the case.
It is worth mentioning here that the criterion of 'adjacency' can coincide with the criterion of 'conditional relevance' if the former is taken to be adjacency in appropriateness. That is, the second part is adjacent to the first part because it is the most acceptable response to it. Thus, adjacency should not be taken or grasped in the structural sense which is deviated by the interruption caused by certain sequences called 'inserted sequences' (See 3.2.3.4.).

3.1.2.3.3 Types of Adjacency Pairs

Levinson (1983: 303) indicates that there are various types of APs such as question-answer, greeting-greeting, offer-acceptance, apology-minimization (See also; Mey, 1993: 243).

One common form of APs is question-answer pairs. Participants can direct questions to others which derive their interactional power from the obligation they place upon a hearer to come back with an answer, or as Sacks (1968) puts it 'appropriate question gets proper answer'. The questioner gets another chance to talk by virtue of his placing the question in the first place, i.e., he obtains a 'reserved right' to speak again. In such a manner, methods of putting the question and receiving an answer can develop into 'chain-structure of turns' (Sperber & Wilson, 1988: 421).

Levinson (1983: 293) reveals that questions can be followed by partial answers, rejections of the presuppositions set by the question, statements of ignorance, denials of the relevance of the question, and so on, as illustrated in the following example:

(68) A: What does John do for a living?
   B: a. Oh this and that.
   b. He doesn't.
   c. I've no idea.
   d. What's that got to do with it?

In such a case, Mey (1993: 248) considers these various answers as 'to the point'; that is, they make sense as answers (depending on the context, naturally), even though they do not provide any 'real' answer to the question, except in some vague, evasive way.

A similar form is the summon-answer sequence. A summon is often termed 'an attention getting device' which includes the terms of address. One of the specific features of this form is that it is a preliminary preamble or preface to some further conversational activity. The difference between the question-answer and summons-answer is that the latter is more constraining since it more forcefully constrains both interlocutors, i.e., speaker and hearer,
whereas in the former the questioner has to talk again. Besides, summons-answer sequence is non-repeated in the sense that once a summon has been answered, the summoner may not begin another summons-answer sequence. A contrast is suggested with question-answer sequence where a questioner can develop QAAQA sequence (Schegloff, 1999: 383).

There is a class of first pair parts which includes Questions, Greetings, Challenges, Offers, Requests, Complaints, Invitations and Announcements which accept either more than one expected second pair part such as (Complaint-Apology/ Justification), or one appropriate second such as (Question-Answer). When the second part is the same as the first, it is called 'reciprocal', but when they are different; they are named 'non-reciprocal' (See Bahrami, 1999: 4).

3.1.2.3.4 Insertion Sequences

It has been indicated in (3.2.3.2) that APs may be separated by other sequences termed 'insertion sequences'. Schegloff (1972) (Cited in Coulthard, 1985: 73) illustrates that the speaker or the participant resorts to such sequences either because s/he doesn't understand or because s/he doesn't want to commit her/himself until s/he knows more, or because s/he is simply stalling, a next speaker produces not a second pair part but another first pair part.

Bloor & Bloor (2007: 107) consider such sequences as intervening APs between the first and second part, as in the following example:

(69) A1: D' you want a beer?
   A2: What've you got?
   B2: Grolsch 'n mm Bud.
   A2: Grolsch please.

Before completing the offer-acceptance pair, A2 initiates a new pair by asking a relevant question. B2 completes this inserted pair, and B2 then completes the first pair with an acceptance (ibid).

Coulthard (1985: 73) emphasizes that APs are normative structures, the second part should occur, and thus the other sequences are inserted between the first pair part that has occurred and the second pair part that is anticipated.

An important view in this regard is the one issued by Mey (1993: 223-4), and by which he argues that inserted sequences do not break or suspend coherence in talk. Thus, "in an insertion sequence, the normal flow of conversation is not stopped; conversationalists behave as if they have been aware that the 'turns' in their talk are operating at different levels" (ibid). However, it can be maintained that inserted sequences may be regarded as means for
reinforcing coherence in talk. This means that they check appropriateness conditions for issuing the second pair part.

Jefferson (1972) (Cited in ibid) proposes an embedded sequence different from 'inserted sequences' issued by Schegloff and labels it as 'side sequence'. She notes that the general flow of conversation may be suspended at an unpredictable point by, for example, a request for clarification, and then the talk goes on again where it left off.

The function of 'side sequence' is to remedy a problem in what has just been said, fundamentally by using a 'questioning repeat' which is an interrogative item indicating that problem. Questioning repeats occur after the questioned utterance has been completed. This is because of the fact that the other speaker may correct himself.

Jefferson (ibid) suggests that the misapprehension sequence has a triple structure: a statement of sorts, a misapprehension of sorts, and a clarification of sorts. In such a case, the side sequence looks rather like Schegloff's insertion sequence. There are, however, two basic distinctions: First of all, the 'statement', is not a first pair part, the other items are in no sense inserted, and there is no exception of who should speak at the end of the sequence or what kind of utterance should follow; secondly, while the sequence 'misapprehension-clarification looks like a pair, there is a third compulsory element in the sequence. This element is an indication by the misapprehender that he knows or understands, such as 'that is better' or 'Yeah'.

(70) Statement: If Percy goes with – Nixon I'd sure like that.
   Misapprehension: Who?
   Clarification: Percy. That young fella that uh – his daughter was murdered.

(ibid)

It can be said that the strict notion of 'side sequence', that the first part is misapprehension and the second part is clarification, is not the 'unmarked' but the 'marked' sequence. That is, not all such suspending sequences follow this pattern. Moreover, 'Who' may be considered as 'surprise' in (70). In addition, Coulthard (ibid: 76-77) highlights that there is no reason why Schegloff's insertion sequence couldn't also have a termination, as in the following example:

(71) A: I don't know where the – wh – this address is. (Q)
   B: Which part of town you live? (Qi)
   A: I live four ten East Lowden. (Ai)
   B: Ah yeah. Termination
   Well you don't live very far from me. (A)

(ibid)
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3.1.2.3.5 Preference Structure

APs are not contentless noises in sequence. Rather, they stand for social actions, and not all social actions are of equal ranks when they are reflected in second parts of some pairs. Thus, the basic assumption is that a first part that contains a request or an offer is typically made to expect an 'acceptance' second part. It is intended that acceptance is structurally more likely than a refusal. This likelihood is termed 'preference'. Preference is not intended as a psychological concept, but rather as a technical means of referring to the sequence and the organization of conversation (Cf. Yule, 1996b: 78-9; Taylor & Cameron, 1987: 113).

Cook (1989: 53-4) stresses the fact that the utterance of one speaker makes a particular kind of response very likely. A greeting, for instance, is likely to be answered by another greeting, a summons by an answer. If they are ignored, it is supposed to interpret this somehow: as rudeness, of deafness, or lack of attention. He adds that there is often a choice of two likely responses. One of the responses is termed the 'preferred response' (because it occurs most frequently) and the other the 'dispreferred response' (because it is less common or unexpected).

Levinson (1983: 307) points out that preferred responses are the unmarked seconds, whereas dispreferred responses are the marked seconds (See Ervin-Tripp, 1993: 253).

Mey (1993: 231) mentions that there is a recurrent and reliable pattern of correlation between the two domains, that of preference and that of the kind of action performed. Thus, for instance, 'in the case of offers or invitations, an acceptance is in preferred format, whereas refusals normally are in dispreferred format' (ibid.). Following Levinson (1983: 336), an illustration of such correlation can be made as in Table (3) below.

Table (3): Preferred and Dispreferred Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Part</th>
<th>Second Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offer/invitation</td>
<td>acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blame/accusation</td>
<td>agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>question</td>
<td>denial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>admission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unexpected (or non-) answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*After Levinson (1983: 336)*
Yule (1996b: 79) gives the following example where the responses in each second part all represent preferred answers. Thus, acceptance or agreement is the preferred second part response to a request (72 a.), an offer (72 b.), an assessment (72 c.), or a proposal (72 d.):

(72)    First part                       Second part
        b. Want some coffee.              Yes, please.
        c. Isn't that really great?       Yes, it is.
        d. Maybe we could go for a walk.  That'd be great.

Checking dispreferred seconds, Levinson (1983: 334) observes that they are distinguished by incorporating a 'substantial number of the following features':

a. 'delays': (I) pause before delivery; (II) by the use of a preface (See b); (III) by displacement over a number of turns via the use of 'repair initiators or insertion sequences.

b. 'prefaces': (I) the use of markers or announcers of dispreferred parts like 'Oh' and 'Well'; (II) the production of taken agreements before disagreements; (III) the use of appreciations if relevant (for offers, invitations, suggestions, advice); (IV) the use of apologies of relevance (for requests, invitations, etc.); (V) the use of qualifiers (e.g. 'I don't know for sure, but ...'); (VI) hesitation in various forms, including self-editing.

c. 'accounts': carefully formulated explanations for why the dispreferred act is being done'

d. 'declination' component: of a form suited to the nature of the first part of the pair, but characteristically indirect or mitigated.

It can be observed that most of dispreferred features are politeness markers. Thus, they include 'downgraders' such as "Well", and qualifiers such as (b v). Also, the use of hedges is in (b IV) and (b II) (See Trosborg, 1995: Ch. 10).

Yule (1996b: 81) presents good examples to illustrate dispreferred features as follows: (73)

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 to X
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
k. hedge the negative    I guess not; not possible

3.1.2.3.6 The Underlying Relation in Adjacency Pairs

One of the important issues in the study of APs is the nature of relation between the two pair parts and the type of action achieved by such parts. Hopper (1992: 13) considers the sequences of acts in APs as speech act sequences. Similarly, Dressler & Barbaresi (1994: 24) use the terminology that has been used to describe APs to label speech act sequences such as offer-acceptance/refusal, greeting-greeting … etc., within their theory of morphopragmatics.

However, Mey (1993) disagrees with such opinions, and considers the acts performed in APs as 'pragmatic acts'. Thus, he (ibid: 261) asserts that pragmatic acts can be looked at from two points of view: societal and linguistic. From the societal view, the focus will be on the constraints imposed on the individual in the form of necessary limitations on personal resources such as life history, education, class and the like. Such constraints concern what is termed 'background knowledge'. By contrast, the linguistic point of view concerns the question: what language is used to perform a pragmatic act, and to create the conditions to perform a pragmatic act? In this case, the notion of 'adaptability of language' plays a noticeable role: this means that the individual members of society rely on language as their chief tool to adapt to the ever-changing conditions surrounding them (See Verschueren, 1999: 12 ). The classical notion of speech act, Mey (1993: 261) adds, belongs to the linguistic viewpoint. This is because of the fact that speech acts are among the means that speakers have in their disposal to control their environment, and in turn to adopt it.

Van Dijk (1980) maintains that what is found in APs are speech acts, but the labels are not so. He focuses on the second pair part indicating that the labels of such seconds do not refer to the speech acts performed, but to the functions achieved by such acts in a given context to be coherent to the previous speech act which is the first pair part in APs. This has led Sbisà (2002:75) to remark that the hearer will accept or agree to the speech act performed by the speaker when the former thinks that it is felicitous. Contrarily, when the hearer finds the speech act performed infelicitous, s/he will express her/his refusal. For instance, when someone has no authority to give an order, the hearer will refuse that order, although the former uses the imperative mood and authoritative intonation.
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Consequently, one can say that the second pair parts are pragmatic functions achieved by certain speech acts to be relevant to the previous speech act.

The local pragmatic coherence relations so far discussed can be presented in an eclectic model illustrated in Figure 2 below:

![Fig.(2): A Model of Local Pragmatic Coherence.](image-url)
In this eclectic taxonomy, the chronological development of the theories of local PRAGMATIC COHERENCE is taken into consideration. The first step in theorizing the taxonomy is that of Van Dijk (1977) in which speech act relations are considered as the only PRAGMATIC COHERENCE relations in language, and they are both mono-logic and dialogic, i.e. they can be issued by the same speaker or by two. The second step is achieved by Levinson (1983) in which the focus has been on the speech act relations that are found only at the dialogic level. The third step is presented by Sweetser (1990) in which the pragmatic relations are divided into speech act relations and epistemic relations. Generally speaking, these types of relations can operate with the assistance of using certain mechanisms as illustrated below.

3.2. Degand's (1998) Techniques

The mechanisms that can be used to help in operating this model make use of Degand's (1998) techniques which can be summed as follows:

1. Paraphrase:

   In this technique, the relation is paraphrased according to the definition of that relation. For instance, 'justification' is defined as that relation in which the function of a preceding speech act is to motivate and activate the performance of the following main speech act (See 3.2.1.2.1).

2. The use of the pragmatic connective:

   Certain relations are concerned with specific type of connectives which, in turn, can be considered as 'indicators' for these relations. For example, the pragmatic connective 'and' is used to convey the pragmatic relation of 'addition' between speech acts. To ensure the meaning of the pragmatic connective, analysts resort to substitution where a connective can be replaced by another one retaining the same meaning. Hence, this technique is an investigating one. For example, if the pragmatic connective 'and' is replaced by 'but' and the meaning is still 'contradiction', one can conclude that 'and' is used here in the meaning of connecting a 'contradiction' relation between speech acts. Generally speaking, the use of the pragmatic connectives is a sign of explicitness in local PRAGMATIC COHERENCE.
3.3. Analyzed Examples for Illustration

3.3.1 Speech Act and Epistemic Relations

To show the validity of the model in this study, the types of pragmatic relations will be investigated here: they are speech act relations and epistemic relations.

The illustrative sample of the situations analyzed here is randomly taken from the novel *Sons and Lovers* by D. H. Lawrence. The number of these situations amounts to fifteen in order to give a clear idea about the workability of the model developed by this study and to provide a vivid picture about the kind of pragmatic relations used in the novel under study. Generally speaking, the analysis of all the situations of the novel reveals that the speech act relations are used more than the epistemic ones. Using the percentage equation to calculate the results shows that the frequencies of using the former relations amount to 98.4 %, whereas the latter are only 1.6 %. This result indicates that the characters of the novel rarely relies on their own personal conclusions to relate their utterances (For other percentages, see Figure (3) and (4) below). This leads one to conclude that the mental epistemicity of the figures is not linguistically reflected in the novel. The following examples of the situations analyzed will be illustrative of the statement that the speech act relations are appealed to more than epistemic ones.

![Figure 3: Distribution of Monologic Speech Act Relations (In percentages).](image-url)
3.3.1.1 Speech Act Relations

(1) Mrs. Morel: You won't die if they do. Beside it's only half-past twelve.

(Mrs. Morel is talking to her son William about his being fast to arrive at a festival)

The relation here is between two speech acts: the speech act of assertion 'Beside it's only half – past twelve' is an 'addition' to the previous speech act of assertion. Thus, it is a relation between two assertions.

(2) Annie: I want to go. I want to go.

(Annie is talking to her mother that she insists on going with William to the celebration)

The relation here is between two speech acts in which the second speech act of assertion 'I want to go' is an 'explication' to the previous speech act of assertion. Consequently, it is a relation between two speech acts.

(3) a. Mr. Morel: Now do come and have this one wi' me. It's easy, you know. I'm pining to see you dance.

b. Mrs. Morel: No, I won't dance.

(Mr. Morel tries to convince Mrs. Morel to dance with him in a party)
In (3) above, the relation is between two speech acts: the speech act of assertion in (3b) is a 'refusal' of the speech act of offer in (3a). This means that the relation is a speech act relation.

(4) Mr. Morel: Eh, the mucky little 'ussy, who's drunk, I sh'd like ter know

I sh'd like ter know.

(After his coming drunken from the bar at night, Mr. Morel quarrels with his wife Mrs. Morel)

In this example, the relation is between two speech acts where the speech act of assertion 'I sh'd like ter know' is an 'explanation' to the speech act of enquiry 'who's drunk'. This proves that the relation is a speech act relation.

(5) a. Mrs. Morel: You don't look as if you'd come much un-curled.

b. Mrs. Morel: I'm like a pig's tail, I curl because I cannot help it.

(In a party before their marriage, Mrs. Morel talks with Mr. Morel about his character)

The relation in (5) above is between two speech acts: an assertion in (5b) which is an 'agreement' with another assertion in (5a) which is an 'assessment'.

(6) a. Paul: Do you know where Arthur is?

b. Mrs. Morel: I do not.

(The family is informed that Arthur joined the army)

In (6) above, again, the relation is between two speech acts: the speech act of assertion in (6b) which is a form of an 'answer' to the speech act of enquiry in (6a), which is a 'question'.

(7) a. Paul: well, what am I but a common clerk.

b. Mrs. Morel: A good deal, my boy!

(Paul speaks to his mother about his status and job)

The relation is between two speech acts: the speech act of assertion in (7b) is a 'disagreement' with the speech act of enquiry in (7a) which is an 'assessment'. This shows a kind of a speech act relation.

(8) Miriam: I wish you could come too. What time are you free?
(Miriam talks to Paul to come to her house)

The relation is between two speech act: the speech act of assertion 'I wish you could come too' functions as a 'justification' for the speech act of enquiry 'What time are you free'.

(9) a. Paul: Well, get the French and we'll do some--some
    Verlaine.

b. Miriam: Yes.

(Paul is teaching Miriam French in her house)

The current relation is between two speech acts: the speech act of assertion in (9b) is an 'acceptance' of the speech act of request in (9a).

(10) Paul: Don't carry on again. I can't work.

(Paul said this to his mother when she interrupts his work talking about a financial problem with his father)

The relation presented in (10) above is between two speech acts: the speech act of assertion 'I can't work' is an 'explanation' for the previous speech act of request.

(11) a. Mrs. Morel: Is there nobody else to talk to?

b. Paul: Not about the things we talk of.

(Mrs. Morel is talking with Paul about his involvement with Miriam all the time)

The relation is between two speech acts: the speech act of assertion in (11b) is seen as a 'denial' of the speech act of enquiry in (11a) which is a blame. This indicates a speech act relation.

3.3.1.2 Epistemic Relations

(12) Mrs. Morel: Take your pudding in your hand –and it's
    only five-past one, so you were wrong –you
    haven't got your two pence.

(Mrs. Morel speaks to William about his being impatient)

The relation that can be seen here is an epistemic pragmatic one. This relation is 'causal' between the premise 'it's only five –past one' and the conclusion 'so you were wrong'. It is an
epistemic relation because it depends on the induction which is made the speaker herself
(Mrs. Morel).

(13) Mrs. Morel: An' he'll be satisfied if he gets his
'tlowance, whether they give him more or not.

(Mrs. Morel talks with William about his father's being late and improvident)

This is also an example of epistemic pragmatic relations. It is a 'conditional' relation
between the premise 'if he gets his 'tlowance' and the conclusion 'An' he'll be satisfied' which
is drawn according to the speaker's induction, and not on factual postulates.

(14) Mrs. Morel: I made that, so I can make thee one.

(Mr. Morel talks to Mrs. Morel about his ability to make coal-cutter to her like the one he
made to his mother)

This, again, is an epistemic pragmatic relation. the utterance 'I made that', which is a
premise, functions as a 'causal' for the conclusion in 'so I can make thee one'. The relation is
epistemic because the speaker concludes a result from a cause (premise) according to his
own induction, not based on facts.

(15) Mrs. Morel: But you're never too tired to go if she will
come for you.

(Mrs. Morel talks with her son Paul about his carelessness to her when he comes late)

The relation in (15) above exemplifies an epistemic pragmatic relation. The premise 'if
she will come for you' is a 'conditional' for the conclusion in 'you're never too tired'. The
relation is epistemic because the speaker draws conclusion from a condition (premise)
depending on her own induction and experience, not on factual matters.

3.4 Conclusions

On the basis of theoretical treatment conducted throughout this work and the analysis
carried out in the previous section, the following conclusions can be introduced:
1. There are two levels of local PRAGMATIC COHERENCE relations: mono-logic and dialogic relations.

2. Some of the types of local pragmatic coherence relations are found at both levels.

3. The relations under study can be organized in the form of a comprehensive model which can be used for their analysis in a precise way.

4. Some techniques are needed to operate the model in question.

5. The workability of the model has been verified through the analysis of a sample of data randomly selected from D.H. Lawrence's 'Sons and Lovers'.

6. The application of the model developed by this study to the data of this work reveals that Local Pragmatic Coherence manifests itself mostly through speech act relations than epistemic ones.

7. The analysis of the data also shows that 'justification' is the most commonly used local pragmatic coherence relation. This proves that the speakers aim to give more explanations for their speech acts to be more felicitous.
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CHAPTER FOUR
A MODEL FOR THE PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF ARGUMENTATION IN ‘JANE EYRE’ AND ‘WUTHERING HEIGHTS’

Fareed Hameed Al-Hindawi
Ramia Fuaad Mirza

4.1. Introduction

Argumentation is a verbal and social activity of reason aimed at increasing (or decreasing) the acceptability of a controversial standpoint for the listener or reader, by putting forward a constellation of propositions intended to justify (or refute) the standpoint before a rational judge (van Eemeren et al., 1996: 5). It is that topic which has a long tradition in history and which has been made by the hands of philosophy, logic, rhetoric, dialectic, and more recently, pragma-dialectic. As such, there have been different models that are developed for the sake of analyzing argumentation from different angles. However, these models do not deal with argumentation from a linguistic perspective; or even when some of them do, they confine themselves to a limited extent. Thus, a need arises to the development of a more comprehensive model. The current study assigns this task to itself through developing an eclectic model which is based on various models, in addition to the researchers’ observations. The workability of the model is tested against four examples chosen from two novels, viz. Jane Eyre by Charlotte Bronte, and Wuthering Heights by Emile Bronte.

4.1.1. Models of Argumentation

These models include the following:

a- Van Eemeren and Grootendorst’s (1983) ideal model of a critical discussion.

b- Toulmin’s (2003) phases of argument.

c- Benoit and Benoit’s (2006) strategies of getting into and out of arguments; and


Van Eemeren and Grootendors’t (1983: 85-7) ideal model of a critical discussion involves four stages on which certain speech acts are distributed (i.e. those which help resolve the difference of opinion which is the gist of a critical discussion). The stages are:
confrontation, opening, argumentation and concluding. As van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1992: 35-6) state, their ideal model is, to some extent, far-away from real life argumentative discourse, so what will be taken from this model is the terminology only, viz. the confrontation stage, the argumentation stage, and the concluding stage.

Toulmin’s (2003: 16) phases of an argument have been put to prove the idea that the procedures (phases) of arguing are the same regardless of the field in which this process occurs. As such, he invokes cases from two different fields (law cases and rational cases) to show that the number of phases (viz. three) is the same, what differs is the kind of evidence or support needed to reach the final stage in each case. In trying to prove his notion, Toulmin gives examples from two different fields both of which are different from the kind of data in the novels under study. Therefore, what will be taken here is the number of phases, i.e. three phases (stages).

Benoit and Benoit (2006: 61-70) strategies of getting into arguments are: insult, accusation, command, and refusal of a request; and those of getting out of arguments are: physical or psychological disengagement, apology, agreement, and restoring the relationship. What will be taken are the strategies of getting into arguments, and some of those of getting out of arguments (viz. physical or psychological disengagement, apology, and agreement). Not all the strategies of getting out of arguments have been taken because the interactants with whom the Benoits’ research had been conducted were roommates, romantic partners, and friends; that is to say, not all of these kinds of interactants are found in the novels under investigation, so the most appropriate strategies have been selected.

According to Trapp’s (2006: 44-6) model of argument episodes, an argument episode is triggered by the perception of incompatibility. The episode is initiated by one participant deciding to confront the other, inventing and editing argument strategies and arguing. The consequences of argument episodes range from conflict (de)escalation, to conflict resolution, to self-concept damage or improvement, to relational improvement or dissolution, and/or to physical violence. One of the requirements of the arguing process, according to Trapp, is what is called ‘argumentative competence’. That very notion will be taken from Trapp. Trapp (ibid.: 44) reveals a very important thing about his model. He states that in developing that model he has struggled with the “trade-off between accuracy and simplicity. When accuracy is the goal, models become less simple; but when simplicity is reached accuracy is sacrificed”.
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4.2. An Eclectic Model

The model intended to be developed by this study can be illustrated as follows: Argumentation consists of three stages: the confrontation stage, the subsequent argumentation stage, and the concluding stage.

Generally, the confrontation stage includes the violation of the addressee’s face (positive or negative) which can be defined as “the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself” (Brown and Levinson, 1979: 66; Cited in Al-Hindawy, 1999: 60). This violation is attained to by one or more of different strategies which include: insults, accusations, request refusal, command, suggestion, comment, statement of disappreciation,… etc.

This stage leads, in turn, to the second subsequent argumentation stage which involves three parts: arguing effectively, arguing appropriately, and combination of both. The combination of effectiveness and appropriateness is termed ‘argumentative competence’. Argumentative competence is initiated by Trapp, Yingling, and Wanner (1986) in a published paper entitled “Measuring Argumentative Competence”. Later on, Trapp (2006) expresses more clearly what is conceived of by argumentative competence.

Effective arguers are those who “make clear connections…, are logical, provide support for arguments, and explain things clearly” (Trapp, 2006: 48).

Translated into pragmatic terms, effectiveness can be found equal to keeping to Grice’s Cooperative Principle (CP) and its maxims. If the preceding features of effectiveness have been considered again, it will be noted that each one of them is equivalent to one of the Cricean maxims:

- Make clear connections = be relevant (the relevance maxim).
- Be logical = tell things which are true and to which you have solid evidence (the quality maxim).
- Provide support for arguments = be as informative as is required (the quantity maxim).
- Explain things clearly = be clear, brief, and orderly (the manner maxim).

Appropriateness, on the other hand, as Trapp (ibid.) sees it, involves avoiding any act of “being obnoxious, arrogant, and overbearing; insulting or poking fun at others; belittling opponents; trying to prevent others from expressing their points of view, and directing arguments against the other person rather than the other person’s position”.

Again, if translated into pragmatic terms the aforementioned features indicate that arguing appropriately entails keeping to the Politeness Principle (PP).
Models of politeness are many, of which Lakoff’s models will be chosen because it “is part of a general system of interactional style which classifies people’s interactional behavior according to how they handle interpersonal relationships” (Eelen, 2001: 49). Since novels are built on a network of interpersonal relationships, then this model seems suitable.

As James (1980: 129-31) argues, Lakoff’s model of politeness is summarized in three rules:

a- Don’t impose on your hearer (distance rule).
b- Give hearer options (deference rule); and
c- Make hearer feel good (camaraderie rule).

These rules are linguistically realized by many strategies which are called modality markers. Some of these strategies include: the use of questions and past tense (distance rule); the use of politeness markers such as titles such as Mr., Miss…etc. (deference rule), and the use of interpersonal markers such as address terms (e.g. first names) (camaraderie rule).

These two principles, i.e. the CP and PP, are very important in face-to-face interaction due to the fact that the CP opens the channel of communication and the PP keeps it open (Leech, 1983: 82).

The second stage leads to the final concluding stage which may come either positively or negatively. It is positive in the sense that the main point of incompatibility has been resolved, thus it may either end by agreement, apology, combination of the two. On the other hand, it becomes negative when the point of incompatibility has not been resolved, i.e. it ends either with physical or psychological disengagement (silence), disagreement, verbal aggression, or combination of the first and third strategies (i.e. physical or psychological disengagement and verbal aggression). These last three strategies (i.e. disagreement, verbal aggression, and the combination) are not mentioned in the Benoits’ strategies. Disagreement and the combination have been added by the researchers because they are very possible strategies of getting out of arguments; the second has been taken from Trapp (2006). Verbal aggression (which involves attacking the person her/himself instead of the standpoint adopted) is termed by Walton (2004: 106) a ‘quarrel’. The term ‘quarrel’ seems more accurate than ‘verbal aggression’, this becomes evident when the meaning of ‘quarrel’ is checked in the dictionary:

quarrel: an angry argument or disagreement between people, often about a personal matter (Hornby, 2002: s.v. quarrel).

Therefore, the third strategy of concluding the process of argumentation is quarrel (which has the same notion of verbal aggression as presented by Trapp, but with a more accurate terminology).
For more clarification, the just illustrated model will diagrammed as follows:

**Figure (1) An Elastic Model for the Pragmatic Analysis of Argumentation**
4.3. Data Analysis

(1) The following two examples taken from Jane Eyre (p.7, 106, respectively) will be analyzed depending on the developed model. The analysis of the resting situations is illustrated in Table (1) below.

**Table (1) The Three Stages of Argumentation Calculated in Percentages in Jane Eyre**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COS</th>
<th>Insult</th>
<th>Accusation</th>
<th>Command</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAS</th>
<th>Arguing effectively</th>
<th>Arguing appropriately</th>
<th>Combination of both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CS</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Apology</th>
<th>Combination of both</th>
<th>Physical Disengagement</th>
<th>Psychological Disengagement</th>
<th>Disagreement</th>
<th>Quarrel</th>
<th>Combination of strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: COS = confronting stage, SAS = subsequent argumentation stage, CS = concluding stage.

**Situation:** Jane, an orphan girl, lives in her dead uncle’s house with his wife and children. One day, the children (i.e. Jane and her cousins) quarrel, and it is her cousin, John Reed, who starts the quarrel. Instead of punishing him, Jane gets punished. One executing the punishment, the following argumentation begins, when Bessie (the servant) tries to convince Jane of behaving well.

**Bessie:** What shocking conduct, Miss Eyre, to strike a young gentleman, your benefactress’s son! Your young master!

**Jane:** Master! How is he my master? Am I a servant?

**Bessie:** No; you are less than a servant, for you do nothing for your keep. There, sit down and think over your wickedness. You ought to be aware, Miss, that you are under obligations to Mrs. Reed: she keeps you; if she were to turn you off, you would have to go to the poor-house.

**Jane:** (I had nothing to say to these words: they are not new to me: my very first recollections of existence included hints of the same kind).

In this example, the confrontation stage is triggered by violating Jane’s positive face through insulting her by Bessie (who characterizes Jane as a servant). The insult has not been
stated by explicitly telling Jane that she is a servant; rather, it is implied in the use of the epithet ‘master’ to characterize her cousin, indicating that someone who has a master could be a kind of servant. This has led to the second stage in which Bessie argues how is Jane is less than a servant.

In the second stage, Bessie is cooperative for she has kept to Grice’s maxims (by being informative, telling the truth, being relevant, and being clear, brief and orderly). The PP, also, has been kept to as is shown by the use of the title ‘Miss’ that indicates deference.

The argumentation process in this example has been negatively concluded because Jane kept silent. Keeping silent, as Benoit and Benoit (2006: 66) state, is negative because it prevents any further interaction among participants, and since it takes two (or more) to engage in and continue a conversation, then the main point of incompatibility (insult in this example) will not be resolved; rather one of the arguers (Jane in this example) disengages and, so, the argumentation cannot continue.

(2) **Situation:** Rochester, the master of the house in which Jane works as a governess, wants to have a conversation with Jane about any subject she chooses. She tells him that it is better that he chooses the topic in order to make sure that it will be of interest to him. So, he asks her whether she agrees with his opinion that he has the right of being a little masterful due to the fact that he is older and has a wider experience than hers. On answering him “Do as you please, sir.”, the following argumentation begins, when Jane tries to convince Rochester of not having the right to command her.

**Rochester:** That is no answer: or rather it is a very irritating, because a very evasive one – reply clearly.

**Jane:** I don’t think, sir, you have a right to command me, merely because you are older than I, or because you have seen more of the world than I have – your claim to superiority depends on the use you have made of your time and experience.

**Rochester:** Humph! Promptly spoken. But I won’t allow that, seeing that it would never suit my case; as I have made an indifferent, not to say, a bad use of both advantages. Leaving superiority out of the question then, you must still agree to receive my orders now and then, without being piqued or hurt by the tone of the command – will you?

The confrontation stage, in this example, is motivated through violating Jane’s negative face by Rochester’s commanding her to reply his question. The command has been explicitly issued as a command (*reply clearly*).
In the second subsequent argumentation stage, Jane argues competently, that is, effectively and appropriately. The effective arguing is demonstrated in her keeping to the CP and its four maxims, therefore she is informative, truthful, relevant, and mannered (i.e. clear, brief, and orderly). The appropriate arguing, on the other hand, is manifested in her keeping to the PP indicated by her use of the title ‘sir’ which shows deference.

The argumentation, in this example, has been positively concluded by showing agreement. The agreement is implied in Rochester’s requesting Jane to receive his orders, at any time, without being piqued or hurt by them; and that indicates the commander’s (i.e. Rochester) admission that he has not the right to command her because of the reasons he mentioned. And that, also, denotes that he has been convinced by what Jane has said, and thus he agrees with her.

(3) Two examples taken from *Wuthering Heights* (475-6) will be analyzed. The results of the analysis of the rest of situations are illustrated in Table (2) below.

*Table (3) The Three Stages of Argumentation Calculated in Percentages in Wuthering Heights*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COS</th>
<th>Insult</th>
<th>Accusation</th>
<th>Command</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.285</td>
<td>64.285</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.285</td>
<td>7.142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAS</th>
<th>Arguing effectively</th>
<th>Arguing appropriately</th>
<th>Combination of both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71.428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CS</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Apology</th>
<th>Combination of both</th>
<th>Physical Disengagement</th>
<th>Psychological Disengagement</th>
<th>Disagreement</th>
<th>Quarrel</th>
<th>Combination of strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.142</td>
<td>7.142</td>
<td>7.142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.428</td>
<td>7.142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: COS = confronting stage, SAS=subsequent argumentation stage, CS=concluding stage.

**Situation:** Heathcliff and Catherine meet after a long period of separation. On seeing him, the following argumentation begins, where Heathcliff tries to convince Catherine that he has not done her any harm.

**Catherine:** You have killed me – and thriven on it, I think. I wish I could hold you till we were both dead! I shouldn’t care what you suffered. I care nothing for your sufferings. Why shouldn’t you suffer? I do. Will you forget me? Will you be happy when I am in the earth!
Will you say twenty years hence, ‘That’s the grave of Catherine Earnshaw. I loved her long ago, and was wretched to lose her; but it is past. I’ve loved many others since: my children are dearer to me than she was; and at death I shall not rejoice that I am going to her: I shall be sorry that I must lose them!’ Will you say so, Heathcliff?

**Heathcliff:** Don’t torture me till I’m as mad as yourself! Are you possessed with a devil to talk in that manner to me when you are dying? Do you reflect that all those words will be branded in my memory, and eating deeper eternally after you have left? You know you lie to say I have killed you; and, Catherine, you know that I could as soon forget you as my existence! Is it not sufficient for your internal selfishness that, while you are at peace, I shall writhe in the torment of hell?

**Catherine:** I shall not be at peace. I’m not wishing you greater torment than I have, Heathcliff. I only wish us never be parted: and should a word of mine distress you hereafter, think I feel the same distress underground, and for my own sake, forgive me. Come here and kneel down again! You never harmed me in your life. Nay, if you nurse anger, that will be worse to remember than my harsh words! Won’t you come here again? Do!.

The confrontation stage, here, is motivated by violating Heathcliff’s positive face when Catherine accuses him of killing and forgetting her. Her accusation is presented in two ways: as an assertion (you have killed me), and as a series of questions which indicate (from Catherine’s point of view) that Heathcliff will forget her sooner or later.

In the subsequent argumentation stage, Heathcliff argues effectively and appropriately. His effective arguing is demonstrated in his keeping to the CP and its four maxims, so he is informative, truthful (which is shown via his use of the verb ‘know’ which denotes that the “information following that verb can be treated as a fact” (Yule, 1996: 27)), relevant, and mannered. His appropriate arguing, on the other hand, is manifested in his keeping to the PP which is employed by:

a- his use of questions (Are you possessed..., Do you reflect..., Is it not sufficient...) which are polite as they are the most indirect.

b- his use of the first name ‘Catherine’ which shows rapport and equality; and

c- his use of the negative form (Is it not sufficient...) which gives the addressee the freedom of giving the response required.

The concluding stage is positive for it ends with a combination of strategies: apology and agreement. The apology is indicated by Catherine’s asking for forgiveness, which is one of the strategies of apologizing (as is indicated by Cohen, 1983:20-4; Cited in Al-Khaza’li, 2009: 116; Benoit and Benoit, 2006: 68). The agreement, on the other hand, is
implied in her saying (*You never harmed me in your life*). This is so because ‘*killing and forgetting*’ harm, and since he has never harmed her in his life, then he has neither killed nor forgotten her.

(4) **Situation:** Catherine and Isabella quarrel in the presence of Nelly. When Catherine leaves the room, Isabella turns to Nelly and argues with her about Heathcliff’s good features. On that point the following argumentation is activated, when Nelly tries to convince Isabella of not marrying Heathcliff.

*Isabella:* *All, all is against me; she has blighted my single consolation. But she uttered falsehoods, didn’t she? Mr. Heathcliff is not a fiend; he has an honorable soul, and a true one, or how could he remember her?*

*Nelly:* *Banish him from your thoughts, miss. He’s a bird of bad omen; no mate for you. Mrs. Linton spoke strongly, and yet, I can’t contradict her. She is better acquainted with his heart than I, or any one besides; and she never would represent him as worse than he is. Honest people don’t hide their deeds. How has he been living? How has he got rich? Why is he staying at Wuthering Heights, the house of a man whom he abhors? They say Mr. Earnshaw is worse and worse since he came. They sit up all night together continually: and Hindley has been borrowing money on his land, and does nothing but play and drink, I heard only a week ago; it was Joseph who told me – I met him at Gimmerton (and Nelly goes on telling Isabella what Joseph has told her). Now, Miss Linton, Joseph is an old rascal, but no liar; if his account of Heathcliff’s conduct be true, you never think of desiring such a husband, would you?*

*Isabella:* *You are leagued with the rest, Ellen. I’ll not listen to your slanders. What malevolence you must have to wish to convince me that there is no happiness in the world.*

The confrontation stage, here, begins with Isabella’s accusing Catherine of telling falsehoods about Heathcliff; so Catherine’s positive face is violated. Although the accusation is not directed to Nelly, yet she chooses to defend Catherine because Nelly knows that what Catherine says is the truth. The accusation is presented as an assertion (she uttered falsehoods, didn’t she) followed by a tag question which is intended to elicit confirmation from the listener.

In the subsequent argumentation stage, Nelly does not argue explicitly about the accusation; rather, she tells Isabella two things: first, to banish Heathcliff from her thoughts; and second, Catherine’s speech is correct though it has been said in a strong manner. This means that Nelly is implicitly defending Catherine. To do so, she has kept to the CP and its
four maxims, i.e. she is informative, truthful, relevant, and mannered. Accordingly, Nelly has been arguing effectively. She has also been arguing appropriately by keeping to the PP which is employed via:

a- her use of the title ‘Miss’ which has been repeated twice to show deference.
b- her use of the past tense (you would never think…) which gives the addressee the impression of having freedom of the type of the response required, and
c- her use of the tag question (would you?) in the past tense which smoothens the impact of imposition.

The concluding stage comes negatively for it ends with disagreement. The disagreement is explicitly expressed by Isabella’s asserting that she will not listen to Nelly’s words, which Isabella calls slanders, in order to emphasize her disagreement with what has been said.

4.4 Conclusions

This study has come up with the following conclusions:

(1) The workability of the developed model has been validated. What establishes that validity is the analysis of four randomly chosen examples from two different novels according to the various classifications of the model. For instance, the first example (from Jane Eyre) is negatively concluded with psychological disengagement (i.e. silence); this is one of the divisions of the eclectic model. The third example (from Wuthering Heights), on the other hand, is positively concluded with a combination of apology and agreement; this is, also, another division of the developed model.

(2) The notion of argumentative competence (as developed in this study) has been employed in the chosen examples. This becomes evident when noticing that the characters (i.e. Bessie in the first example, Jane in the second, Heathcliff in the third, and Nelly in fourth) have kept to the CP and its four maxims (thus they have been arguing effectively), and to the PP (thus they have been arguing appropriately).

(3) Through the analyzed examples, it has been shown that arguing competently, that is, effectively and appropriately, does not guarantee how the final stage is concluded. This is so because in the four examples, the competent arguing has been appealed to, yet two examples (viz. the second and third) have been positively concluded (with agreement and combination of apology and agreement, respectively); and the other two have been negatively concluded (with psychological disengagement and disagreement, respectively).
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CHAPTER FIVE

A PRAGMA-STYLISTIC STUDY OF SYMBOLISM IN JOSEPH CONRAD’S ‘HEART OF DARKNESS’

Fareed Hameed Al-Hindawi
Hasan H. M. Abu-Krooz

5.1 Introduction

The term "symbolism" is derived from the word "symbol" which derives from the Latin symbolum, a symbol of faith, and symbolus, a sign of recognition. Using symbols to embody abstract ideas and emotions is central to the concept of symbolism. In writing, symbolism is the employment of a word, a phrase, or a description, in a way that exceeds denotative meaning of the words themselves. This type of expanding the meaning scope can turn any textual representations into so powerful linguistic instruments. In literature, symbolism is intended to indicate textual meanings beyond what is superficially given in texts and discourses. The plot and action that take place in a story can be thought of as one level, while the symbolism of certain things in the writing acts on another level to enhance the story.

Black (2006: 124) states that ‘an interesting pragmatic approach to symbolism is offered by Eco (1984:137)’. His suggestions about the creation and reception of symbol place it firmly in the interpersonal context which characterizes pragmatic approaches to interpretation". Symbolism is thus seen as an example of textual implicatures, which invites the reader to explore possible meanings (and the motivation for encoding them allusively) in the usual way (Ibid). The motivation for using symbolic modes in any context such as the ones employed by modern novelists is to achieve certain functions such as: influence, manipulation, indirectness, and revealing style of the novelist.

Generally, there are some sound literary masterpieces that have received much praise and comprehensive attention from those who seek creativity and great works that reflect the ingenuity and elegance of the creative inspiring minds, which have produced them. One of
the most outstanding instances of such elevated pieces of work is *Joseph Conrad's Heart of Darkness* which is considered, according to Svensson (2010:4) as one of the great works of English literature. In similar vein, Guven (2013:79) argues that Conrad's ambivalent treatment, which contains timely and invaluable symbolic uses of pragma-stylistic devices that touch upon various dimensions of life and humanity literary heritage. This novel swarms with different linguistic characteristics, more precisely pragma-stylistic aspects that require a heedful consideration and scrutiny.

It seems that Joseph Conrad, one of the prominent English novelists of the Modern era, has made use of certain pragma-stylistic devices that signal symbolism in his novels. They have received a great deal of popularity. However, symbolism, which is a broad topic has mainly been tackled and studied from a literary perspective. Yet, the linguistic elements of symbolism have largely remained unexamined and even when they are examined; such examinations are characterized by many weaknesses and gaps (Black, 2006: 127). More precisely, the pragmatic components forming the structure of this literary genre as well as the Pragma-stylistic strategies employed for performing it have not thoroughly been investigated (ibid.). In other words, the pragma-stylistic aspect of symbolism has not been given its due attention. Consequently, a need rises to deal with symbolism from this angle. This has prompted the study to concern itself with the aim of establishing a pure pragma-stylistic approach to symbolism. Precisely, it attempts to find answers to the following questions:

1. What is the pragma-stylistic structure of symbolism?
2. What are the pragma-stylistic strategies used by the characters of the novel under study to actualize each phase of symbolic mode of interaction?
3. What are the most common pragma-stylistic strategies employed in issuing and preserving the continuation of symbolic modes of interaction?
4. What are the differences, if there are any, between the employments of the pragma-stylistic strategies used for fulfilling those modes of symbolism?
5. What contributions do the pragma-stylistic strategies mentioned in (3) above have to some of the major themes of the novel under study?

To answer the questions raised above, an analytical framework is developed by this study on the basis of other relevant models available in the literature. The current work traces
a number of hypotheses in relation to the questions above. These include: Hypothesizing that a diversity of pragma-stylistic elements constitute the pragma-stylistic structure of symbolism in the data scrutinized. Further, it is hypothesized that a variety of pragma-stylistic strategies are utilized to attain symbolism in the data of the work. Moreover, there are some basic differences in the exploitation of the pragma-stylistic strategies that can be traced back in the data under analysis. Finally, some of the pragma-stylistic strategies that appear in the data under scrutiny contribute to the major themes of the novel under analysis. It is noteworthy to notice that the current work excludes investigating the functions of symbolism in compliance with the limited scope set for it.

5.2 Theoretical Background

5.2.1 Pragmatics and Literature

Throughout its history, pragmatics has done a lot in terms of investigating and tackling literary works and products. In this regard different scholars assert that pragmatics produce various models to analyze and investigate literature. However, they differentiate between linguistic pragmatics; the study of language in use, and literary pragmatics; the contextualized study of literature (Verdonk, 2002:45).

Literary pragmatics treats literary texts in their use of communication. It stresses the part played by the context in dealing with literature since all exploitations of language occur in a rather situational context. Moreover, much of the contemporary literary pragmatics tends to define literature as having a special functional and communicative status. It does not only emphasize the communicative aspects of contexts, but also it borrows certain concepts from linguistic pragmatics to study literature such as the application of the concept of speech acts in literature and the concept of politeness which is practiced by Sell's(1991) as well as Black's (2006) employment of pragmatic theories (deixis, speech acts, politeness and conversational implicatures) in their treatment of literary works.

Dascal (2003:273)argues that the involvement of pragmatics studying literary texts is indispensable. Pragmatics is a multi-use-theory of language. Consequently it is not to be restricted to the analysis of conversation, excluding literature of its scope. Additionally, analyzing literature provides pragmatics with new ways to develop its theories and sharpen
its principles. On the other hand, an adequate analysis of literature requires making use of the conceptual resources of pragmatic theory.

Likewise, literary pragmatics is concerned with the effects intended by the author to help readers understand literary works. Such effects not only count on the exploitation of linguistic resources, but also on the contextual aspects that determine the use of the linguistic items. Thus, pragmatic aspects and principles have a great impact on the study and analysis of literary texts. Pragmatics provides a new perspective to study literature not only through linguistic resources but also through extra-linguistic theories.

5.2.2 Stylistics and Literature

Widdowson (1975:4-7) thinks that stylistics is the study of literary style from a linguistic orientation. He indicates that literature has captured the attention of linguists for a long period since it represents the data that can be accounted for in terms of linguistic description to show its effective use of language and its patterns. Likewise, Hickey (1993:1) points out that "The study of language and the study of literature obviously have a common frontier, and stylistics is the border area". In a similar vein, Short (1996:2) sees stylistics as "an approach to the analysis of literary texts using linguistic expression".

It can correspondingly be argued that the predominance of literary texts as the main focus of stylistics is reflected and supported by the alternative names of stylistics such as literary stylistics, literary linguistics, critical linguistics, literary pragmatics and so on (Jeffries and McIntyre, 2010:4).

Linguistics and literature share an outstanding history of interaction. Literature exploits the entire linguistic repertoire to convey its aesthetic form and message. This close relation has been claimed and tackled by works of many scholars such as Halliday (1971), Enkvist (1973), Leech (1977), Carter and Simpson(1989), etc., who attempt to establish such close relation in which stylistics tries to combine both approaches. In addition, a great interest is given to the study of literature within the framework of language teaching at departments of modern languages, of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics (Zongxin, 2003: 6).

Stylistics is born as a reaction to the subjectivity and impressionism of literary studies. It tries to replace this subjectivity with explicit and systematic description and
analysis. Stylistic analysis is part of literary studies. It is used to demonstrate how language is used in literary works. It is also used to understand the possible meanings in texts as the general assumption that the process of analysis will reveal the good qualities of any text. In some models of stylistic analysis, the observation of the reoccurrence of certain stylistic features is used to make judgment about the nature and quality of literary text (Niazi and Gautum, 2010:4).

Thus, Stylistics bridges the gap between linguistic analysis and literary studies. It is a gateway to the interpretation of literary works that helps identify their purpose, goals and effects. Interpreting and finding out literary works objectives, influence and intentions is the major concern of a rather contemporary and a significant field of study that brings literature and linguistics altogether and establishes the firm relation that holds between them. This field which is the major concern of this work is discussed in (2.3 below).

5.2.3 Pragmatic Stylistics

Pragmatic stylistics is a subfield of stylistics that comes into the linguistic scene in the 1960s; however it receives full attention of text analysis during the 1980s and the advent of the 1990s. Given that Stylistics concerns itself with treating the ways in which meaning is created in terms of exploiting linguistic means to actualize literary and other textual ends. That is why, stylisticians make use of linguistic models, techniques and theories to show how and why a text works the way it does, and how textual meanings are encoded and then decoded (Busse et. al., 2010:1).

Huang (2007:19) defines pragma-stylistics or pragmatic stylistics as the application of the theories and methodologies of pragmatics to the study of the concept of style in language. Pragmatics aids stylistics since it widens its scope and equips it with new devices to discover those meanings or affects (Bex et. al., 2010:37). Prose fiction has attracted the attention of stylisticians like Verdonk (2002), Simpson (2004), Toolan (2006), etc. basically because of the shift in the concern of linguistic research away from the core of syntax, phonology, lexicology, semantics, towards the interdisciplinary studies of text and discourse. Influenced by this kind of shift, linguists have given these devices a try to enhance the study of stylistics. Black (2006:2), in her thorough treatment of pragmatic stylistics, states that stylistics deals with the way of understanding the meaning of (a literary) text by different readers or individuals and this can be affected by the language style the reader uses. Since pragmatics is
defined as the study of language in use including the situation around the user; it is, then, better for stylistics to take into consideration the use of the tools that are proposed by pragmatics. In other words, pragmatic stylistics comes close to linguistic stylistics. This variability of stylistics displays the borderlines between pragmatics and stylistics, that is, in what way pragmatic theories, such as speech acts (SAs) can be employed to achieve stylistic purposes. Scholars have shown that the aim of pragmatics is to show how the users of a language can get sentences to communicate their intentions which are not literally stated through the propositional content of the sentences. Stylistics has been shown to be a valuable tool for an analyst who wishes to interpret a text from different points of view (Niazi and Gautum, 2010: 12).

5.3 Model of Analysis

The model to be employed for analyzing selected texts taken from the renowned work of literature in question is based on Eco’s model (1984) as well as Niazi and Gautams’ (2010) model and Al-Hindawi and Abu-Kroozs’ (2012) model with some modification. It is composed of two main linguistic components: stylistic part that incurs different lexical, syntactic, foregrounding and lexical cohesive devices; and pragmatic part which involves distinct pragmatic notions (actualized by means of discrete pragmatic strategies).

5.3.1 Eco’s (1984) Pragmatic Model of Symbolism

Eco (1984) develops a pragmatic approach of symbolism, including pragmatic theories such as speech acts, conversational implicatures and deixis. Black (2006: 125) asserts that an interesting pragmatic approach to symbolism is offered by Eco (1984) in which Eco offers his view of how symbolism works and a possible explanation of why it is used. She (Ibid) adds "This approach does not place major constraints on interpretation; what it does is to suggest how and why we arrive at symbolic readings, and even why we decide that it is an appropriate reading strategy to adopt. Indeed, it is an essential part of Eco’s view that readers will vary in their interpretations according to their encyclopedic knowledge and, generally, what they are able to bring to the text, in the way of deriving appropriate implicatures via the Gricean maxims".
According to Eco (1984: 142) Symbolisms transform the experience into an idea, and an idea into an image, so that the idea expressed by the image remains always active and unattainable and, even though expressed in all languages, remains inexpressible. In "genuine symbolism," the forms do not signify themselves; rather, they "allude to," hint at a wider meaning. A true symbol for Eco offers a range of indeterminate meanings, which neither the author nor the receiver is able to pin down fully.

5.3.1.1 Character as a Source of Symbolism

Eco’s (Ibid) account of symbolism seems to imply that it is most commonly found in the narrator’s voice in a narrative, but this is not always the case, though it is perhaps the commonest. There are also examples of symbolism where focalization is rooted in a character. As with any implicatures, much depends on the reader’s ability to pick up and interpret. There is no guarantee of correct interpretation. This is equally the case with many conversational implicatures in ordinary discourse, which interlocutors may fail to pick up.

5.3.2 Niazi and Gautams’ (2010) Pragma-Stylistic Model

Niazi and Gautam (2010:44) argue that pragma-stylistic analysis in linguistics refers to the identification of patterns of usage in speech and writing, so the analysis of the text in the domain of stylistics incorporates various levels. These levels consist of grammatical, lexical, syntactic, discourse, semantic, pragmatic and levels. In this regard, samples of a text are analyzed in terms of some or all of the features of these linguistic levels. Thus, the analysis is conducted by identifying certain pragma-stylistic devices and their impact on the text.

5.3.2.1 Lexical Analysis

The lexical level of analysis studies the choice of particular lexical items in a text, their distribution in relation to one another, and their meanings. It aims at identifying and determining quality and meaning in text. Consequently, repetitions and groupings of words on lexical ground are to receive analytical focus. It is worth to mention that these lexical items and units come in the form of speech acts (assertives, expressives, representatives, etc...) (Short, 1996: 12).
5.3.2.2 Syntactic Analysis

Sentence structures and rules for ordering and combining words to form larger stretches are mainly related to Syntactic Analysis. In the analysis of syntax, Niazi and Gautam (2010:65) assure that the syntactic structures with reference to complex, compound, simple, long periodic and loose sentences have to be considered. Furthermore, syntactic parallelism and the employment of contrasted sentences may contribute to the stylistic consistency of texts; and creates unique segmental meanings within the scope of the text.

5.3.2.3 Foregrounding

Foregrounding is defined as "that method of highlighting a linguistic feature which the writer wants to make noticeable". It is the general principle of artistic communication that the created work (text) must deviate from the norm (Rajimwale, 2009: 196). In this regard, Niazi and Gautam (2010:7) believe that foregrounding "establishes the hierarchy of meanings and themes in the text, bringing some to the fore and shifting others to the background." Coupling, convergence, contrast, irony, inter-textual connections and few other phenomena come under the umbrella term(foregrounding). They (Ibid) realize the significance of investigating these phenomena altogether since taking them together forms the missing link between the whole text and its minor parts. Thus, foregrounding offers a theory of analysis that helps the reader develop the tools required for active and independent reading, being the core of reader-centered stylistics.

5.3.2.4 Lexical Cohesion

Generally, cohesion is one of the strategies employed by language in building up texts and creating discourses. Niazi and Gautam (2010:71) indicate that cohesion is concerned with the grammatical and lexical ties and connections between different elements in a text (For further information on cohesion see Halliday and Hasans, 1985: 4and Salkei, 1995: 12). There are different but interrelated cohesive elements that construct texts. Thus, cohesion happens whenever the comprehension and configuration of some components in the text or discourse are based on that of another. In other words, the preceding element presupposes the following one(s) and determines their meanings. As already mentioned, cohesion is established by means of various lexical and syntactic devices. In this regard, lexical cohesion assumes a central role in building up texts.
Lexical cohesion is a relationship that holds between lexical items in texts and discourses through repeating similar linguistic items, synonymy which is actualized by loose or close if not identical synonyms, antonyms or oppositions are employed when two words or phrases are opposite in meaning, and collocations which are defined by Halliday and Hasan (1985: 187) as those items that systematically relate to each other in a given text. They also call them collocational cohesion.

5.3.2.5 Speech Acts: Direct and Indirect

In their pragmatic approach to the study of literary works, Niazi and Gautam (2010:71) state that "Speech Act Theory is a theory of language use, which is basically concerned with how people use language for the purpose of communication." They (Ibid) indicate that Austin (1962) develops the theory on the basis of the central notion that language is used to do things. Furthermore, Searle (1969) completes the work of Austin by establishing conditions for speech acts. First, Searle distinguishes between two major types of rules: constitutive and regulative. Then, Searle (1969) adds that speech acts fall into five categories: assertives, expressives, directives, commissives, and declaratives. Each of these five types of acts comprises other sub-acts that could be differentiated from each other by their felicity conditions (Niazi and Gautam, 2010:206)

1. Assertives are speech acts that have the truth-value which state what the speaker believes to be the case or not, using such verbs as: tell, inform, affirm, state, suggest, conclude, deny, report.

2. Expressives are speech acts that tell about the feeling of the speaker. They express an attitude to or about a state of affairs, employing such verbs as: apologize, appreciate, congratulate, deplore, detest, regret, thank, welcome.

3. Directives (imperatives) are attempts to get the hearer to do something, by means of such words as: ask, beg, challenge, command, dare, invite, insist, request.

4. Commissives are speech acts that commit the speaker to a (future) course of action, utilizing verbs such as: guarantee, pledge, promise, swear, vow, undertake.

5. Declaratives – are speech acts that change the world by making the utterance: I now pronounce you man and wife, I sentence you to be hanged by the neck until you be dead, I name this ship....(Ibid: 206-7)

Another important distinction between speech acts is highlighted by Niazi and Gautam, 2010:209) that is: direct and indirect speech acts. A direct speech act is the one that performs
only one linguistic function, whereas an indirect speech act can perform more than one linguistic function at the same time (For fully detailed explanation of direct and indirect speech acts, See Yule, 1996: 47, and Crystal, 2008: 446).

As far as the five basic categories propounded by Searle (1969: 55) are concerned, it can be stated that utterances in literary works in general and novels in particular represent a network of intended (direct and/or indirect) acts that are meant to serve some kind of function(s). According to (Niazi and Gautam, 2010:227) assertives, for instance, are used by novelists to introduce a state of affairs, fulfilling the function of imparting a piece of information to the reader. Consequently, it is easy to realize the fact that the novelists' and writers' pragmatic devices are used to achieve and actualize their stylistic ends.

5.3.2.6 Politeness Principle

In terms of politeness pragmatic notion, Niazi and Gautam (2010:212) consider politeness as the pragmatic principle "that should control the ways according to which language is to be used in order to maintain and consolidate our social relations and linguistic interactions ". Further, the face of a person (the person self-public image) plays a vital role in preserving these social relations and maintaining linguistic interactions. They (Ibid) assert the significance of politeness rules proposed by Lakoff (1979) (the originator of the politeness theory) to the study and analysis of literary works. Lakoff (1979: 102) suggests three rules of politeness that are analogous to Grice’s maxims of conversation:

- Don’t impose (distance)
- Give options (deference)
- Make A feel good- be friendly (camaraderie)

It is believed that these rules are present in any interaction. But they are employed differently in different cultures. Besides, politeness is realized by different pragmatic devices including performative verbs, explicit and implicit hedging, indirect claims, and adverbs to establish solidarity which is one of the basic goals sought by writers/speakers (Hinkel, 1997: 26). Consequently, politeness strategies are combined with other pragmatic means and devices to sustain utterances and fulfill certain stylistic ends. In this regard, Niazi and Gautam (2010:213) think that the pragmatic politeness device might be employed "where the speaker wishes to verbally attack the hearer and at the same time doesn’t want to appear impolite".
5.3.2.7 Deixis

According to Niazi and Gautam (2010:218), deixis is a Greek word that means "pointing via language". It derives its significance from one of the basic functions of utterances we use, namely, pointing at someone, something, or a specific time. Any linguistic item that is used to actualize such references is termed a deictic expression (Ibid). Deictic expressions have their basic uses in face-to-face interactions. Nevertheless, they are context-dependent linguistic elements of utterances. In other words, they may refer to any specific person, place or time depending on the context in which they are employed.

*That man is very tall. He must have trouble buying clothes.*

The deictic expression *(that man)* must be given a pragmatic interpretation, while the pronoun *he* is said to ‘refer back’ to the foregoing element. However, linguistic expressions that are employed as deictic expressions or deictics include demonstratives, first and second person pronouns, and tense markers, adverbs of time and space, and motion verbs (Huang, 2007:134).

5.3.2.8 Conversational Implicatures

It is generally acknowledged that interactants do cooperate in their face-to-face interactions by following certain conversational rules or maxims. Grice (1975) is the first to tackle cooperation. Following Grice, Niazi and Gautam (2010:210) argue that "communication is made possible as a result of interactants' mutual cooperation". Such cooperation is one the basic devices employed by writers/authors to communicate their intentions, aims and ideas to the readers. This is mainly done by violating the four maxims of the cooperative principle, generating conversational implicatures.

Conversational implicatures is a component of speaker's meaning that constitutes an aspect of what is meant in a speaker’s utterance without being part of what is said. What a speaker intends to communicate is characteristically far richer than what s/he directly expresses, linguistic meaning radically underdetermines the message conveyed and understood. Speaker S tacitly exploits pragmatic principles to bridge this gap and counts on hearer H to invoke the same principles for the purposes of utterance interpretation (Horn, 2006: 1).

Moreover, violating the maxims produces many linguistic devices that are used by authors to make a connection with their readers. Pragma-rhetorical tropes are a case in point.
here; consequently Al-Hindawi and Abu-Krooz's (2012) model of Pragma-Rhetorical Tropes is adopted by the researchers for the essential complementary role played by these devices in the analysis conducted in this work.

5.3.3 Al-Hindawi and Abu-Krooz's (2012) Pragma-Rhetorical Tropes Model

Al-Hindawi and Abu-Krooz (2012) advance their model of Pragma-Rhetorical Tropes for the analysis of literary texts, which contains rhetorical devices with pragmatic-oriented ends. The model comprises two major parts, namely, clarification and emphatic tropes.

5.3.3.1 Clarification Tropes

According to Al-Hindawi and Abu-Krooz (2012: 20) a major type of tropes might be employed by writers to impart some attitudinal and evaluative ideas in relation to certain topic or person. Those tropes include:

a. Metaphor

From a Pragmatic perspective, metaphor (which is a rhetorical device with pragmatic dimension) represents one of the major ultimate outcomes of flouting Grice’s conversational maxims (Al-Hindawi and Abu-Krooz, 2012: 20). Metaphor is a figure of similarity, a word or phrase is replaced by an expression denoting an analogous circumstance in a different semantic field (Gibbs; 2001:326). The comparison adds a new dimension of meaning to the original expression. Unlike simile, the comparison is not made explicit (‘like’ or ‘as’) are not used.

b. Simile

Another pragmatic-oriented rhetorical device that is highlighted by Al-Hindawi and Abu-Krooz (2012: 20) is simile. Simile is exploited by writers to exercise some pragma-stylistic effects on the readers (Ibid). Simile is an explicit comparison (using “like” or “as”) between two things of unlike nature that yet have something in common. Two things are openly compared with each other, introduced by ‘like’ or ‘as’ (Cruse, 2006: 165). However, explicit comparisons might be used effectively to leave the desired impact on the readers.

c. Irony

According to Al-Hindawi and Abu-Krooz (2012: 21) irony is heavily built on the pragmatic notions pillars, since it is generally considered by many linguists (like Attardo, 2001:165; Harris, 2008: 10; and Xiang Li, 2008:5) as sub-strategy of a broader category of indirect speech acts as well as conversational implicatures. Irony is some kind of difference
between what an interlocutor utters and what he or she believes to be true, such as the utterance “What a sunny day” during a storm (Xiang Li, 2008:5). Pragmatically speaking, any utterance (depending on the context) can be used for the purpose of irony, whether it signals the opposite or echoes some other person attitude.

### 5.3.3.2 Emphatic Tropes

Al-Hindawi and Abu-Krooz (2012: 21) identify another important major type of rhetorical tropes that might be employed by writers/speakers for emphatic pragmatic purposes. The emphasis tropes include:

**a. Rhetorical Questions**

Generally, rhetorical questions (RQs) are questions that require no answers (Al-Hindawi and Abu-Krooz, 2012: 22). They form a distinguishing stylistic feature of the writings and works of some writers (Ibid). Moreover, a rhetorical question is an effective pragma-rhetorical tool that might be used to persuade readers of adopting those writers' own ideas and beliefs. Pragmatically speaking, rhetorical questions have the illocutionary force of an assertion of the opposite polarity from what is apparently asked. That is, a rhetorical positive question has the illocutionary force of a negative assertion, and a rhetorical negative question has the illocutionary force of a positive assertion (Black, 2006:26).

**b. Overstatement (Hyperbole)**

Using some exaggerating linguistic devices with pragmatic functions is another significant characteristic of the writing style of some writers (Ibid.: 22); of course, Joseph Conrad is a case in point in this regard. This linguistic exaggeration is termed by linguists as Hyperbole or overstatement. Hyperbole is defined as a figure of speech involving deliberate exaggeration for rhetorical effect, to increase impact or to attract attention. Exaggeration may be negative or positive (Cruse, 2006: 80). After metaphor, hyperbole is the most common trope.

**c. Understatement (Litotes)**

Al-Hindawi and Abu-Krooz (2012: 22) argue that understatement is seen as a by-product of flouting the maxims of quantity and quality. Thus, it is utilized by writers and speakers for emphatic pragma-rhetorical ends (Ibid.). An understatement is a statement which, somehow, because it is conspicuously less informative than some other statement, can be used to express the meaning of the more informative statement (Ruiz, 2006: 6). Such purposeful uninformativity runs counter to the Gricean principle that one should do what one
can to make oneself understood, but it is consistent with the contrary principle that one should do no more than one has to. Pulling the observations discussed above together, the eclectic model can be introduced as illustrated by Figure (1) below.

Figure (1) An Eclectic Model for the Pragma-Stylistic Analysis of Symbolism
5.4. Data and Analysis

5.4.1 Data

The data of the work are represented by the texts taken from the novel under scrutiny. These texts are characterized by certain properties which are highlighted below:

1. It is an interactional process that advances in the following way: At the outset of each text, Joseph Conrad uses a combination of Pragma-Stylistic strategies intermixed with one another (indirect/direct speech acts and/or conversational implicatures connected by means of deictic and politeness expressions). Additionally, all the aforementioned pragmatic strategies are triggered actualizing various lexical cohesive devices at the same time, which in turn triggers symbolic modes and produces their effect in the mind of the reader.

2. In a similar vein, it is noteworthy that indirect speech acts along with politeness strategies combined with foregrounding devices are so heavily used that their employment outnumbers the use of other pragma-stylistic devices in the text. This fact is very significant since it reflects the great linguistic abilities and the highly elevated style of the narrator/novelist.

3. Different parts of the text of the novel explicitly and implicitly tackle various themes and fundamental concern of post-colonial issue and its symbols.

5.4.2 Analysis

5.4.2.1 Methods of Analysis

The model developed by this study and schematized in Figure (1) above is the basic apparatus for analyzing the data under analysis. The analysis conducted by means of this model represents the pragma-stylistic analysis. The analysis is quantitatively supported by a statistic analysis performed by employing the percentage equation.

5.4.2.2 Pragma-Stylistic Text Analysis

5.4.2.2.1 Pragma-Stylistic Structure

As far as the pragmatic structure of symbolism is concerned, the analysis shows that symbolic mode is a communicative mode of interaction which comprises three sub-modes or phases: the triggering mode phase, the maintaining mode phase, and the sealing mode phase. These phases or stages are composed of certain pragmatic-stylistic components forming the pragma-stylistic structure of symbolism which can be illustrated as follows:

In the triggering mode phase (See for example Text 1 below), the analysis reveals that five central pragma-stylistic components, namely: speech acts, conversational implicatures,
deixis, synonymy and parallelism are the constructing elements of this opening stage of symbolism. Speech acts, conversational implicatures, deixis, synonymy and parallelism are realized by various pragmatic and stylistic strategies. The analysis of the data of the maintaining mode phase of symbolism shows that five pragma-stylistic constituents compose the pragma-stylistic construct of this phase, viz. pragma-rhetorical tropes, conversational implicatures, politeness, structural cohesive devices and synonymy. As for, the analysis of data of the final sealing phase, it indicates that this stage contains two pragmatic elements, in addition to other two interrelated stylistic ones, namely, speech acts, pragma-rhetorical tropes, parallelism and synonymy.

To sum up, the analysis of the three phases above shows that pragma-stylistic structure of symbolism is composed of seven major components, viz. speech acts, conversational implicatures, deixis, politeness, pragma-rhetorical tropes, parallelism, synonymy and structural cohesive devices. This finding fulfils the first aim of this study, namely: identifying the pragmatic structure of symbolism, that is the pragma-stylistic components of which symbolism is composed) and verifies its first hypothesis which reads: speech acts, conversational implicatures, deixis, politeness, pragma-rhetorical tropes, parallelism, synonymy and structural cohesive devices are the major pragmatic components of symbolism.

5.4.2.2.2 Pragma-Stylistic Strategies

The analysis of the speech act, deixis and conversational implicatures strategies used in the triggering mode reveals that the assertive, expressive, representative and declarative speech act, quality and quantity maxims, and deictic strategies are all used in triggering symbolic mode of interaction. However, Expressive and assertive speech acts strategies as well as deictic strategy are the most common pragmatic strategies used as they have high percentages as compared to others. Similarly, synonyms and parallel structures strategies are the distinguishing stylistic strategies of this symbolic opening mode. This finding verifies the first part of the second hypothesis proposed in this work, that is, (assertive, expressive, representative and declarative speech acts, quality, quantity and relation maxims, deictic strategies, are the most common strategies exploited in triggering symbolic modes of interaction)

As regards the maintaining symbolic mode of interaction phase, the analysis indicates that pragma rhetorical tropes, politeness and conversational implicatures are represented by
simile and rhetorical questions strategies, tact maxim, quality, quantity and relation maxims strategies. This finding verifies the second part of the second hypothesis of this study (**simile and rhetorical questions strategies, tact maxim, parallel structures, and synonyms strategies are the most common strategies exploited in maintaining symbolic modes of interaction**). Yet, quality, and quantity maxims strategies are the most dominant pragmatic strategies employed. This fact is verified by the high percentages of employing them as compared to others. Stylistic synonymy and cohesive devices are represented by synonyms, repetition strategies which have the highest density of use in the texts under analysis.

Finally, the analysis of the sealing mode phase shows that the following strategies are used in relation to the four pragma-stylistic components of which this phase is composed: expressive and representative speech acts, simile, parallel structures, and synonyms. It is noteworthy that the parallel structures and synonyms strategies have the highest occurrences among the whole four pragma-stylistic elements of symbolism in this stage.

**Text (1)**

"They were dying slowly—it was very clear. They were not enemies, they were not criminals, they were nothing earthly now—nothing but black shadows of disease and starvation, lying confusedly in the greenish gloom. Brought from all the recesses of the coast in all the legality of time contracts, lost in uncongenial surroundings, fed on unfamiliar food, they sickened, became inefficient, and were then allowed to crawl away and rest. These moribund shapes were free as air—and nearly as thin. I began to distinguish the gleam of the eyes under the trees. Then, glancing down, I saw a face near my hand. The black bones reclined at full length with one shoulder against the tree, and slowly the eyelids rose and the sunken eyes looked up at me, enormous and vacant, a kind of blind, white flicker in the depths of the orbs, which **died** out slowly."(Conrad, 1902/1983:19).

Text (1) is of great significance since it triggers the symbolic mode between the narrator and the reader that reflects the fact that the natives remain an element (symbol) of fantasy for Marlow (the narrator) until he meets them. These natives represent the interruption of European fantasy for a moment, that is, they are real and a shock for Marlow. He describes the natives, as in this discourse, which is employed by Conrad to deeply influence his readers and to stress his rejection to colonialism.

The pragma-stylistic structure of this **opening symbolic mode** of interaction is composed of speech acts, conversational implicatures, synonymy, parallelism and deixis. This finding
validates the first part of the first hypothesis of this work (speech acts, conversational implicatures, deixis, politeness, pragma-rhetorical tropes, parallelism, synonymy and structural cohesive devices are the major pragmatic components of symbolism). These pragma-stylistic intricate elements are blended and combined by means of one complex pragma-stylistic strategy realized by various strategies distributed as follows. The triggering mode is initiated by the use of contextual symbolic forms and expressions actualized by a series of expressive SAs (They were dying slowly, it was very clear, They were not enemies, they were not criminals, they were nothing earthly now) and deictic devices (they, now, these) placed in parallel structures and which are mixed with synonyms (enemies, criminals, black shadows, moribund shapes) and repetitions of the deictic (they) to indirectly condemn the brutality of colonialism and convince the reader of this belief. This finding verifies the first part of the second hypothesis (assertive, expressive, representative and declarative speech acts, quality, quantity and relation maxims, deictic strategies, are the most common strategies exploited in triggering symbolic modes of interaction).

Marlow cannot exactly define the natives; however, the only thing he is sure is that they suffer under the control of the Europeans. Besides, he is aware that the Europeans also give harm to nature in order to earn more. In other words, Marlow realizes that Europeans destroy not only the natives but also the jungle. So, he symbolizes these condemned deeds by means of intricate network of pragma-stylistic strategies that are placed together to establish two issues central to the core of this novel, that is, colonialism and injustice. The tremendously interwoven texture of this text incorporates a blend of various pragma-stylistic devices utilized by Conrad in order to set the scene for such important themes.

The immediate phase of maintaining the symbolic mode consists of pragma-rhetorical tropes, conversational implicatures, politeness, synonyms and cohesive devices. This finding validates the second part of the first hypothesis of this work (speech acts, conversational implicatures, deixis, politeness, pragma-rhetorical tropes, parallelism, synonymy and structural cohesive devices are the major pragmatic components of symbolism). Amazingly, the highly intricate continuity of the text carries on and develops smoothly without interruption by reduplicating the same pragma-stylistic strategies which actualize the pragma-stylistic components of this phase in a way that reflects discourse unity and powerful style of the writer/narrator. Thus, the text reinvents itself through resorting to another group of representative SAs (Brought from, fed on unfamiliar) followed by two representative
Strategies (they sickened, became inefficient). Stylistically, another group of stylistic devices are intermingled and interwoven into the pragmatic structure of the text. This stylistic texture is formed by means of lexical ties of synonymy devices put in the form of adjectives (uncongenial, unfamiliar, moribund) and verbs (lost, sickened, and become) which are supported by another pragma-stylistic strategy of simile realized in as air—and nearly as thin. The finding here verifies the second part of the second hypothesis of this study (simile and rhetorical questions strategies, tact maxim, parallel structures, and synonyms strategies are the most common strategies exploited in maintaining symbolic modes of interaction).

Surprisingly, the pragma-stylistic complex strategy is duplicated in the final sealing mode of interaction phase, which has the following pragma-stylistic constructing elements (i.e. speech acts, pragma-rhetorical tropes, parallelism and synonymy). This is done by means of another series of polite expressive SAs (began to distinguish, glancing down, I saw a face near, the eyelids rose which died out slowly) that implicate and realize additional stylistic functions of synonymy and repetition represented by stylistic items like (die and eye). Moreover, these stylistic devices are also used in such a parallel lexical and structural order that they contribute to the discoursal unity and high textuality of the text. These facts and frequencies are shown in Table (1).

Table (1) Frequencies and Percentages of Stylistic and Pragmatic Devices in Text (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pragma-Stylistic Strategies (PSS)</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synonymy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Structure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deictic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PSS</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure (2): Rates of the Pragma-Stylistic Strategies in Text 1

Text (2)
"I’ve seen the devil of violence, and the devil of greed, and the devil of hot desire; but, by all the stars! These were strong, lusty, red-eyed devils, that swayed and drove men—men, I tell you. But as I stood on this hillside, I foresaw that in the blinding sunshine of that land I would become acquainted with a flabby, pretending, weak-eyed devil of a rapacious and pitiless folly. How insidious he could be, too, I was only to find out several months later and a thousand miles farther. For a moment stood appalled, as though by a warning. Finally descended the hill, obliquely, towards the trees I had seen. ‘I avoided a vast artificial hole somebody had been digging on the slope, the purpose of which I found it impossible to divine. It wasn't a quarry or a sandpit, anyhow.” (Conrad, 1902/1983:20).

Text (2) linguistically constructs its symbolic mode of interaction via the employment of the pragma-stylistic elements of speech acts, parallelism, conversational implicatures, synonymy, deixis and politeness. These pragma-stylistic components are realized by a complex pragma-stylistic strategy fulfilled as follows: The text begins with an assertive SA strategy (I’ve seen the…), combined with three expressive structurally paralleled (the devil of violence, and the devil of greed, and the devil of hot desire) strategies that are followed by an array of stylistic strategies of repetition (the devil of) and synonymy (strong, lusty, red-eyed), which are combined with the stylistic device of parallelism of structures that include at the same time near synonymous lexical cohesive words along with the pragmatic deictic expressions (I stood on this, I foresaw that). It is clear that, this text incorporates a
highly fabricated stylistic texture realized by the employment of pragmatic elements such the pragmatic deictic strategy (I, these and it) which actualize a stylistic function of repetition.

This fact is evident in the employment of various stylistic means: a foregrounding device is actualized in the parallel sentences, which in turn include repetition devices by repeating the lexical item (devil) along. The reason behind adopting so many stylistic devices is that, these linguistically interrelated aspects, based on Widdowson's view (1975:221), play an important part in the setting up of the intra-textual relations that hold between the textual linguistic elements.

It is noteworthy that the quantity maxim is being infringed through adding further descriptions (the devil of violence, and the devil of greed, and the devil of hot desire) more than usually expected or required by the reader in order emphasize the and maintain the symbolic European mode represented by the (devil) in the text. Further, the relation maxim is violated in terms the rhetorical question (RQ) (How insidious he could be) strategy which has another emphatic purpose of consolidating the central mode of symbolism actualized in the text. Then, the pragma-stylistic complex strategy is that triggers the symbolic mode of interaction is reinvented sealing the text by means of another series of assertive and expressive SAs (I stood appalled, I descended the, I had seen, ‘I avoided a vast artificial, I found it impossible .It wasn’t a quarry) which are again utilized by Conrad to perform several stylistic functions of repetition, synonymy and parallel structuring.

**Table (2):** Frequencies and Percentages of Stylistic and Pragmatic Devices in Text (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pragma-Stylistic Strategies (PSS)</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity Maxim</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation Maxim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deictic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synonymy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Structure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PSS</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Text (3)
"Not a very enthralling book; but at the first glance you could see there a singleness of intention, an honest concern for the right way of going to work, which made these humble pages, thought out so many years ago, luminous with another than a professional light. The simple old sailor, with his talk of chains and purchases, made me forget the jungle and the pilgrims in a delicious sensation of having come upon something unmistakably real. Such a book being there was wonderful enough; but still more astounding were the notes pencilled in the margin, and plainly referring to the text."(Conrad, 1902/1983:61).

Text (3), initiates another symbolic mode of interaction which comprises the same pragma-stylistic constructing elements noticed in building up Text (2), i.e. (speech acts, parallelism, conversational implicatures, synonymy, deixis and politeness). These stylistic and pragmatic components form the pragma-stylistic structure of symbolism of this text. They are represented by utilizing a very neat intricate network of pragma-stylistic strategies which commences with pairs of synonymy strategies actualized in the words (honest, right, work, professional, luminous, light).

This text definitely supports Conrad's perspective on the of European modes of representation that are present in Marlow's finding a book, An Inquiry into some Points of Seamanship, in a deserted hut. This discourse implies that the Europeans dominate the natives’ lands and the book stands for European ways of life. This view is established by
employing a combination of pragma-stylistic strategies. The text is commenced with two stylistic groups of successive synonym cohesive devices combined with parallel structures (singless of intention, an honest concern for the right). Moreover, the same thing can be said in relation to the intra-textual parallelism between enthralling book and humble pages) which are used to assert this mode of interaction by infringing the relation maxim. In addition, the quantity maxim is being opt out by adding the aforementioned strategies. Then, an assertive strategy and an additional quantity maxim is violated by means of the stretch (The simple old sailor, with his talk of chains and purchases, made me forget the jungle). Very significant and highly interwoven the lexical items of the texture of text (3) are! The double-function that Conrad exploits in building up the texture of his text is the source of his creativity and success. Also, two expressive (sensation of having come upon something) and declarative (made me forget the jungle) pragmatic strategies are employed to seal the text.

Additionally, deictic pronouns (you, his, and me) are used here to interrelate the speech acts and strengthen the whole text. Another noticeable notion is the employment of the stylistic device of lexical repetition of near synonyms (right, honest, real, concern and intention) in order to maintain the symbolic mode relevant to the book and to enhance the texture of the text. It is worth to mention that synonym devices are also paralleled. Thus, there is high density of parallel structures that equals the number of other stylistic devices. Table (3) below provides the frequencies and percentages of each strategy.

Table (3) Frequencies and Percentages of Stylistic and Pragmatic Devices in Text (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pragger-Stylistic Strategies (PSS)</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity Maxim</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation Maxim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deictic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synonymy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Structure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total PSS</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.3 Results and Discussion

Analyzing the selected texts reveals the following results:

1. Generally, stylistic devices are realized by the use of other pragmatic counterparts, particularly assertive, and expressive speech acts and deictic expressions, in order to create the unity of thought achieved by the utilization of this complex pragma-stylistic aided by the unity of the forms exploited.

2. Various lexical cohesive ties are heavily used through the whole text with special focus on different forms of synonymy (near and full) and repetition which have the highest density in the texts analyzed and is used to depict a complete picture of what is stated in the text. These lexical devices are actualized in the form of different speech act strategies.

3. The Foregrounding device is another distinguishing stylistic feature that is realized through the text via the employment of various stylistic devices, such as parallel structures, phrases and words, and deviant uses of some lexical items. Such deviance is represented by pragmatic conversational implicatures and pragma-rhetorical strategies.

4. Interestingly, Lexis (the choice of specific lexical items) is highly interwoven and is fully employed in favour of building up smooth undisrupted intra-textual relations that contribute to the unified texture of the texts analyzed.
5. Expressive and assertive direct speech acts are utilized in abundance (in texts 1 and 2) either alone or combined with other speech acts and deictic expressions as well as various stylistic devices of synonymy. Such direct issuance of speech acts is justified by the fact that the most important and critical issues must be made clear fully and explicitly.

6. Politeness strategies are implicitly issued by means of certain stylistic devices, sometimes, and indirect speech acts. However, representatives are also adopted in the text as obvious politeness indicators that usually reflect how intimate with and close the speaker is to addressee or the reader.

8. Remarkably, deictic pragmatic strategies are mainly actualized in the form of separable personal pronouns that respectively function as pragmatic discoursal connectors, bringing different stylistic and pragmatic means together.

9. Quantity and relation maxims are the most common conversational maxims used to issue conversational implicatures.

5.5 Conclusions
On the basis of the results and findings arrived at through the analysis, the following conclusions can be introduced:

1. The pragma-stylistic structure of symbolism is composed of a speech acts, conversational implicatures, deixis, politeness, pragma-rhetorical tropes, parallelism, synonymy and structural cohesive devices.

2. Expressive and assertive speech acts strategies as well as deictic strategy are the most common pragmatic strategies used as they have high percentages as compared to others(%17.4, %11.5, and %5.7)/(%8.5)/%17.4,%17.4, and10.8) of use among the entire pragmatic strategies employed. They implicate and actualize stylistic lexical cohesive devices. This is done to consolidate the text and give it precision and highly intricate texture that reflects the high elevated style and creativity of the narrator/writer, which are employed to deeply affect his addressees/readers.

3. The most significant stylistic device used and most frequently repeated through the whole analyzed texts is parallelism (parallel structures and expressions) in order to preserve text unity. This conclusion is confirmed by the high percentage of employing this stylistic device (% 20.4, % 15, and %32.5).
4. The texts' precision and discoursal micro and macro unity result from another significant linguistic tool, that is, stylistic devices (introduced below), which are intricately and amazingly interwoven into the entire structure of the text.

5. Repetition and synonymy also have exceptional intra-textual densities each serving a particular stylistic aim. Consequently, each stylistic cohesive device serves several interrelated various distinct pragma-based and stylistically aimed ends clearly justified with close scrutiny. However, the analysis of three texts shows that the leading percentages are those of exploiting repetition, and the analysis of texts (2 and 3) displays the highest frequencies (%24.6, and % 21.6) respectively.

6. The speech act (representative and declarative) strategies are also used with frequency in Text (1) and (3); while collocation parallel stylistic device is mainly used in Text (3). This finding assures the fact that style variation employed by Conrad is aimed at giving his text a discoursal unity in a comprehensive way.

7. The successful and effective management of the pragmatic strategies to deal with speech acts, which are normally considered as face threatening acts, that might endanger the goals of producing the text supports the creativity of Conrad's style.

8. Figures of speech like simile and RQs are utilized by Conrad whenever it is necessary to provide his addressee/reader with a pure image of critical issues and confusing situations.

9. Directness and simple highly interwoven creative textuality are the salient features of this monumental masterpiece novel: employing the ordinary words that are at the disposal of everyone in the most extraordinary ways is what grants the text its fame and dominance. The undeniable and undefiable capturing style is its distinguishing remark.

10. It is evident that Conrad employs pragmatic means in order to fulfill his stylistic ends. This collusion is supported by a rather equal use of pragmatic strategies of deixis that realize the same number of synonymy and repetition strategies. Further, the same thing applies to the utilization of the expressive and assertive SAs that have additional and equal stylistic functions of synonymy and repetition.
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CHAPTER SIX

A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF GOSSIP IN RICHARD BRINSELY SHERIDAN'S 'THE SCHOOL FOR SCANDAL'

Fareed H. H. Al-Hindawi
Ramia Fuaad Mirza

6.1. Introduction

Gossip is a topic that is very easy to interact with when heard of for the first time. It is very common to the extent that it is sometimes thought to be a manifestation of any 'ordinary' everyday life – a very important part of our communicative and "social behaviour that nearly everyone experiences, contributes to, and presumably intuitively understands" (Foster, 2004, p. 78).

Nevertheless, in the twentieth century gossip has attracted the attention of only anthropologists, psychologists, sociologists, evolutionary biologists, philosophers and literary critics (Prodan, 1998, p.1).

Nowadays, emphasis has been shifted to approach gossip differently at various levels. For example, there have been studies (such as Prodan's, just cited) that have tackled gossip in a hybrid method (that is, sociological and linguistic (at both the pragmatic and the sociolinguistic levels)). Other studies, such as Eggnis and Slade's (1997), have dealt with gossip linguistically but in a superficial way. That is, they have quickly referred to the politeness principle and the search for agreement in their approach of gossip without giving a full account of the employment of this principle in gossip. Besides they have only limited their study to the negative side of gossip, whereas almost all the scholars, who deal with the topic, agree that gossip does have a positive facet.

Accordingly, the present study attempts to establish a pure pragmatic perspective of gossip through investigating its generic pragmatic structure (that is to say, the different stages of gossip). Besides, it aims to develop a model to pragmatically analyze gossip which, at the same time, can be utilized to help trace the pragmatic achievement of the different functions
of gossip. To achieve these, twenty situations taken from Sheridan's comedy as a whole will be analyzed on the basis of the model developed.

6.2. Definition

It is very common that when anybody embarks on explaining something, s/he begins by giving a definition in order to draw a clear picture of that very thing. But, paradoxically, there might be cases, of which gossip is one, where it is very difficult to put forward a clear-cut definition that fits all cases. That is, gossip is one of the terms that are defined differently on the basis of how one tries to approach or study it. For instance, if one tries to approach gossip sociologically, then gossip can be defined as "away of talking between women in their roles as women, intimate in style, personal and domestic in topic and setting, a female cultural event which springs from and perpetuates the restrictions of the female role, but also gives the comfort of validation" (Jones, 1980, p. 243; for more definitions, see, p. Rosnow and Fine (1976, p.87), De Sousa (1994, p. 26), De Vos (1996, p. 20), Holland (1996, p. 198), Emler (2001, p. 318) and Iterson et al. (2002, p. 26)).

It can be said, then, that the definition of gossip is stipulative, p. it can be tailored according to one's aims of studying it. By so saying, an agreement with Izuogu (2009, p. 10) is reached. He states that "gossip does not lend itself to simple definitions or uniform explanations. We all know what gossip is, but defining, identifying, and measuring it is a complex enterprise for practical investigations".

However, as far as this work is concerned, the operational definition will be Foster's (2004, p. 83), p. "in a context of congeniality, gossip is the exchange of personal information (positive or negative) in an evaluative way (positive or negative) about absent third parties" (italics ours).

In the following few lines, a short elucidation shows how this definition addresses the problem of this study – the pragmatic tackling of gossip. The key word in Foster's definition is 'exchange'. Exchange is, actually, an umbrella term that embraces different pragmatic notions. Since any exchange requires at least two interlocutors to communicate, then such a kind of communication means that the pragmatic concepts (such as the Cooperative Principle and Conversational Implicature, the Politeness Principle, and Presupposition) are (almost) all employed in order to open the channel of communication and keep it open as well, regardless of how this communication ends (i.e., whether or not it satisfies the convictions of both of the communicating parties). Put differently, any exchange
almost means the non-literal use of language to mean (communicate) more than it seems to at face value. That very thing (i.e., the additional hidden meaning) is one of the main domains of pragmatics – the pillar of this work.

There remains one thing to close down the discussion on the definition of gossip, p. why should gossip be launched in a context of congeniality? Why not in an ordinary context of communication (two interlocutors (at least) with a specific topic)? Eggnis and Slade (1997, p. 282) give an illustrative account on this point. They argue that unless that sense of agreement is confirmed (to the speaker), then s/he will back away from the gossip. Besides, if the interlocutors (participants) do not agree with the gossip, then they will not enable the gossip (in particular) and communication (in general) to continue. By so claiming, Eggnis and Slade as well as this work confirm the idea that the cooperative aspect of people's conversational activity is manifested in the preference for agreement in discourse.

6.3. Functions of Gossip

It is well-known that language, as the basic means of communication, is used to perform different functions. Whether transactional, interactional or aesthetic, any exchange should be purposeful. So gossip, as an exchange, must have functions as well. Despite the slight differences, there is a considerable agreement on the number and taxonomy of the functions of gossip (One exception is De Vos (1996, p. 23-4), where he numerates only three functions for gossip. But at closer inspection, it seems that they are actually four, in that the first function, social control, embeds another function – influence. For more details, see ibid.). Gossip has four main functions, p. knowledge, friendship, influence, and entertainment.

6.3.1 Knowledge

The first function of gossip is to exchange information (knowledge) about others. It might be known that there are two ways whereby a person can get information about the other(s). One is direct by asking the person himself (which is normally dispreferred and employed almost in official contexts); the other is indirect by asking some people (whether friends, acquaintances, neighbours, etc.) about some other one, and this type is very common in the majority of societies.

As far as gossip is concerned, it is definitely an indirect yet a basic and "an efficient means of gathering and disseminating information" (Foster, 2004, p. 84). By the same token, Schmidt
(2004, p.17) remarks that gossip "serves as a way to inform and receive information". Being an indirect way of communicating different kinds of information (as hinted at before, see introduction), gossip involves two facets, p. positive and negative. It is positive when it is, for example, "meant to instruct another about appropriate actions within the surrounding culture" (Baumeister et al., 2004, p. 115). On the other hand, it becomes negative when it is used as a means of devaluing or destroying others' (names), or even as a scandalous tool (Eggnis and Slade, 1997, p. 280; Foster, 2004, p. 84).

There remains one important thing, referred to by Foster (ibid.), about the various pieces of information to be considered gossip. He invokes Yerkovich (1977) to assert that "information, no matter how salient or scandalous, isn't gossip unless the participants know enough about the people involved to experience the thrill of revelation". Knowing the people involved in gossip breathes relevance to the aforementioned context of congeniality (See 2. above) at two levels, p. the first is concerned with the agreement which people seek. If people do not know each other, then they will not engage in gossip because they do not feel safe to talk about others as freely as they want (especially if the communicated pieces of information are unfavorable). The second is concerned with the different functions one tries to achieve via gossip. Whatever the function might be, the possibility of achieving it will dwindle if the people involved do not know each other [For more details on this function, see De Backer (2005), Chapter 2.]

6.3.2 Friendship

As De Vos (1996, p. 24), Dunbar (2004, p. 105), and Foster (2004, p.85) notify, gossip plays a good role in establishing or strengthening relationships with others. It does so at both the individual level and the group level. As for the first, gossip can be employed as a way of advertising one's own advantages, as a friend, an ally or even a mate. At the group level, on the other hand, people either break the ice (i.e. people gossip to clarify more their viewpoints about others), or they gossip to cement already developed relationships. Viewed as such, gossip, at the group level, can either include or exclude people depending on the degree of 'friendliness' or 'intimacy' shown by the different people involved in gossip. In a nutshell, by functioning as a friendship motivator, gossip, at the group level, distinguishes insiders from outsiders.
6.3.3 Influence

This is the most important function of gossip, as claimed by Foster (ibid., p. 86). He thinks that gossip can help draw a map of the social behavior of the individual either competitively or instructively. The function of influence is viewed as competitive when people "attempt to gain control in situations, purposefully influencing the attitudes and actions of others in a specific direction" (Schmidt, 2004, p. 15). It becomes instructive when it is, for example, employed to reform or stigmatize the sinner, or when it sheds light on what (not) to behave in different contexts. Dunbar (2004, p. 105), in his turn, adds another aspect of the instructive influence of gossip, p. seeking or giving advice to others.

The importance of this function manifests itself in the fact that when we try to learn (or when we are being taught) certain norms or forms of social behavior, both formally and informally, then gossip would be the most common means to do so as it needs no special skill to produce, as do storytelling and singing, for instance (Foster, 2004, p.86). It must be mentioned that the degree of influence of gossip varies from one person to another, the thing which is beyond the scope of this study.

6.3.4 Entertainment

There are times, as Foster (ibid.) observes, when gossip serves no less no more than a way of passing some (redundant) time between interlocutors. It is neither used for knowledge, nor for friendship or influence – it is merely used for the "immediacy of amusement". Consequently, gossip as entertainment can be said to provide relief from monotony in certain work environments (Foster, ibid.), or it can, as De Vos (1996, p.24) comments, "create catharsis for guilt; constitute a form of wish fulfillment".

The most important thing to be noted about this function is that "the entertainment value of gossip occurs outside the actual exchange" (Foster, ibid.). He stresses that the entertaining value of gossip cannot be scaled at any level because it is something emotional or psychological that differs from one person to another. He supports his opinion by invoking what Spacks (1982, p. 21) argues that trying to account for the entertaining factor of gossip is just "like efforts to elucidate what's funny in a joke". Accordingly, this very function will not undergo the pragmatic analysis intended to be held in this study, as pragmatics has nothing to do neither with emotions nor with psychology.

Before embarking on explaining this model, it must be mentioned that it was the only one found as serving the purposes of this study at the time of conducting this research, as such this model is the only one invoked.

Eggnis and Slade (1997, p. 284-98) present their view by positing a clear idea about what a generic structure is meant to be. They characterize such a structure as being 'ideal', p. it has no fixed or rigid schema; rather it is a description of the underlying structure which participants often orient (but not necessarily stick) to.

As such, one can conclude that the structure of gossip is as stipulative as its definition. Yet, as they assert, there are obligatory and optional elements or stages (as they, apparently, use the two terms interchangeably) for gossip, as discussed below, p.

6.4.1 Different Stages of Gossip

These stages, as they (ibid.) point out, occur in a specified sequence, as follows, p.

1. **Third Person Focus (TPF) Stage**, p. Functions to introduce the gossipee and in most cases to beckon the deviant behavior.

2. **Substantiating Behavior (SB) Stage**, p. This stage functions to present two things, p. the event about which gossip launches (as this event highlights some departure from normality); and the solid support (enough convincing information) provided by the gossiper(s) to make the other participants pass a negative evaluation.

3. **Pejorative Evaluation (PE) Stage**, p. This is the final stage where the events outlined in the SB stage are evaluated and commented on. As a matter of fact, it is in the PE that a gossip exchange is motivated and driven forward.

Eggnis and Slade (ibid.) give an important clue on these stages, p. in spite of being obligatory (core), these stages do not occur alone. There might be other intervening elements that co-occur with them (and thus called optional).

To clarify more, they argue that in the process between signalizing a behavior as being inappropriate or unacceptable (hence providing evidence) and then pejoratively evaluating it, there is often a speaker who requests more details. In other words, the cycle of SB followed by PE is often prompted by another speaker asking for further information. This optional element in which such a request is made has been labelled **Probe**. Another optional element which might follow the probe is **Defense**, p. where a listener disagrees with the speaker (gossiper) by defending some aspect of the gossipee. And this is normally followed by a
Response to Defense (by the gossiper). As a result of these two elements, there comes a compromise position where one of the parties concedes, and here we have what is called Concession. The final optional element in this generic structure is labelled Wrap-up, p. a thematic summation of the event which pinpoints the aforementioned deviant behavior in the TPF stage.

Eggnis and Slade sum up this generic structure in the following way, p. TPF stage paves the way for the negative (pejorative) evaluation which is reached by means of the SB stage whose function is to provide sufficient support that lays the ground for the PE, as just hinted at. Besides, they devise the structural formulae (that includes both the obligatory and optional elements) for gossip as follows, p.

Third Person Focus ^ [{Substantiating Behavior ● {(Probe)/ Pej. Evaluation} ^ (Defense) ^ (Response to Defense)] " ^ (Concession) ^ (Wrap-up)}]"

Key, p.
[^ = is followed by, ●= occur in either sequence, () = optional, [] = domain of recursion or sequencing, {= either/ or, "=recursion].

Eggnis and Slade finish up explaining their generic structure by further detailing the PE stage (as it is the real stage in which gossip is motivated and driven forward, as mentioned before (See 4.1 above). They summarize what they have in mind in Fig (1) below.

**Figure 1. The structure of the pejorative stage**

They give the following examples to further clarify these divisions, p.
1. (It is really ridiculous), an example on evaluation of offence as an attribute.
2. (It was the laughing stock of the whole hospital), as a value.
3. (She's pretty insecure, that girl), an example on the general attribute of the offender evaluation.
4. (She has made an absolute fool of herself), as a specific.
5. (She was the laughing stock of the whole hospital), as a value.
6. (I just do not understand), as an example on evaluation by incomprehension.
7. (I mean I would have asked), an example on evaluation by an alternative behavior.

6.4.2 The Generic Pragmatic Structure of Gossip as Developed in this Study
On the basis of what has been just reviewed about the generic structure of gossip, it is time to achieve the second aim of this work, p. developing the generic pragmatic structure of gossip, which will itself be the model utilized to analyze the data. Egganis and Slade's (1997) structure will be partially adopted for one reason, p. theirs concentrates only on the negative facet of gossip, whereas gossip has two valences, positive and negative, as indicated before (See 2. above).

The developed pragmatic structure (henceforth, the model) can be illustrated as follows, p. Gossip consists of three stages, p. **Third Person Focus** stage (henceforth, **TPF**), **Substantiating Behavior** stage (henceforth, **SB**), and **Evaluation** stage (henceforth, **E**). Two important things must be indicated in advance. First, the third stage has been named as evaluation only in order not to specify it with only one facet of gossip (whether positive or negative); rather, it refers to the general concept of gossip. Second, only the obligatory (core) elements of the structure will be included, all other optional elements will be excluded to make the model (and consequently the analysis) simpler.

6.4.2.1 Third Person Focus Stage
This stage introduces the gossipee in addition to some information about her/him to be gossiped. It has been hinted at before that any piece of information cannot be considered as gossip unless the gossipees are known by the people involved in this exchange (See 3.1 above). Pragmatically speaking, "what a speaker (writer) assumes is true or known by a listener (reader) can be described as a presupposition" (Yule, 2006, p. 117). Hence, the TPF is pragmatically achieved by presupposition.
Presupposition is of six types, p. existential, factive, non-factive, lexical, structural and counterfactual (Yule, 1996, p.27-30) [For the definition and example on each of these types, see ibid].

6.4.2.2 Substantiating Behavior Stage

In this stage, the gossiper should posit some extra convincing support to get others involved in gossip. To pragmatically achieve this goal, the data reveal that conversational implicature is the pragmatic strategy that is employed to pass through this stage. But a point of caution must be raised here. By conversational implicature is not meant the ordinary violation of the Gricean maxims; rather, it is used as an umbrella term to embrace two types of pragmatic strategies, p.

1. Relevance.
2. Rhetorical devices.

As for relevance, Wilson and Sperber (2004, p.607) argue that "the expectations of relevance raised by an utterance are precise enough and predictable enough to guide the hearer towards the speaker’s meaning".

Rhetorical devices, on the other hand, include, p. metaphor [a figure of speech in which a word or phrase is used to describe something it does not literally denote, e.g. this journal is a gem (McGlone, 2007, p.2)] , irony [as defined by Xiang (2008, p.5), is a discordance between what is said and what is really believed to be true, as in "What a sunny day" during a storm], simile [the direct comparison between two things or action via the use of 'like' or 'as', such as, p. Their house is like a Renaissance palace, (Cruse, p. 2006, p. 165)], rhetorical questions [those questions which do not except an answer, as in, p. Is that a reason for despair? (Quirk et al.,1985, p. 825-6)], overstatement [the deliberate positive or negative exaggeration to increase impact or to attract attention, as in The traffic was moving at a snail's pace (Cruse, 2006, p.80)], and understatement [an expression of less strength than what would be expected. For example, an army officer lost his leg, but when asked how he feels, he looks down at his bloody stump and responds "Strings a bit" (Web source 1)]. One might wonder, p. what rhetorical devices have to do with conversational implicature? As a matter of fact, those devices have much to do with conversational implicature as they violate one or more of the Gricean maxims. Metaphor, for instance, violates the quality maxim as stated by Rozina and Karapetjana (2009, p.598).
There remains one very important thing that the data of the work have revealed about the employment of these rhetorical devices, p. being optional. That is, it is not necessary to find one or more of these devices in the SB stage, as is the case with relevance. Rather, they are either employed as a convincing support or not, but all in all the relevance maxim still takes the lead in this stage. Consequently, in the model diagram those devices will be parenthesized to indicate optionality.

6.4.2.3 Evaluation Stage
This is the final stage where the events outlined in the first two stages are evaluated and commented on either positively or pejoratively. Whether this or that, this stage is pragmatically divided into two sub-stages, p.

1. Communicative-intent oriented [that is, one of two types of intent, as argued by Leech 1983 and Sperber and Wilson 1986, that refers to speaker meaning. The other is the informative intent which refers to sentence meaning (Web source 2)]; and

2. Gossiper oriented.

6.4.2.3.1 Communicative-intent Oriented Evaluation
This first sub-stage of evaluation is further sub-divided into two branches, p.

1. Communicative-intent per se, p. which, as the data show, is expressed by different speech acts such as, p. (dis)praise, criticism, blame, etc.

2. Communicative-intent Issuer, p. which, as in the just outlined sub-stage, is expressed by means of different speech acts (the same just indicated ones) with the difference that they are, here, oriented to the gossipee and not to her/his intent?

It must be noted that Eggnis and Slade's further divisions of each of these two sub-divisions (i.e. as attribute, as value, general and specific) will not be taken into consideration in this developed pragmatic model, as they have much to do with psychology which is far beyond the scope of this study. This very reason, i.e. the psychological dress of Eggnis and Slade's structure, has led this work to replace their terminology with a more accurate pragmatic one, hence there becomes (Communicative-intent Oriented) instead of (Behavior Oriented).

6.4.2.3.2 Gossiper Oriented Evaluation
In this sub stage of evaluation, it is the gossiper that is addressed and not the gossipee. Hence, this addressing is tackled from two various aspects, p.
Evaluation by incomprehension, p. This is arrived at by different speech acts as in, p. request, criticism, blame, thank, etc., because it manifests the addressees' (un)acceptability on what is said. As such, they will either request more information from the gossiper about some certain topic, or they will criticize, blame, thank, praise or whatsoever act that expresses their (dis)approval on what is gossiped.

Evaluation by alternative behavior, p. Which is achieved by different speech acts as well, like, p. suggestion and advice. This sub-stage is represented by these two speech acts only because they share in common the feature of giving some other alternatives that imply benefit for the addressee (alone in case of advice) and the addressee (in case of suggestion) concerning some certain issue.

Whether the gossiper oriented evaluation is arrived at by incomprehension or an alternative behavior, the Politeness Principle (henceforth, PP) must be activated at this very stage. This is mainly because "the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange", as remarked by Lakoff (1977, p.88), becomes really at stake when the interchange shifts from talking about some third 'absent' party to another some 'present' one. The model of Politeness that will be chosen is Lakoff's (1973) as it applies very much to the data of this work, which are represented by various situations selected from a comedy entitled The School for Scandal by Richard Brinsley Sheridan. This drama has been found representative of what is required by the data needed for analysis.[ For the detailed discussion of this model, see Al-Hindawi (1999, p.97-104)].

The following diagram shows clearly how these various pragmatic strategies are distributed over the different stages of gossip, in order to form the eclectic model that will be utilized to analyze gossip pragmatically.
Key, p. TPF = Third Person Focus, SB = Substantiating Behavior, E = Evaluation, PP = Politeness Principle

Figure 2. A Model for the Pragmatic Analysis of Gossip
6.5. Data Analysis and Findings

In this section, the pragmatic perspective of gossip will be empirically manifested. This will be done by means of the following procedures, p.

1. The eclectic model as developed by this study will be used to analyze the data of the work, which are represented by twenty situations taken from Sheridan's comedy as a whole.
2. The mathematical statistical tool that will be used for calculating the results of the analysis is the percentage equation.

It must be indicated that the data of the work are characterized by being concise and precise. They are concise in that the situations analyzed in the work as whole are not lengthy. They are precise in that there are no irrelevant details in the situations that might corrupt the smoothness of analyzing gossip pragmatically. Besides, they are various as far as topics are concerned. Consequently, the selected drama is representative of what is required by such a work to analyze.

6.5.1 Illustrative Examples for the Pragmatic Analysis

Due to the fact that the situations are too many to be analyzed in a work like this; only some illustrative examples (viz. seven) will be posited to reveal the kind of the analysis conducted, in addition to shedding light on the findings.

Situation (1), p. LADY SNEERWELL. Why truly Mrs. Clackit has a very pretty Talent—a great deal of industry—yet—yes—been tolerably successful in her way—To my knowledge she has been the cause of breaking off six matches[,] of three sons being disinherited and four Daughters being turned out of Doors. Of three several Elopements, as many close confinements—nine separate maintenances and two Divorces.—nay I have more than once traced her causing a Tete-a-Tete in the Town and Country Magazine—when the Parties perhaps had never seen each other's Faces before in the course of their Lives.

VERJUICE. She certainly has Talents.

LADY SNEERWELL. But her manner is gross.

VERJUICE. 'Tis very true. She generally designs well[,] has a free tongue and a bold invention—but her colouring is too dark
and her outline often extravagant--She wants that delicacy of Tint--and mellowness of sneer--which distinguish your Ladyship's Scandal.

The TPF in this example is initiated by the employment of the existential presupposition represented by the proper name 'Mrs. Clackit', in addition to the discussion of her talent. In the immediate SB, Lady Sneerwell, the gossiper, employs both of the pragmatic strategies, p. the relevance principle and a rhetorical device, viz. metaphor. As for relevance, the gossiper tells things which breathe relevance to the main topic of gossip (See the example itself). That is, the cognitive level is easily reached. At the communicative level, on the other hand, what is intended to be really communicated is that Mrs. Clackit has a good ability in destroying things (for instance, breaking off marriages, causing three sons being disinherited, etc.). A metaphor, that is industry, has been used to describe that very ability in order to show how skilful she is in doing that, due to the fact that any industry needs a certain skill to perform.

The E, which is communicative-intent oriented, is positive (though in some abnormal way). The evaluation is expressed by praising both the communicative-intent per se, and the communicative-intent issuer herself at the same time. As for the first, it is expressed by praising Mrs. Clackit's ability to screw things up by calling it a talent, as talent is an individual-specific feature (regardless of whether it is good or bad). The second, in its turn, is expressed, also, by implicitly praising her of being so skilful in that ability because assuring (via the use of the qualifier certainly) that a person has talents means that s/he is good at doing certain things while others are not.

After that (first E), another aspect of the same gossipee is tackled, p. her manner, which is described as being terrible (gross). Hence, there is another TPF with the same person (consequently, with the same existential presupposition) but different information to be gossiped (thus different SB and E).

In the (second) SB, only the relevance principle with its two levels is employed. The cognitive level is easily reached as Verjuice mentions only the things which make reference to what she intends to communicate at the other level (See the situation itself for examples). At the communicative level, Verjuice intends to criticize Mrs. Clackit's coloring and outline by describing them as being too dark and extravagant successively, things which are dispreferred in general.

The (second) E is a pejorative evaluation of the communicative-intent issuer (Mrs. Clackit) herself. It is expressed by implicitly criticizing her for not being delicate and
mellow via the use of the verb 'want', which means that she has neither delicacy nor mellowness. This can be more emphasized by the fact that if someone has something already, then why s/he wants it again? Humans want only the things which they do not have.

**Situation (2), p. LADY SNEERWELL.** For our mutual interest--but I have found out him a long time since[,] altho' He has contrived to deceive everybody beside--I know him to be artful selfish and malicious--while with Sir Peter, and indeed with all his acquaintance, He passes for a youthful Miracle of Prudence--good sense and Benevolence.

**VERJUICE.** Yes yes--I know Sir Peter vows He has not his equal in England; and, above all, He praises him as a MAN OF SENTIMENT. In this example, TPF is triggered by the existential presupposition represented by the personal pronoun 'him' (referring to Surface), in addition to introducing some of his features.

Only the relevance principle is employed in the SB. The cognitive level is achieved so easily, as Lady Sneerwell mentions the relevant things only (See the example itself). At the communicative level, she intends to communicate the idea that in spite of his bad features (selfishness and malice); Surface still has some good ones like prudence and benevolence, consequently he is not that bad person as one might be deceived at first. The E is engendered by positively evaluating the communicative-intent issuer himself. This is expressed by praising him to be a man of sentiment, which is a basic motivation to treat others with such good features as prudence, and benevolence that Surface already has, and hence meaning that he is a wise and tolerant man.

**Situation (3), p. SURFACE.** But--Madam--let me caution you to place no more confidence in our Friend Snake the Libeller--I have lately detected him in frequent conference with old Rowland [Rowley] who was formerly my Father's Steward and has never been a friend of mine.

**LADY SNEERWELL.** I'm not disappointed in Snake, I never suspected the fellow to have virtue enough to be faithful even to his own Villany.

The TPF, in this example, is engendered by the existential presupposition represented by the proper name 'Snake', who is introduced by the gossiper (Surface) as someone that must be warned of.
The SB embraces both relevance and one of the rhetorical devices, p. irony. As regards relevance, it works effectively, yet not easily as the preceding examples, at the cognitive level. That is, what is mentioned about Snake (i.e. being detected in frequent conference with Rowland, the steward, who is not a friend of Surface) makes no direct relevance to why Snake should be warned of. But with a little cognitive processing, it will soon become clear that since someone (who is supposed to be at your side) is detected (and not just normally found) with some other one who is not a friend, then it means that such a person must be put under the consideration of caution. Consequently, what is intended at the communicative level is that Snake's loyalty is not purely oriented to the gossips (Surface and Lady Sneerwell), thus they must be cautious about that.

The E is pejoratively oriented to the communicative-intent issuer himself (Snake). This is expressed by criticizing him for being not virtuous and unfaithful.

**Situation (4), p. LADY SNEERWELL.** Nay but we should make allowance[---]Sir Benjamin

is a wit and a poet.

**MARIA.** For my Part--I own madam--wit loses its respect with me, when I see it in company with malice.--What do you think, Mr. Surface?

**SURFACE.** Certainly, Madam, to smile at the jest which plants a Thorn on another's Breast is to become a principal in the mischief.

**LADY SNEERWELL.** Pshaw--there's no possibility of being witty without a little [ill] nature--the malice of a good thing is the Barb that makes it stick.--What's your opinion, Mr. Surface?

**SURFACE.** Certainly madam--that conversation where the Spirit of Raillery is suppressed will ever appear tedious and insipid--

**MARIA.** Well I'll not debate how far Scandal may be allowable--but in a man I am sure it is always contemptable.--We have Pride, envy, Rivalship, and a Thousand motives to depreciate each other--but the male-slanderer must have the cowardice of a woman before He can traduce one.

The TPF is motivated by the existential presupposition represented by the proper name 'Benjamin', with some features about him (especially his wit).

The SB employs both relevance and metaphor. Just like the preceding example, relevance at the cognitive level does not work easily; rather, it needs further processing. This is so due to
the employment of the metaphor (thorn on another's breast) to indicate clearly Benjamin's malice. So, what is intended at the communicative level is that Benjamin's wit is not to be viewed positively as the general attribute suggests, p. he, actually, maliciously employs it with others.

The E is, also, pejoratively oriented to the communicative-intent issuer himself (Benjamin). This is expressed by explicitly criticizing him for traducing others via attributing 'woman cowardice' to a 'man'.

**Situation (5), p. LADY SNEERWELL.** Beg her to walk in. Now, Maria[,] however here is a Character to your Taste, for tho' Mrs. Candour is a little talkative everybody allows her to be the best-natured and best sort of woman.

**MARIA.** Yes with a very gross affectation of good Nature and Benevolence--she does more mischief than the Direct malice of old Crabtree.

**SURFACE.** Efaith 'tis very true Lady Sneerwell--Whenever I hear the current running again the characters of my Friends, I never think them in such Danger as when Candour undertakes their Defence.

The TPF, here, is started by the existential presupposition 'Candour', with some of her bad features such as affectation of good nature and benevolence. The SB employs the relevance principle only, where the cognitive level is easily processed as Maria (the gossiper) mentions only relevant things directly (See the example itself). At the communicative level, on the other hand, she intends to communicate that Candour not only has 'gross affectation…benevolence', she is in fact worse than that, for she does more mischief than malice alone.

The E is pejoratively oriented to the communicative-intent issuer herself (Candour). It is expressed by implicitly dispraising her for being the worst person to defend others. That is to say, Candour is too bad a person whose defense cannot be trustworthy at all; on the contrary, if she defends someone, then s/he is to be considered at real danger from such a 'talkative' woman.

**Situation (6), p. MRS. CANDOUR.** So they are Child--shameful! shameful! but the world is so censorious no character escapes. Lord, now! who would have suspected your friend, Miss Prim, of an indiscretion Yet such is the ill-nature of people, that they say her unkle stopped her last week just as she was stepping into a Postchaise with her Dancing-master.
Maria. I'll answer for't there are no grounds for the Report.

Mrs. Candour. Oh, no foundation in the world I dare swear[;]
no more probably than for the story circulated last month,
of Mrs. Festino's affair with Colonel Cassino--tho' to be sure
that matter was never rightly clear'd up.

Surface. The license of invention some people take is monstrous
indeed.

Maria. 'Tis so but in my opinion, those who report such things
are equally culpable.

The TFP, in this situation, is, also, triggered by the existential presupposition 'Prim', tackling
her behavior which is described by indiscretion.

In the SB, Candour (the gossiper) employs only the relevance principle. At the cognitive
level, she makes things easily processed by mentioning directly relevant things to indiscretion
(i.e., Prim's going with her dancing-master). Consequently, at the communicative level, Mrs.
Candour intends to communicate that Prim is not a very well-behaved girl and that her
manner is to be suspected.

The E is pejoratively, yet politely, oriented to the gossiper herself (Mrs. Candour). This is
expressed by implicitly blaming her for reporting other people's private things, which is
addressed via the use of the utterance 'culpable'. The PP, in its turn, is activated by the very
indirect blame oriented to the gossiper.

6.5.2 Findings

The mathematical statistical analysis arrived at by applying the percentage equation has
shown the following, p.

1. Existential presupposition (represented by the proper noun) is employed 100% in the
   TPF.

2. The percentage of relevance employment in the SB is 100%, which is very much
   higher than that of the rhetorical devices which is 36% (which has been calculated by
   summating the percentages given below and then dividing the result on the total
   number of the strategies which is six).

3. Percentages of the different rhetorical devices are as follows, p.
   - Metaphor, p. 80%.
   - Irony and simile, p. 25%.
- Rhetorical question, p. 10%.
- Overstatement, p. 55%.
- Understatement, p. 50%.

4. In the E, the percentages have been distributed as follows, p.
- Positive evaluation, p. 40%.
- Pejorative evaluation, p. 60%.
- The percentage of the different strategies employed in ECII (Evaluation of Communicative-intent Issuer) is double its counterpart in ECI (Evaluation of Communicative-intent) (that is, 50%, 25% respectively). Moreover, that very percentage of the various strategies of ECII (i.e. 50%) is higher than both of the different strategies of EI (Evaluation by Incomprehension) (which is 30%) and EAB (Evaluation by Alternative Brhaviour) (which is 0%). This last (0%) reveals that neither suggestion nor advice are employed in the work under analysis as part of E. Consequently, the EAB has not been activated by the investigated work as a vital part in the developed model.

5. Percentages of the three functions of gossip are shown as follows, p.
- Knowledge, p. 50%.
- Friendship and influence, p. 25%.

6.6. Achievement of the Functions of Gossip

After analyzing some situations on the basis of the developed model, it is time to trace the achievement of the three functions of gossip (See 4. above).

Interestingly, data analysis has revealed that the different functions of gossip can be specified right from the first stage, TPF, and can be further verified by the two later stages, SB and E. That is, if the TPF is engendered by tackling certain type of information (as in situations 1,2,4 and 6 above), then gossip functions to exchange information (which is equally exchanged positively and negatively) (See 3.1 above). Hence, in the pragmatic achievement of this function we notice the following, p.

1. TPF is triggered by existential presupposition.
2. In the SB relevance is necessarily employed whereas the rhetorical devices employment is optional.
3. The E can be either positive or pejorative towards the gossipee or the gossiper.
In another situation (that is, situation 3), TPF starts by making an influential act, p. Surface's warning. Consequently, gossip in such an exchange functions to competitively influence the other’s attitude (Sneerwell in this example) concerning the behavior with such a person (i.e. Snake) (See 3.3 above). This is further emphasized by Sneerwell's pejorative evaluation of the fellow.

Situation 5 exhibits another function of gossip, p. friendship. This function is reached by the way in which the gossipee (Candour) is introduced (by Sneerwell, a gossiper) to Maria (another gossiper), that is, by advertising Candour's advantages (being the best-natured and best sort of woman) in an attempt to establish a relationship between the two. As such, the friendship function, in this example, works at the individual level (See 3.2 above).

6.7 Conclusions

On the basis of the findings arrived at by means of the analysis, this study has come up with the following conclusions, p.

1. The developed model has proved its validity in pragmatically analyzing gossip.

2. The pragmatic achievement of the various functions of gossip follows the same track of the generic pragmatic structure of gossip itself. That is, the developed pragmatic structure of gossip shows at the same time the pragmatic strategies via which the functions of gossip are achieved.

3. In the SB, relevance has been shown to be more significant than the rhetorical devices, due to the fact that relevance has been employed in all the situations with a percentage of 100%, whereas the percentage of the employment of the rhetorical devices is only 36%.

4. The most common function of gossip is to exchange knowledge, which is to be pejoratively evaluated in the end. The negative tint of gossip might be given due to this very point, that is to say, the percentage of the pejorative evaluations of gossip (that is 60%) exceeds that of the positive one (that is 40%). As such, gossip can be weakly defended to have an equally positive facet.

5. There is no clear-cut distinction between TPF and SB. Consequently, it can be said that in the normal course of things, TPF is embedded within SB.

6. Existential presupposition, represented by the proper name, is the only kind of presupposition that is used to initiate TPF with a percentage 100%. As a matter of fact, this makes sense due to the fact that whenever anyone tries to gossip, s/he will
definitely specify who the gossipee is in order to keep communicating as easily as required. So, there is no need for further indirectness since the one to be backbitten is not present, thus one can feel free to mention her/his name to make things clearer.
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CHAPTER SEVEN

A MODEL FOR THE PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF GOSSIP IN J. AUSTEN’S ‘EMMA’

Fareed H. Al-Hindawi
Hassan H. Abukrooz

7.1. Introduction
People gossip constantly at the office, over the fence within families and at happy hour. Everyone gossips. Gossip occurs in every society, among young and old people. You can gossip with just a few people or with a lot, depending on the medium you use to transmit your information. Thus, gossip is the spoken script for most face-to-face encounters.

Yet, few people understand gossip’s complex nature. Some think it is negative, especially targets (people spoken about), who have experienced its negative effects. However, some view gossip as a positive aspect of life, in that it enhances social cohesion and acculturation (Schmidt, 2004:1).

Nowadays, gossip has been tackled more deeply at different levels. For instance, there have been studies (such as Eder and Enke's 1997), that have touched upon the linguistic side of gossip, i.e. investigating and analyzing gossip via the employment of pure linguistic tools. Other studies such as Stouck and Giltrow (1991) and Prodan’s (1998) have approached gossip on the pragmatic and the sociolinguistic levels, yet rather rapidly and superficially. That is, the pragmatic level has been treated quickly and haphazardly. In other words, the pragmatic principles involved in composing the pragmatic structure of gossip have been dealt with without giving a full account of their employment in gossip. Besides Prodan’s (ibid.) work limits itself to the negative side of gossip, whereas many scholars (See Gluckman (1963), Dunbar (1996) and De Baker (2005)) who have investigated the topic agree that gossip does have a positive facet.

Consequently, the current study endeavours to lay down a pure pragmatic perspective of gossip through developing a model devoted to analyze gossip pragmatically apart from any sociological, biological or any other non-linguistic prospect. The validity of the model will be
verified against data represented by different situations chosen randomly from Austen's Emma.

7.2. Definition

Gossip assumes a crucial part of our daily life exchanges; therefore many scholars have attempted to define and scrutinize this phenomenon. Various researchers have defined gossip differently. Some see it only as negative talk behind someone else’s back. In this regard, Besnier (1994:9) defines gossip as “a negatively evaluative and morally laden verbal exchange concerning the conduct of absent third parties that takes place within a bounded group of persons in a private setting, the gist of which is generally not intended to reach the ears of its victim”. Similarly, Emler (1994:177) considers gossip as unreliable and inaccurate, an entirely fallible source of information about other people.

Others generalize gossip to any talk about a given individual, present or not. In this respect, Dunbar (2004) (Cited in Foster; 2004:80) defines it broadly as ‘conversation about social and personal topics’, whereas Hess and Hagen (2006:339) believe that the most useful definition of gossip would be: "gossip is a personal conversation on social topics. The information exchanged, truthful or deceptive, can benefit the sender, the receiver, or both."

It seems that the above mentioned definitions have included the everyday understanding of the term gossip which is not sufficient to encompass gossip; therefore a more operative definition of gossip can be produced through incorporating the three basic components of the structure of gossip: content, circumstances (context) and functions. In addition to the minimal decisive feature in the structure of gossip, that is the third party property which is stressed by many scholars such as Foster (2004) and De Baker (2005). These interrelated components and the third party minimal feature play a pivotal role in apprehending gossip. Therefore, De Backer's(2005:38) account of gossip meets and covers all the aforementioned constructing components of gossip. According to De Backer (ibid.:40)

“Gossip is information about the deviant or surprising (which both depend on the context) traits and behaviors of one (or more) third person(s) (most often non-present, but potentially present in the conversation), and where the sender has true/false knowledge of the gossip content.
De Backer’s (ibid.) definition relates the functions of gossip to their context and adds another defining characteristic of gossip (i.e. the elements of surprise and deviance). For that reason, De Backer’s (ibid.) account of gossip is adopted by this work.

7.2.1 Models of Gossip

Only the models of gossip that can be utilized in developing the pragmatic eclectic model targeted by this research are discussed below.

7.2.1.1 Eder & Enkes’ (1991) Model for a Basic Structure of Gossip Episode

A model of a basic structure of a gossip episode is advanced by Eder and Enke (1991:496) to define gossip, stressing that gossip involves evaluative conversations or episodes in which there is a positive or negative evaluation about other persons. Despite the fact that Eder and Enkes’ (ibid.) model is about the (basic) structure of gossip, their findings reveal that it is a flexible one but the ordering of acts is critical. This structure comprises two key elements that identify gossip: the identification of a target and an evaluation of the target acts (Ibid: 497).

Thus, gossip episodes are initiated by identifying the target of gossip episode (gossippee) before an evaluation is made, since the target is not present. Once identification and evaluation occur, a variety of acts can follow. These include explanations, expansion on the evaluation, support, exaggerated effect and challenges. In other words, gossip episodes proceed through two stages:

- **Beginning of episode stage:** Here, a participant in the exchange identifies the target of gossip and usually evaluates him/her negatively while a second participant either supports or challenges it.

- **Possible acts in response/explanation act:** At this stage the gossiper offers a summarized or expanded explanation for his initial evaluation of the target of gossip. Then a series of possible acts (strategies) are adopted by the gossiper or any other participant, since participants in the gossip episode have numerous opportunities to participate through recoursing to one of the following strategies:

  - **Support:** Discussing the acts of an absent third party is potentially face threatening, therefore a need rises to obtain an explicit support given for the gossip to proceed. This support act is actualized by expressing similar ideas to those related by the gossiper, asking questions, or using assessments to show involvement in the gossip episode.
• **Expansion:** This is another strategy whereby the gossip initiator or other participants can strengthen the initial evaluation provided by the gossiper. It is intended to offer further evaluation.

• **Exaggerated effect:** Here, the effects of the acts already evaluated are maximized by the gossiper or his interlocutors to extend the gossip exchange. Some exaggerated effect expressions such as “God damn” are used to exercise a deep impact on the interlocutor.

• **Challenge:** This strategy is adopted by receivers of gossip in response to the evaluations made by the gossipmonger. Nevertheless, it basically occurs when the indirect evaluations are offered or the participant misinterprets implicit remarks.

It seems that the above mentioned acts represent kinds of strategies that are supposed to appear in the novel under study. This leads to doing two things:

1. The strategies proposed by the model are adopted.
2. The strategies adopted are liable to modification (which includes making some change to an already existing strategy; or adding some possible one) and this is to be done in accordance with the data of the present study.

### 7.2.1.2 Brusk’s (2010) Model for Gossip Initiation:

Brusk (2010:141) develops what he calls a computational model for gossip initiation, depending on previous pieces of work in the field, such as Eder and Enkes’ (1991). The proposed model proceeds as follows:

When the participants are engaged in a conversation, the stage of ‘Gossip Initiation’ is triggered (The source state is unspecified, but it can be assumed that the participants have greeted each other and perhaps talk for a while before gossip is initiated).

Then the target of gossip is selected via the ‘Select Target’ strategy. After that, the transition from ‘Select Target’ strategy to ‘Establish Gossip’ strategy is activated. If there is no target that fulfills the initial criteria, the gossip is cancelled (never initiated). If the target is found, the next step is to establish the relationship between participants.

### 7.2.2 An Eclectic Pragmatic Model

The model which is intended to be developed by this paper is based on the findings arrived at through surveying the aforementioned models, alongside with the observations made by the researchers themselves.

This model can be illustrated as follows:
7.2.2.1 Pragmatic Structure

Gossip is a communicative face-to-face process which consists of three stages: the initiation stage (IS), the explanation of gossip acts stage (EGAS), and the evaluation stage (ES). These three stages are pragmatically composed of certain pragmatic components forming the pragmatic structure of gossip which can be illustrated as follows:

The initiation stage incorporates two major pragmatic elements, namely; presupposition and speech act distributed over two sub-stages. However, the speech act element forms the ‘triggering gossip’ sub-stage which is used to trigger gossip. As for the second part of the initiation stage, it is built on the presupposition pragmatic component, employed to identify the gossipee.

As regards the explanation of gossip acts stage, it comprises three pragmatic components, viz. presupposition, conversational implicatures and politeness. These pragmatic elements occupy three different complementary parts (sub-stages) that can be illustrated as follows. The first sub-stage is taken over by the presupposition element. As for the second sub-stage, it includes the conversational implicatures. Finally, the maintaining sub-stage embraces the conversational implicatures and politeness elements.

Eventually, the evaluation stage encompasses only one pragmatic element, which is the speech act component.

To sum up, the gossip process actualized by the eclectic model developed by this study reveals that the pragmatic structure of gossip consists of four major components, viz. speech act, presupposition, conversational implicatures, and politeness distributed over three stages (See Figure (1) below).

7.2.2.2 Pragmatic Strategies

The three stages mentioned above have their own pragmatic strategies which are used to realize each of the aforementioned pragmatic components involved in the gossip process, as such; each will be briefly discussed.
7.2.2.2.1 Initiation Stage

Generally, the initiation stage incurs two important elements: a speech act and a presupposition which are actualized by employing various pragmatic strategies distributed over two sub-stages as follows.

7.2.2.2.1.1 Triggering Gossip

The data of this work reveal that gossip exchanges can be triggered by employing a vocative strategy coupled with one of the following speech act strategies that include (telling, claiming, stating, and criticizing).

7.2.2.2.1.1 Vocatives

A vocative is usually a noun phrase, denoting the one or more persons to whom the sentence is addressed. It is either a Call, drawing the attention of the person or persons addressed, or an Address expressing the speaker's relationship or attitude to the person or persons addressed (Quirk et al, 1985:773).
Gossipers can employ these two strategies to achieve gossipy functions such as (intimacy, manipulation, control) (See for example De Backer (2005:40-5)). They can trigger a gossip exchange and then manipulate or control their audience thoughts or attitudes to the gossipee by recoursing to one of these two vocative strategies. According to Kubo (2004:333), the vocative pragmatic sub-strategies are used for issuing certain illocutionary acts accompanied by concomitant perlocutionary acts. These perlocutionary can help affect or tamper with the ideas of the receivers of gossip and consequently achieve gossip functions.

7.2.2.2.1.1.2 Speech Act Strategies

Speech act strategies are the pragmatic means, representing the speech act component, which might be employed by gossipers to trigger their gossip exchanges. This can be realized by issuing one of the following speech acts:

a. SA of Telling

This speech act strategy belongs to the macro class of Searle’s (1969:66) assertives, which commits S (in varying degrees) to something being the case, i.e., to the truth of the expressed proposition (Edmondson, 1981:144). Furthermore, it can be understood by the fact that most tellers give the source of information or the reason of giving the information. So, telling strategy might be used to trigger gossip interactions and prepare the interlocutor for the explanations that follows (ibid.:145).

b. SA of Stating

This is another speech act incorporated under the umbrella term of Searle’s (ibid.) assertives. SA of stating is issued to express opinions or viewpoints about other people, accordingly attitudes to the gossip targets might be explicitly or implicitly manifested via enacting the stating SA.

c. SA of Claiming

Claiming is another example of the assertive class of speech acts. Although it has the power of assertion, it differs from the two aforementioned assertive SAs in that the speaker gives exact source of experience, depending on his own knowledge of the aberrant acts of the gossipee(s) (ibid.).

d. SA of Criticizing

Gossip conversations are commenced sometimes by issuing a speech act of criticizing which is undertaken by gossipers to bring forth pejorative evaluations of the gossipee’s behaviour. Yet, it has to be differentiated from other similar acts such as blame or detest
(Jackson, 1986: 222). This is done by consulting the felicity conditions of these speech acts (See Searle (1969) and Edmondson (1981)).

7.2.2.2.1.2 Gossipee Identification
The identification of the gossipee is the most powerful trigger of gossip interlocutions; therefore the pragmatic presupposition triggers coupled with epithets are utilized for identification purposes.

7.2.2.2.1.2.1 Epithet
Prodan (1998:79) defines Epithets as short descriptions preceding names, function in similar ways to presupposition and are found in abundance in gossip situations. Besides, epithets involve a description of somebody’s character or most important quality. In this respect "poor" is the most common and widely used epithet that serves to distance the community from the victim/recipient of sympathy (Corazza, 2004:17).

1. Poor Jane, I don’t know how she can live with a villain like Eddy.

7.2.2.2.1.2.2 Presupposition Triggers
Identifying the gossipee is actualized by gossipers through using the following pragmatic strategies of presupposition (Prodan, 1998: 75):

a. Existential Presupposition
Proper names (e.g. Emma, Eliza), possessives (her uncle, your cousin, my brother etc…) are usual manifestations of existential presupposition (See also Levinson (1983), Yule (2000) and Huang (2007)).

2. Mr. Elton’s manners are not perfect, but there is such a good-temper and good-will in Mr. Elton as one cannot but value (Austen, 1816/1984:).

b. Temporal Clauses
Presupposition is triggered by a temporal clause usually followed by referent name or possessive (Huang; 2007:65).

3. After she shot to stardom in a romance film Jane married. (ibid.)

c. Cleft Sentences
The presupposition here is triggered by two sub strategies: cleft and pseudo-cleft sentences.

4. It was Baired who invented television. (Cleft sentence)

5. What Baired invented was television. (Pseudo-cleft sentence) (Ibid.: 66)
7.2.2.2 Explanation of Gossip Acts Stage

The second stage embraces three sub-stages that include three pragmatic elements: the summary of gossip acts comprises the presupposition component which is actualized via using projection and modality; the expansion of those acts contains the conversational implicatures embodied in the pragma-rhetorical tropes; and maintaining the gossip acts which encompasses the conversational implicatures element generated by infringing the cooperative principle maxims and the politeness component realized by means of observing the politeness maxims of Leech (1983).

7.2.2.2.1 Summary of Gossip Act

Summarizing deviant behaviour is basically achieved via adopting projection and modality strategies (Prodan, 1998: 75)

7.2.2.2.2.1 Projection

According to (ibid.:62), projection is defined as an explicit introduction of a person's speech (direct or indirect) or thoughts.

7.2.2.2.2.1.1 Types of projection

Projection strategies are classified into three major classes according to the type of the projecting elements involved in the projection process:

7.2.2.2.2.1.1.1 Projection Devices

Generally, projection devices include the following:

a. Reporting Projecting Devices

Reporting speech projecting sub-strategy that is realized by the use of one of the following verbs: (say, remark, observe, point out, report; ask, demand, inquire, reply, explain, protest, continue, warn, insist, complain, shout, boast, murmur, stammer) (Halliday, 1985:229).

b. Ideas Projecting Devices

Ideas can be embedded in nouns. The projecting element here is the mental process noun (or idea) that functions as head of nominal group. Some of the principal nouns of projection, as reported by Halliday (1985: 240) are: (thought, belief, knowledge, feeling, notion, suspicion, sense, idea, expectation, view, opinion, prediction, assumption, conviction,
and discovery. doubt, problem, question, issue, wish, desire, hope, fear, intention, desire, hope, inclination, decision, resolve) (ibid:231).

c. Facts Projecting Devices

Here a fact is projected impersonally, either by a relational process (it is the case that…) or by impersonal mental or verbal process and this projection may be made explicit, as in:

it is /may be / is not (the case) that… (ibid:235)

7.2.2.2.2.1.1.1.2 Nebulous-Agent Projection

When projecting clauses are characterized by pronouns or nouns with unstable or unclear referents, the process is called nebulous-agent projection. For example, "They say, some say that ….. (Prodan, 1998:66).

This sub-strategy distances the gossiper from the knowledge base of his/her community. In this sense, the gossiper attempts to bond his/herself with his/her audience against "some people" (Stouck and Giltrow, 1991:568).

7.2.2.2.2.1.1.3 Agentless Projection

Agentless projection, in which a clause is projected, but not attributed to a speaker/thinker, has “the effect of appearing to distribute the claim more widely, beyond the scope of the immediate, contingent, and possibly interested position of the speaker, and situating the proposition in the larger community of consensus” (ibid.).

They are believed to be perfect match, but they have had several clashes lately.

7.2.2.2.1.2 Modality

Modality is defined as the term for a cluster of meanings centered on the notions of necessity and possibility: what must be or what merely might be (Griffiths; 2006:110). However, expressions of modality exhibit an intriguing spectrum of partially similar meanings or interpretations that can be distinguished mainly into two broad kinds depending on the underlying speech function of the clause: deontic and epistemic (Halliday; 1985: 335).

a. Deontic Modality

Deontic modality enables language users to express their attitudes as to whether a proposition relates to an obligatory situation or permissible one, or somewhere in between. It indicates permission or obligation, encoding the world's social constraints. Hence, gossipers may
exploit deontic modality markers to show obligation towards their audience to achieve, for instance, the gossip goal of intimacy.

b. Epistemic Modality

Epistemic modality expresses the possibility of a proposition's being true in fact, given what is already known. Additionally, Prodan (1998:69-70) argues that epistemic modality encodes the speaker's limits of knowledge, playing a significant role in the mechanisms of gossip. What differentiates epistemic modality from deontic modality, in addition to the context, is that the former is centered on a proposition contained in the sentence, while the latter may be centered on some entity or entities, typically denoted by the subject of the sentence.

Gossipers may utilize these pragmatic strategies to draw conclusions, issue judgments, and even to manipulate or tamper with information they provide their audience with in order to control their attitudes and opinions towards certain persons’ acts.

7.2.2.2.2 Expansion of Gossip Acts

Pragma-rhetorical tropes are adopted by gossipers to expand on the deviant or the socially disapproved acts (behaviour) of their gossipees.

7.2.2.2.2.1 Clarification Tropes

Some tropes may be used to clarify the speaker's ideas, attitudes and to show his/her evaluation of certain topic or person (Harris, 2008:2). Those tropes include:

a. Metaphor

Metaphor is defined as a figure of similarity, a word or phrase is replaced by an expression denoting an analogous circumstance in a different semantic field (Gibbs; 2001:326). The comparison adds a new dimension of meaning to the original expression. Unlike simile, the comparison is not made explicit (‘like’ or ‘as’) are not used (For more details of metaphor, see Mihas (2005), McGlone (2007), Rozina and Karapetjana (2009:118)).

Pragmatically speaking, metaphor is not only rendered from the flouting of Grice’s conversational maxims, but also from violating Sperber and Wilsons' relevance maxim. Thus, metaphor may be a suitable pragma-rhetorical device at the gossipers’ disposal to convey their opinions, evaluations, attitudes toward their victims (gossipees) indirectly, as in:

7. "He's a monster, how could he have done such a bad thing?" (Austen, 1984: 56).
b. Simile

Simile is an explicit comparison (using “like” or “as”) between two things of unlike nature that yet have something in common. Two things are openly compared with each other, introduced by ‘like’ or ‘as’ (Cruse, 2006: 165). However, explicit comparisons might be used effectively to leave the desired impact on the listeners.

8. A: Jasmine is a delicate pretty girl.

B: She walks like a proud peacock. Whom does she think to fool with her fake gentle smile?

Here the gossiper B elaborates on the deviant behaviour of Jasmine, the gossipee, to whom she directs her claims and accusations via employing the pragma-rhetorical strategy of simile intended to maximize the condemned acts by means of explicit comparison.

c. Irony

Irony is defined as a discrepancy between what a speaker says and what he or she believes to be true, such as the utterance “What a sunny day” during a storm (Xiang Li, 2008:5).

As for the relation between irony and the pragmatic issues, irony is traditionally seen as sub-strategy of a broader category of indirect speech acts as well as conversational implicatures, on which it entirely relies, Attardo (2001:165) maintains. Pragmatically speaking, any utterance (depending on the context) can be used for the purpose of irony, whether it signals the opposite or echoes some other person attitude. This ironic utterance is meant to actualize certain gossip functions via the employment of different pragma-rhetorical devices such as hyperbole, rhetorical questions, metaphors, excessive politeness etc…

7.2.2.2.2.2 Emphasis Tropes

Mendoza and Peña (2007:152) argue that some tropes, such as overstatement and understatement, are basically employed by speakers for emphatic purposes. The emphasis tropes comprise:

a. Rhetorical Questions

Rhetorical questions (RQs) are generally defined as questions that neither seek information nor elicit an answer (Han, 1997:3). Moreover, a rhetorical question is an effective pragma-rhetorical tool that might employed gossipers to persuade receivers of gossip of their own ideas and beliefs, or to validate the claims they raise against a third party.
Pragmatically speaking, rhetorical questions have the illocutionary force of an assertion of the opposite polarity from what is apparently asked. That is, a rhetorical positive question has the illocutionary force of a negative assertion, and a rhetorical negative question has the illocutionary force of a positive assertion (Black, 2006:26).

b. Overstatement (Hyperbole)

Hyperbole is defined as a figure of speech involving deliberate exaggeration for rhetorical effect, to increase impact or to attract attention. Exaggeration may be negative or positive (Cruse, 2006: 80).

After metaphor, hyperbole is the most common trope. Accordingly, it might be adopted by gossipers to magnify the deviant deeds or rejected actions of others (gossipees) and in the meantime achieving gossip goals. Estranging gossipees, for instance, from the society of gossipers may bond gossip participants and group them in community of consensus about good behaviour.

c. Understatement (Litotes)

Understatement is a by-product of flouting the maxims of quantity and quality. An understatement is a statement which, somehow, because it is conspicuously less informative than some other statement, can be used to express the meaning of the more informative statement (Ruiz, 2006: 6). Such purposeful uninformativity runs counter to the Gricean principle that one should do what one can to make oneself understood, but it is consistent with the contrary principle that one should do no more than one has to.

7.2.2.2.2.3 Maintaining Explanation of Gossip Acts

The third sub-stage of explanation act stage is used to maintain the explanations, expansions and deviant behaviours specified by the aforementioned strategies of this stage.

7.2.2.2.2.3.1 Infringing the maxims

When speakers infringe the Gricean maxims, they generate conversational implicatures exploiting them for communicative purposes. Grice (1975) states four occasions in which these conversational implicatures are generated as follows:

1. The ‘Silent’ Violation of the maxims. When s/he wants to lie, deceive or manipulate, since s/he knows that the hearer will not capture the real intended meaning (Grundy, 2000:73).

2. The speaker’s desire to fulfill two conflicting maxims (maxims in clash) results in his /her flouting one maxim to invoke the other.
3. Opting out of the Cooperative Principle (CP), by saying ‘I can’t say more, my lips are sealed’, in order to avoid divulging a secret.

4. The last and most important category of non-observance of the maxims is maxim-flouting. Here the speaker exploits an obvious infringement of one of the maxims in order to generate an implicature. Infringing the conversational maxims as illustrated above provides interactants (gossipers) with a powerful pragmatic device to achieve their conversational gossipy goals.

7.2.2.2.3.2 Politeness strategies

Leech’s (1983) maxims might be exploited by gossipers to sustain their gossip interactions and maintain their evaluations. These include the following:

- Tact maxim (in directives [impositives] and commissives): minimise cost to other; [maximise benefit to other]
- Generosity maxim (in directives and commissives): minimise benefit to self; [maximise cost to self]
- Approbation maxim (in expressives and decelerations [assertives]): minimise dispraise of other; [maximise praise of other]

Leech (Ibid: 107) believes that “Politeness Principle is required to mitigate the intrinsic discourtesy of the goal”.

9. Could you lend me your ears? for what I have mentioned is real? (as said by a gossiping female friend to her colleague)

The speaker/gossiper uses the tact maxim (which is actualized here by the use of the modal "Could") to establish intimacy with the addressee, and support the explanations provided by him for the sake of keeping the gossip session open.

7.2.2.3 Evaluation Stage

This is the final stage which wraps up the whole process of gossip. It includes strategies via which this stage is described as positive or negative.

The evaluation stage might conclude with one of the following positive strategies: agreement or support or both of them. These strategies are considered ‘positive’ because adopting
them entails bonding gossippers and introducing them to a world of consensus and solidarity by reaching some good conclusions about their gossipee.

On the other hand, the evaluation stage becomes negative when the deviant or unaccepted behaviour of the gossipee is realized finally, getting the gossip participant’s approval regarding it. This occurs if one of the following strategies is adopted: agreement or support or challenge.

For more clarification, the above discussed model (which will be adopted for analyzing the data of the present paper is systematically introduced in Figure (1) below, where each arrow (       ) is to be read as ‘by means of’. Thus, the initiation stage is initiated by means of triggering gossip which is done by means of vocative, telling, stating, claiming and criticizing; as well as identification of gossipee actualized by the use epithet and presupposition strategies; and this leads to the explanation act stage which is performed by means of summarizing, expanding and maintaining acts, and this, in turn, leads to the evaluation stage which can be either positive or negative.
Figure (2) An Eclectic Model for the Pragmatic Analysis of Gossip
7.3. Data Collection and Description

7.3.1 Data Collection

The data of this paper are collected from Jane Austen’s Emma. Thus, twenty conversational situations which represent all the gossip situations in this novel have been scrutinized. However, due to the limits of this study, five conversational situations have been chosen as illustrative examples to represent the analysis of the rest of the other situations. This is done so because the major aim here is to test the workability of the pragmatic model developed by this study rather than other things.

7.3.2 Data Description

Generally, the data under analysis are characterized by the following features:

1. Length: They are lengthy and sometimes very lengthy to the degree that they take over two or three whole pages.

2. Variation: As far as the participants and topics are concerned, they are various. The participants come from different classes of society (to mention just an example): an ex-governess and her lady as in the gossip interaction between Mrs. Weston, and Emma, see situation (4) below. As regards the topics, various ones are discussed through the twenty gossip situations of the novel. They include: stating certain characteristics (as when Harriet states the general characteristics of Mr. Martin, see situation (1) below), persuading the interlocutor of the gossiper's attitudes towards the gosippee (as in the gossip exchange between Mrs. Weston, Isabella and Emma, see situation (4) below), and marriage (as in the conversation between Mr. Knightly and Emma, see situation (5) below).

3. Understandability: The language used in the gossip situations of this novel is perceivable. That is, the language used by Austen’s characters in Emma is easily captured since it provokes the ordinary daily life talks and conversations.

7.4. Data Analysis and Findings

7.4.1 Data Analysis

7.4.1.1 Methods of Analysis

The analysis of the data is done by means of the following procedures:

1. The eclectic model as developed by this paper is used to analyze the data of the work.

2. Statistically, the percentage equation is utilized to calculate the findings of the analysis.
7.4.1.2 Overall Analysis

In connection with the overall analysis of the results of all the data under scrutiny, various findings are advanced below.

7.4.1.2.1 Pragmatic Structure

The analysis shows that gossip is an interpersonal process which consists of three stages: the initiation stage (Henceforth IS), the explanation of gossip acts stage (Henceforth EGAS), and the evaluation stage (Henceforth ES). These stages are composed of certain pragmatic components forming the pragmatic structure of gossip which can be illustrated as follows: the initiation stage contains two pragmatic elements, viz. speech act and presupposition; while the second stage consists of three pragmatic components and these are: presupposition, conversational implicatures and politeness; finally the evaluation stage embraces only one pragmatic constituent, that is the speech act. These results are tabulated in Table (1) and sketched out in Figure (3) below.

Table (1): Percentages of All the Pragmatic Components of Gossip

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Speech Act</th>
<th>Presupposition</th>
<th>Conversational Implicatures</th>
<th>Politeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGAS</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aforementioned pragmatic components are realized by certain pragmatic strategies which are elucidated in (4.1.2.2) below.
7.4.1.2.2 Pragmatic Strategies

The analysis of the speech act strategies employed in the IS reveals that the SAs of telling, claiming, stating, and criticizing are all used in triggering gossip. However, the SA of telling is the most frequently used one. The frequency of using this SA has amounted to 40%, while that of using claiming, stating, and criticizing have amounted to 10%, 20%, and 10% respectively. As for the presupposition strategies which are used in the gossipee identification sub-stage, the analysis indicates that the existential presupposition strategy realized by the proper name has the highest percentage, i.e 100%.

As regards the analysis of the data in the EGAS, it shows that the projection and modality strategies are more frequently utilized by gossipers in the EGAS than the emphatic trope strategies. This finding is supported by the leading frequencies reaped by those two strategies (100% and 70% respectively).

Finally, the analysis reveals that the negative strategies of agreement and challenge have the highest percentages (20% and 25%) among all the other strategies of the evaluation stage.

All the results mentioned above are introduced in Table (2) and elucidated in Figure (4) below.

\[Figure (3):\ Total\ Rates\ of\ All\ the\ Pragmatic\ Components\ of\ Gossip\]
Table (2) Percentages of the Overall Occurrences of All the Pragmatic Strategies of Gossip Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IS</th>
<th>Triggering Gossip</th>
<th>Gossipee Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ES</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag.</td>
<td>Sup.</td>
<td>Both of them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** IS = initiation stage, EGAS = explanation of gossip acts stage, ES = evaluation stage, V. = vocative, Te. = telling, C. = claiming, S. = stating, Ep. = epithet, Pt. = presupposition trigger, Em. = epistemic modality, Dm. = deontic modality, Pd. = projection device, Np. = nebulus projection, Ap. = agentless projection, M. = metaphor, Sm. = simile, I. = irony, Rq. = rhetorical question, O. = overstatement U. = understatement Ql. = quality, Qn. = quantity, R. = relation, Mn. = manner, T. = tact, G. = generosity, A. = approbation, Sy = sympathy, Ag. = agreement, sup. = support, and chl. = challenge.
7.4.1.2.3 Illustrative Analyzed Examples

Situation (1): Emma: What sort of looking man is Mr. Martin?

Harriet: Oh! Not handsome—not at all handsome. I thought him very plain at first, but I do not think him so plain now. One does not, you know, after a time. But did you never see him? He is in Highbury every now and then, and he is sure to ride through every week in his way to Kingston. He has passed you very often.

Emma: That may be, and I may have seen him fifty times, but without having any idea of his name. A young farmer, whether on horseback or on foot, is the very last sort of person to raise my curiosity. The yeomanries are precisely the order of people with whom I feel I can have nothing to do. A degree or two lower, and a creditable appearance might interest me; I might hope to be useful to their families in some way or other. But a farmer can need none of my help, and is, therefore, in one sense, as much above my notice as in every other he is below it.

Harriet:: To be sure. Oh yes! It is not likely you should ever have observed him.
This gossip situation (Chapter IV, page 18) is triggered when Emma asks Harriet, her best friend, some questions about Mr. Martin’s, the gossipee, personality. So, Harriet takes this opportunity to influence Emma’s ideas of Mr. Martin’s character and convince her of the good qualities he has.

The initiation stage (Henceforth IS) is launched through commencing the gossipee identification (Henceforth GI) sub-stage embraces a presupposition element embodied in the existential presupposition strategy ‘Mr. Martin’, used to define the gossipee. After that, the sub-stage of triggering gossip (Henceforth TG) is motivated by the gossiper, Harriet, by means of issuing a speech act of claiming (Oh! Not handsome—not at all handsome) which embodies the speech act element of gossip structure. This claiming strategy is used to advance a disparaging view of the gossipee’s acts.

The explanation of gossip acts stage (Henceforth EGAS) is achieved by activating the summary of gossip acts sub-stage which comprises the presupposition element represented by the pragmatic strategy of projection realized by the verbs ‘thought’ and ‘think’ in (I thought him very plain at first, but I do not think him so plain now). Additionally, the epistemic modality adverb ‘sure’ is employed to assert the gossiper’s ideas. The modals ‘may’ in (may be, and I may have seen) are used to confirm what is issued by the gossiper. Then, the gossip expansion is achieved by employing the overstatement strategy which includes the conversational implicatures element (I may have seen him fifty times, but without having any idea of his name) to maximize and extend the effect of the modalized acts. Finally, the sub-stage of maintaining the gossip acts is triggered by only infringing the maxim of quantity via illustrating further explanations to vouch for the negative nature of the gossip acts (A young farmer, whether on horseback or on foot, is the very last sort of person to raise my curiosity).

The evaluation stage (Henceforth ES) is completed by a negative evaluation introduced in the form of agreement to the gossipers’ assertion of the simple pejorative side of the gossipee’s gossip acts. Likewise, the agreement (Oh yes! It is not likely you should ever have observed him) is actualized by employing a speech act of stating strategy which represents the pragmatic speech act element of gossip pragmatic structure.

**Situation (2): Elton** I cannot rate her beauty as you do, but she is a pretty little creature, and I am inclined to think very well of her disposition. Her character depends upon those she is with; but in good hands she will turn out a valuable woman.

**Emma:** I am glad you think so; and the good hands, I hope, may not be wanting.

**Elton:** Come, you are anxious for a compliment, so I will tell you that you have improved her. You have cured her of her school-girl’s giggle; she really does you credit.
**Emma:** I should be mortified indeed if I did not believe I had been of some use.

In situation (2) (Chapter V, page 25) Mr. Elton, the gossiper, attempts to get intimate with the gossip receiver, Emma, through praising the gossip acts of the gossipee, Harriet since she’s Emma’s very close friend and follows her steps of etiquette and polished behaviour. Consequently, discussing her acts positively get the gossiper closer to Emma.

Here, the IS is started by the TG sub-stage which is activated by the gossiper, Mr. Elton, who use a speech act of telling strategy (I cannot rate her beauty as you do) which embodies the speech act element of gossip pragmatic structure and it is intended to specify the gossiper’s positive view. As for the GI sub-stage, it encompasses a presupposition element embodied in the existential presupposition strategy ‘she’ used to define the gossipee.

The EGAS is achieved by actuating the summary of gossip acts sub-stage which includes the presupposition element represented by the projection verb ‘think’ in (I am inclined to think very well of her disposition). Besides, the epistemic modal ‘will’ is employed to consolidate the gossiper’s projected opinion of the gossipee’s gossip acts. At the same time, the gossip expansion is realized by employing the understatement strategy which contains the conversational implicatures element (she is a pretty little creature) to amplify and expand the impact of the modalized acts. Finally, the sub-stage of maintaining the gossip acts proceeds through breaking the maxim of relation via giving apparently unrelated explanations to prove the positively oriented gossip acts (are anxious for a compliment, so I will tell you…..). Also the tact maxim (which stands for the politeness element) is observed in (I should be mortified indeed) in order to show the gossiper intimacy towards the gossip receiver and therefore achieving the gossip function of intimacy.

The ES is ended by a positive evaluation introduced in the form of agreement to the gossippers’ attitude of the gossipee’s gossip acts. This agreement (did not believe I had been of some use) is realized via the issuance of a speech act of stating strategy which represents the speech act element of gossip pragmatic structure. It is used here to confirm the positive evaluation made by both gossip participants.

**Situation (3): Emma:** To be an old maid at last, like Miss Bates! That is as formidable an image as you could present, Harriet; and if I thought I should ever be like Miss Bates! So silly—so satisfied—so smiling—so proosing—so undistinguishing and unfastidious— and so apt to tell everything relative to everybody about me, I would marry to-morrow. But between us, I am convinced there never can be any likeness, except in being unmarried.

**Harriet:** But still, you will be an old maid! And that’s so dreadful!
**Emma:** Never mind, Harriet, I shall not be a poor old maid; and it is poverty only which makes celibacy contemptible to a generous public! A single woman, with a very narrow income, must be a ridiculous, disagreeable old maid!. Poverty certainly has not contracted her mind: I really believe, if she had only a shilling in the world, she would be very likely to give away sixpence of it

**Harriet:** That is a great charm.

This gossip conversation (Chapter V, page 25) is intended to tackle marriage which is one of the major themes of this novel. The gossiper, Emma wishes to control her receiver’s of gossip (Harriet) opinion about Emma’s marriage through setting Miss Bates, the gossipee, as a bad example to be followed in pursuing a dream of marriage.

In this situation, the IS is engendered by the GI sub-stage which incurs a presupposition element represented by the existential presupposition strategy ‘Miss Bates’ used to identify the gossipee. As regards the TG sub-stage which consists of the speech act element, it is initiated by issuing a speech act of criticizing strategy (To be an old maid at last, like Miss Bates! That is as formidable an image as you could present) that introduces the gossiper’s negative view of the gossipee’s gossip acts.

The subsequent EGAS is commenced by triggering the summary of gossip acts sub-stage which includes the presupposition element represented by the projection verb ‘thought’ in (I thought I should ever be like Miss Bates! So silly—so satisfied). Also, the deontic modal ‘should’ is utilized by the gossiper to stress the criticism raised by her in the IS. At the same time, the gossip expansion is achieved by employing the overstatement strategy (So silly, so satisfied, so smiling, so proosing, so undistinguishing and unfastidious, and so apt…) which incorporates the conversational implicatures element. This element is generated by breaking the maxims of quality and quantity through providing over stated unjustified additional information about the gossipee. Finally, the sub-stage of maintaining the gossip acts embraces two pragmatic elements. The first element of this sub-stage is the conversational implicatures produced by violating the maxim of quantity (A single woman, with a very narrow income, must be a ridiculous, disagreeable old maid) to vindicate the gossiper’s expanded negative point of view of her victim of gossip. Whereas the second element of this sub-stage is politeness expressed by abiding by the sympathy maxim in (if she had only a shilling in the world, she would be very….).

The ES incorporates the speech act element of gossip pragmatic structure. This final stage is concluded by a negative evaluation presented in the form of agreement to the
gossipers’ attitude of the gossipee’s gossip acts. This agreement is actualized by issuing a speech act of stating strategy embodied in the statement (That is a great charm).

**Situation (4): Emma**: Mr. Elton’s manners are not perfect, but there is such a good-temper and good-will in Mr. Elton as one cannot but value.

**Mr. Knightley**: Yes, with some slyness, he seems to have a great deal of good-will towards you.

**Emma**: Me! Are you imagining me to be Mr. Elton’s object?

**Mr. Knightley**: Such an imagination has crossed me, I own, Emma; and if it never occurred to you before, you may as well take it into consideration now.

**Emma**: Mr. Elton in love with me! What an idea!

**Mr. Knightley**: I do not say it is so; but you will do well to consider whether it is so or not, and to regulate your behaviour accordingly. I think your manners to him encouraging. I speak as a friend, Emma. You had better look about you, and ascertain what you do, and what you mean to do.

**Emma**: I thank you; but I assure you, you are quite mistaken. Mr. Elton and I are very good friends and nothing more.

In this gossip exchange (Chapter VIII, page 34) Mr. Knightley, the gossiper, attempts to influence the attitudes of the gossip receiver, Emma, through persuading her that Mr. Elton is not the right person in spite of his affections for her.

The IS, here, is started by the GI sub-stage which is composed of a presupposition element represented by the existential presupposition strategy ‘Mr. Elton’. The TG sub-stage is initiated by issuing a speech act of telling strategy (Mr. Elton’s manners are not perfect, but there is such a good-temper and good-will in ……..) used to pass on the gossiper’s positive view of the gossipee’s gossip acts.

The EGAS is launched by bringing in the summary of gossip acts sub-stage actualized by the projection verb ‘seems’ in (seems to have a great deal of good-will towards you). Additionally, the epistemic modality markers ‘never’ and ‘may’ are exploited to support gossip information given in the IS (never occurred to you before, you may as well take it into consideration now). After that, the gossip expansion is brought forward by means of the rhetorical question strategy (Me! Are you imagining me to be Mr. Elton’s object?). This strategy contains the conversational implicatures element which is generated here by infringing the maxim of quality. Eventually, one pragmatic element composes the maintaining of the gossip acts, which is the politeness component invoked by observing the generosity maxim in (You had better look about you, and ascertain ….). This can be
illustrated by the fact the gossiper attempts to politely get intimate with his interlocutor by offering her a piece of advice.

The ES is accomplished by a positive evaluation advanced by the gossip recipient, Emma, in a very unusual way, as she partially agrees to the positive nature of the gossip acts of the gossipee. This agreement is actualized by issuing a speech act of stating strategy embodied in the statement (Mr. Elton and I are very good friends and nothing more).

Situation (5): Emma: She is an odd woman!—But I never allow myself to speak ill of her, on Frank’s account; for I do believe her to be very fond of him. I used to think she was not capable of being fond of anybody, except herself: but she has always been kind to him. And it is no small credit, in my opinion, to him, that he should excite such affection; for, though I would not say it to anybody else, she has no more heart than a stone to people in general; and the devil of a temper.

Mrs. Weston: Mrs. Churchill rules at Enscombe, and is a very odd-tempered woman; and his coming now, depends upon her being willing to spare him.

Isabella (Mrs. Knightley): Oh, Mrs. Churchill; everybody: and I am sure I never think of that poor young man without the greatest compassion. To be constantly living with an ill-tempered person must be dreadful. It is what we happily have never known anything of; but it must be a life of misery. What a blessing, that she never had any children! Poor little creatures, how unhappy she would have made them!

In this gossip interaction (Chapter XIV, pages 69-70), Mrs. Weston and Isabella, the gossipers, manipulate and influence the ideas of the gossip receiver, Emma, to the gossip victim, Mrs. Churchill, by criticizing the bossy hard-hearted character of her to persuade Emma that she controls her adopted son’s life, giving him misery and sufferance.

The IS, here, is started by the GI sub-stage which engenders a presupposition element incorporated in the existential presupposition strategy ‘she’ and ‘Mrs. Churchill’. Whereas, the TG sub-stage which comprises the speech act element is activated by issuing a speech act of telling strategy (is an odd woman!—But I never allow myself to speak ill of…. ) intended to indirectly express the gossiper’s negative view of the gossipee’s gossip acts.

The EGAS is initiated immediately by activating the summary of gossip acts sub-stage motivated by the projection verbs ‘believe’ and ‘think’ in (I do believe her to be very fond of him. I used to think she was not capable of being fond of anybody, except herself). Also, the deontic modal ‘should’ is utilized by the gossiper to enhance his issued claims concerning the aberrant acts of the gossipee, Mrs. Churchill. Immediately, the gossip is expanded by means of a metaphor strategy (she has no more heart than a stone to people …) which contains the
conversational implicatures element. This element is generated by infringing the quality maxim by means of a metaphoric expression ‘stone’ which is intended to depict the merciless cruel acts of the gossipee. Finally, the sub-stage of maintaining the gossip acts is accomplished by violating the maxims of quantity and relation (To be constantly living with an ill-tempered person must be dreadful. It is what we happily have never known anything of; but it must be a life of misery) to stress the gossiper’s expanded negative point of view of her victim of gossip.

The ES is concluded by a negative evaluation illustrated in the form of support to the gossippers’ attitude which is offered by the gossip receiver, Mrs. Knightley. This support is realized by the issuance of the speech acts of stating and criticizing strategies embodied in the statements (everybody: and I am sure I never think of that poor young man without the greatest compassion. To be constantly living with an ill-tempered person must be dreadful. It is what we happily have never known anything of; but it must be a life of misery).

7.4.2 Findings
The statistical analysis arrived at by applying the percentage equation reveals the following:
1. Existential presupposition (represented by the proper noun) is employed 100% in the IS.

2. The percentage of projection and modality employment in the EGAS is 100%, which is very much higher than that of the Gricean conversational maxims which is 60% (which has been calculated by summatting the percentages given below of the total number of the strategies which is four).

3. In the ES, the percentages of evaluation strategies have been distributed as follows:
   Positive evaluation: 40%.
   Pejorative evaluation: 60%.

4. In the ES, the speech act of stating strategy has a leading frequency that amounts to 60% because it is used (either solely or in collaboration with the criticizing strategy) to express agreement on, or support of the negative evaluations made by gossippers.
7.5. Conclusions

The developed model has proved its validity in pragmatically analyzing gossip, as it has successfully revealed many pragmatic aspects associated with gossip as illustrated below in the findings arrived at by this work.

1. Existential presupposition, represented by the proper name and possessive pronoun, is the only kind of presupposition that is used to initiate IS with a percentage of 100%. This is illustrated by the fact that specifying the third absent party (gossipee) is a minimal feature for triggering gossip interaction therefore; the gossipee must be identified clearly in order to keep the gossip channel open.

2. In the EGAS, projection and modality has been shown to be more significant than the rhetorical devices, due to the fact that projection and modality has been employed in all the situations with a percentage of 100%, whereas the percentage of the employment of the rhetorical devices and the Gricean conversational maxims is only 60%.

3. Emphatic tropes have been employed more frequently whenever gossipers wish to support their pejorative attitudes to the gossipee and amplify the impact of the gossipee’s gossip acts on their interlocutors. This conclusion is supported by the high percentage reaped by them which amounts to 80%.

4. Agreement and support are the most common pragmatic strategies of negative evaluation in that they have the highest percentages that amount to 40% and 20% respectively.

5. In the ES, the negative rather than the positive type of gossip is dominant. This dominance is supported by the overall results of negative evaluation which amount to 60% in the novel under investigation.
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CHAPTER EIGHT
A COGNITIVE PRAGMATIC STUDY OF INNER VOICE IN THE FILM ‘ELEGY OF A VOYAGE’

Fareed H. H. Al-Hindawi
Susan Abdulhadi Kadhim

8.1. Introduction

If pragmatics is the investigation of meaning-in-context, then cognitive pragmatics is generally demarcated as incorporating the investigation of the cognitive aspects and methods intertwined in the understanding of meaning-in-context. It is advocated that a consideration of how thoughts are expressed and generated through inner speech can provide understanding into how the various human communication skills operate. The present study aims to investigate the inner voice: thinking via words. It is cognitive pragmatics which is of supreme significance in intellectual aspects, and understanding in other languages. Vygotsky (1986: 249, cited in McCafferty & Ahmed, 2000: 201) portrays inner voice as follows:

In inner speech words pass away as they give rise to thought. Inner voice is to a great degree of sophisticated and unadulterated connotations. It is a self-motivated, unstable, unbalanced thing, flickering between word and concept, the two more or less stable, more or less resolutely defined mechanisms of spoken pragmatic concept.

To reveal the cognitive pragmatic dimensions of this linguistic phenomenon, this work has set itself the task of pragmatically analyzing it in a movie work which is thought to be rich of it. Precisely, the analysis of the pragmatic employment of inner voice by the narrator is intended to be conducted in the Russian film "Elegy of a voyage". This film is directed in 2001 by Aleksandr Sokurov. Writers are: Aleksandr Sokurov, Alexandra Tuchinskaya. The star and narrator is Aleksandr Sokurov. In this regard, this study endeavors to answer the questions of exactly how the implicature mechanism is learned, how the relevance theoretic approaches to implicature In addition to the status of defaults of using first person pronouns
are processed online, and what the implications of the employment of metaphor, presupposition and contextual findings are for the scrutiny of inner voice with respect to cognitive pragmatic theory.

Inference tackles the cognitive procedures by which interlocutors understand meaning beyond what is said. Despite its importance, it is not included in the paper due to the limited scope of this work.

Basically, this paper aims to uncover the significance of the illustrative setting in conveying the message of the film. In relation to this aim and the questions raised above, it is hypothesized that: 1. the scrutiny of context is essential but typically not sufficient for the pragmatic intellectual capacity of utterances. 2. the narrator is the storyteller, the fictional 'I' in a first-person narration, the speaker and conceivably the occasional critic established in the film. 3. metaphor is a not fundamental strand in the work of cognitive pragmatics, and 4. counter-factual presupposition is the dominant type of presuppositions in the data under scrutiny.

To attain the aims of the study and test its hypotheses, a model is developed for the analysis of the data under scrutiny. Moreover, a statistic analysis is piloted by means of the percentage equation. This kind of analysis is intended to quantitatively support the results of the cognitive pragmatic scrutiny and confirm or reject the hypotheses of the study.

8.2. Literature Review

8.2.1 Pragmatics

People habitually say something that has altered meaning from what they exactly say. Though they employ language as the central aspect of interaction to make an active communication, they often cannot obtain their goals straightforwardly for the reason that people regularly do some linguistic activities which cannot be understood simply and easily. Accordingly, to recognize people's linguistic behavior in communication with each other, pragmatics is needed. Pragmatics is needed because when people understand about pragmatics, they will understand not only the explicit meaning of an utterance but also its implicit meaning. Implicit meaning consists of expectations, purposes, and objectives. That is why pragmatics is essential to be studied since it can analyze how language is employed in a certain context (Yule, 1996: 4).
According to Yule, Pragmatics is the investigation of the association between "linguistic forms and the users of those forms" (ibid: 5). Yule adds that Pragmatics is the study of the use of language in specific situations.

From this definition, it is seen that there is a close relation between the linguistic forms and people who use them. An utterance can have some different meanings if it is uttered by different people with different status, different job, and different gender.

Earlier to Yule, Trudgill (1992: 61) points out that Pragmatics tackles the meaning of 'utterances as they occur in social context'. Here, Trudgill would underline two points. First, it is concerned with meaning in context; second, it is about the speaker's or listener's intention. Accordingly, pragmatics may be described as the study of the meaning of linguistic utterances for their interpreters.

Prior to Trudgill, Leech (1983: 6) sees pragmatics as studying meanings with respect to situation. It means that by using pragmatics people can differentiate meanings of one's utterance based on the situation of the communication. Thus, different situations influence the meaning of speech.

As for Mey (1993: 42), pragmatics is the investigation of the surroundings of human language techniques as these are identified by the society context. Here, Mey clearly states that context of society holds an essential role in the uses of language. It means that different contexts will determine different types of language use.

8.2.2 Cognitive Pragmatics

According to Kasher (1991: 54), cognitive pragmatics is the understanding of the aspects of linguistic use surrounded by the mechanical and hypothetical framework of cognitive knowledge. Broadly speaking, there are two points of view on pragmatics: the "philosophical" and the 'cognitive'. From the philosophical point of view, an interest in pragmatics has been to a great extent assumed by issues in semantics. A familiar occurrence of this was Grice's concern to attain a close semantic parallel between operators and their normal language partners, like, 'not', 'and', 'or', 'assuming', 'each', 'an/a few', and 'the'. (Kasher,1991:54-6)

The starring role of pragmatics is basically to redirect any essentials of unspoken meaning that might obscure the semantic meaning and affect the hoped-for matches between rationality and speech. Commenting on this view, Fauconnier (2006: 657) sees that, there is a need to seek for what seek for what account for scalar phenomena, speech acts and
Performatives, presupposition, referential opacity, so-called figurative speech, metonymic pragmatic functions, and implicature; however he believes that old problems are framed in novel ways.

Pragmatics involves creating competence in the comprehension uses of sentences, particularly in speech acts, discussions, discourse registers, and expanded talking turns. Utterances can be created by more than one participant, as in discussion, or in different types of monolog, most remarkably narrative and exposition (Hans-Jörg, 2012: 65).

**8.2.3 Narrative as a Mode of Understanding**

The remarkable development of narrative is a reason for both celebration and caution. Exceptional work has been done in an extensive variety of fields, and the outcome has been an extraordinary vitality and energy. Undoubtedly, 'narrative turn' in the social sciences reproduces a typical alteration in understanding the human condition. Simultaneously, there has developed some apprehension about narrative aspects overextending its reach and thus losing some of its specific values as a device for mentality. Within the narrative zone, film provides sufficient and reliable data that can represent the phenomena of the narrator inner voice. (Tudor 1974, 225-6)

**8.2.3.1 Film**

**8.2.3.1.1 Definition**

Film is one of art forms. While there is some other explanation which claims that film is the part of audio visual arts, most of which also emphasize mobility and temporal sequence. It cannot be separated from the society since both of them have particular influence on each other. Since film includes a story, it shows an account of imaginary or real people and events. In other words, a film can reflect the real world. This explains why a film can represent a case in a real life. (ibid.)

There are some terminologies related to film. First, there is the word cinema. According to Metz (1977 cited in Kolker, 2000: 9), cinema indicates the entire institution of film making, film distribution, film exhibition and film viewing. Further, in England it usually refers to the place where a film is shown. Differently, in the United States, movie replaces cinema and the word film is reserved for serious intent. Likewise, in Hollywood, the people who make films sometimes call them pictures.
The derivation of the word 'film' comes from the point that film has factually been the most important medium for recording picture, comprising picture show, photo-play and the most frequently movie.

8.2.3.1.2 Elements of film

In analyzing a film, someone has to understand its elements so that s/he can make a detailed analysis. The elements of a film, according to (ibid:228) can be identified as follows:

a. Scene: a section of film usually made up of a number of shots which is combined by time, setting and the characters.

b. Plot: the unified structure of a film.

c. Character: an imaginary person who acts in a film. In other words it refers to a person in a literary work. Character can be described in a physical sense (as for example short, has brown eyes, wears a hat, etc.

d. Point of view: the angle of vision from which a story is narrated.

e. Conflict: a struggle between opposing forces in a film usually resolved by the end of a story.

8.2.4 The Narrator's Inner Voice in Films

The investigation of narrative in film has a long history. This creativity is essentially a formation of the 20th century. It was only then when it came to be called narratology. Cognitive narratologists try to migrate trickiness just in the cooperation of reader and content. The narrator's inner voice in films guarantees dynamic mental procedures on the premise of learning of the world. Relating the etymological contribution to the individual learning is an intellectual procedure. The narrator's inner speech can be a remark or an assessment, for example, 'it is awesome' or a question like 'what should I do?' or a self-assurance as in 'Take as much time as is needed' (Tomlinson, 2000: 137).

It has been emphasized that there is a close connection between language of the silver screen and 'inner speech'. Montage, as well as common speech, comprises fragmentary expressions rather than complicated and coherent sentences. Inner speech has been scrutinized more significantly by Vygotsky in his works (1920) and later in his book 'Thought and Language' (1934). One of the fundamental standards of Vygotsky in this work is that the origins of language and speech are discrete (Vygotski, 1982: 99).
Berk (1991:21) points out that narrator's inner speech in a film is the private speech or the silent dialogue in which the need to engage in inner speech never disappears. It is the cognitive pragmatic tool that helps to overcome obstacles and acquire new skills. The author and the 'I' of the text are not the same.

8.2.5 Elegy of a Voyage

Sokurov (the author of the text of the film) makes a remark about the inner voice in the film summarizing it in few sentences which go as follows:

“People once lived here. I knew them. I believe I lived among them, too. When someone died, we wept. We were afraid that we were becoming fewer. Then we began to move our houses closer to the road. Everyone did so. We all wanted to live close together. No one wanted to live apart. But I can't recall whether it helped us.” (Web source 1)

In this film, the creative change of the objects of reality achieves the apex of the author's modification of this reality. The author's musings and words expect the presence of visual pictures crystallized from gleaming impressions of reality, formed in a way that is eloquent yet somber, fabulous yet honest.(ibid.)

In this voyage the names of individuals and spots are distanced: this free dream, a fantasy about the unendingness of space and time, needs no borders or travel papers. Pictures of the local land: a sacred place in a congregation where a child is being immersed, encompassed by solemn appearances, the well-known scenes of “abandoned homeland”, the wilderness zone - are prevailing by different pictures: by the sparkling lights of a western town during the evening, by the representation of a young fellow, talking a remote dialect and holding his grin even at a miserable memory. Neither the scenes nor these representations pass on unmistakable signs of today's life. Or maybe the perpetual nonexclusive components of different wellsprings of human presence do as such. Just the executive's will drive the gathering of people to the point of meeting. At the point when, finishing him betrayed rooms of a gallery during the evening, in old sixteenth century Dutch artworks one perceives and perceives the slippery balminess of lifespan and the endless longing for a voyage - with the goal that one may return - to each other. For craftsmanship alone can give the one of a kind opportunity to partake in this cycle (ibid.).
8.3. Model of Analysis

The model intended to be developed for the analysis of the data under scrutiny is an eclectic one which is intermingled out of the various concepts discussed in the following lines.

8.3.1 Van Dijk’s (1977) Model of Analysis

The model approached by Van Dijk (1974:9) is basically dependent on the analysis of “Context”. The analysis of context is necessary in which the focus is on the diverse social contexts that are generally categorized and are in turn demarcated by some properties.

8.3.1.1 Context Analysis

Unmistakably, the scrutiny of context is essential but typically not sufficient for the pragmatic intellectual capacity of utterances. After the comprehension of the utterance the definite assignment of a speech act takes place. Obviously, after the understanding of the expression itself (ibid: 12).

The diverse social contexts thus generally categorized are in turn demarcated by the following properties (ibid: 13):

(i) positions (e.g. roles, status, etc.).
(ii) properties (e.g. sex, age, etc.).
(iii) relations (e.g. dominance, authority).
(iv) functions (e.g. father, waitress, judge, etc).

These aspects of social contexts are scientifically interrelated. They describe the potential actions of the social members in the respective contexts.

As for the contextual course of action, the following elements can be identified (ibid:14):

1. Macro-action: Narrators have intuitive thoughts about the universal association of action, both in construction(plans) and in reflection in addition to clarification of action. They are capable to mark level differences and provide a categorization of action as one comprehensive action.

2. Previous action: With the intention of understanding that the specific speech act is suitable to the narrator, he must be conscious of his own (previous) activities and the fundamental knowledge.
8.3.2 Booth's (1991) Model of Analysis

Booth (1991: 17) discusses the employment of deictic expressions: first person pronouns in which his study concerns itself with indexical expressions that are associated with the role of the narrator.

8.3.2.1 Deixis: First-Person Pronoun

The first-person singular pronoun ‘I’ is a deictic, or indexical expression. In the sense of ‘indexical’ it is related to only one role: that of the narrator. The author and the narrator are not the same entity. The narrator, to Booth (ibid: 16), is the speaker of the story, the fictional “I” in a first-person narration, the teller of the story and potentially the occasional commentator in third-person accounts.

Booth (ibid: 19) first identifies the inner voice with what he terms “the intuitive apprehension of a completed artistic whole”: It comprises, to be brief, the natural apprehension of an accomplished artistic whole; the primary importance to which this inner voice is dedicated, irrespective of what party his originator be appropriate to in real life, is that which is stated by the total form. The category of person and the specificity of person deixis, assume that there is an I in every narrative, even when it does not appear. Every narrative is, by definition, virtually made by an I.

8.3.3 Sperber and Wilson's (1995) Model of Analysis

Sperber and Wilson's (1995:55) model of analysis is proposed to be developed for the analysis of the "communicative principle of relevance", which states that by the demonstration of making an articulation, the speaker is conveying that what he has recently said worth listening to, i.e., it gives intellectual impacts worth of handling exertion required to locate the importance. In such manner, each demonstration of correspondence will look something like this: the speaker communicates his aim to the listener in an intentional way.

8.3.3.1 The relevance-theoretic approach to implicature

Conversational implicature (C.I) is a sort of roundabout correspondence, initially portrayed by the language philosopher Grice. He recommends that in a typical discussion, speakers and audience members share a cooperative principle. At the point when a speaker seems not to follow the maxims, he infers a unique capacity different from the literal meaning of form. The speakers suggest that the listeners realize that their words ought not be taken at their face
value and that they can induce the unsaid meaning. Grice (1967, 1989) utilizes the idea of implicature to manage cases in correspondence where what a speaker implies goes beyond the meaning literally communicated by a specific utterance (ibid :56).

The relevance-theoretic approach to implicature has been introduced by Sperber and Wilson (1995) as a component of a more extensive endeavor to shift pragmatics into an intellectual and cognitive structure. Concerning implicature, relevance theory can be portrayed as basically a reductionist hypothetical approach for two causes. First, it lessens all the pragmatic principles that have been proposed to underlie the generation of implicature by the Griceans and the neo-Griceans into a single 'Principle of Relevance'. Second, it diminishes all the diverse types of meaning in the Gricean/neo-Gricean structure, (for example, what is said, conventional implicature, short-circuited implicature, generalized conversational implicature, particularized conversational implicature, and so on) into only two general classifications: Explicature and implicature. The benefit of a definition that gives a focal part to relevance is that it clarifies the absence of the only implicature in specific settings.(ibid: 45)

8.3.4 Gilles Fauconnier's (2006) Model of Analysis

Gilles Fauconnier's (2006) model of Analysis is a cognitive model with a mental categorization that is intermingled with pragmatic aspects. The focus is on the analysis of presupposition as it is highly employed in the data under scrutiny.

8.3.4.1 Presupposition

The presuppositions of an utterance are the pieces of information that the speaker undertakes to be known or shared in order for the utterance to be significant in the current context. Presuppositions are presumed to contemplate the associations between the mental spaces that are set up in progressing talk. Mental spaces are conceptual packets built as an individual thinks and talks for incentives behind schedule comprehension of an activity. Mental spaces are partial intellectual aspects comprising components and are prearranged by frames and psychological models. Consider the following example of mental space development provoked by sentence (1) coming at a assured fact into a specific discourse in context (Fauconnier, 1998: 45).

(1) George thought the winner received $200.
The speaker may have a specific context in the mind, for which there is a role 'winner', and that role has value like 'Harry'. The clarification, then, is that the speaker considers Harry as the winner. The language is prompted for the invention of conceptual spaces. The initial space and the partial structure are in correspondence with what has already been presented by then in the talk or what might be presented unreservedly on the grounds that it is logically accessible in the circumstance. The phenomena of presupposition can also be found in film since film is portrayal of society. Many people say that film, which is also called motion picture, is a cultural artifact created by certain cultures which reflects the cultures. Below are the types of presupposition that will be clarified because they are evident in the data under scrutiny.(ibid:46-9)

1. **Counter Factual Presupposition**

   Counter Factual Presupposition is the type of presupposition which occurs when the assumption of what is presupposed is not only untrue, but is the opposite of what is true, or contrary to facts. For example, some contingent structures, for the most part called counterfactual conditionals, presuppose that the data, in the if- clauses, is not true at the time of utterance. For example, 'If only Martha were here to see this. Here, Martha has already passed away for years and thus the real situation is quite the opposite of what is spoken by Wanda.

2. **Lexical Presupposition**

   Lexical Presupposition is the postulation that, in employing one word, the speaker can act as if additional meaning (word) would be understood. For instance: Everyone, stop the 'roughhousing'! This example presupposes that everyone else is still doing the roughhousing.

3. **Structural Presupposition**

   In this type, certain sentence structures have been investigated as traditionally and routinely presupposing that part of the structure which is thought to be valid. Such as, 'Where did you find that card?' This might presupposes that the card has been found.

4. **Factive Presupposition**

   This type is called factive presupposition since a few words are utilized as a part of the sentences to mean certainties, for example, know, acknowledge, lament, happy, odd and mindful. For instance, "fire bad", and "we know" in which the word “know” can be used in the sentences to denote facts.
8.3.4.2 Metaphor

A second strand of central work in cognitive etymology which associates constantly with the first is the extensive improvement of metaphor. Illustration is fundamental and constitutive for all the reasoning that one does, and that in the plan of development, metaphor makes the likelihood of 'dynamic' thinking, logical and numerical thought, and philosophical theory. (ibid: 55)

The mind is exemplified and metaphor gives it the supremacy that it has. The regular approach to talk and think about event structure is in terms of movement. In this allegorical mapping, states are areas, change of state is change of area, causes are forces, purposes are destinations, means are ways to goal, guided activity is guided movement, and so forth. This is extensively reflected by the lexical and grammatical features of language one employs to express event structure (ibid: 56), as in the following examples:

1. She went unwise.
2. He entered a state of ecstasy.
3. The garments are somewhere between drizzling and waterless.
4. The home run threw the troop into a turmoil.
5. He walked her through the difficult.
6. I've hit a brick wall. Do it any way you could.
7. They're moving ahead/at a standstill.

These are not inaccessible examples; they are metaphorical constructing as they play a vital role in most of the theoretical systems.(ibid: 57)

Pulling together all the information and notions required to form our eclectic model of analysis, this model can be presented and schematized by Figure (1) below:
8.4. Data and Analysis

8.4.1 Data

8.4.1.1 Data Collection and Description

The genre of the film is chosen as a subject of this study because of its great potential in disclosing the interactive strategies of the participants and cognitive pragmatic features of the resulting texts. The study can further develop the argumentation that interacts with inner voice. The film chosen here is that of *Elegy of a Voyage*. The data collected by the study are in the form of the transcript of the film, from the internet via downloading them and then having them printed. The film involves the narrator's inner voice.
8.4.2 Analysis

8.4.2.1 Methods of Analysis

The eclectic model developed and introduced in Figure (1) is the basic means utilized here to pragmatically analyze the inner voice in the Russian film: Elegy of a Voyage. Additionally, a statistical tool represented by the percentage equation is used for calculating the results yielded by the analysis. The transcript of the film is read repeatedly and then analyzed pragmatically and statistically, which is for the most part used to put forth broad subjective expressions. Two vital focuses ought to be given due consideration preceding setting out the analysis:

1. The examples are given numbers in each type and stage of analysis. This is done for explicitness and easy access.
2. The film is quite lengthy, so analyzing all the representative situations will occupy a very large space in the work. Thus, only some illustrative examples are presented.

8.4.3 Illustrative Analyzed Examples

As mentioned above, the situations representing the data are too many, and scrutinizing them all can occupy a large space in this work; merely some representative examples will be presented:

8.4.3.1 Context Analysis

1. I have never been here before.
   A. Frame structure
      (i) setting:
      1. the narrator, here, is the speaker
      2. the time is autumn
      (ii) positions: in a village
      (iii) properties: 1. He is a man. 2. He has difficulties in living.
      (iv) relations: He knows the monk and he was walking with him.
      (v) functions: host: the narrator.
   B. Contextual course of action:
      1. Macro-action: Arrival of the narrator when he sees the monk.
      2. Previous acts: description of the nature: the sky, tree, birds, water, etc.
A. Frame structure

(i) setting:
1. the narrator is the speaker himself.
2. the time is winter

(ii) positions: in a palace

(iii) properties: 1. He is an old man. 2. He is looking for something inside the palace.

(iv) relations: He was alone.

(v) functions: painter: the narrator.

B. Contextual course of action:

1. Macro-action: One feels as if he is inside a dream.
2. Previous acts: A story that is told by a soldier about the word "life"

Table (1) and figure (2) below will show the percentages of the analysis of context and their schematizations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context Analysis</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (1): Statistics of Context analysis

Figure (2): Rates of Context Analysis
Table (1) and figure (2) above validates the first hypothesis. The percentages of context analysis which are (80%, 70%, 66%) demonstrates that the narrator employs such strategy to m strengthen the utterances so as to express them in a way that sounds more interesting to the hearer.

8.4.3.2 Deixis: First Person Pronouns

1. *I* wanted to speak about the prayer of the Chalice.

   ‘*I*’ is for the most part used to put forth broad subjective expressions. Storytellers utilize the pronoun *I* to present themselves as people and talk from their own particular insider viewpoint, ideally highlighting one's great qualities and achievements. It can be delineated that *I* covers all out data about the speaker; the storyteller does not talk here as an appropriately furious man. Here "*I*" proposes numerous different things as a person, a national, etc. A large portion of these all out participations, which is accessible from the nature of his internal voice, however not here pertinently are clouded in his employments of *I*– here his employments of "*I*" (and 'my') mean basically "*I*" the suggested speaker'.

2. What *I* am doing here? Who sent me? In passing here the compel of the other individual references in this turn, can be noted. In any case, it is not the self-reference – 'I' – that accomplishes this. 'I' is essentially a man reference that alludes to the inferred speaker. At the point when a speaker depicts himself as having a place with a class, it is the all-out segment of the articulation that passes on the verifiable individual nature of the speaker and not the individual reference. The other first individual pronouns utilized are 'Me' and 'My.' 'We' is utilized when the suggested storyteller is communicating his own perspectives and feelings. I is suggestive of the feeling of "belonging".

3. *I* see smoke above the night town. *I* can't recognize it…..*I* see a strip of water.

   Here, the inner voice is talking in his ability as a representative for the collectivity in portraying the beginnings of his work. Self reference appears to be suitable here seeing that he is depicting what anybody could see and report – an awful mishap. He regards it extremely perceptibility as unproblematic. He displays his purpose of perspectives and presents himself by the redundancy of 'I' in which the principal 'I' distinguishes him as an effective speaker. While the second one helps him to allude to his emotions, while the last one declares his discourse and underscores his internal discourse as a controlled word.
4. I am hovering over the rooftops, and road lights. I am giving a valiant effort, not to investigate windows. Despite everything I don't have a clue about the town. The implied narrator utilizes the self-reference ‘I’ and ‘we’ as etymologically Self-reference relies on upon 'I'- contemplations which have the property of being insusceptible to mistake through misidentification since one can't utilize an 'I'- thought without realizing that 'I' alludes to himself. The limit with regards to self-reference presupposes an authority of the main individual pronoun; and a dominance of the principal individual pronoun presupposes the limit with regards to self-reference. The table and figure underneath will demonstrate the rates of first person pronoun:

**Table (2): Statistics of deixis: first person pronoun**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>First Person pronoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure (3): Rates of First Person Pronouns**
As shown on Table (2) and Figure (3) above, the fictional “I” in a first-person narration has highly percentage. This finding partially verifies the second hypothesis in this study (i.e. The narrator is the speaker of the story, the 'I' in a first-person narration.

8.4.3.3 Relevance

The relevance - theoretic way to deal with utterance utilizes a solitary informative rule, which some have seen as excessively reductive and improbable, making it impossible to have the essential point by point illustrative power. The advantage of a detailing that gives a prevailing part to importance is that it elucidates the absence of the only-implicature in specific environments. This, in turn, has its effect on the language of the speakers, as revealed in the following:

1. I slept three hours a year.
   The utterance certainly implicate that the narrator rarely has a good sleeping, he sacrifice his time to sleep to add interestingness and to refer to the uniqueness of the narrator.

2. As fine as only a creation of God…..
   In spite of the fact that this is the typical way of discourse, there are conditions, by the by, in which the specific recommendation ought to be comprehended to mean exactly what it says and not something else well beyond what it says. One such condition is that in which the speaker does not know whether the subcontrary suggestion is additionally valid; another is that in which reality of the subcontrary is not of any minute, seeing normally requires a moment pass and the impact is ordinarily that of a humorous "unsaying" or retroactive convenience.

3. I couldn't say even to myself what they were about?
   The speaker forgets a significant bit of data, the recipient won't comprehend what the speaker is attempting to state. Since understanding what is said is the result of contextualisation processes, in which many individuals will prefer diverse contextualisation cue so that a similar articulation will be given diverse significance since right then and there that "cue" is related, to some extent, to that situation. The implicit interpersonal meanings in this utterance can be paraphrased as more polite expression to be used to smoothen the communication.

4. The sea began to get warm.
   The in the first place translation got to by the listener would be adequately important yet would not be the most applicable one compatible with the speaker's methods and objectives. A propositional shape imparted by an articulation which is even-mindedly developed on the
premise of the propositional blueprint or layout (consistent frame) that the expression encodes; its substance is an amalgam of etymologically decoded material and logically gathered material.

**Table (3): Statistics of Relevance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure (4): Rates of Relevance**

Table (3) and figure (4) illustrate that relevance is pervasive in film: 66%, 43%, 27%, 44%. These percentages are those triggered by "different descriptions" and "change of state". Such percentages confirm that the cognitive conversational utterance forms used to perform specific actions.

**8.4.3.4 Presupposition**

1. And if someone should see you, the safety of the hotel, the sanctuary, no one would ever come again.
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The narrator starts to freak out and try to get rid of the human from his hotel. It can be seen that the presupposition used, if someone should see you, the safety of the hotel, the sanctuary, no one would ever come again is counter factual because it can be presupposed that no one else in the hotel has seen him and the hotel is still packed full of monsters. The conversation takes place in a small closet near the lobby of the hotel. The narrator is talking about Jonathan being in the hotel. When Dracula finds out that there is a human in his hotel, he starts to freak out and try to get rid of the human from his hotel. The function of the conversation is to show the audience the feeling of terrified felt by Count Dracula realizing there is a human in his “human-free” hotel. Then it can be said that the implied meaning of the conversation is that Count Dracula is terrified of Jonathan's existence in the hotel.

2. That guy's crazy! Trying to eat everything.

It can be seen that the presupposition used in this utterance, that guy's crazy! Trying to eat everything is a lexical presupposition because it can be presupposed that by saying that he is trying to eat him, he has another implied meaning in this sentence. It is that he does not manage to eat him. Then it can be said that the implied meaning of this inner voice is that he does not manage to kill Jonathan and Jonathan feels relief because of it.

3. He said" why have I recalled this now?"

It can be seen that the presupposition used in this utterance, why have I recalled this now, is a structural presupposition because it can be presupposed that he has recalled. The function of this inner speech is to show that the narrator is surprised that Mavis has his personal stuff. Then it can be said that the implied meaning of the speech is that the narrator actually does not want Mavis to recall.

4. I realize he was so glad.

The expression I realize explicitly sets up this mental space. It can be seen that the presupposition used in this utterance, I realize he was so glad, is a factive presupposition because the word “glad” can be used in the sentences to denote facts. The fact is that everybody is listening to this speech. The table and figure below will show the statistics and rates of presupposition:
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The employment of any counter-factual presupposition is dominant. The percentage of (60%), as displayed on Table (4) and Figure (5) above, supports this finding. This verifies the fourth hypothesis of this paper (i.e. counter-factual presupposition is the dominant type of presuppositions in the data under scrutiny).

8.4.3.4 Metaphor

1. Anybody can get on stage, you know, with enough lights and sets and music and sound and attachment with people and whatever and just perform.
The word ‘attachment’ means (the possession of romantic feelings for someone/affection / friendship). The narrator presents this expression to perceive the utilization of some word or expression as proof of a desire with respect to the speaker to indicate some delicate purpose with the audience and to be more affective by introducing more emotions and feelings through the use of metaphor.

2. Minutes are quick but hours are slow.

Two things are shown: that the rising, moving transient units have speed and that some have more prominent speed than others. Be that as it may, how could this be? The constituent parts of a moving item in space should all move at a similar speed. Hours are made out of minutes. A clear "figurative" projection would require that minutes, hours, hundreds of years, and so on., would all have a similar speed. What has happened is that uncoupled items that move at various speeds in space are anticipated onto constituent parts of a fleeting interim in the mix. There is a Catch 22 in the standard analogy examination of time as space in having a source area of moving articles that incorporates speed, since speed as of now appears to require time. This oddity is settled in the standard examination by accepting that movement is uniform, with the goal that speed is unimportant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Metaphor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to what is found on Table (5) and Figure (6) above whereby metaphor has highly percentages (that is, 70%). This finding rejects the third hypothesis in this paper (i.e. Metaphor is a not fundamental strand in the work of cognitive pragmatics).

8.5. Conclusions

In the light of the results and findings of the analysis, this study has come up with the following conclusions:

1. Context analyses are harmonized with those of cognitive pragmatic scrutiny. The analysis of context is a essential but typically not a adequate condition for the pragmatic intellectual capacity of utterances, it requires other pragmatic tools to arrive at complete understanding. The percentages of context analysis which are (80%, 70%, 66%) demonstrates that the narrator uses such tactic to strengthen the utterances so as to express them as more interesting to the listener wherein the scrutiny of context is essential but typically not an adequate condition for the pragmatic understanding of utterances. This finding verifies the first hypothesis.

2. It seems that acts of self-referring emanate from diverse degrees of communicated self-awareness along with diverse degrees of communicated commitment to the narrator's inner voice by appealing to features and self-attribution of intellectual conditions. This is quite evident in the percentages that shows that indexical expressions (53%, 50%, 35%, 20%, 22%) are regularly employed. It has been found that the narrator is the teller of the story, the 'I' in a
first-person narration, the speaker of the story and theoretically the infrequent critic established in the film and this verifies the second hypothesis.

3. The aim for all of metaphor theorists is that they want to go far beyond the normal emphasis on cross-domain mapping and implication allocation. One need to maintain directly the greater complication of amalgamations that lies behind the noticeable metaphorical and theoretical schemes, there is also a need to take into consideration their cultural history, and to account obviously for the developing structures they create, both over cultural time and over individual time. Metaphor is a fundamental strand in the work of cognitive pragmatics.

4. All types of presupposition convey meanings more than what is said. They are commonly used in films so that the narrator's intended meaning should not always be explicitly stated to reflect the cognitive implied meaning or the additional meaning of utterances based on the context. Structural presupposition is the dominant type of presuppositions in the data under scrutiny. This rejects the fourth hypothesis. And this is reflected by the percentages (44%, 39%, 31%, 22%).

5. The advantages of conversational implicature and relevance analysis are in illustrating the kinds of things, narrator can do with words and identifying some of the cognitive conversational utterance forms used to perform specific actions. This is evident in the percentages calculated in this regard: 66%, 43%, 27%, 44%.

6. As other consciousness-related phenomena, inner speech is not easy to scrutinize. Inner speech is an attractive and significant one, if only because of the significance that it seems to have in films. It is principally an apparatus for organized behavior. Inner speech is an uncharacteristic form of speech. The employment of cognitive pragmatic tools is a necessary condition for analyzing filmic narration and context besides context analysis.

7. This research shows that inner speech as a highly researchable topic, a feature of both theoretical and empirical communications. Inner speech has a cognitive pragmatic function to play which comes out in slighter or stronger forms in films. Film provides sufficient and reliable data that can represent the phenomena of inner voice. Even if one cannot fully understand its philosophy, it can be understood as his/her subconscious feeling.

8. The eclectic model developed by this work has proven to be workable for the analysis of the target data. This conclusion is built on the fact that using it in this regard as successfully revealed all the cognitive pragmatic aspects which have been scrutinized and thus helped in attaining the aim of the work.
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