BADJI MOKHTAR UNIVERSITY-Annaba
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of Letters and English Language

Polycopié. Élaboré en vue de l'obtention de l'habilitation universitaire

PRAGMATICS/ Lectures for Master 1 LMD Students in Language Sciences

Dr. Hana Nedjah

2023-2024

Table of contents

Course Description and Aims

The course provides Master I students in language sciences/English language with knowledge and skills to understand how speakers use words and sentences to convey meaning in context and the principles that lie behind the interpretation of utterances in specific situations. It introduces students to the key concepts in pragmatics as they pertain to the use of language and its relations to the context of usage. It offers a broad overview of the concepts and tools which are required for analyzing how linguistic communication works such as cooperative communication, implicature, politeness, illocution, locution, perlocution, performative utterances and speech acts. The course will examine linguistic data from English and other languages students are familiar with (in particular Arabic and French) and explore theories and methodologies concerning how we use language to do things like make requests, ask questions, tell stories, be polite, take part in conversations and in institutional talk. Students' skills of analysis, critical thinking, discussion and teamwork are also promoted through class activities, such as lecturing, brainstorming, discussion, questions and answers, group discussion assignments on pragmatic analysis, which help to develop students' analytical skills introduced in other courses of language theory.

Course objectives

The course aims to:

1. Introduce the basic concepts and analytical techniques in the study of language from a communicative and pragmatic perspective
2. Help students develop an understanding of different levels of meaning
3. Train the students to become sensitive to, and skilful at examining how context and pragmatic principles affect interpretation and how language is employed to communicate various types of meaning
4. Prepare the students for further studies in applied language studies.

Thanks to class attendance and individual study, students are expected to acquire the following knowledge, skills, and competences:

1. **Knowledge and understanding:**

   - Learning the basic technical vocabulary that is currently used in the philosophy of language and the pragmatics of linguistic communication;

   - Correctly interpreting statements and arguments concerning philosophical-linguistic subjects and especially scientific texts belonging to the field of pragmatics;

   - Being acquainted with the main topics that are currently discussed in pragmatics: knowing what the context is and how it influences communication; what speech acts are and how they can be classified; what presuppositions and conversational implicatures are; what politeness is and what role it plays in communication, etc.;

   - Being acquainted with the main theories that scholars have proposed to account for pragmatics phenomena: knowing how indexicals and demonstratives work; understanding the concept of performative and the concept of illocutionary force; knowing the theory of pragmatic presupposition and Grice's explanation of implicatures; knowing the maxims of politeness and the distinction between positive and negative face, etc.;

   - Understanding the importance of pragmatic phenomena for social communication and marketing strategies.

- **Ability to apply knowledge and understanding**:

  - Ability to use the technical vocabulary acquired to correctly describe linguistic phenomena in general and pragmatic phenomena in particular;

  - Ability to recognize and analyse the main pragmatic phenomena that occur in different types of texts and media;

- Ability to apply pragmatic theories to the analysis of the communicative exchanges of daily life, so as to provide convincing explanations of the speakers' behaviours and reactions.

➢ **Judgment ability:**

- Ability to foresee and assess the conversational effects and possible socio-relational consequences of the use of diverse communicative tools.

- Taking into consideration the ethical dimension of social communication for the sake of a conscious and responsible use of communicative tools.

Semester one

- **Lecture one: Pragmatics: origins and definitions**
- **Lecture two: Pragmatics and semantics/ Pragmatics and syntax**
- **Lecture tree: Context**
- **Lecture four: Deixis**

Lecture one: Pragmatics: Origins and Definitions

1. Introduction

Linguistics is the scientific study of language, and its study typically includes the study of our knowledge of sound systems (phonology), word structure (morphology), and sentence structure (syntax). It is also widely acknowledged that there is a significant distinction between our competence and performance. Our competence is our knowledge of the norms of our own idiolect – our own internalized language system that has many similarities to the idiolects of other speakers in our community but is almost certainly not identical to them. (For example, it's unlikely for two speakers to share the same vocabulary.) Our performance, on the other hand, is what we actually do linguistically, including all of our hesitations, false starts, interrupted sentences, speech errors, and frequently imperfect comprehension.

In language use, there is a tight relationship between form and meaning. The study of linguistic form entails the examination of a variety of linguistic unit levels: Phonetics is the study of individual speech sounds, phonology is the study of how these sounds pattern systematically within a language, morphology is the study of word structure, and syntax is the study of sentence structure. These forms may be associated with meaning at each level. At the phonetic/phonological level, individual sounds typically lack semantic significance. However, intonational contours are associated with particular meanings; the study of prosody focuses on these associations. Individual words and morphemes are conventionally associated with meanings at the morphological level; this is the domain of lexical semantics and lexical pragmatics. This is the domain of sentential semantics. We deal with pragmatics above the level of the sentence, which includes meaning that is inferred based on contextual factors rather than being traditionally associated with a particular utterance.

If you see a notice like "drink to your fill" on a library shelf, you undoubtedly understand what each word means and what the sign means. You are not likely to interpret the notice as a request to consume natural liquid water. If you were exceptionally intelligent, you would realize that you should read as many books as possible. You have attempted to discern the meaning that the writer of the notice intended to communicate by using the meaning of the words in conjunction with their context.

Speakers and writers frequently intend much more than they express and expect their audiences to comprehend them. In general, they will presume that certain aspects of unstated meanings can be deduced from the context. This assumption is based on their shared environment, values, social conventions, and worldview, which guides their interpretation of meanings beyond words and grammatical structures. The final objective is to correctly interpret the speaker's intended meaning. In the study of pragmatics, the concept of the speaker's or writer's intended meaning is a crucial component. In addition, as you will see in this study, traditional pragmatics is all about investigating the speaker's or writer's intended meaning as opposed to the literal meaning of the words.

2. Origins of Pragmatics

"...in the history of linguistics, pragmatics is a remedial discipline born, or reborn, of the severely limited scope of Chomskyan linguistics (while in philosophy, the interest in language use can be attributed in part to 'language reformism'). It could be argued that pragmatics was exercised [...] without being preached prior to 1957."

Levinson, Stephen, Pragmatics

The term pragmatic has established itself in linguistic literature in recent years thanks to numerous investigations undertaken within this discipline. Today, therefore, it is legitimate to "speak of pragmatics as a branch of the sciences of language. The works of John Langshaw Austin and Paul Grice are often regarded as the preaching beginnings of this branch. Reference is here made to the series of lectures called the William James Lectures given by J. Austin in 1955. Through these lectures, this linguist introduces a central notion for pragmatics, that of act of language. He defended by this "the idea that language in communication has not primarily a descriptive function, but an actional function; by using language, we do not describe the world, but we carry out acts, acts of language." (Ibid.)

The origins of pragmatics can be traced back to the philosophy of language around 1930s: Charles Morris, Rudolph Carnap, and Charles Peirce. Peirce classified semiotics into syntax (the study of signs' formal relationships to one another), semantics (the relationship of signals to what they represent), and pragmatics (the relationship of signs to their users and interpreters). Carnap(1939) organizes them according to their level of abstraction, stating that syntax is the most abstract, followed by semantics and pragmatics at the conclusion.

In the 1950s, the ideal language philosophy school was concerned with the study of logical systems of artificial/formal language, which culminated in the development of today's formal semantics. The ordinary language school of thought was another school of thought. It called for a focus on natural language, citing Austin's theory of speech acts and Grice's conversational implicature as examples. Around 20 years later, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, Noam Chomsky's supporters spoke out against abstract linguistic views, and their campaign resulted in the "pragmatic wastebasket" becoming empty, as Yeoshua Bar-Hillel phrased it. This meant that linguists conducted extensive study in the 1970s to provide order to linguistic theories.

The evolution of pragmatics is divided into **three stages:**

The first stage took place in the 1930s. For the first time, the term "Pragmatics" was utilized as a subfield of semiology (the study of signs). Carnap stated in 1938 that pragmatics should concentrate on the relationships between users, words, and references. Charles Morris separated semiology into three components in 1940: syntactics/syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. The second stage, from 1950 to 1960, Austin, Searle, and Paul Grice developed their theories of speech act and implicature theory. The third stage in 1977, when Jacob L. Mey published the first Journal of Pragmatics in Holland. Levinson published "Pragmatics" in 1983, while Geoffrey Leech published "Principle of pragmatics" in 1984. The

International Pragmatics Association (IPrA) was founded in 1988. This was the year that marked the emergence of as an independent discipline.

There are two main school of pragmatics: the British/ American school and the European School. T**he British and American school** focused on Grammar and sentence structure, deictic expression, conversational implicature, presupposition, speech, and conversational structure. It was known as micro-pragmatics.

- **The European school** had a broader scope. It concentrated on macro-pragmatics topics such as conversational analysis, cultural anthropology, social linguistics, and psycholinguistics in the communication process.

3.Definitions of pragmatics

The term “pragmatics” was first coined in the 1930s by the philosopher C.W. Morris; developed as a subfield of linguistics in the 1970s. According to Liu (2007), Charles Morris introduced the first modern definition of pragmatics, and since then many other specialists have continued to conceptualize this branch of linguistics. In researching pragmatics, a plethora of definitions has been offered to shed insight on pragmatics' nature, principles, and scope. Let’s examine a few of them.

By defining pragmatics as "the relations of signs to interpreters," Morris (1938: 6) alludes to the main concerns of the field. However, the precise meaning of the terms and the nature of the relationship involved are open to several interpretations. Morris's own emphasis on the definition's central idea suggests that signals are typically created with interpretation in mind. For example, in figure 1 the addressee-the students of the class- decoded the message sent by the sender that they need to be silent.

Figure 1. Showing ‘keep silent’ (Arif ,2016)

More recently, Kasper (1993) defined the term as “the study of people's comprehension and production of linguistic action in context” (p. 3). This brief definition states the elements of context and production as relevant elements of pragmatics that are fundamentals of any speech act in a language. Context, as Kasper viewed it, consists of the social and cultural circumstances in which communication takes place. These circumstances play a critical role in how messages are constructed, conveyed, and how they are received. Kasper also uses a broad term, “linguistic action,” (p. 3) which is a somewhat general term used to describe the capacity of producing utterance that a learner has.

According to Leech & Short (1981, p.290), pragmatics is "the study of that aspect of meaning that is derived not from the formal properties of words, but from how utterances are used and how they relate to the context in which they are uttered." Note that the term "utterances" is not synonymous with "sentences."

Pragmatics is "the study of meaning in relation to speech situations," according to Leech (1983, page 6). The context of the speech enables the speaker to use language to accomplish a specific effect on the mind of the audience." Thus, the discourse is goal-oriented (i.e., the intended meaning of the speaker or author).

According to Levinson (1983, page 9), pragmatics is "the study of those aspects of the relationship between language and context that are relevant to the writing of grammars." Notice in this definition that the primary focus is on the interrelationship between language and context-dependent principles of language usage.

According to Yule (1996, p.127), pragmatics is "the study of speaker-intended meaning." It is, in many ways, the study of unspoken meaning or how we understand what is intended even when it is not explicitly stated (or written).

Also noteworthy is the emphasis on comprehension as well as production, a distinction that is particularly relevant for second language learners' daily lives. Even more recently, Crystal defined pragmatics as: the study of language from the point of view of the users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction, and the effects their use of language has on the other participants in an act of communication. (as cited in Barron 2003, p. 276)

This definition analyses pragmatics from the perspective of the users. It takes into account the different choices that speakers are able to make when using the target language, depending on the social interaction of their communication. The notion of choice brings another aspect into consideration useful to language learners, namely, developing the ability to make the right choices among a variety of pragmatic elements.

On this same topic, the focus on the user, research by Sharples, Hogg, Hutchinson, Torrance and Young (2009) provided a definition based on the concepts of context and identity. They define pragmatics as "Those aspects of the study of language that pertain to the identity and intentions of the speaker and hearer, and the context in which speech takes place." (Pragmatics)

Regarding context, they said that "it is sometimes most narrowly regarded as the body of world knowledge to which speakers and hearers have access in generating and interpreting speech" (Sharples et al., 1996, Pragmatics). They also consider context and identity as factors that may influence pragmatic competence, which means that the style or manners of the speakers change according to these factors.

4.Principles of Pragmatics

From the preceding definitions of pragmatics, it is clear that there are some characteristics that help us comprehend the principles and objectives of pragmatics: Each definition emphasizes the following:

1. language use, i.e., language in actual communication situations (language performance as opposed to merely cognitive skills);
2. . language performance as opposed to merely cognitive skills. In other words, how language users communicate orally and in writing is more significant than the grammatical correctness of their utterances.
3. discourse or utterance as opposed to sentence.
4. The context of the speech – the location of the conversation's/discourse's participants.
5. the purpose of the utterance/discourse or the speaker's intent.
6. Participants in a conversation/discourse situation, their roles, relationships, and identities, because these factors influence how meanings are encoded and interpreted.
7. Shared assumptions/knowledge, cultures, or communication norms among participants.
8. The fact that interactants do not interpret meaning based solely on their knowledge of the language system, but also on their knowledge of the world, cultures, or worldview. A pragmatics analyst attempts to explain what communicators actually "do" with language, whether consciously or unconsciously, by focusing on utterances in communication rather than sentence structure.

Example:

- *Jide steps out of a vehicle. Fortunately, he notices his friend Mark standing nearby. He advances to speak with Mark while the taxi waits.*
- Jide: Mark, how are you? Do you have ome currency?
- Mark: I do not have enough money to pay for a taxi ride.

Observe that Jide appears to pose two questions: "what's up?" and "Do you have any spare change?" Mark realizes immediately that Jide is not posing a yes-or-no question, but rather a request for money to pay his taxi fare, so he responds with an explanation. Again, he assumes that "what's up" is more of a greeting than a query. Now, "yes" or "no" would have been the appropriate response to the second query if it had been posed in a different setting, such as a bank. Obviously, if they were complete strangers, Mark would not have used the same words; therefore, "what's up" was not only a salutation but also a means of initiating a conversation/discourse. It also suggests that they share a psychological bond or relationship. Jide correctly assumed that mark would accurately interpret his "questions"

5. Pragmatics as a 'wastebasket'

During the mid-twentieth century, pragmatics was metaphorically referred to as the "waste-basket" of linguistics. This metaphor not only implies a negative connotation to this field, but Philosophy and Progress also diminish its importance in the fundamental domains of languages throughout that period. Nevertheless, Mey (2001) views it as evidence of the unique 'status' of pragmatic study in its early stages, which ultimately contributed to the emergence of a new academic field known as 'Pragmatics'.

The debate over the examination of language, specifically the comparison between abstract and concrete principles, has not only been a topic in the field of philosophy of language but also persists in linguistics since the 1950s. The consequences of this argument and the prevalence of the abstract technique of language study during this period have been symbolically elucidated in the history of linguistics. At that time, a group of linguists were envisioning a scenario where they were working with different parts of languages, including their abstract principles, on a table while having a waste-basket placed in front of them. The quotation below visualises the working technique of the linguists, specifically their tendency to disregard abstract language qualities and discard unresolved portions/features of common language.

By placing the investigation of the abstract, potentially universal, features of language in the center of their work tables, linguists and philosophers of language tended to push any notes they had on everyday language use to the edges. As the tables got crowed, many of those notes on ordinary language in use began to be knocked off and ended up in the wastebasket. (Yule, 1996, p.6)

The metaphorical use of a wastebasket to represent a place for discarding insignificant notes and features of ordinary language originated from the ideas of Yehoshua Bar Hillel, an Israeli philosopher and linguist (1915-75). Bar Hillel referred to semantics as the "waste-basket of syntax" (Mey, 2001). Hillel's idea requires additional elucidation in order to reveal the waste-basket metaphor of pragmatics.

Lecture Two: Pragmatics and Semantics/ Pragmatics and Syntax

1. Introduction

Semantics and pragmatics are two subfields of linguistics that study the meaning of language. They both focus on how speakers use words to communicate meaning, but they approach the question of meaning from different perspectives.

2. Pragmatics, semiotics, syntax and semantics

One traditional distinction in language analysis contrasts pragmatics with semiotics, syntax and semantics**.** **Syntax** is the study of the relationship between linguistics forms, how they are arranged in sequence, and which sequences are well-formed. It explains how words are put together to make sentences with specific meaning. This type of study generally takes place without considering any world of reference or any user of the forms. **Semantics** is the study of the relationship between linguistic forms and entities in the world; that is how words literally connect to things. Semantic analysis also attempts to establish the relationship between verbal descriptions and state of affairs in the world as accurate (true) or not regardless of who produces that description. **Semiotics** is concerned with the use and interpretation of signs and symbols. It provides a way to study communication focusing not only on spoken or written language but also on all kinds of communicative signals or "signs." (That is why the field is called "semiotics," based on the Greek words for signs and significance.) In contrast to semantics, syntax, and semiotics, **pragmatics** is the study of the relationship between linguistic forms and the users of those forms. It focuses on the literal and nonliteral components of language as well as how social or physical settings affect the way certain linguistic expressions are used. In this four-type distinction, only pragmatics allows humans into the analysis. The advantage of studying language via pragmatics is that one can talk about peoples' intended meanings, their assumptions, their purposes or goals and the kinds of actions that they are performing when they speak. The big disadvantage is that all these very human concepts are extremely difficult to analyze in a consistent and objective way.

3. What is meaning?

Meaning covers a variety of language aspects, and there is no general agreement about its nature. Looking at the word itself, the dictionary will suggest a number of different meanings of the noun 'meaning' and the verb' mean'. Two aspects of linguistic meaning can be distinguished:

1. **Sense:** it refers to the mental representation of a meaning; the concept you get in mind when you hear a word. Sense refers to the inherent meaning of the linguistic form; it is concerned only with intra-linguistic relations. It is the collection of all the semantic features of the linguistic form; it is abstract and de-contextualized.

   Example:

   - Desk: a piece of furniture with a flat top and four legs, at which one reads and writes
   - I: first person, indicating the speaker

2. **Reference:** the actual entities in the world that an utterance refers to. Reference means what a linguistic form refers to in the real, physical world; it deals with the relationship between the linguistic element and the non-linguistic world of experience.

   Example:

   - If I say 'that desk' and point at a particular desk, the referent is that actual physical thing.

All linguistic forms have sense, but not reference. • The linguistic forms with the same sense may have different references in different situations. • Some linguistic forms with the same reference might differ in sense.

In our course, the word 'mean' can be applied to language users, i.e. to speakers, in the sense of 'intend'; and it can be applied to words and sentences in the sense of 'be equivalent to'. i.e What something expresses or represents. Therefore, to understand what meaning is, one has to keep in mind whether we are talking about what speakers mean or what words (or sentences) mean.

4. Pragmatics vs Semantics

Semantics and pragmatics are two branches of linguistics that deal with the meaning of a language and link language to the world. Each branch deals with meaning differently. The only obvious similarity between the two branches is that they both examine the meaning of words and sentences in different ways. According to Lyons (1977), semantics is a branch of linguistics that is concerned with meaning, whereas Levinson (1983) defined Pragmatics as a branch of knowledge that is concerned with language use. However, both fields are integrally related to one another.

Both semantics and Pragmatics are concerned with peoples' ability to use language meaningfully. While semantics is mainly concerned with a speaker's competence to use language systems, the chief focus of pragmatics is a person's ability to derive meanings from specific kinds of speech situations. In other words, to recognize what the speaker is referring to; to 'fill in 'information that the speaker takes for granted and doesn't bother to say.

Eg: I'm hungry

1. *Said by a beggar who has not eaten all day*
2. *Said by a child who hopes to put off going to bed*
3. *Said by a man who wants to have lunch with his co-workers.*

The three events obviously have something in common ' the same words' and yet, they indicate different intentions and are liable to be interpreted differently because the situations and the participants are different.

According to Bach (1997) the distinction between pragmatics and semantics is easier to apply than to explain. Delineating the boundary is not as simple as it may appear. For instance, semantic meaning is sometimes referred to as context-independent, whereas pragmatic meaning is sometimes referred to as context-dependent. In contrast, pragmatic meaning is frequently identified as meaning that does not affect the truth conditions of the utterance, whereas semantic meaning is frequently identified as meaning that is truth-conditional. While both are true the majority of the time (i.e., semantic meaning is context-independent and truth-conditional, whereas pragmatic meaning is context-dependent and non-truth-conditional), there are instances in which the two distinctions do not align precisely.

Perhaps the main reason for introducing the semantics-pragmatics distinction is to provide a framework for explaining the variety of ways in which what a speaker conveys can fail to be fully determined by the (conventional) linguistic meaning of the sentence he utters:

- ✓ ambiguity
- ✓ vagueness (and open-texture)
- ✓ semantic underdetermination
- ✓ implicitness
- ✓ implicature
- ✓ non-literalness
- ✓ non-truth-conditional content
- ✓ illocutionary force

Another reason for invoking the semantics-pragmatics distinction is to shed light on a number of other distinctions:

- ✓ type vs. token
- ✓ sentence vs. utterance
- ✓ meaning vs. use
- ✓ context-invariant vs. context-sensitive meaning

- ✓ linguistic vs. speaker's meaning
- ✓ literal vs. nonliteral use
- ✓ saying vs. implying
- ✓ content vs. force

It is clear that there is a distinction between what would seem to be the usual meaning of a word or a sentence, and the meaning it has in certain specific circumstances or contexts. It is this distinction that allows us to say one thing and mean another. This is the primary difference between pragmatics and semantics.

According to Chierchia and McConnell-Ginet (1990) the question of how semantics relates to pragmatically oriented theories is "wide open." For them, semantics deals with those aspects of meaning that remain constant whenever a given expression is uttered: Semantics covers what expressions mean, while pragmatics covers what speakers mean in using the expressions. Along these lines, it is standard, Green (1989) claims, to distinguish between what a sentence means and what a speaker intends to convey by the utterance of the sentence, and to restrict the role of semantics to explicating the meaning of sentences in terms of conditions that must be fulfilled for the sentence to be used to truthfully describe a situation.

Thus, aspects of the interpretation of utterances that do not involve **truth conditions** are commonly considered outside the domain of semantics, Green (1989). Whether an utterance is a promise, a prediction, or a question and how metaphorical expressions are understood are matters of pragmatics, not semantics. Furthermore, semantics is **compositional:** The meaning of a complex expression relates in a predictable way to the meanings of the parts from which it is constructed. The meaning of the whole is a function of the meaning of the parts.

Pragmatics, on the other hand, is the study of situated uses of language, Chierchia and McConnell-Ginet (1990); adding this caveat: "Since direct experience with interpretation of language is experience with interpreting uses, however, we cannot always be sure in advance which phenomena will fall exclusively in the domain of semantics and which will turn out to require attention to pragmatic factors as well," a fact that makes it difficult to free semantics from pragmatic considerations. (Chierchia and McConnell-Ginet, 1990:5)

Pragmatics involves how speakers use language in contextualized social interactions -- how they do things with words, as Austin would say. Semantics invites a focus on meaning and truth conditions without regard to communication and context.

In order to make sense of the semantic- pragmatic distinction, we need to take several other distinctions into account that involve primarily **context** and **utterances, interpretations and sentences.**

Lecture Three: Context

1. Context in pragmatics

pragmatics is the study of language use by individuals in specific social situations and the study of language in its social context began with the rise of popular interests in sociolinguists, pragmatics, discourse analysis and ethnography of speaking in the 1970's particularly as a reaction to purely abstract linguistics. Scholars were concerned with a more balanced way of studying language, other than focus on language structures alone. To them it was crucial to also examine the relationship between language and society and how language use is influenced by the social context. The goal of this kind of contextual study according to Dell Hymes (1974) is to:

1. Involve language in practical issues such as education, minority groups and language policies.
2. Show how social function gives form to the ways in which linguistic features are encountered in actual life.
3. Identify social functions and discover ways in which linguistic features are selected and grouped to serve them (sharing a concern with social realism and validity).
4. Show that a socially constituted linguistics is concerned with social as well as referential meaning and with language as part of

2. Context Meaning and Features

Context refers to the situation, within which language functions. It may be physical/environmental, social context or institutional situation, including events, time, culture or social conventions that can influence language use. The first use of the term "context of situation" is attributable to Bronislaw Malinowski, a social anthropologist, who in his study of language behaviors among some native Indians concluded that language is a “**mode of action”** and as social behavior is closely tied to the relevant social situation in which it is used (Malinowski, 1935).

The meaning of words was not to be restricted to sounds of utterances or their grammatical structure, but must include the “pragmatic context” in which they are uttered. J.R. Firth (1957) expounds this study and in his contextual theory of meaning argues that context is the bedrock of any linguistic enterprise because “normal linguistic behavior as a whole is meaning effort, directed towards the maintenance of appropriate patterns of life” (p. 223). Since every utterance occurs within a “culturally determined context of situation”, meaning is tied to that context about the speaker and the ways he perceives himself, his roles in the society and his relationship with other members of the society.

As pragmatics investigates context-based meaning, it will be impossible to talk about pragmatics without reference to the context in which utterances are made. And, as a matter of fact, linguistic codes are actually selected and used according to some social sets of standards. Contextual considerations make the difference between structural linguistics and sociolinguistics, pragmatics and discourse analysis. We shall look at the features of context as we examine the various types of contexts.

3.Types of contexts

3.1. Linguistic Context

This refers to the set of words in the same sentence or utterance. This forms the linguistic environment that determines the sense of the words in the context. For example if the word “shoot” , on the one hand, appears in a linguistic context along with other words like “dribble,” “penalty,” “goal”, or “over the bar”, we immediately understand the *shoot* that is meant. If on the other hand, the same word appears with words like “soldier”, “artillery” or “war,” the meaning is immediately known. The linguistic context (also known as *co-text*) of a word or words therefore has a strong effect on what we may think such words mean. Generally, words occur together and frequently used with some particular words with which they collocate.

3.2.Physical/environmental Context

Again, we know that words mean on the basis of the physical or environmental context. As we saw previously, the meaning of the word “drink” on a library shelve is different from its meaning on the door of a canteen. The physical context definitely influenced our interpretation of the word. Our understanding of words or expressions is much more tied to the physical context particularly in terms of the time and place being referred to in the expressions. Other features of the context include

1.Participants, e.g. boys, girls, men, traders.

2. On going activity, e.g. playing, chatting, and debating.

3. The place, e.g. church, class, stadium, dining table.

4. The time, e.g. time of the day or season. Hymes (1964) identifies the following general contextual features: *Participants, Topic Setting, Channel, Code (dialect/style), Message form (debate, chat… etc*) All of these features may not rigidly be ascribed to the physical context. For example, the channel/medium or code through which the piece of discourse is carried out are determined by other variables such as education, age, status or class which may well be described as some features of the social-cultural context.

3.3.Interpersonal Context

The interpersonal context focuses on psychological considerations that influence speech or talk. There is no doubt that the state of the mind of the speaker or writer places some constraints on the quality or amount of interactions s/he engages in. His inputs and reactions are predictable if he is sad, happy, excited or bored.

Critics of pragmatic emphasis on such criteria as intention, belief or rationality, argue that the understanding of text and talk is not dependent on elements rooted in psychology rather, on social factors such as “power” and “status” and how they are distributed and maintained linguistically in the society (Lavandera, 1988). Interestingly, many social analysts of discourse, among who are also interested in pragmatics do indeed recognize the influence of socio-cultural variables that affect the production of discourse, or text.

However, the fact remains that individual speakers or writers do make linguistic choices and decide what to say and how to say it. Therefore factors that place constraint on their ability to do this (e.g. state of the mind) is of interest to pragmatic analysts.

3.4.Situational/socio-cultural Context

Unlike the other contexts discussed above, the situational context concerns mainly with socio-cultural considerations. The context of culture includes beliefs, value system, religion, conventions that control individuals’ behavior and their relationship with others. These sociocultural rules of behavior often guide them in order to communicate effectively with one another. Some beliefs or conventions may be considered as universal, while some are culture-specific, especially those that guide utterances, non-verbal communication and other forms of social behavior that may be interpreted meaningfully.

Knowledge of socio-cultural rules of behaviors brings up the idea of “communicative competence” which according to Dell Hymes (1972) is the ability of the speaker to know when to speak, when not and as to what to talk about with whom, when, where, and in what manner. This competence is integral with attitudes, values and motivations concerning language, its features and uses in the most suitable and appropriate contexts. Take this example:

A little child: (scribbles unintelligibly on the surface of a white paper and presents it to his father, smiling) Daddy see…!

Father: (hugs the child) ah…beautiful, this is the most brilliant writing I've ever seen.

The father has applied the best communicative etiquette in his response to his child's writing, considering the context and the participant in the communication event.

3.5.Institutional Context

Much of what we refer to here as "institutional context" may have actually been covered as part of the social/cultural context, but it is necessary to identify certain elements of the context in some specialized kind of settings like educational institutions, which impose some constraints in language use. Take a Convent or a purely Islamic institution for example: there are certain conventions there that govern people's mode of communication and behavior that is not just "social" or "cultural." We consider this as institutional and much of these institutional standards or "common sense assumptions" (Fairclough, 1989), determine social behavior and individuals simply imbibe them as natural and unchanging.

For example, there are certain ways people must greet one another in some of these places. Expressions such as "bless you" or "it is well" in some Christina mission universities have become almost institutionalized that people are made to believe that unless they greet each other that way, they may never be enjoying certain privileges. In some cases these rather peculiar manners of expressions help to identify the individuals and the institutions they are associated with.

4. Functions of Context

In terms of its relationship with pragmatics, the function of context mainly lies in its influence on the expression and interpretation of meaning. Context cannot exert its influence on its own. It participates in the process of decoding meaning.

From the speakers' point of view, its function can be understood at least from three aspects:

First, it will decide the content to be expressed according to the purposes and goals of communication. Second, it will define the style of speech act according to the setting or scene. Third, it will decide the channel of communication in accordance with the situation presented.

And **from the audience's point of view**, the function of context includes the following three dimensions: First, it helps to assign reference Second, it serves as an anchor to get rid of pragmatic ambivalence and vagueness. (He Ziran and Chen Xinren, 2004, pp.118-121) Semantic enrichment is realized when context helps the audience to fill the information gulf. And Dijk believed that his model for understanding context would offer "a general foundation for pragmatics." (van Dijk, 2008, p.5)

Lecture Four: Deixis

1. Origins

Deixis is one of the most important notions in general linguistics and is a vital link between the real life environment around us (time frame, physical location, people involved, etc) and what we actually say (the linguistic terms used). Deixis has always been at the heart of reference research as widely known literature in semantics and pragmatics demonstrates. Being fundamental, it is in the common focus of several disciplines: cognitive science, linguistics and psychology.

The origins of deixis is ‘deiktikos’ (deicitic) in Greek, meaning ‘pointing’, which reflects the core function of deixis. Deixis has been called by different names in different approaches: Pure index (Pierce, 1932) Indexical Symbol (Burks, 1948), Indicator (Goodman 1951), Indexical expression (Bar-Hiller, 1954).The important feature of deictic pointing is that it cites not only referents but also gestures towards locating them- in relation to a speaker and a hearer.

2. Definitions

Crymes (1968) has defined deixis as ‘‘any pointing that locates either a real-world referent or a linguistic referent in terms of its orientation to the speaker spatially and temporally…’’ (p.63) For Fillmore (1997) deixis (deictics) refers to those lexical items and grammatical forms which can be interpreted only when the sentences in which they occur are understood as being anchored in a specific context. That context identifies the participants in the communication act, their location in space, and time during which the communication act is performed.

For Yule (1996) deixis refers to pointing via language. To accomplish this pointing, we use **deictic expressions**; Eg: what’s that? you are using a deictic expression (that) to indicate something in the immediate context. Deictic expressions are also sometimes called **indexicals** (ibid). Deictic expressions depend on the speaker and hearer sharing the same spatial context, in face-to face spoken interaction. As such, speech heavily depends on knowledge of the context: where and when a sentence is uttered and by whom. These three dimensions are traditionally seen as the so-called deictic centre of all linguistic events.

For Buhler (1934), any expression which locates a referent in space or time is a deictic expression. Expressions like: I, we, you, this, that, here, there, now, yesterday, next year are all indexed to the speaker in speaking; that is, they take their current interpretation from the speaker at the moment of speaking. it is necessary for a listener to identify the speaker, the time and the place of utterance in order to interpret fully what was said and what was meant by what was said.

According to Chapman (2011), deixis refers to a category of expressions whose main purpose is to connect uses of language to the context in which they appear. These are ubiquitous in language.

Deixis, in a broad sense, is potentially context-dependent linguistics expression and typically anchoring in the perspective of the speaker. In this regard, the view that deixis is, in fact, a part of pragmatics is highly advocated, as its interpretation depends directly and primarily on features of the context ,i.e., context-dependent, such as the speaker and addressee, their location in space, time, etc.

3. Types of Deixis:

As for deixis, a phrase is interpreted with regard to the time, location, or interlocutors of the linguistic exchange in which it occurs, or relative to other linguistic material in that very exchange (Birner, 2013). Consequently, four major categories of deixis can be distinguished. Three major ones: person, spatial and temporal while social deixis is characterized as a marginal category based on the occurrence of deictic elements in spoken interactions.

3.1.Person deixis

Person deixis localises an entity in relation to the position of the speaker and/or hearer (Green, 2008). First and second person pronouns typically refer to the speaking and hearing speech participants, whereas third person pronouns designate the non-speech or narrated participant. According to Lyons (1983) the active participants are the speaker and the addressee, whereas the third person is not an active participant in the speech act. {SPEAKER (I), ADDRESSEE (YOU), OTHERS (HE- SHE-IT- THEY)} for examples:

1) *I* was late., 2) *You* arrived early., 3) *I* saw *them*.

In many languages, the three deictic categories of speaker, addressee, and other(s) are expanded with markers showing relative social status. That is, expressions which reflect higher status are referred to as *honorifics*. Additionally, the discussion of the circumstances which cause the selection of one of these forms rather than another is occasionally designated as social deixis (Yule, 1996).

A well-known example of social contrast encoded within person deixis is the distinction between forms used for a familiar versus a non-familiar addressee in some languages such as Tu (familiar)/Vous (non-familiar) distinction in French, German (du/Sie) and Spanish (tu/Usted). The choice of one form will certainly communicate something (not directly said) about the speaker's view of his or her relationship with the addressee.

3.2. **Spatial deixis.**

Spatial deixis localizes both the speech participants and the narrated participants in space. The most frequent words are the pronouns *this/that* and *these/those* . Other expressions that belong to this category are the adverbs *here/there* and prepositions *in/on* (Levinson, 1983).

Spatial deixis also entails whether something is near the speaker or not (*this vs that*). In all languages, there are pairs of verbs such as *come/go* , *bring/take* , which are interpreted to identify the direction of the motion, towards or away from the place of speech event, hence the spatial deixis is the marking in language of the orientation or position in a space.

Lyons (1977:) states that “there are two ways in which we can identify an object by means of a referring expression: first, by informing the addressee where it is; second, by telling him what is like, what the properties it has or what class of objects it belongs to”(p.648)

According to Yule (1996), it is important to remember that, in considering spatial deixis, location from the speaker’s perspective can be fixed mentally as well as physically. Speakers seem to be able to project themselves into other locations when they temporarily away from their home location or prior to actually being in particular locations eg: I’ll come later (movement to addressee location). This is sometimes described as **deictic projection.**

It is suggested that the truly pragmatic basis of spatial deixis is actually psychological distance. Thus, physically near objects tend to be treated by the speaker as psychologically close. Similarly, something that is physically distant is typically treated as psychologically distant (ibid).

3.3.Temporal Deixis

Temporal deixis is another category of deictic expressions. It refers to an event of an utterance, which takes place any time relative to the speaking time and is, therefore, represented by tense, time adverbials and sometimes by spatial prepositions such *as in the evening, at midnight, on time* . The location of an event referred to and represented by time and tense constitutes the deictic centre in the utterance of a speaker. In English, the present and the past are morphologically marked. Morphology is an area of study within grammar that describes how words are composed. A linguistic element is morphologically marked when it is more distinctively identified than another element, by adding a morpheme. A morpheme is the minimal unit of meaning. For example, the first person present tense *I work* is not morphologically marked.

On the other hand, the third person *he work-s,* and the past tense *he work-ed* are marked by the morpheme -s and -ed. The future is constructed using the modal verb *will* . Another way to express the future in English is by attaching an adverb of time indicating the future illustrated in the following example: I *go* on holiday *next week* ., my friend *is going to* sing in a concert tomorrow. (future with phrasal verb *be going to*), They *will* bring the car in to be fixed. (future with modal verb *will*), I *lived* in Cyprus for eight years. (morphologically marked past tense -*ed*)

3.4. Social deixis

Social deixis refers to the relation between the speaker and the addressee and third party referents (Fillmore, 1977). According to Levinson (1983) social deixis is those aspects of language structure that are anchored to the social identities of participants in the speech event, or to relations between them, or to relations between them and other referents (p.63). In some languages, such as Spanish, French, Romanian, the singular second person pronoun has two forms: *tu* and *usted* - *vous-dumneavoastra*. The first form (*tu*) is used to address to a speaker in an informal or relaxed way. The second form (*usted* – *vous* – *dumneavoastra*) is used in a more formal or polite context. In Modern English, there is no such distinction for the second person pronoun *you* .

Under the cover term of social deixis, Fillmore (1977) includes a number of linguistic phenomena such as: devices for person marking, for example pronouns; the various ways of separating speech levels; distinctions in utterances of various types which are dependent on certain properties of the speech act participants; the various ways in which names, titles, and kinship terms vary in form and usage according to the relationships among the speaker, the addressee, the audience and the person referred to; linguistic performance which can appear in terms of social acts, such as insults, greetings, expressions of gratitude; linguistic performances which can accompany social acts, such as *there you go* , and, finally, the various linguistic devices that helps a speaker establish and maintain a deictic anchoring with a given addressee.

4. Proximal and Distal Deixis

According to Green (2006), deixis is normally considered to be the encoding of the spatiotemporal context and subjective experience of the encoder in an utterance. Terms like **I**, **here**, **now** and **this** are deeply context-dependent and signify a sort of cognitive centre of positioning for the speaker. That is, what is *here* for the speaker may be *there* for the addressee(s).(p.178)

Prior to that, Yule (1996) proposes that the most basic distinction made by deixis seems to be "near the speaker" and "away from the speaker". Hence, there are both **proximal** terms (this, here, now) and **distal** terms (that, there, then).(p.9)

As for deictic elements, it is suggested that a broad distinction can be made between what is closed to or distant from the speaker (Yule, 2017.p.367). Moreover, **proximal** terms are normally understood in terms of the speaker's location, i. e. the deictic centre. Therefore, **now** is usually comprehended as referring to some point or period in time that has the time of the speaker's utterance at its centre. However, **distal** terms can mostly indicate "away from speaker's" (Yule, 1996,p.10).

Nevertheless, this is not the case in some languages. For instance, Japanese has a three-part deictic system. So, it is possible to distinguish near the speaker (kore), near the addressee (sore) and away from both (are) (LoCastro, 2012, p.24).

5. Deixis and Anaphora

Anaphora, as a term, is used in two ways in the literature:

1. As a general description of coreferential process, where one element refers back to anther
2. In the restrictive and technical sense of anaphoric binding, where the anaphor is restricted to necessarily referentially dependent noun phrase (Lebeaux, 1992)

Cristal (1997) describes anaphora as ‘ a term used in grammatical description for the process or result of a linguistic unit deriving its interpretation from previously expressed unit or meaning (the antecedent) p.19. Stirling and Huddleston (2002) have described anaphora as the relation between an anaphor and an antecedent, where the interpretation of the anaphor is determined via that of the antecedent, For example:

Max claims he wasn’t told about it

Reading his sentence, we are concerned with *he* (the anaphor) and *Max* (the antecedent) and *he* is understood to refer to the same person as *Max* by virtue of the relationship of anaphora

Anaphora and deixis have a great deal in common. Forms maybe simultaneously deictic and anaphoric (Stirling and Huddleston, 2002). For example:

I was born in London and have lived here all my life

In this sentence, *here* is anaphoric in that it obtains the interpretation ‘in London’ from the preceding preposition phrase, but at the same time it is deictic in that it refers to a place, which includes where the utterance-act takes place.

Semester Two

- **Lecture one: Gricean's Cooperative Principals**
- **Lecture two: Implicature**
- **Lecture tree: Cooperative Principle/ Violating and Flouting**
- **Lecture four: Leech's politeness maxims**
- **Lecture five: Searle's Speech Act Theory**

Lecture one: Grice’s Cooperative Principals

1.Introduction

In every individual's life, communicating and interacting with others is vital for carrying out a healthy social and professional relationship. It helps spread awareness, knowledge and helps one to build understanding among all sorts of people around the world. Communicating and interacting helps a person to easily express his/her feelings, ideas, and thoughts; it facilitates as well to create a special bond with the colleagues, family members, friends and so on.

2. The Gricean conversational principles

Paul Grice, a British philosopher of language, formulated which is now called the Cooperative Principle: "Make your conversation contribution as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged (1975: 45). In his William James Lectures at Harvard and Oxford Universities in 1967, Grice explicates the Cooperative Principle and he pays attention in order to limit the use of it for describing talk exchanges presenting the following features: "The participants have some common immediate aim, the contributions of the participants are dovetailed, mutually dependent; there is some sort of understanding (often tacit) that, other things being equal, the transactions should continue in appropriate style unless both parties are agreeable that it should terminate" (Grice, 1989: 31).

Grice (1989, 29) considers that "Our talk exchanges … are characteristically, to some degree at least, cooperative efforts and each participant recognize in them … a common purpose or set of purposes, or at least a mutually accepted direction".

Grice's "super principle" (1989: 285) integrates four conversational maxims as it follows:

- **Quantity Maxim**: Make your contribution as informative as is required; Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.
- **Quality Maxim**: Do not say what you believe to be false; Do not say that for which you lack

adequate evidence.

- **Relation Maxim**: Be relevant.
- **Manner Maxim**: Avoid obscurity of expression; Avoid ambiguity; Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity); Be orderly. (Grice, 1975: 45-46)

The philosopher suggests that there is a conventional way of speaking which everybody accepts as standard behavior. When an individual produces, or hears an utterance, he / she assumes that it will normally be true, have the right amount of information, be relevant, and will be formulated in understandable terms. If an utterance does not appear to conform to this model then he / she does not assume that the utterance is nonsense, but he / she considers that an appropriate meaning is there to be inferred. In Grice's terms, a maxim has been flouted and thus an implicature generated. Most prevailing theoreticians share Grice's theory and state:

Sperber and Wilson (1986: 162) use the system of presupposition to give their analysis of the CP a "common sense" justification. The assumption of the high degree of cooperation demanded by the CP is presented as common knowledge, and therefore unchallengeable: "It seems to us to be a matter of common experience that the degree of cooperation described by Grice is not automatically expected of communicators. People who don't give us all the information we wish they would, and don't answer our questions as well as they could are no doubt much to blame, but not for violating principles of communication."

3. Failing to observe the maxims

Paradoxically and quite often, people fail to observe the maxims of cooperation, whether deliberately or accidentally. There are five main ways of failing to observe a maxim:

a. Flouting b. Violating c. Infringing d. Opting out e. Suspending

3.1.Flouting -

Mey (1996: 70) provides a comprehensive definition of "flouting": "we can make a blatant show of breaking one of the maxims ... in order to lead the addressee to look for a covert, implied meaning".

- Flouting Quantity*:* the speaker gives too much or too little information.
- Flouting Quality: the speaker says something that does not represent what he / she thinks by using sarcasm, irony, and hyperbole to exaggerate.
- Flouting Manner: it involves the absence of clarity and transparency of communicative intentions.
- Flouting Relation: occur when the response is obviously irrelevant to the topic (quick change of topic, overt failure to address interlocutor's purpose in asking a question).

3.2. Violation of a maxim -

Violation is defined as the unostentatious or "quiet" non-observance of a maxim. A Speaker who violates a maxim "will be liable to mislead" (Grice, 1975: 49). Violating a maxim is the opposite of flouting a maxim. Violating a maxim prevents or discourages the hearer from seeking for implicatures and encourages their taking utterances at face value.

When violating the maxim of quantity, the speaker does not provide the hearer sufficient information. As for the maxim of quality, the speaker is not honest and provides wrong information. When violating maxim of manner, he / she may say everything excepting what the hearer desires to cognize. Concerning the last maxim, of relation, here one can observe that the speaker endeavors to change the discussion subject or to deflect the hearer.

E.g:

A: Did you have fun at your cousin`s wedding?

B: The location was near a lake, there many guests, italian food, they brought a DJ from Cluj...

B is ambiguous giving a lot of information about the wedding, exept the response that A expected: a simply yes or no answer, thus violating the maxim of manner.

3.3. Infringing the maxims

Maxims infringement occurs when a speaker fails to observe the maxim, although he / she has no intention of generating an implicature and no intention of deceiving.

Usually, infringing results from **defective linguistic performance** (for instance a child, a foreigner or a person who can`t speak the language well) or from **impaired linguistic performance** brought about by emotions and states, such as excitement, nervousness, etc.

E.g: Japonese custumer: Do you have lice?

English seller: What??

The Japonese often prononce "r" as "l" so he says "lice" instead of "rice", thus infringing the maxim and causing misunderstandings.

3.4. Opting out of the maxims

A speaker opts out of observing a maxim whenever he / she indicates unwillingness to cooperate as the maxim requires.

E.g: Reporter: What can you tell us about the state of Mr. Hastings?

Doctor: I`m sorry. Such information is confidential.

The doctor deliberately fails to observe the maxim as he refuses to give the information required due to the doctor-patient confidentiality.

3.5. Suspending the maxims

Under certain circumstances there is no expectation on the part of any participant that one or several maxims should be observed (and non – fulfillment does not create any implicatures).

For instance, in the case of communication via e-mails, notes, the Quantity Maxim is suspended because such means are functional owing to their very brevity.

4. Limitations of the cooperative principle

The first issue is regarding the different cultures, countries and communities, each having their own way of observing and expressing maxims. For instance, if you are in Britain and you say: "We`ll see...anyway…I `ll give you a call tomorrow" and you don`t call at all, it`s considered a violation of the maxim of quality, whereas in other countries this is a normal way of flouting by implying “I am not quite interested”.

Another problem represents the overlap that appears often between the maxims. It can be difficult to identify which maxim acts, because sometimes there are two or more operating in the same time. Grice’s theory of implicature is one of the most important contributions to pragmatics.

Lecture Two: Implicature

1.Introduction

Implicature 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 she 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.

2. Definitions

“Implicature” denotes either (i) the act of meaning or implying one thing by saying something else, or (ii) the object of that act. Implicatures can be part of sentence meaning or dependent on conversational context, and can be conventional (in different senses) or unconventional. Figures of speech such as metaphor, irony, and understatement provide familiar examples.

Implicature serves a variety of goals beyond communication: maintaining good social relations, misleading without lying, style, and verbal efficiency. Knowledge of common forms of implicature is acquired along with one's native language at an early age. Conversational implicatures have become one of the principal subjects of pragmatics.

An important issue in semantics is the degree to which sentence meaning determines what is said. Implicature has been invoked for a variety of purposes, from defending controversial semantic claims in philosophy to explaining lexical gaps in linguistics

- Speaker Implicature

o H. P. Grice (1913–1988) was the first to systematically study cases in which what a speaker means differs from what the sentence used by the speaker means.

- In the Gricean model, the bridge from what is said (the literal content of the uttered sentence, determined by its grammatical structure with the reference of indexicals resolved) to what is communicated is built through implicature.
- Consider the following dialogue.
- Alan: Are you going to Paul's party?
- Barb: I have to work.
- If this was a typical exchange, Barb meant that she is not going to Paul's party. But the sentence she uttered does not mean that she is not going to Paul's party. Hence Barb did not say that she is not going, she implied it.
- Grice introduced the technical terms implicate and implicature for the case in which what the speaker said is distinct from what the speaker thereby meant or implied.[1] Thus Barb implicated that she is not going; that she is not going was her implicature. Implicating is what Searle (1975: 265–6) called an indirect speech act. Barb performed one speech act (meaning that she is not going) by performing another (saying that she has to work).
- It is not possible to fully understand speakers without knowing what they have implicated as well as what they have said. What someone has implicated is not given to us directly. We have to infer it from evidence. We would typically infer that Barb meant she is not going to the party in (1) from what she said, what Alan asked, and our assumption that Barb

was responding to Alan's question. Because implicatures have to be inferred, they can be characterized as inferences. However, implicating is not itself inferring. Hearers infer what speakers implicate. Furthermore, all speech acts have to be inferred from contextual evidence, including what was said and what sentence was uttered. Barb even had to infer which person Alan was referring to.

3. Types of implicature

- o Conversational implicatures are those calculated on the basis of the maxims/ Context .
- o Conventional implicatures are non-truth-conditional inferences that do not employ cooperative principles, they are simply attached by convention to particular lexical items or expressions.

3.1.Conventional Implicature

- o Conventional implicatures , in contrsast to conversational ones, are not based on the cooperative principles or maxims.
- o They don’t have to occur in conversations, and they don’t depend on special contexts for their interpretation.
- o They are associated with specific words and result in additional conveyed meanings when those words are used.
- o For example the interpretation of any utterance including the conjustion ‘but’ is based on an implication of contrast , in The utterance ‘ Mary suggested black, but I chose White: the fact that mary suggested black is contrasted via the conventional implicature of ‘but’, with I chose white.
- o Other english words such as’even’ and ‘yet’ also have conventional implicatures. When even is included in any sentence describing an event, there is an implicature of contrary to expectation such as in the utterance:
- o * Even John came to the party

o * He even helped tidy up afterwards.

o The conventional implicature of ‘yet’ is that the present situation is expected to be different, or perhaps the opposite, at a later time.

For example in the utterance Dennis isn’t here yet, the speaker produces an implicature that she expects the statement ‘ Dennis is here’ to be true later.

o Conventional implicatures can be expected to contrast with the conversational ones on all the distinctive properties:

o conventional implicatures will be non-cancellable because they do not rely on defeasible assumptions about the nature of the context;

o conventional implicatures will be detachable because they depend on the particular linguistic items used (you cannot substitute and for but without losing the conventional implicature);

o they will not be calculated using pragmatic principles and contextual knowledge;

o they may be expected to have a relatively determinate content or meaning

3.2. Conversational Implicature : Grice distinguished between two kinds of conversational implicatures:

3.2.1**. Generalized conversational implicatures** are those that arise without any particular context or when no special knowledge is required to calculate the additional conveyed meaning. In English, phrases that involve indefinite articles such as a/an, are typically interpreted according to the generalized conversational implicature.

o Ex: I walked into a house

o Implicature: The house was not my house.-

3.2.1.1. Scalar Implicatures

Another type of generalized conversational implicatures are commonly communicated on the basis of a scale of values and are consequently known as scalar implicatures in which certain information is communicated by the use of words expressing one value from a scale of values expressing quantity and quality , and where terms are listed from the highest to the lowest value(all, most, many, some, few) or (always, often, sometimes)

The basis of scalar implicature is that, when any form in the scale is asserted, the negative of all forms higher on the scale is implicated(we denote the degree of something , thereby implicating the negation of all degrees above the chosen one)

3.2.2 **Particularized conversational implicatures** are those which do require such specific contexts.

- Context is important in order to infer the right implicature.
- Ex: A: Do you want to go to the cinema tonight?
- B: My little sister is coming for a visit.

On the surface B's reply doesn't seem to be relevant however, he wanted to implicate that she wouldn't have time to go to the cinema because she will be busy with her sister, so she flouted the maxim of relevance.

Most of the floutings or exploitations of the maxims are particularized, e.g. ironies require particular background assumptions to rule out the literal interpretations. It could be claimed that metaphors (England is a sinking ship) or tautologies (War is war) convey what they convey in a relatively context-independent way.

In any case, it is clear that the two dimensions cross-cut: for example, all implicatures that arise from observing the maxim of Relevance are particularized, since utterances are relevant only with respect to the particular topic or issue at hand.

Lecture Three

Cooperative Principle: Violating and Flouting

1.Introduction

Perhaps, the most salient part of human communication is epitomized in a conversation. The conversation, itself, as a reciprocal act, retains specific rules and regulations. For the most part, it incorporates topic nomination, turn-taking, negotiation of meaning, etc (Markee & Kasper, 2004). However, to convey the meaning through the medium of communication, interlocutor should follow certain strategies or what the language philosopher H. P. Grice (1975) has termed as Cooperative Principle (CP). The principle consists of four maxims: quality, quantity, relevance, and manner, which represents how people are anticipated to perform in a conversation, in general. In other words, the CP imposes certain restrictions on participants to adjust their speech in correspondence with the maxims.

2. Violation of Maxims

Violation, according to Grice (1975), takes place when speakers intentionally refrain to apply certain maxims in their conversation to cause misunderstanding on their participants' part or to achieve some other purposes. The following are examples of violation in the four aforementioned maxims:

- Mother: Did you study all day long?
- Son who has been playing all day long: Yes, I‘ve been studying till now!

In this exchange, the boy is not truthful and violates the maxim of quality. He lies to avoid unpleasant consequences such as; punishment or to be forced to study for the rest of the day.

- John: Where have you been? I searched everywhere for you during the past three months!
- Mike: I wasn't around. So, what's the big deal?

John poses a question, which he needs to be answered by Mike. What Mike says in return does not lack the truth, however is still insufficient. This can be due to the fact that Mike prefers to refrain from providing John with the answer. John's sentence implies that Mike has not been around otherwise he did not have to search everywhere. John does not say as much as it is necessary to make his contribution cooperative. Hence, he leaves his listener unsatisfied.

• Teacher: Why didn't you do your homework?

• Student: May I go and get some water? I'm so thirsty.

In the above exchange, the student's answer is by no means relevant to the teacher's question. One reason for this answer can be the fact that the student is trying to evade the interrogation posed by the teacher.

• Sarah: Did you enjoy the party last night?

• Anna: There was plenty of oriental food on the table, lots of flowers all over the place, people hanging around chatting with each other…

Sara asked a very simple question, however what she receives from Anna is a protracted description of what was going on in the party. Two interpretations can be made from Anna's description: 1. Anna had such a good time in the party that she is obviously too excited and has no idea where to begin. 2. Anna had such a terrible time and she does not know how to complain about it.

In addition, the aforementioned example can also be a case of a multiple violation. A multiple violation occurs when the speaker violates more than one maxim simultaneously. In this example, Anna is not only ambiguous (violating the maxim of manner) but also verbose (violating the maxim of quantity) at the same time.

3. Flouting of maxims

Unlike the violation of maxims, which takes place to cause misunderstanding on the part of the listener, the flouting of maxims takes place when individuals deliberately cease to apply the maxims to invite their listeners to infer the hidden meaning behind the utterances; that is, the speakers employ implicature (S. C.Levinson, 1983). In the case of flouting (exploitation) of cooperative maxims, the speaker desires the greatest understanding in his/her recipient because it is expected that the interlocutor is able to uncover the hidden meaning behind the utterances. People may flout the maxim of quality so as to deliver implicitly a sarcastic tone in what they state. As in:

Teacher to a student who arrives late more than ten minutes to the class meeting:

• Wow! You're such a punctual fellow! Welcome to the class.

• Student: Sorry sir! It won't happen again.

It is obvious from what the teacher says that he is teasing the student and his purpose is, by no means, praising him. He exploits the maxim of quality (being truthful) to be sarcastic. Likewise, the student seems to notice the purpose behind the teacher's compliment and offers an apology in return. Furthermore, individuals can flout the maxim of quantity to be humorous. As in the following example:

Majid and Ali are talking on the phone:

• Ali: Where are you, Majid?

• Majid: I'm in my clothes.

Majid tells the truth because it is expected that people are always in some clothes, yet he flouts the maxim of quantity because the information is insufficient for Ali. While it is not what Ali really tries to find out, he still knows that Majid tries to convey a sense of humor, and the rest of the conversation continue similar to the following statements:

• Ali: That I know. I mean, seriously, where are you man?!!!

• Majid: Well, at work, but I'll be finished in two hours.

Or, they may flout the maxim of relevance to avoid hurting the recipient's feelings:

• Bob: What were you and Anna talking about? You were looking at me all the time!

• Marry: Oh, well… why don't we go get something to drink?

Marry answers Bob question with a suggestion in an obvious attempt to evade it perhaps to avoid hurting Bob's feelings. Hence, she flouts the maxim of relevance. As the rest of the conversation continues, one can notice the reason for this flouting:

• Bob: Are you avoiding this conversation? There has to be something going on about me! Why aren't you brave enough to tell me?

• Marry: Well, you know… they think that you are the one who stole that money.

Some individuals can exploit the maxim of manner, as well:

• Wife: Darling….. What's the story with that new watch on your wrist?

• Husband: Oh, this watch you're talking about! I knew it… I told my boss that my wife would be curious when she sees it. Oh, you have no idea how much they're satisfied with my performance, lately! The husband would be better off if he told his wife from the beginning of the conversation that his boss awarded him a prize. However, he flouts the maxim of manner to assure his wife that the watch was a gift from a person that she also knew and there is no need for jealousy.

Lecture Four: Leech's Politeness Maxims

1.Introduction

Leech's politeness theory adds a number of maxims to the Gricean account. Grice's seminal ideas on conversational implicature gave rise to quite a lot of debate in the linguistic community. Adherents of Grice's ideas soon realized that the maxims account had a number of weaknesses, which they tried to solve by postulating further maxims or attempting to refine the existing ones.

2. Politeness pragmatic scales

The politeness principle is a series of maxims, which Geoff Leech has proposed as a way of explaining how politeness operates in conversational exchanges. Leech defines politeness as forms of behavior that establish and maintain comity. That is the ability of participants in a social interaction to engage in interaction in an atmosphere of relative harmony. First, one has to know what being "polite" means. Leech has this to say on the subject: "Some illocutions (eg orders) are inherently polite, and others (eg offers) are inherently impolite. In his theory, Leech (1983: 109) sets up three pragmatic scales.

2.1.The cost-benefit scale deals with the cost or benefit that an action will have for the hearer: the higher the cost to the hearer, the less polite the illocutionary act is; and the lower the cost (or the higher the benefit) the more polite it is.

2.2.The indirectness scale has to do with the degree of indirectness of an act regarding its illocutionary goal. Leech asserts that indirectness gives rise to optionality and, at the same time, minimizes the impositive force of the illocution. Therefore, the more indirect a stance is, the more polite (1983, pp.108). However, this is not categorical. That is why the concept of optionality is needed

2.3.The optionality scale accounts for the choice given to the hearer to refuse: as "it becomes progressively easier for *h* to say no (...) negative politeness (*i.e.* serving the avoidance of the cost to *h*) is increased" (Leech 198, pp. 109).

The three scales are interrelated, i.e., the higher the cost the more indirect the utterance will be and the greater the amount of optionality to the addressee. These scales underlie all the maxims of politeness.

3. Leech's politeness maxims

By putting forward his Politeness Principle, Leech establishes himself as a key contributor to the research on politeness. He regards politeness as forms of behavior and a phenomenon existing in all languages aiming to establish and maintain comity and harmony (Leech, 1983, p.104). Leech's Politeness Principle can be demonstrated as follows: other things being equal, minimize the expression of beliefs which are unfavorable to the hearer and at the same time (less important) maximize the expression of beliefs which are favorable to the hearer (Leech, 1983, p.251). Modeling himself after Grice's Cooperative Principle, Leech sums up six maxims of the Politeness Principle as explained below. The six maxims that Leech (1983, pp. 83-84) postulates are influenced by the distinction he draws between negative and positive politeness. Negative politeness consists in minimizing impoliteness while positive politeness involves maximizing politeness. This leads to a dual vision of the six maxims as follow

3.1. The tact maxim

The tact maxim is the most important kind of politeness in English speaking society. The tact maxim applicable in illocutionary functions classified as 'impositive' e.g ordering, requesting, commanding, advising, recommending, etc., and 'commissive' e.g promoting, vowing, offering, etc.

Tact maxim according to leech, involves minimizing the cost and maximizing the benefit speaker/hearer.

The tact maxim focuses more on the hearer/recipient.

The tact maxim criteria are:

- Minimize cost to other

- Maximize benefit to other

Example:

You know, I really do think you ought to sell that car. Its costing more and more money in repairs and it uses up far too much fuel.

The tact maxim is adhered to by the speaker minimizing the cost to addressee by using two discourse markers, one to appeal to solidarity, you know, and the other as a modifying hedge, really, one attitudinal predicate, i do think, and one modal verb, ought. On the other hand, the speaker maximizes the benefit to the addresses in the second part of the turn by indicating that s/he saves a lot of time and money by selling the car.

Sample answer the phone! (impolite)

The tact maxim is not adhered, which suggests extreme irritation with other behavior, so it is impolite.

3.2.The generosity maxim

The generosity maxim involves minimizing the benefit and maximizing the cost to self. Generosity maxim only applicable in impositives and commisives. Generosity maxim focuses more on the speaker/sender.

The generosity maxim criteria are:

1 Minimize benefit to self

2 Maximinize cost to self

For example

(3) You can lend me money to buy a house (impolite)

(4) I can lend you money to buy a house

(5) You must come and have dinner with us

(6) We must come and have dinner with you (impolite)

The offer (4) and invitation (5) are presumed to be polite for two reasons: firstly, because they imply benefit to other, and secondly less crucially, because they imply cost to self. And in 3 and 6 the relation between self and other on both scales is reversed. Benefit to other but does not imply any cost to self apart from the verbal effort to giving the advice itself.

3.3.The approbation maxim

The approbation maxim involves minimizing dispraise and maximizing praise to speaker/hearer. The approbation maxim is only applicable in illocutionary functions classified as ‘expressive’ e.g thanking, congratulating, pardoning, blaming, praising, condoling, e.g etc. And ‘assertive’ e.g stating, boasting, complaining, reporting etc. Approbation maxim is closed to politeness strategy of avoiding disagreement. The approbation Maxim criteria are

1 Minimize dispraise of other

2 Maximize praise of other

The example (7) and (8) will serve to illustrate the illocutionary functions of thanking and complaining, in which the speaker maximizes praise of the addressee in (7) and minimize dispraise in (8):

(7) dear aunt Mabel, I want to thank you so much for the Christmas present this year. It was so very thoughtful of you

(8) I wonder if you could keep the noise from your Saturday parties down a bit. Im finding it very hard to get enough sleep over the weekends

(9) your food is not delicious

In (9) a fall of the approbation maxim, because A say unpleasant things to

3.4.Modesty maxim

The modesty maxim involves minimizing praise and maximizing praise of self. The modesty maxim is only applicable in expressive and assertive. Modesty maxim is found in self deprecting expression.

The modesty maxim criteria are

1 Minimize praise of self

2 Maximize dispraise of self

For example

(10) A: they were so kind to us

B: yes, they were, weren't they?

(11) A: you were so kind to us (impolite)

B: yes, I was, wasn't I?

As (10) shows, it is felicitous to agree with another's commendation/praise except when it is a commendation of one self. But (11) fault maxim of modesty, it is to commit the social transgression of boasting.

3.5.The agreement maxim

The agremeent maxim involves minimizing disagreement and maximizing agreement between self and other. The agreement maxim is only applicable in assertives. Agreement maxim seeks agreement and avoids disagreement.

The agreement maxim criteria are

1 Minimize disagreement betweeen self and other

2 Maximize agreement between self and other

For example

(12) A: a referendum will satisfy everybody

B: yes, definitely

(13) A: it was an interesting exhibition, wasn't it?

B: No, it was very uninteresting

As 12 shows, it is agreement maxim because agreement was happened between self and other, in 13 partial disagreement happened so agreement maxim was fault it is often preferable to complete disagreement.

3.6.The sympathy maxim

The sympathy maxim involves minimizing antipathy and maximizing sympathy between self and other. The sympathy maxim is only applicable in assertive. Sympathy maxim can be found in polite speech acts as to congratulate, commiserate of express condolence.

The sympathy maxim criteria are:

1 Minimize antipathy between self and other

2 Maximize sympathy between self and other

For example:

(14) I'm was sorry to hear about your father

(15) I'm was sorry to hear your father's death (impolite)

Can be interpreted that (14) as a condolence, an expression of sympathy for misfortune, and it might be preferable to say, instead of (15)

Although Leech proposed these six maxims, he did not claim that they were the only existing ones, leaving the list open to include further categories.

Lecture Five:

Searle’s Speech Act Theory

1. History of the Speech Act Theory

The term 'Speech Acts' can be viewed in two ways: as a phrase and as a main clause. As a phrase, it would consist of the adjective 'speech' describing the noun 'acts' to mean the kind of acts done with speech. As a sentence (clause), it would consist of a noun subject 'speech' and a verb predicate 'acts'. It would be a statement that speech does things (acts). Most likely, the first is what J. R Searle meant when he termed J.L Austin's original concept of illocutionary acts as Speech Acts.

Although the Speech Act Theory is generally associated with John Searle, its origin can be traced to 1955 when the philosopher, J.L Austin in his William James lectures at Harvard University proposed that sentences do more than just describe states of affairs in the world and that some sentences cannot be tested for their truth properties. He postulated that sentences can be used to perform actions. This, he called the illocutionary act. His series of William James lectures were published posthumously in 1962 in a book called 'How to Do Things with Words.' Unfortunately, Austin didn't live long enough to see his ideas become popular. It was Searle, Austin's student, who worked on his ideas and came up with the Speech Act Theory which has become a relevant and popular linguistic theory today (Mey, 2001, pp.92-93, Huang, 2007, p.93).

2. Searle's Taxonomy of Speech Acts.

Searle proposed four processes involved in a speech act: the utterance acts which has to do with the uttering of words and which is synonymous with Austin's locutionary acts, the propositional acts which has to do with the content of the utterance and involves referring and predicating, the illocutionary acts which involves the action of promising, questioning, commanding and stating, etc. This is perfectly in sync with Austin's own illocutionary acts and it is the most important concept in the speech act theory such that it is what comes to the minds of many people when speech act is mentioned.

Lastly, Searle brings in Austin's perlocutionary acts which are the effects of the illocutionary acts of the speakers on the hearers. It seems that Searle only split Austin's locutionary acts into utterance acts and propositional acts. It is however, pertinent to note that these processes naturally occur together and not in isolation of one another. For example:

There is a policeman by the corner.

In saying the example above, I would have performed the utterance act of uttering words, the propositional content act of referring and predicating, the illocutionary act of asserting or warning and the perlocutionary act of frightening the hearer and making him run away or some other effect depending on the situation.

In Searle's article 'A classification of illocutionary acts', he classified illocutionary acts into representatives, directives, commissive, expressive and declarations. (1977, pp.34)

- **1. Representatives**: These are what Austin originally called constatives. Here the speaker is committed to the truth of the expressed proposition. Representatives include: stating, concluding, reporting, asserting and claiming. For example:

  Searle propounded the speech acts theory.

- **2. Directives:** In directives, the speaker tries to stir or direct the hearer towards a particular act. They include: requesting, ordering, questioning, and advising. The example below is a directive.

Do you mind stepping aside for a while?

- **3. Commissive**: These express an obligation on the part of a speaker. They commit the speaker to a future course of action and include: promising, offering, threatening, pledging, vowing. Consider the following: example; *I will be back.*

- **4. Expressive:** Expressive, as the name suggests, express a psychological state of the speaker. They include: apologizing, blaming, thanking, praising, congratulating, welcoming. For example: *Congratulations on the birth of your baby.*
- **5. Declaratives**: These are unique because they have the power to change the world immediately after they are altered. They are used for excommunicating, pronouncing judgements, declaring war or freedom, firing from employment or christening.
- *I declare tomorrow a public holiday (said by the president of a country).*

Searle's taxonomy above is based on **four dimensions**: the illocutionary point, the direction of fit, the expressed psychological state and the propositional content (Huang, 2007, pp. 106). Worthy of note here is the fact that a single utterance can have several illocutionary forces. for instance, could be a promise, threat or warning. However, Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs) like stress, intonation contour, punctuation, mood of the verb and most importantly the context in which the utterance is said can help the hearer know what illocutionary act is intended.

3. Searle's Indirect Speech Acts

The five types of speech acts discussed above can be placed in two broad categories called **direct and indirect speech acts**. Direct speech acts is when the utterance form has a one-on-one relationship with the illocutionary act performed by the sentence. Austin proposed the explicit and implicit performatives when an illocutionary act is performed directly. Explicit involves the use of a performative verb (which Searle preferred to call a Speech Act Verb henceforth SAV) that points to the illocution of the utterance. Contrastively, implicit performatives do not make use of such SAVs yet the illocutionary act of the sentence is still obvious because it is a direct speech act for example:

Stop that! –direct(an imperative used to give an order), implicit(no SAV)

I command you to stop. – direct(same as above), explicit(command is an SAV)

Searle builds on this by postulating that there is not always a one-on-one relationship between form and meaning (illocution). This is called indirect speech acts. Other scholars who also pointed out that the same utterance can be made directly and indirectly are: Sadock 1970, 1972, Gordon and Lakoff 1971, Green 1975 (Geis, 1995, p.7).The most common indirect speech act form is the directives (Levinson, 1983, p.264).

For politeness sake, most requests do not take their normal imperative form. They instead take the interrogative or the declarative (sentence type, not speech act type). Commissives like offers and invitations also use the interrogative indirectly instead of the imperative or declarative forms they are meant to take. Declarative speech acts are almost always direct. For instance, the example above, “Do you have a pound?” is a request to pay my bill, not for information.

Do you wanna come to my party after classes? – an interrogative used to invite instead of the declarative “You are invited to my party after classes.”

It is not the case that the hearer finds it difficult to understand the illocutionary point of an indirect speech act. The speaker’s illocutionary act is calculable by the context, Gricean cooperative principle (especially the relevance maxim), the shared background knowledge of the speaker and the hearer (linguistic and non linguistic) and some inferences on the part of the hearer (interlocutor).

4. Searle’s Felicity Conditions and Rules

According to Geis, “One of Searle’s (1969) most important contributions to speech act theory was his development of the Austinian concept of felicity.” (1995, p.6). Felicity conditions (Austin’s term) are those necessary for the successful production of a speech act. When all the conditions are met, then the speech act is happy and if not(an infelicitous act), then it is a misfire or abuse (Austin, 1975, p13). Searle proposed nine conditions for promising which he grouped under four types of conditions namely: preparatory, propositional content, sincerity and essential conditions.

He further differentiated between regulatory rules that only regulate an activity and constitutive rules that themselves make up a game or activity. He posits that speech act rules are of a constitutive nature and can be drawn from the felicity conditions. Hence, the rules for promising are also preparatory, propositional content, sincerity and essential rules (Searle, 1991, Searle, 1969, Huang, 2007, Mey, 2001, Yule, 1996, Collavin, 2011).

5. Problems and Critique of Searle's Speech Act Taxonomy

Every theory has a loophole and attracts criticism. This section looks at some of the problems associated with the Searlean taxonomy. Let's start with his term 'Speech Acts' which has been seen as misleading because the actions (illocutionary acts) carried out by speech can also be done non-linguistically or non-verbally. For example, I can use signs to request that someone should shut the door. Let's give credit to Geis (1995, pp.13-14) for my next example. Suppose a company captain has called for volunteers to reconnoitre behind enemy lines and that a soldier is interested in volunteering for this mission. She might volunteer by taking a step forward, raising an arm (non-verbal) or by saying 'I'll do it' or 'I volunteer' (verbal). They would all still have the same force of volunteering.

Hence, Geis believes that speech acts are not just linguistic but also social and a better term for speech acts should be communicative acts because communication is social and can be verbal or non-verbal. Furthermore, in Searle's felicity conditions for promising and requesting, only the propositional content condition is linguistic; the others are non-linguistic but social (1995: 12, 15).

Searle has also being accused of only systematizing Austin's principles (Levinson, 1983, p. 238) and that some of his classes of speech acts are alike with Austin's. For instance, commissives are common to both of them (Mey, 2001, p.124) and Searle's directives seem to be only a change of name of Austin's exercitives. In a linguistic theory such as the one Searle proposed, context is indispensable. For instance, the utterance 'It is going to rain' would be a complaint if the rain would affect my planned activities. It would be a warning if I say it to someone who is planning a picnic and it would only be a statement of fact if said by the weather forecast.

Also, the difference between a promise and a vow is the social (institutional) context of its utterance. It is true that Searle mentioned context as important in calculating indirect speech acts but he doesn't include a contextual factor in his felicity conditions. He didn't explore all possible contexts in his analysis of utterances but used ideal contexts that suited the purpose of his analysis.

Since language is universal, good language theories should be universal. Another problem with Searle's classification is that it does not transcend cultures and languages. Rosaldo (1982) observed that the promising act is not found among the Ilongots of the Philippines because there is a general lack of interest in sincerity and truth in that community. Harris (1984: 134-135) also noted that the speech act of thanking is absent in the Australian aboriginal language, Yolngu.

Additionally, every utterance is part of a larger conversation or discourse and the position of an utterance in a discourse determines, to some extent, the illocutionary force of that utterance. If, for instance, an utterance A 'You stole a pen?' occurs after an utterance B 'I stole a pen yesterday'. Utterance A would then be taken as a request for confirmation or as an expression of surprise and not as a request for information. One flaw of Searle and other speech act theorists is that, they extracted the utterance from its discourse and analysed it in isolation. Finally, Searle claimed that his taxonomy of speech acts was based on twelve criteria (Searle 1979) but in reality he used only four of these (Mey 2001, p.119). These four criteria have been already mentioned above.

6. **Relevance of the Searlean Taxonomy**

In spite of its seemingly numerous flaws, Searle's theory of speech act is still the most popular speech act theory today. His taxonomy of speech act is useful as a language theory so much that although, it was originally the concern of philosophers, many linguists have delved into the study of speech acts today.

Contrary to Levinson’s view, Sbisa (2009, p.229) sees Searle’s principles as diverging sharply from Austin’s. His brilliant observation that language has an illocutionary character and that whenever we use language something is done, is yet to be disproved. Some languages may not have some of Searle’s speech acts but every language has some speech acts (at least assertions, if not any other) which makes Searle’s theory really a universal one. His indirect speech act has become truer with time.

Conclusion

Based on the general aims of this course, some objectives as a whole were set out. These are the things students should be able to do by the time they complete the course. If they are able to meet the objective, they would have achieved the aims of the course mainly:

- Explain the meaning of pragmatics as a sociolinguistic study and the difference between pragmatics and semantics
- Describe the influence of the context comprising social assumptions, values, conventions or world view on speakers and hearers
- Explain such concepts as speech acts, politeness, conversational principles or implicature.
- Discuss at least one theory of pragmatics and how it has enabled you to understand better the functions of language in the context of people and situations
- Apply the knowledge gained to communicate effectively in different social contexts, especially applying such concepts as politeness, indirectly speech act or indexicals in social communication
- Participate in further studies and research in pragmatics

References

Austin, J. (1975). *How to Do Things with Words.* (S. Edition) New York: Oxford University Press.

Bach, K. (1997). The Semantics-Pragmatics Distinction: What It Is and Why It Matters. In: Rolf, E. (eds) Pragmatik. Linguistische Berichte. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-663-11116-0_3

Collavin, E. (2011). Speech Acts. In Bublitz, W. & Norrick, N (Eds.), *Foundations of Pragmatics.* Berlin and Boston: Walter de Gruyten GmbH & co.

Crystal, D. (1987) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: CUP

Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power.* London: Longman Leech, G. (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman

Fodor, Jerry A., 1975, *The Language of Thought*, Harvard University Press.

Frege, Gottlob, [1892] 1952Grice, H. P., (1975), "Logic and Conversation", in P. Cole and J. Morgan, eds., *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3, Academic Press

Geis, M. (1995). *Speech Acts and Conversational Interaction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Grice, H.P. (1989) *Studies in the Way of Words*, Harvard University Press

Grice, H.P., (1982), "Meaning Revisited", in N. V. Smith, ed., *Mutual Knowledge*, Academic Press

Halliday, M.A.K. and Ruquaiya Hasan. (1885) *Language, Context and Text.* Victoria: Deakin University.

Leech, G.N (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*, Longman

Levinson, S. (1983) *Pragmatics*, Cambridge University Press

Levinson, S. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Levinson, S. (2000) *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*, MIT Press

Luchjenbroers, June. (1992) Relevance theory and context discussion. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, Oct, 1992, PP590-615.

Moyer, Melissa G. (1996) Pragmatics, the state of the art: a talk with Jef Verschueren. *Links & Letters*, 1996, PP12-140.

Poznan, Roman Kopytko. (2004) What is wrong with modern accounts of context in linguistics. *Views*, Sept, 2004, PP45-60.

Searle, J. (1970). *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1975). Indirect Speech Acts. In Cole, P. & Morgan, J. (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, vol 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.

Searle, J. (1977). A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. In Rogers, A., Wall, B. and Murphy, J. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Texas Conference on Performatives, Presuppositions and Implicatures.* Washington D.C: Centre for Applied Linguistics.

Searle, J. (1979). *Expression and Meaning Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1991). What is a Speech Act? In Davis, S. (Ed.), *Pragmatics – A Reader*. New

Van Dijk, Tenu A. Text, Context and Knowledge. (2008), http://www.discourse.org.

Verscheuren, J. (1999) *Understanding Pragmatics*, Arnold

Wilson, Deirdre. Relevance Theory in Y. Huang (ed.) Oxford Handbook of Pragmatics. Oxford University Press, Oxford:2016.

Wolf, George. Malinowski's Context of Situation. *Language and Communication*, Vo

Yi Luo. Context Theory and the Foundation of Pragmatics. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science. Vol 5, Issu.8, 2016, pp17-21.

Yule, G. (1996) *The Study of Language* 2nd Ed. Cambridge: CUP

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.