



**ANALYSIS OF ASSERTIVE SPEECH ACTS IN KHUSHWANT
SINGH'S TRAIN TO PAKISTAN**

DR. DHANAJI NAGANE
Head, Department of English
Sharadchandraji Pawar College,
Jejuri, (MS), India

ABSTRACT

Analysis of the highly marked assertive speech acts in Khushwant Singh's Train to Pakistan (1956) in the light of the theory of speech acts and the context in which they take place can throw light on the various characters, their behavior, relationship, attitude, intention and the authorial point of view. Train to Pakistan can be better understood with help of the principles and theories in pragmatics in general and theory of speech acts in particular. The authenticity of the characters is established via the utterances of the characters in the context and the dimensions of illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect in the given socio cultural situations. The present paper is not merely an attempt to apply the theory of assertive speech acts to the selected novel, but to add a new perspective to the series of research done in this field. The application of the theory of assertive speech acts to the selected utterances reveals how the analysis in the context in which they occur can contribute for the authentic interpretation of the fictional discourse.

Keywords: Pragmatics, Speech Acts, Assertive, Utterances, Literary Discourse, Context

Introduction

Pragmatics studies how people comprehend and produce a communicative act or speech act in a concrete speech situation, which is usually a conversation. However, the users of language, as social beings, communicate with each other using language in social situations and the society controls their access to the linguistic and communicative means. While defining pragmatics, George Yule remarks that pragmatics is the study of “invisible meaning” (1996). Some of the important definitions of pragmatics by the well-known pragmatists are given below.

1. *Pragmatics is the study of those principles that will account for why a certain set of sentences are anomalous, or not possible utterances.* (Levinson, 1983:6)

2. *Pragmatics can be usefully defined as the study of how utterances have meanings in situations.* (Leech, 1983:06)

3. *Pragmatics is about explaining how we produce and understand such everyday but apparently rather peculiar uses of language.* (Peter Grundy, 1995:4)

4. *Pragmatics studies the use of language in human communication as determined by the conditions of society.* (Jacob Mey, 2001:6)

It is amply clear from the above definitions that context is at the centre of meaning. In other words, pragmatics is more concerned with the meanings that the words or linguistic expressions convey implicitly rather than what they explicitly denote at the surface level. Pragmatics attempts to analyze how more is communicated than what is actually said by various theories and principles such as speech act theory, cooperative principle, politeness principle, implicatures, etc against the backdrop of factors such as culture, religion, history and society.

J. L. Austin, for the first time, studied language from different point of view and brought to notice that apart from true and false statements, and truth conditions there are other possibilities in language, which are non-assertive categories that include questions, commands, exclamations, etc. He studied language from non-conventional point of view which is a kind of reaction to traditional view of language. Austin and Searle contributed a lot to the speech act theory. Searle (1969:16) says “*Speaking a language is performing speech acts, acts such as making statements, giving commands asking questions, making promises and so on.*” George Yule (1996:46) defines speech acts as “*Speech acts are actions performed via utterances.*” David Crystal (2003) mentions that speech acts is a theory which analyzes the role of utterances in relation to the behavior of the speaker and the hearer in interpersonal communication. It is not an ‘act of speech’ [in the sense of parole] but a communicative activity. In the process of communication, a speaker performs various acts of ordering, asking, arguing, mocking, blaming, warning, advising, praising etc.

Searle’s Typology of Speech Acts

J. R. Searle (1969) made a significant contribution in the study of speech acts. He says that to understand language one has to understand the speaker’s intention. According to him, language is intentional behavior. Therefore, it should be treated like a form of action. Searle refers to statements as speech acts. The speech act is the basic unit of language that expresses meaning. In fact, an utterance expresses an intention. Mostly, a speech act is a sentence, but it can be a word or phrase as long as it follows the rules necessary to carry out the intention. When a person speaks, s/he performs an act. Speech act is not only used to choose something but also essentially to do something. Speech act lays stress on the intent of the act as a whole. According to Searle, understanding the speaker’s intention is crucial to arrest the meaning.



Without the speaker's intention, it is not possible to understand the words as a speech act. According to him, there are five types of speech acts such as Assertives, Commissive, Expressives, Directives and Declaratives.

A] Assertives

Assertives are the speech acts in which the speaker asserts 'a proposition to be true, using such verbs as affirm, believe, conclude, report, deny, etc

B] Commissives

Commissives are the speech acts in which the speaker commits himself/herself to a future course of action by using verbs such as guarantee, pledge, promise, swear, vow, undertake, warrant, etc.

C] Expressives

Expressives are the speech acts in which the speaker expresses an attitude to or about a state of affairs using such verbs as apologize, appreciate, congratulate, deplore, detest, regret, thank, welcome, etc.

D] Directives

Directives are the speech acts in which the speaker tries to make the hearer do something, with words such as ask, beg, challenge, command, dare, invite, insist, request, etc.

E] Declaratives

Declaratives are the speech acts in which the speaker aims to change the world via his/her utterances.

The above stated five categories of speech acts help us understand the speaker's communicative intention and the hearer's recognition of it. Thus, both the speaker and hearer are usually benefited in this process by the circumstances surrounding the utterance. However, it is impossible to focus on above all categories; therefore, the present paper intends to analyze only assertive speech acts selected in Khushwant Singh's famous novel, *Train to Pakistan*. Thus, the present analysis focusing on assertives in *Train to Pakistan* helps sensitize students of English Literature and Language to understand as form of arts which reflects multi-dimensions of human society.

What Is Assertive Speech Act?



Assertives are the speech acts in which the speaker asserts 'a proposition to be true, using such verbs as affirm, believe, conclude, report, deny, etc (Searle,1969). This class also includes stating, suggesting, criticizing, replying, concluding, predicting, denying, disagreeing, etc. Assertives are usually expressed through declarative form. However, this is not the only form to express representatives or assertive speech acts. They can be expressed using the imperative and interrogative forms as well. It is observed that assertive speech acts not only present the real state of affairs but they are also 'tellable'. In the books on Physics, assertive speech acts are used for asserting something or providing some scientific information regarding heat, light, sound, gravity, etc. For example: "*Light travels faster than sound*".

Train to Pakistan: At a Glance

Train to Pakistan tells us a story of a predominantly Sikh village on the frontier between India and Pakistan. The peaceful villagers, known for their hospitality, their love for Muslim fellow villagers, are caught in the emotional turmoil. They can neither ask the Muslims to stay on for their own safety nor to go forgetting years of loving relationship. Mano Majra, the border village, is thus, caught in a serious emotional and violent situation. Trainloads of dead refugees arrive at Mano Majra creating a very tense situation. Hundreds of refugees are crossing over the Sutlej River.

The arrival of the trainloads of dead Sikhs and Hindus create a great law and order problem for the magistrate, Hukum Chand, and the sub-inspector of Mano Majra. The authorities as well as the villagers realize that the Muslims of Mano Majra must be evacuated and sent to the refugee camp for their own safety. The Mano Majra Muslims are, therefore, sent to the camp, they were then to be taken to Pakistan by train. Iqbal, a visiting party worker and Juggut Singh, a local ruffian have been arrested by the police on a suspicion. Malli and his gang are also arrested but Hukum Chand devises a different plan. He takes a decision to release Malli and his gang. He sends a message to the Muslim officer of the refugee camp to receive Mano Majra Muslims before any violence takes place. The magistrate releases Juggut and Iqbal also. All the players of the drama are, thus, present on the scene.

The militant Sikhs decide to attack the refugee train going to Pakistan and kill the Muslims on it. Juggut's fiancée, Nooran is on this train. When preparations are being made to attack the train, Juggut is executing his own plan to allow the train to go safely to save his fiancée. He climbs the pillar near the railway line and succeeds in cutting down the rope that was supposed to throw down the refugees sitting on the rooftops of the train. He succeeds but the bullets of the militants hit him. The train to Pakistan goes safely crossing the border.

There are a number heart-rending, emotional, romantic scenes interspersed in the novel along with the cunning plotting of Hukum Chand, the magistrate and the sub-inspector of Mano Majra. One can trust Khushwant Singh to make a room for blatant sex-scenes in his narration.

It is on the background of this tense situation, the clandestine love affair of Juggut Singh and Nooran unfolds. As they make love away from the village, hiding in the field, the dacoits loot and murder the local baniya in Mano Majra. Iqbal the activist arrives at the Gurudwara as he is assigned the duty by his party to enlighten the villagers. Iqbal, the city-bred activist is satirized and exposed in the violent situation created by the partition. However, Juggut, trying to save his beloved, emerges a romantic hero, who sacrifices his life.

Analysis of assertive speech acts from this novel is made in this present paper emphasizing the speech situation in which the characters are placed, the illocutionary force of the speech acts of the characters and parlocutionary effect on the conversational partners.

Analysis of Assertive Speech Acts

Assertive speech act has an illocutionary force of the speaker's belief and has a factual propositional content. Assertive speech act may represent a subjective state of mind of the speaker. They are either 'true' or 'false' and commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition. This class includes stating, suggesting, criticizing, replying, concluding, predicting, denying, disagreeing, reporting, informing, etc.

The opening scene of the action of the novel is the arrival of the band of robbers to Mano Majra. Jugga, the resident of Manao Majra, is not among them though he is a part of their gang. The robbers would like to tease him by throwing bangles at his doorstep. They have come to loot and rob Lala Ram Lal, the local baniya. The spearman says:

*"Jugga could give the bangles to that weaver's daughter of his
They would look well with those large gazelle eyes and the little mango
breasts". (P. 15)*

The spearman, the addresser, one of the robbers of the Malli gang, addresses the above utterance to his fellow robbers. The robbers have arrived at the outskirts of the village, Mano Majra, and they are waiting for the last train to pass. Passing the last train is the signal to say good night. They are discussing Juggut Singh, who is a fellow robber but who has not joined them. Therefore, they have decided to throw bangles at his doorstep accusing him of being a coward, and an effeminate fellow. In Indian culture, bangles are associated with a woman and are considered as an object of beauty and not of bravery. Juggut has an affair with a weaver's daughter, Nooran, in the neighborhood. The robbers evidently know this and they are joking about it.

The spearman explicitly teases Juggut Singh in his absence but implicitly he envies him for his liaison with Nooran, a weaver's daughter. The spearman mocks what Juggut would do with the bangles. He predicts that Juggut would give bangle to his beloved, Nooran. The addresser also describes the beauty of Nooran, indirectly suggesting how Juggut is infatuated with her. The illocutionary force implicitly indicates how the addresser is gloating over the physical features of the youngish girl, and, may be, envies Juggat Singh for keeping relations with Nooran. The intentionality of the spearman is to make his conversational partners laugh.

The fellow robbers envy Juggut for his liaison with the girl, and joke about it. The perlocutionary effect of the speech act produced by the spearman is ends up describing the beauty of the girl and the hidden feeling of envy for Juggut. The comment made by the addresser is taken light-heartedly by the colleagues.

The scene of the action is still the same. The band of robbers still discusses Juggut Singh's love affair and the coquettish beauty of Nooran, his fiancée. This affair of Juggut with Nooran has become the topic of merriment and slander mongering for the whole group. The gunman, who speaks the following lines, evidently knows more about the clandestine meeting of Juggut and Nooran.

"She must give Jugga a good time,"... "During the day, she looks so innocent you would think she had not shed her milk teeth."..... "But at night, she puts black antimony in her eyes." (P. 15)

The above utterance is addressed by the gunman, one of the robbers of the Malli gang, to his fellow robbers. The robbers gather outside Mano Majra at night and discuss Juggut Singh's infatuation with a girl called Nooran, who is a weaver's daughter. They decide to offer him bangles to accuse him of cowardice. However, the talk turns on Jugga's affair with weaver's beautiful young daughter.

The gunman's speech act emphasizes Nooran's deceptive character. The gunman states how the girl, Nooran, would be giving a good time to Juggut Singh. He describes the girl contrasting the impression she gives during the day and how coquettish she is during the night. When the gunman talks about what she is at night, he 'sighs'. This 'sighing' is to make his listeners realize how enticingly the girl transforms herself at night. It also indicates the speaker's envy for Juggut. The use of antimony in her eyes is one example of her coquettish preparations. Here, Nooran's milk teeth are associated with her innocence.

The gunmen make the fun of the deceptive nature of Nooran in the above speech act to bring home to the others the cunning nature of the girl. The intended perlocutionary effect of the gunman's utterance here is to make the listeners realize the duplicitous nature of Nooran in



the context. When the gunman describes Nooran's beauty, the fellow robbers feel envy for Juggut Singh. One of the robbers remarks that black-antimony is good for her eyes and it has a cooling effect.

When the robbers wait for the last train to come and pass, therefore, they are waiting to listen to whistle of the train, which is the signal for them to rob the house of Lala Ram Lal, the baniya. As the last train passes, they come to Lalaji's house. The scene at Lalaji's house is gruesome and pathetic. The women in the house know that there are robbers at the door. They stall for a while, but it is of no use. The robbers break open the door. The old woman watching the horrible scene says:

"I tell you Lalaji is not in. He has taken the keys with him. We have nothing in the house." (P.17)

An old woman, the addresser, in the house of Lala Ram Lal addresses the leader of the robbers, Malli, outside. The robbers threaten the inmates of Lala Ram Lal's house, asking them to open the door or they would smash it. This is the scene at midnight at Mano Majra. The last train has left the village, and the robbers have chosen this time to rob Lala Ram Lal's house. Lala Ram Lal is the rich Hindu moneylender who stays with his family in the village.

The addresser, an old woman, states directly that Lalaji is not at home but indirectly she wants the robbers to go away. The woman knows very well that there are robbers at the door and they want to rob her house. The robbers also know that the woman is telling a lie, that Lalaji is not in the house and there is nothing in the house. Her statement, '*He has taken the keys with him*', clearly shows that she is quite aware of the robbers trying to get into the house.

The effect of the above speech act is indirectly suggested by the robbers' act of smashing the door, indicating that the woman is lying to them. The robbers listen to the woman's assertive speech act addressed to them but do not believe it. They smash the door in. The woman's act of telling a lie is infelicitous because she is not sincere in her assertion. However, her intention to prevent robbery and possibly save the life of Lalaji is quite justifiable. Her assertion does not convince the robbers because the robbers know how the people in the house would react to their call. The old woman's assertive speech act is, therefore, a feeble attempt to save Lalaji and the house from being robbed.

The following scene is very pathetic. As Malli drag Lala out of his hiding palce he cries and pleads with the robbers, and yet he tells them lies, that there is nothing left in the safe. Lala pleads:

"There is nothing left in the safe; only my account books. I have given you all I have. All I have is yours." (P.18)



Lala Ram Lal, the addresser, is the moneylender and the only Hindu family in Mano Majra. He addresses the above utterance to the leader of the robbers, Malli, who has smashed the door and forcibly entered his house. The robbers do not believe the woman saying that Lala is not at home. They get hold of the boy and threaten to kill him. The boy is frightened and tells them that Lala is upstairs. The robbers go upstairs and drag Lala out from under the cot. Lala is terrified. He offers wads of notes to the robbers and states that he has nothing left in the safe.

The intention of Lala Ram Lal is to deceive Malli, the leader of the robbers. Lala Ram Lal asserts that there is nothing left in the safe and he has already given everything to the robbers. Lala addresses them pleading that whatever he has is only theirs, and there is nothing left with him except his account books. Lala Ram Lal lies to the robbers in order to save money kept in the safe.

Lala Ram Lal's speech act does not have intended effect on the robbers because they know that Ram Lal is lying. They continue to beat and batter Lala Ram Lal and demand the keys of the safe. Lala goes on crying and begs for mercy. Lala's cries, however, have effect on the women of the house who are over hearers. They give alarming call 'Dakoo, Dakoo!' in view to draw the attention of the neighbourhood.

The scene shifts to Juggut Singh's house. He stealthily goes out to meet his lady friend, Nooran. However, his old mother catches him while going out. This scene takes place much before the band of the robbers' arrival to loot Lala Ram Lal's house. Here, Juggut responds to his mother's question:

"To the fields,"..... "Last night wild pigs did a lot of damage." (P. 20)

Juggut Singh, the addresser, stealthily goes out of the house, with a spear in his hand. He evidently goes to meet Nooran, his fiancée, at night when everyone is asleep. Juggut's mother, the addressee, is awake. She asks him where he is going. He makes an excuse that he is going to the fields to drive away wild pigs. He further informs her that the pigs had done a lot of damage to the crops. The mother is worried about Juggut because he is on the parole. In addition, he is forbidden to leave the village after sunset. She also knows that Juggut is making false excuses.

Juggut Singh's assertion that he is going to the fields is a lame excuse for going out. He lies to his mother that he is going to drive away wild pigs but actually he goes to meet his beloved, Nooran. This is midnight and the safe time for the lovers to meet without being seen.



Juggut's intention is that his mother should allow him to go out at night. The mother is worried about Juggut as he is on probation, and if the police find out that he goes out at night, he could be jailed. The above speech act has, therefore, no desired perlocutionary effect on his mother. She has no option but to keep quite.

The following speech act is a rustic romantic encounter between Juggut Singh and Nooran. Nooran is a Muslim girl and Juggut is a Sikh young man. Their love story is a redeeming feature of the gruesome partition politics. Though Juggut is a farmer, he is a recognized 'budmash', with a criminal record in the police station, and presently he is on probation. He is not allowed to leave the village after sunset. He meets Nooran secretly outside the village, at night. Nooran says:

"You put your hands on the person of a strange woman. Have you not mother or sister in your home? Have you no shame?" (P.21-22)

Juggut Singh, the addressee, is a notorious 'budmash' of Mano Majra and Nooran, the addresser, a weaver's daughter, is his lady-love. They are in the field, making love outside the village at midnight. Nooran is held flat on Juggut's body, limb to limb. Juggut fondles her. She is in his clutches. The phrase '*a strange woman*' is a reference to the speaker herself.

Nooran accuses Juggut Singh of putting his hands on a strange woman. The question that follows is a rhetorical one, reminding him aggressively that he has a mother or a sister at home and he should not molest a strange woman like this. '*Have you no shame?*' is also a mock question stating 'you are shameless.' The entire speech act is a mock protest and erotic teasing.

The intended effect of Nooran's mock protest on the addressee, Juggut, is more an endearment than anger, as he knows that Nooran is playful and endearingly mischievous. This speech act, therefore, has an opposite effect on the addressee, who playfully accepts his being 'budmash'.

The romantic encounter between Juggut and Nooran is rudely disturbed by a sound of a gun-shot. Nooran panics because she thinks the gun-shot might wake up her father and the whole village, and her absence would be discovered. Juggut is oblivious to any such danger. He hardly has an idea that his robber colleagues would choose his own village for robbery. Nooran may love him but she must also keep appearances. She would not like to be discovered in his company. Nooran says:

"This is no time for jesting. There is murder in the village. My father will get up and want to know where I have gone....." (P. 23)

Nooran, a weaver's daughter, addresses the utterance to her lover, Juggut Singh, the addressee. This is a clandestine night rendezvous of Juggut and his fiancée, Nooran. Their



meeting takes place when the robbers have attacked Lala Ram Lal's house. There is a sound of a gun-shot and Nooran is afraid that this will wake up her father and he would be looking for her. She is afraid of being caught in this illicit affair with Juggut, and would like to run back to her house before act of meeting Juggut is discovered.

Nooran indirectly suggests Juggut Singh to go back home before she is discovered. Here, Nooran intends to tell Juggut that this matter is serious as she has heard a gun-shot. She asserts that there is a murder in the village. Naturally, there would be commotion, the villagers would come out, and her father would also wake up. She is afraid that her absence in the house would be noted, and her father would start asking about her. She would like to go back home before she is discovered. This speech act is a fearful supposition of Nooran of the impending danger. The illocutionary force of Nooran's assertive speech act is to inform her lover about the consequences of her being caught red-handed.

There should be an effect of Nooran's fear on Juggut Singh. But he seems to be oblivious to the fears of Nooran. He chooses to mollify her fears. He does not believe that there is any further trouble. Nooran's plea that she must go back at once does not have any effect on him. He counters it saying that she should say that she was with her friend.

A new character, Iqbal Singh, is introduced here. Iqbal comes to Mano Majra to do some social work on behalf of his party, which is evidently a leftist party, working in the opposition of the ruling Congress Party. Iqbal has to stay in the Gurudwara, as there is no lodging establishment in the village. Iqbal says:

"I am a social worker, Bhaiji. There is much to be done in our villages. Now with this partition there is so much bloodshed going on someone must do something to stop it." (P.48)

Iqbal, the addresser, who has come to Mano Majra as a leftist activist, comes to stay in the Gurudwara, the only place where strangers can find accommodation. He introduces himself to Bhai Meet Singh, the addressee, the keeper of the Gurudwara. He claims that, he has come to Mano Majra to do something about the bloodshed going on.

Iqbal introduces himself to Meet Singh and tells his purpose to visit Mano Majra. He reports that the bloodshed is going on across the Indo-Pak border and says that someone must stop the bloodshed. He tries to impress Meet Singh with his purpose of visit. Iqbal's intention is to communicate his legitimate and socially beneficial work at Mano Majra. Iqbal addresses Meet Singh using the honorific 'Bhaiji'.

The utterance of Iqbal Singh does not have a desired effect on Bhai Meet Singh. Bhai is not interested in the political activity of Iqbal. However, he does not react to the nature of the



work of Iqbal, Meet Singh addresses him respectfully and wants to know the personal details of him. Though Meet Singh does not express it in words, he is impressed by the speech of Iqbal, as Iqbal appears well educated and is engaged in important social work.

The scene of the following speech act is the same. Meet Singh, the bhai of the Gurudwara, and Iqbal Singh exchange their opinions. Meet Singh says:

“Everyone is welcome to his religion. Here next door is a Muslim mosque. When I pray to my Guru, Uncle Imam Baksh calls to Allah.....” (P. 49)

The above utterance is addressed to Iqbal Singh by Meet Singh. Meet Singh tells Iqbal that sometimes American missionaries come to Mano Majra. Iqbal asks him if he likes their preaching Christianity. Meets Singh’s response as given above is typical Indian point of view. Every religion, he says, is welcome here.

Meet Singh’s utterance gives the factual information about the atmosphere of religious tolerance in Mano Majra, which he believes to be true to his knowledge of the world. This is contrasted with the Western monolithic religious society. Meet Singh, indirectly says that the prayers of the Muslims and the Sikhs go simultaneously without getting disturbed. He states here that the Sikhs and the Muslims are neighbors and live peacefully. The expression ‘*Uncle Imam*’ has an illocutionary force of showing social solidarity between the Sikhs and Muslims.

There is no intended effect of Meet Singh’s speech act on Iqbal Singh. Iqbal knows the religious atmosphere in the East and the West. He is a communist. He does not relate the religion with morals and quarrels. The novelist, Khushwant Singh, through Meet Singh, brings out here the contrast between the Indian and the Western society. The perlocutionary effect of Meet Singh’s statement is nil on the addressee, Iqbal.

On the contrary, Iqbal says in the following speech act that Europeans do not quarrel about their religions as we do here and they do not really bother very much about religion:

“They do not quarrel about their religions as we do here. They do not really bother very much about religion.” (P.49)

The addresser, Iqbal, responds here to the addressee, Meet Singh’s question, how many religions there are in Europe. The conversation between Iqbal and Meet Singh is about religious atmosphere in the East and the West. Meet Singh tells him how in India everyone is welcome and they follow their religious practices. Iqbal tells Meet Singh how, in the West, people do not quarrel in the name of the religion, and that they do not care much about religion.



The intention of Iqbal's assertive speech act here is to bring out the contrast between the West and East especially India. It is an absolute denial of Meet Singh's earlier proposition about religious harmony in India. Iqbal contrasts the Western monolithic religious society with India's multi-religious population. Iqbal gives information to his conversational partner about religion. This is in contrast with the situation in India. Here, in India there are quarrels among religious communities.

The perlocutionary effect of the contrast between the West and the East is negative on Meet Singh. Meet Singh does not appreciate the West not caring about religion. He observes how there is a lack of morality in the West. Citing an example, Meet Singh reacts and says that in the West people have illicit relations with the women other than their wives.

Iqbal has arrived at the Gurudwara. Whenever there is a new guest at the Gurudwara, the villagers drop in to wish him and bring something for him to eat. The recent major event is the partition of India and the political freedom. Naturally, their talk turns to this new topic. For common people, this freedom hardly means anything. The village life, they feel, is unaffected by it. One of the Muslims utters:

"Freedom is for the educated people who fought for it. We were slaves of the English, now we will be slaves of the educated Indians—or the Pakistanis." (P.62)

The above utterance is the response of the Muslim, the addresser, to the discussion on freedom going on among Iqbal Singh, Meet Singh, Lambardar and the addresser himself in the Gurudwara. Gurudwara is a meeting place for all. When others learn of the coming of a new guest, the visitors gather to see Iqbal and bring something for him. Iqbal, being educated, is drawn into their questions and answers. The Muslim makes a shocking statement about freedom being only for the educated Indians.

The utterance of the Muslim in this context is a comment of a common man whose life remains unaffected by freedom. For the poor, the place of English is now taken by the educated Indian class. The common man indirectly states that the uneducated Indians were neither happy in the past in the province of the British Government nor will be happy in the future, Gandhiji's independent India.

The Muslim speaker's utterance is addressed to all those present in the Gurudwara, but the utterance is directed to Iqbal, the representative of the educated Indians. Iqbal is surprised to listen to this analysis of the freedom movement. The perlocutionary effect of the speaker's utterance is mainly on Iqbal.

Conclusion

The analyses of speech acts in Khushwant Singh's *Train to Pakistan* in terms of the theory of assertive speech acts presented by Searle (1969) offers a new perspective to study literary discourse especially fictional discourse. While studying the conversations of the characters, the speech situation, illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect are kept at the centre. The study of the linguistic interactions of the characters with the help of illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect is a novel way of interpreting fictional discourse and understanding the socio-cultural dimension. The highly marked assertive speech acts of the characters selected in *Train to Pakistan* have been analyzed meticulously. It is observed that the characters and speech situation in *Train to Pakistan* are interwoven on the background of the most gruesome historical event of the partition of the Indian subcontinent into India and Pakistan. It is represented by the microcosmic world of the border village, Mano Majra, a predominantly Sikh village, with Muslim families about equal in number. The Sikhs are peasants and the Muslims are tenants, some are weavers and potters. The social relationship between them is that of mutual respect and friendship. The analysis also brings out simplicity and forthrightness and finally helplessness of the villagers, their human concern, and fellow feeling.

REFERENCES

1. **Austin, J. L.** (1962), *'How to Do Things with Words'*, Oxford: Clarendon Press
2. **Bloomfield, Leonard** (1933), *'Language'*, New York: H. R. and Winston
3. **Brown, G. and Yule G.** (1983), *'Discourse Analysis'*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
4. **Cutting, Joan.** (2002), *'Pragmatics and Discourse: A resource book for students'*, London and New York: Rutledge Publishers
5. **Mey, Jacob,** (1993), *'Pragmatics: An Introduction'*, Oxford: Blackwell
6. **Singh, Khushwant** (2002) *'Truth, Love and a Little Malice: An Autobiography'*, New Delhi: Viking,
7. **Singh, Khushwant** (1956), *'Train to Pakistan'*, New Delhi: RAVI DAYAL Publisher
8. **Nagane D.** "Understanding Speech Acts." Indian Streams Research Journal 01/11/2012: pages 1-5. Print and Online.
9. **Natkare B.** "A Study Of Conversational Implicatures In Girish Karnad's *Hayavadana*." Indian Streams Research Journal 01/11/2013: pages 1-3. Print and Online.
10. **Natkare B.** "Speech Act Analysis of Arthur Miller's 'A View from the Bridge'." Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies 03/03/2015: pages 102-108. Print and Online.
11. **Yule, George** (1985), *'The Study of Language'*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
12. **Yule, George** (1996), *'Pragmatics'*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.