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Abstract

Kachru (1966), Van Olphen (1970), Singh (1978) and Arya (1979) explored Modality in Hindi and used the formal and semantic criteria for studying Hindi Modals. Like English, in Hindi too, Modals cover a large number of semantic categories – permission, obligation, wish, possibility, promise, threat, offer etc. Austin (1962), Searle (1969), Halliday (1970) and Leech (1983) contributed to the Functional Approach and believe that utterances cannot be confined to mere linguistic acts but perform various communicative acts and functions depending on the social contexts in which they are used by the interlocutors.

This paper analyses the data on a four-point scale using the following parameters: 1. Meaning 2. Illocutionary Act 3. Illocutionary Function and 4. Attitude of the Speaker. It makes an attempt to apply the Speech Act approach to the study of Modals in Hindi. The Study concludes that Modals in Hindi not only express multiple notional categories but also perform multiple illocutionary acts and functions.
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Introduction

Unlike English, not much scholarly attention has been paid to modality in Hindi. However, recently some Hindi grammarians like Kachru (1966), Van Olphen (1970) and Amar Bahadur Singh (1978) explored this category in Hindi. There seems to be considerable disagreement among scholars on the list of Hindi modals. Based on the
available scholarly material, my attempt in this section is to focus on auxiliary verbs that function as modals in Hindi.

Yamuna Kachru (1966) recognises ‘sak’ and ‘cuk’ as the only modals in Hindi. However in her later study she rejected ‘cuk’ and included ‘par’ and ‘cāhiye’ in her list of modal verbs.

Van Olphen (1970) identifies only three modals in Hindi ‘sak’, ‘pā’ and ‘cuk’.

Amar Bahadur Singh (1978:184) grouped auxiliaries in Hindi into temporal and non-temporal categories. Modals like ‘ho / hotā’ which represents contingent / unreal belongs to the temporal whereas modals like ‘pā’ and ‘sak’, representing accomplishment and ability respectively, belong to the non-temporal group. Apart from temporal and non-temporal categories, Singh also talks about a third category called obligatory. He puts it under the non-temporal class. ‘cāhiye’ representing a moral idea and ‘hai’ and ‘par’ representing compulsion are treated under this category. But Singh does not recognise obligatory as a modal category (1978:185).

Arya (1979) discussed the works of the above-mentioned grammarians and used the notional and syntactic criteria for the identification and classification of modals in Hindi. He rejected ‘cuk’ as a modal auxiliary and regarded it as an aspect marker in Hindi. Arya included ‘gā’ in his list of modals as it is ambiguous in use in the same manner as the other epistemic modals ‘sak’ and ‘cāhiye’ are used. ‘gā’ like ‘sak’ and ‘cāhiye’ refers to the event of the proposition in the past, present and future. It can be used with both past and non-past tenses. ‘cuk’ fails to pass the test of ambiguity and functions only as an aspect marker along with the modal auxiliary (1979:336). Hence it does not find a place in Arya’s list of modal auxiliaries in Hindi. Arya included ‘gā’, ‘sak’, ‘cāhiye’, ‘par’ and ‘pā’ in his list of modals.
Controversy regarding inventory apart, we propose to discuss in detail the functions of modal auxiliaries recognised by Arya in his work as his list is based on both the semantic and the syntactic analyses of these verbs. We believe that various semantic categories like permission, obligation, wish, possibility, promise, threat etc. are universal in nature and, therefore, are found in both the two languages under investigation. However, these notional categories which are manifested through the formal means of modal auxiliaries are often influenced by various sociological and pragmatic factors. We, therefore, propose to confine our study to the functional aspect of these modal auxiliaries only.

The Speech Act Approach

All the earlier approaches to the study of language confined their studies to the semantic and formal aspect of language. Traditional grammar defined some grammatical categories on the basis of their meaning and some on the basis of their forms and functions. Nouns, verbs, tense, number, gender and modals are the various grammatical categories which have been treated by using semantic criterion whereas adjectives and adverbs are the grammatical categories which have been defined using functional criterion.

Structuralists criticized the mixing of criteria by traditional grammarians and based their studies exclusively on the form of words. They completely avoided relying on semantic criterion as it was thought to be outside the scope of scientific analysis due to its arbitrariness and introspective nature. They endeavoured to make the study of language a purely objective discipline and were interested in collecting and analyzing data, classifying form of various grammatical categories and formulating general principles which could be applicable to the data of language.

Structuralists tried their best to make the study of language as scientific as it could be and rejected various notional definitions like ‘noun is the name of a person, place or Language in India www.languageinindia.com
thing’ or ‘verb is a word that denotes action’ given by the Traditional Grammarians. But confining the study of language to only form resulted in so many anomalies in Structural linguistics.

These anomalies in Structural Linguistics and the consequent dissatisfaction against it ultimately resulted in the publication of Noam Chomsky’s book “Syntactic Structures” in 1957 which gave birth to Transformational Generative Grammar. While Structuralism confined itself to the description of the data, Transformational Generative Grammar went a step further and took into consideration native speaker’s intuitive knowledge of the language as the data. Generative linguists regarded language as a mental phenomenon which is acquired and not inherited and the data for its study is available through intuition. Generative Grammars have attached priority to syntax and completely ignored the social aspect of language. “But by accepting ambiguity and synonymy as among the basic data of linguistics, Chomsky opened a door for semantics” (Leech 1983:2). However, Chomsky missed the important point when he confined his study only to the linguistic competence of the native speakers and refused to go beyond it.

Philosophers like Searle (1969), Austin (1962) and Hymes (1972) were able to discover this leak, which was a great hindrance in the way of the perfection of Chomskian paradigm. They all contributed in different ways to the functional approach to the study of language. These philosophers opposed Chomsky by charging him of ignoring the situational use of language. According to them, people use language in different types of socio-cultural situations, which govern their lives. Any approach that disregards the social aspect of language is bound to be incomplete. A person cannot become competent in the use of language unless he learns to use a language in various socio-cultural situations. The functional grammarians discovered this lacuna and tried to overcome it by incorporating in their works socio-semantic functions of speech acts. Philosophers like Austin (1962), Halliday (1970), and Leech (1983) gave momentum to the functional approach.
J.L. Austin (1962) contributed significantly to the functional paradigm by relating meaning to its illocutionary force. He believes that a person utters a sentence not only to convey something but also to perform some act. When a person utters a sentence like 'I promise to come back within a week', he is not making a simple statement but is performing the act of promising. According to Austin, "a complete account of the meaning of a sentence cannot be restricted to semantic analysis as these are usually understood and that they must be extended to include information about the kind of speech act involved in uttering the sentence – that is, its illocutionary force " (Boyd and Thorne 1969: 58). In languages, words perform multiple functions and different functions of words are governed by different contexts in which they are uttered. Context or the underlying conditions, which are in the background and shape the utterance, often provide us clues to distinguish various functions of utterance from one another. The speech act approach developed by Austin particularly "focuses upon knowledge of underlying conditions for production and interpretation of acts through words." (Shiffrin1994: 6).

It is very unfortunate that the term 'speech-act' is widely misunderstood. Many people believe it to be the act of vocal utterance or an act of communication through spoken language. But Austin's doctrine of speech-act "gives explicit recognition to the social or interpersonal dimension of language behaviour and provides a general framework for the discussion of the syntactic and semantic distinctions that linguists have traditionally described in terms of mood and modality" (Lyons1977: 725).

The earlier linguists attached more importance to sentences and utterances and regarded them as the minimal unit of human communication system. Austin looked at communication system through the goal-oriented pragmatic point of view. For example when a person says to a stranger, "There is a dog in my house", he not only informs him about the presence of the dog in the house but also warns him never to think of trespassing his house.
Austin, thus, regarded the performance of a speech act as the smallest unit of communication system. Austin divided the speech acts into locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary. Locutionary act refers to the utterance of a sentence with a certain sense in a context. It includes the phonetic act, the phatic act and the rhetic act. Illocutionary act is an act performed in saying something and refers to "utterances, which have a certain conventional force"(Leech1983:176). Perlocutionary act refers to the results or consequences achieved by saying something.

In the beginning of his discussion, Austin has made a distinction between performatives (short) utterances and constatives (descriptive) utterances. This distinction is related to the various functions performed by language. In his work "How to Do things with words"(1962) Austin says that constatives utterances refer to the statements which describe some event, process or state of affairs and which can be characterized as either true or false. Performatives utterances, on the other hand, instead of evaluating something as true or false, are used to do something. The difference between constatives and performatives utterances depends upon the difference between saying something and doing something by the means of language. Austin, in this way, challenged the view of the logical positivists who thought that language makes only empirically verifiable statements. According to them language had only one function i.e. descriptive. All the other utterances are classified as emotive.

But people like Wittgenstein (1961) who were earlier associated with this theory, soon came to realize that language utterances are heterogeneous and are determined by various social conventions. A person becomes competent in the use of language by learning to use a language in different types of social contexts. Besides relating the use of language to social situations, Wittgenstein also relates the semantic aspect of a word to its use. Thus both Wittgenstein and Austin "emphasize the importance of relating the function of language to the social contexts in which languages operate and insist that, not only descriptive, but also non-descriptive utterances should be of concern to the philosopher" (Lyons1977:728).
Another philosopher who made significant contributions to speech act theory and who enriched it is Searle (1969). According to Searle ‘a theory of language is a part of a theory of action’ (1969:17). Searle rejected the distinction between meaning and speech acts, which Austin had indirectly made. He says that 'the study of speech acts are not two independent studies but one study from two different points of view" (1969:18). Searle holds that there are two types of speech acts--direct speech acts and indirect speech acts. He believes that whenever a speaker wishes to perform some goal with the help of the use of language, it requires a chain of actions. In a direct speech act a speaker believes that the hearer understands his message and this understanding of the message will lead him to perform the desired action. Searle defined indirect speech acts as "cases in which one illocutionary act is performed indirectly by way of performing another"(1969:60).

Searle regards that both direct and indirect speech acts are performed at the same time and the performance of the one leads to the performance of the other. For example, the utterance 'This room is very hot, isn't it?' implies that the speaker wants the hearer to switch on the cooler. Thus through an indirect speech act exemplified above a direct speech act is performed. The indirect speech act leads the hearer to infer that the speaker wants him to switch on the cooler.

But Professor Leech is not satisfied with means-ends analysis. He is of the view that we cannot restrict all the uses of language to only instrumental function, as "we cannot treat all discourse as motivated by the goal of bringing about some result in the mental or physical condition of the addressee” (Leech 1983:40). "The concept of goal", says Professor Leech "should be applicable to the phatic use of language, the avoidance of taboo subjects and taboo vocabulary, etc. and other cases where although the pattern of linguistic behaviour may be clear, few people would claim that the user is aware of the goals that motivate this behaviour” (1983:40).
Apart from classifying speech acts into direct and indirect, Searle also classified illocutionary acts into various categories. His classification is based on the politeness principles. According to him, "assertives commit to the truth of the expressed proposition” are "neutral as regards politeness " (Leech1983:105).

Assertives include stating, suggesting, boasting, complaining, claiming, reporting and belong to the collaborative category of illocutionary functions. Directives are the speech acts "intended to produce some effect through action by the hearer: ordering, commanding, requesting, advising and recommending are examples" (Leech1983: 106). These acts in most of the cases belong to the competitive category of illocutionary functions.

In the next place come commissives, which commit to some future action "e.g. promising, vowing, and offering. These illocutionary acts are related to convivial function of politeness. Expressives express "the speaker’s psychological attitude towards a state of affairs which the illocution presupposes: e.g., thanking, congratulating, pardoning, blaming, praising, condoling etc. Expressives like commissives also belong to the group of convivial as in them the "illocutionary goal coincides with the social goal" (Leech1983: 104).

The last category in the classification of illocutionary acts based on politeness maxims is the class of declaratives. Declaratives "bring about the correspondence between the propositional content and reality; e.g. resigning, dismissing, christening, naming, excommunicating, appointing, sentencing etc."(Leech1983: 106). Declaratives according to Searle are institutional acts and do not involve politeness.

All verbal utterances take place in various types of socio-cultural situations. Hence an important feature of speech acts is that they have a close affinity with the socio-cultural background of the speakers and listeners. Human languages are culture specific. Speech acts differ from culture to culture. Individuals while communicating or interacting with the other individuals have to manage the socio-cultural conventions. These socio-
cultural conventions play a vital role in human communication system. All languages differ from each other in these socio-cultural aspects pertaining to the context and form. Languages also differ in the use of the conventional principles of politeness, cooperation, informativeness, truthfulness, relevance, perspicuity, and clarity.

Hence the theory of speech act which relates meaning to its illocutionary force is of great relevance. For example, 'He will come on Monday' can be analyzed as 'I predict he comes on Monday' and 'He may come on Monday' can be analyzed as 'I guess he comes on Monday.' In the above examples, modals 'will' and 'may' are related to the illocutionary forces of the speaker's mental acts of predicting and guessing respectively.

Methodology and Data Collection

Halliday (1970) regards modality an important element of the semantics of personal participation. He believes that it is derived from the interpersonal function of language. Any discussion of modality will remain superficial without a consideration of the notions of speech act and illocutionary force which are governed by various speech situations. The addressee will be able to decode the semantics of modality fully well only if he is familiar with the context of the utterance. Therefore, we propose to study modals using the speech-act and pragmatic parameters developed by Austin, Searle and Leech as laid down in our discussion on ‘The Speech-Act Approach’.

The data to support our point of view in the present paper have been collected from popular one-act plays written in Hindi. A detailed reference to the plays has been given in the appendix at the end of the paper. The data from these plays are preferred as these plays are written by the native speakers of Hindi and contain dialogues which are representative of the language spoken by the native speakers. We have selected only one example for each notional category expressing modality in Hindi. We have proposed to analyze data using the following pragmatic parameters: 1. Meaning 2. Illocutionary Act 3. Illocutionary Function 4. Attitude of the speaker.
Functions of ‘sak’

In Hindi, ‘sak’ implies permission, ability and possibility. Instead of two different forms –‘may’ and ‘can’ – used in English, Hindi has only one form ‘sak’ which is used for all the three semantic options – permission, ability and possibility.

1. डॉक्टर: क्या मैं अंदर आ सकता हूँ?
   Doctor: I in come may
   Doctor: May I come in? (subah jarūr āyegī)
   I request you to permit me to go inside.

Context of the Utterance:

(a) डॉक्टर: क्या मैं अंदर आ सकता हूँ?
   Doctor: I in come may
   Doctor: May I come in?

(b) राव साहब: देखिये डॉक्टर डैसाई, मैं आपसे पहले ही कहा था, मैं ने सावन कुक्रेजा का केस लिया है अब मैं उसके बारे में आपसे बातचीत करना भी समझता?
   Rao Saheb: see Dr. Desai I you already told was I Savan Kukreja of case already taken had now I him about you talk do even
   ucit nahīṁ samajhtā
   proper not deem
   Rao Saheb: See, Dr. Desai, I had already told you that I had taken the case of Savan Kukreja. Now I don’t deem it proper even to talk about him.

Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:

Meaning: Request for permission.
I request you to permit me to go inside.
Illocutionary Function: Competitive.
Attitude of the Speaker: Speaker wishes that the hearer permits him to do the act described in the propositional content.
The speaker wishes that the hearer allows him to go inside.

2.  
\[ \text{ḍākṭar desāī} : \text{kyā ek ḍākṭar kī haisiyat se maiṁ} \]
Doctor Desai : whether a Doctor as capacity I
\[ \text{āpkī koī madad kar saktā hūṁ?} \]
you any help do may is
Dr.Desai : May I help you as a doctor?  \text{(subah jarūr āyegī)}

Context of the Utterance:
\[ \text{daisāī} : \text{namaste vakīl sāhab. āj phir binā} \]
Desai : Namaste vakil saheb today once again without
\[ \text{batāye ā gayā māph karnā} \]
invitation come have excuse.

Desai : Namaste Mr. Advocate. Once again I have come without invitation.

Excuse me.
\[ \text{rāv sāhab} : \text{lekin ḍākṭar} \]
Rao Saheb : but doctor
Rao Saheb but Doctor…………
\[ \text{ḍākṭar daisāī} : \text{ṭhahariye vakīl sāhab maiṁ koī purānī} \]
Doctor Desai : Stop Advocate Mr. I same old
\[ \text{bātaiṁ dohrāne nahīṁ āyā hāṁ} \]
things to repeat not come have.
\[ \text{abhī āpne jaslīn hāspīṭal maiṁ phon} \]
just now you Jasleen hospital in telephone call
\[ \text{kiyā thā. maiṁ vahīṁ bāiṭhā thā} . \]
made had. I there sitting was.
\[ \text{vahīṁ par maiṁ ne āpke ghar kā prāblm sunā} \]
There I your home of problem heard
\[ \text{aur maiṁ phauran yahā par ā gayū.} \]
and I at once here reached.
\[ \text{kyā ek ḍākṭar kī haisiyat se maiṁ āpki koī} \]
a doctor in capacity as I you any

madad kar saktā hūṁ? maiṁ āpke beṭe ko
help may I your son
dekhanā cāhtā hūṁ
attend want

Dr. Desai stop, Mr. Advocate. I have not come to repeat the same old things. Just now you made a call to Jasleen Hospital. I was sitting there. There I heard the problem of your home and reached here at once. May I help you as a doctor? I want to attend to your son.

**Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:**

Meaning: Offer

Illocutionary Act: Commissive.

I request you to tell me if I can help you in my capacity as a doctor.

Illocutionary Function: Convivial.

Attitude of the Speaker: The speaker is willing to perform the action described in the propositional content.

The speaker is willing to help the hearer by attending his son who is an Aids patient.

3. āp kabhī bhī pāgal nahīṁ ho sakte
   you mad never go can
   You can never go mad.  

   *(cakkardār sīḥiyāṁ aur andherā)*

**Context of the Utterance:**

mahārāj : jī hāṁ, āp na āte to shāyad maiṁ bhī pāgal
Maharaj : Sir yes, you not had come then, perhaps, I too mad ho jātā.
   would have gone .

Maharaj : Yes, sir, had you not come, then perhaps I too would have gone mad.

manohar : chī chī fazūl kā ċār hai, āp kabhī bhī pāgal
Manohar : tut tut baseless it fear is you mad

nahīṁ ho sakte
   never go can
Manohar : No, its baseless fear. You can never go mad.

**Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:**

Meaning: Assurance.
Illocutionary Act: Assertive.
I assure you that there is no possibility for you to go mad.
Illocutionary Function: Collaborative.
Attitude of the Speaker: Friendly. Speaker assures the hearer of the impossibility of the event described in the propositional content.

4. \(\text{umā ab mere bagair nahīṁ rah saktī} \)
   \(\text{Uma now me without not live can.}\)
Now, Uma can’t live without me. \((cakkardār sīṭhīyāṁ aur andherā)\)

**Context of the Utterance:**

*mahārāj* : \(\text{nahīṁ nāṭak to nahīṁ mujhe lagtā hai ki umā ab} \)
Maharaj : No drama not I feel am that Uma now
   \(\text{mere binā nahīṁ rah saktī} \)
   \(\text{me without not live can}\)
Maharaj : No, it’s not a drama (this can’t be acting at all). I feel that now Uma can’t live without me.

*manohar* : \(\text{aur tum bagair umā ke rah sakте ho?} \)
Manohar : And you without Uma live can
Manohar : And can you live without Uma?

*mahārāj* : \(\text{shāyad uske maujūdā hālat mujhe uske liye gahrā} \)
Maharaj : Perhaps her present circumstances me her for deep
   \(\text{ākārṣhaṇ karāte hai aīsā lagatā hai \ldots \; shāyad maiṁ} \)
   \(\text{attraction make feel it seem s perhaps I} \)
   \(\text{umā ke bagair nahīṁ bhī rah sakта} \)
   \(\text{Ummi without not too live can}\)
Maharaj : Perhaps her present circumstances make me feel (have) attraction for her. It seems perhaps I too can’t live without her.

**Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:**
Meaning: Impossibility.
Illocutionary Act: Assertive.
I guess / predict that now it will not be possible for Uma to live without me.
Illocutionary Function: Collaborative.
Attitude of the Speaker: Speaker predicts about the impossibility of the event described in the propositional content.
The speaker predicts that now Uma can’t live without him.

5.  
*hamāre yahā se koi bhī brāhmaṇ binā kuchh khāe*

Our houses at no(any) Brahmin without something eating

*nahīṁ jā saktā*

leave can

No brahmin can leave our house without eating something.  
[(buddhū kā kāṁṭā)]

**Context of the Utterance:**

*paṇḍitjī* : to ghar dekhkar nirṛtay le lo. kal

Panditji: then family after taking into account decision take. Tomorrow

*sarṇkrānti* hai din acchā hai acchā bahinjī mujhe anumati

Sankranti is day auspicious is well dear sister me permit
do. in laṛkiyom ke ghar bhī sūcnā de dūṁ

to go these girls of family also inform let

Panditji: Then take a decision after taking into account the family status.

Tomorrow is Sakranti – an auspicious day. Well dear sister, permit me to go. Let me inform the families of these girls.

*raghunāth kī māṁ : paṇḍitjī dādh pīte jāiye. hamāre yahā se*

Raghunath of mother: Panditji milk have please our house at

*koi bhī brāhmaṇ binā kuch khāe nahīṁ jā saktā*

no brahmin without something eating not leave can.

Mother of Raghunath: Panditji, please have some milk. No Brahmin can leave us without eating something at our houses.

**Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:**

Meaning: Permission, offer.
Illocutionary Act: Commissive.
We vow that no Brahmin is permitted to leave us without eating anything.
Illocutionary Function: Convivial
Attitude of the Speaker: Speaker intends to fulfill the vow described in the propositional content.
Speaker intends to be hospitable to Panditji.

6. \(\text{vidhātā की cāl ko koi nahiṁ rok saktā}\)
   God of the design nobody not check can

Nobody can check the design of God. \(\text{(buddhū kā kūṁṭū)}\)

**Context of the Utterance:**

\(\text{ilāhī : rab kī marjī bābū. sāb usī ke kie se}\)
Ilahi : God's of wish babu. Everything him alone done by
   hotā hai
   is

Ilahi : God's wish babu! Everything is done by him alone.

\(\text{raghunāth : īshvar balvān he, ilāhī bhāī. vidhātā kī}\)
Raghunath : God almighty is, Ilahi Bhai. God's
   cāl ko koi nahiṁ rok saktā
   design nobody check can.

Raghunath : God is almighty, Ilahi Bhai. Nobody can check the design of God.

**Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:**

Meaning: Present ability.
Illocutionary Act: Assertive.
I assert that nobody is able to check the design of God.
Illocutionary Function: Collaborative.
Attitude of the Speaker: The speaker wishes the hearer to know the information described in the propositional content.
Functions Of ‘pā’

In English ‘can’ and its past form ‘could’ both are used for referring to the ability in the present and the past respectively. In Hindi, ‘sak’ and ‘pā’ are used for referring to the concept of ability. So we can call them modals of ability. ‘pā’ as a modal auxiliary characteristically occurs in the negative sentences whereas ‘sak’ occurs in both the affirmative and the negative sentences. Both ‘pā’ and ‘sak’ can also be used in the past for expressing past ability. But in the past tense, ‘pā’ cannot be used in an affirmative sentence as a substitute of ‘sak’ which is used for referring to both the present and the past abilities. However, in a negative sentence, when we replace ‘sak’ by ‘pā’ in the past, we get quite a normal sentence.

7. yah kes ab iṣṭena hī nahīṁ ho pāyegā
This case now stand not shall be able to
This case shall not be able to stand up. (subah jarūr āyegī)

Context of the Utterance:

shārdā : āj kot se jaldī vāpip ā gayai āj to sāvan kukrejā ke
Sharda : today court from early come have today Savan Kukreja’s
case of date was
Sharda: You have come early from the court, today. Was it not the date of Savan
Kukreja’s case?

rāo sahab : hāṁ vo kes to māno khatam ho gayā, sāvan kukrejā ne pāmc
Rao Sahab : yes that case perhaps over is. Savan Kukreja five
sāl pahle hī vo jagah apne nām karvā lī thī āshram ke ċraṭ ke
years ago that place his name registered got had Ashram of trust of
sabhī craṭījo ko yā to ċarā dhāmkā ke yā fir paiae dekar unse sabhī
case of date was
the papers either threatening by or money giving them all
kāgaṭā par dastkhat karvā liye the. ċāktar daisāī
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Rao Saheb : Yes, that is perhaps over. Savan Kukreja had got that place registered in his name five years ago. Either by threatening all the trustees of the Ashram or by giving them money, he had got all the papers signed by them. Dr. Desai was left all alone. That case can’t stand now.

**Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:**

Meaning: Inability, weakness (negative sentence).

Illocutionary Act: Assertive.

I assert/state that this case shall not be able to stand now.

Illocutionary Function: Collaborative.

Attitude of the Speaker: The speaker simply informs the hearer about the information (weakness of the case to stand to a trial in the court) described in the propositional content.

8. **ham kiśi ko rok nahīṁ pāye**

   we anybody stop not were able to

   We were not able to stop anybody.  (**tūṭe parivesh**)  

**Context of the Utterance:**

karunā : bahut burī bāt hai. ve gālī dene lage hai

Karuna : very bad it is. he abusing started has.

Karuna : It is very bad. He has started abusing.

Sharat: ispāṣṭ hai ki ve hīn bhāv kā shikār ho gaye hai.

Sharat: clear is that he inferiority complex to a victim become has.

ghor nirāśāvādī hai. kabhī kabhī ese log pāgal tak ho jāte haiṁ.

great pessimist has. Sometimes such people mad go.

Sharat: It is clear that he has become a prey (victim) to inferiority complex. He’s a great pessimist. Sometimes, such people go mad.

karunā : yahī to maiṁ kaḥtī hīṁ. tum log unke bāre mēṁ sochte kyōṁ
Karuna: This is what I say. You people think about him.

not you always what pleased done have. Your own voiced heard.

ham kisi ko rok nahin pahe.

We anyone stop not could

Karuna: This is what I say. Why don’t you people think about him? You have always done what pleased you. Heard your own voice. I couldn’t stop anyone of you.

**Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:**

*Meaning:* Ability (in) in the past.

*Illocutionary Act:* Assertive.

I state that we were not able to stop anyone of our children from going their own ways.

*Illocutionary Function:* Collaborative.

*Attitude of the Speaker:* The speaker regrets about his inability to perform the action described in the propositional content.

9. *calo, ham dono cale aur dekhe ek dubla-patlā admi*

let, us both of go and see a lean and thin person

*jallād jaise bhayānak gundo par kaise vijay pātā hai* hangmen like dangerous rogues over how victory able to get is.

Let both of us go and see how a lean and thin person is able to get victory over dangerous rogues like hangmen. *(itihās aur satyā)*

**Context of the Utterance:**

*nambar tin : nahin maiṁ kisi kā gulām nahin hūṁ*

Number three: No, I anybody of slave not am

No.3 : No, I’m not anybody’s slave.

*kāminī : yahin to tummeṁ ek acchī bāṁ hai, tum kisi ke* Kaminī: This in you a good thing is, you anyone of

gulām nahin ho. gāndhī mahāṁ kō tum jaise vyaktiyo kī hī
Prashant Mishra, M.A., M.Phil., Ph.D.
The Core Functions of the Hindi Modals
– Speech Act Approach

Kamini: This is a good thing in you that you aren’t anybody’s slave. Gandhi Mahatma needs men like you. (meekly) Let both of us go and see how a lean and thin person is able to get victory over dangerous rogues like hangmen.

Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:
Meaning: Present Ability (Complex Sentence).
Illocutionary Act: Assertive.
The Speaker affirms that Gandhi has special ability to conquer the hearts of dangerous rogues like hangmen.
Illocutionary Function: Collaborative.
Attitude of the Speaker: The speaker is surprised with the ability of Gandhi to control the rioters.

Functions of ‘Cāhiye’

Modality, according to Halliday, is a form of participation by the speaker in the speech event (Halliday 1970). ‘cāhiye’ is a modal used in Hindi by the speakers to give their opinions or to express their assessment with respect to the obligations to be fulfilled by the members of the society. Wish, advice, suggestion, exhortation, intentions are recommendatory in nature. In the illocutionary act, the addresser, who may be an elderly or wise man, recommends the addressee to behave or act in a particular manner as it is necessary for the welfare of the addressee as well as society. The semantic categories underlying a ‘cāhiye’ construction express various semantic features including ‘desirability’, ‘necessity’, ‘obligation’, ‘inference’ and ‘potentiality’. These semantic categories are expressed at the surface level by the use of modal ‘cāhiye’.
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**Context of the Utterance:**

mahārāj : maiṁ to nahīṁ - magar ab vah merai bagair
Maharaj : I can not - but now she me without nahīṁ rah saktī
        not live can.
Maharaj : I can’t ---but now she too can’t live without me.
manohar : hūṁ āi think tumhai issai kabhī shādī
Manohar : Yes! I think – you her marry nahīṁ karnā cāhiye shashi
        never should Shashi
Manohar : Yes! I think –you should never marry her Shashi.
mahārāj : mere man kī tasvīr bilkul sāf he. mainai ek
Maharaj : my mind of picture quite clear is. I one jīndgī ko sudhārne kā nishcay kiyā hai maiṁ umā
to reform of decided did have I Uma ko samāj maiṁ vahī pratishtā dilāūṁgā jo ki
to society in the same reputation get shall that merī patnī ko milnī cāhiye.
my wife to given should.
Maharaj : The picture in my mind is quite clear. I have decided to reform a life. I shall / will make sure that Uma gets the same respect/status that is due to my life.

**Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:**

Meaning: Suggestion, recommendation, advice.
I recommend you never to marry Uma.
Illocutionary Function: Competitive.
Attitude of the Speaker: Speaker wishes that the hearer follows the suggestion given in the propositional content.
Speaker wishes the hearer never to marry Uma.

11. niṣṭil istemāl karne ke bād tor denā cāhiye.

Needles using after break should.

After using needles, we should break them. (*subah jarūr āyegī*)

**Context of the Utterance:**

rajū : mujhe chūnā nahīm ṣāktār arkal mujhe –
Raju : me touch do not doctor uncle me –

Raju don’t touch me, Dr.uncle, don’t ……..

ṣāktār desāī : tumheṁ eḍs huā hai tumse kisne kahā ki tumheṁ chūne
Doctor Desai :You aids suffering are you who told that you touches

se eḍs hotā hai.

aids affect will.

Doctor Desai: You are suffering from aids. Who told you that aids will affect one who touches you?

rāv sāhab : sabhī kahte haiṁ
Rao Saheb : All say

Rao Saheb : All say.

ṣāktār desāī : nā samajh haiṁ, galat kahte haiṁ. dekho beṭe tumheṁ chūne
Doctor Desai : unwise are, a lie tell , see my son you touching

se tumhāre kapre pahnne se, tumhārī thālī meṁ khānā khāne se eḍs
by your clothes wearing by, your plate in eating by aids

kā prasār nahīṁ hotā. sirf seks aur blaṭ in do hī mādhyamoṁ se
spread not does. only sex and blood these two means by

iskā failāv hotā hai. ājkal to dispojebal niṣṭil istemāl karte hai tāki
it spreads these days disposable needles use so that

Language in India [www.languageinindia.com](http://www.languageinindia.com)
9 : 10 October 2009
Prashant Mishra, M.A., M.Phil., Ph.D.
The Core Functions of the Hindi Modals – Speech Act Approach
atts na ho. isiliye nigil istemal karne ke bad taur dena

aids does not affect. therefore needles using after break
cahiye.

should.

Dr. Desai: They are unwise, they tell a lie. See, my son, by touching you, or by
eating in your plate, aids doesn’t spread. It spreads only by means of sex and blood.
These days we use disposable needles so that aids does not affect others. Therefore,
after using, the needle must be broken.

Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:
Meaning: Inference, logical conclusion.
Illocutionary Act: Assertive.
I infer that after using needles, we should break them.
Illocutionary Function: Collaborative.

Attitude of the Speaker: Speaker assumes the information given in the propositional
content on the basis of the events or circumstances described in the propositional
content.

12. Manohar: ye pagal sacmuc daivta hote hai, maharaj
Manohar: these lunatics really Godly are, Maharaj
kumar inhaim vahi prem, vahi shradh vahi bhav dena cahiye
Kumar they same love, same respect same reverence given should
jo bhakt apnai bhagvan ko daita hai
that devotee his God to give s.

Manohar: These lunatics are really Godly, Maharaj Kumar. They should be
given the same love, the same regard and the same reverence that a devotee gives to his God.

(cakkardar sikhym aur andhera)

Context of the Utterance: Same as above.

Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:
Meaning: Advice, suggestion, recommendation.
I wish you to pay the same love, the same respect and the same reverence to lunatics that you pay to your God.
Illocutionary Function: Competitive.
Attitude of the Speaker: Speaker wishes the hearer to follow the suggestion given in the propositional content.
Speaker wishes the hearer to pay the same love, the same regard and the same reverence to lunatics that he pays to his God

13. hameṁ ek aurat ke khūn se apne hāth nahīṁ raṅgne cāhiye
we a woman of blood with our hands not colour should.
We should not colour our hands with the blood of a woman. (ītiḥās aur satya)

Context of the Utterance:
number pācīṁ: tum mūrakh ho. maiṁ aurat par vishvās nahīṁ kar saktā. vah bahut
Number five: you a fool are. I a woman believe not can. she very

khatarnāk hoṭī hai. akele hī sakṛōṁ purūso ko ullaḥ banāne kī shakti usmeṁ
dangerous is. Alone hundreds men of befool to the power she
hai.
has.
Number five: You are a fool. I can’t believe a woman. She is very dangerous. She alone has the power to befool hundreds of men.

number cārā : lekin fir bhī hameṁ ek aurat ke khūn se apne hāth nahīṁ
Number four: Even then we a woman of the blood with our hands not
raṅgne cāhiye.
colour should.
Number four: Even then, we should not colour our hands with the blood of a woman.

Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters :
Meaning: Advice, moral obligation.
I suggest that we should not colour our hands with the blood of a woman.
Illocutionary Function: Competitive.
Attitude of the Speaker: The speaker wishes that the hearer follows the suggestion given in the propositional content.
The speaker wishes the hearer not to kill a woman.

Functions Of ‘gā’

As an auxiliary modal, ‘gā’ is used to express various semantic notions like willingness, intention, determination, prediction, command and request. To express these notional categories, ‘gā’ is used in Hindi as an equivalent of ‘will’, ‘would’, ‘should’, ‘could’ and ‘must’. It covers a wide range of semantic options in Hindi. These semantic notions are used in various socio-cultural situations to achieve various illocutionary goals. ‘gā’ is used as a modal auxiliary in Hindi to express the intentions of the speaker. The speaker either intends to assure somebody by promising him or intends to warn somebody by threatening him. Offers and promises are used to provide incentives to the people in our society. Threats, warnings, on the contrary, serve as deterrents to discourage people indulging in anti-social or anti-national activities.

14. jarūr lаuṭ āegā ummī
certainly back come will Ummi.
He will certainly come back Ummi. (cakkardār sīthiyāṁ aur andherā)

Context of the Utterance

Uma: kitnai din bīt gae hai. tum tau kahtai thi merā
Uma: how many days passed away have. You do told my
lāl lauṭ āegā.
darling back come will.
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Uma: How many days have passed away. You told me that my darling will come back.

mahārāj: hāṁ hāṁ! jāṛū r lauṭ āegā ummī.
Maharaj: Yes, yes! certainly back come will Ummi..
Maharaj: Yes, yes! He will certainly come back Ummi.

**Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:**
Meaning: Assurance.
Illocutionary Act: Commissive.
I assure you that your son will certainly come back.
Illocutionary Function: Convivial.
Attitude of the Speaker: The speaker is willing to help the hearer in relieving tension due to the death of her son.

15. māṁ tumhāṛī patnī ko apne baṝgle par rakhūṁga.
   I your wife my bungalow at keep will.
I will keep your wife at my bungalow. *(cakkardār stīhiyāṁ aur andherā)*

**Context of the Utterance:**

*manohar: shashi, tum .ummi ko merī kaiar māṁ chor jāo ...... māṁ*
Manohar: Shashi, you ummi to my care under leave I ........

*tumhāṛī patnī ko apnai baṝgle par rakhūṁga. tum kuch roj ghūm your wife of my bungalow at keep shall. You few days trip*  
āo. jāo yūrop yā iṅglenţ.
have. go Europe or England.

Manohar: Shashi, you leave Ummi under my care. I shall keep your wife at my bungalow. You, have a trip for a few days. Go to England or Europe.

*mahārāj: nahīṁ dāktar, ab kahīṁ nahīṁ jāʊṁga. apne īshvar se*  
maharaj: No, doctor, now anywhere not go will. Your God to

*manāie ki vah merī umā ko acchī kar de.*
pray that he my Uma to cure do to.
Maharaj: No doctor, no I won’t go anywhere else. Pray your God to cure my Uma.

**Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:**

Meaning: Promise.
Illocutionary Act: Commissive.
I promise you to keep your wife at my bungalow.
Illocutionary Function: Convivial.
Attitude of the Speaker: Speaker intends to help the hearer by performing the action described in the propositional content.

Dr. Manohar intends to help Shashi by keeping his wife at his bungalow.

16. **mahārāj:** narsa! maiṁ apne baccai ko abhī-abhī dekhna

Maharaj: Nurse! I my child just now see cāhūṁgā.

I wish to see my child just now. (*cakkardār sthiyāṁ aur andherā*)

**Context of the Utterance:**

**mahārāj:** kaun ā rahā hai.

Maharaj: who coming is.

Maharaj: Who is coming?

**naukar:** ā ḍākṭār manoharlāl sāhab hai.

Servant: Doctor Manoharlal saheb is.

Servant: It is Doctor Manoharlal saheb, sir.

**mahārāj:** narsa! maiṁ apne baccai kau abhī-abhī dekhna

Maharaj: Nurse! I my child to just now see cāhūṁgā.

like would/determined

Maharaj: Nurse! I would like/determined to see my child, just now.
Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:
Meaning: Wish
Illocutionary Act: Commissive.
Illocutionary Function: Convivial.
Attitude of the Speaker: Insistence. Speaker insists to perform the action described in the propositional content.

17. ṛākṭar bansal : sābko mār ḍālūṃgā.
Doctor Bansal : you all kill shall.
Doctor Bansal : I shall kill you all. (cakkardār sīthiyāṁ aur andherā)

Context of the Utterance:
ṛākṭar bansal: jāo. sab jāo. hailain…. kishorī sab jāo. tum sab
Dr.Bansal : Go. all go. Helen Kishori all go . you all
mairai dushman hau. maine... maine tum maine se kisī ko kabhi bhī pyār
my foes are. I I you anyone of loved
nahīṁ kiyā maine sabse nafrat kartā hūṁ sabko mār ḍālūṃgā.
never have I all of you hate do am. You all kill would.
Doctor Bansal: Go, all go away. Helen…… Kishori – all go away. You are all my foes. I, I have never loved any one of you. I hate all of you. I would kill you all.

Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:
Meaning: Threat.
Illocutionary Act: Commissive.
I threaten to kill you all if you don’t go away.
Illocutionary Function: Confictive.

Attitude of the Speaker: Speaker insists to perform the action described in the propositional content if the hearer does not follow his orders.
Speaker insists the hearers to go away or he will kill him.
18.  यात्री : नाहीं माईं पाई द ही जाऊंगा।
Passenger : No I walk down would.
Passenger: No, I would walk down. (बुधु का काम्प्टा)

Context of the Utterance:

इलाही : तात्पर्य वात्य काहीते तो बोलो।
Ilahi : mule need then tell.

यात्री : नाहीं माईं पाई द ही जाऊंगा।
Passenger : no, I walk down go would.
Ilahi, Tell me if you need a mule.
Passenger : No, I would walk down on foot.

Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:

Meaning: Determination.
Illocutionary Act: Commissive.
I am determined to walk down on foot.
Illocutionary Function: Collaborative.

Attitude of the Speaker: Insistence. Speaker insists to fulfil the intentions expressed in the propositional content.
Speaker insists to walk down on foot.

19.  अभी ग्यांते भर मे पहुंच जाओ।
      An hour’s time reach shall.
You shall reach there within an hour. (बुधु का काम्प्टा)

Context of the Utterance:

राघुनाथ : दारसूरी जाना हैं जी . माईं पहलई काबी
Raghunath : Darsoori go is . I before

इद्हर आया नाहीं कितना दूर हैं कब तक पहुंच जाऊंगा?
Here come never. How far is when reach shall.
Raghunath: I want to go to Darsoory. I have never been there before. How far is it? When shall I reach there?

\(kanyā: yahī\quad pandrah-bīs\quad din\quad maiṁ\quad tīn-cār\quad sau\)

Girl : about fifteen-twenty days three-four hundred kos to hogā miles must.

Girl : In about fifteen to twenty days’ time. It must be at a distance of three to four miles.

\(pahlī\quad istrī\quad :\quad chīh,\quad yahī\quad do\quad ḍhaī\quad kaus\quad bhar\quad hai.\)

First woman : it two two and half miles is

\(abhī\quad ghanṭai\quad bhar\quad maiṁ\quad pahuṁc\quad jāogai.\)

an hour’s reach would.

First woman : No it is about two to two and a half miles away. You shall reach there in an hour’s time.

**Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:**

Meaning: Prediction.

Illocutionary Act: Assertive.

I predict that you shall reach within an hour.

Illocutionary Function: Collaborative.

Attitude of the Speaker: Speaker guesses about the truth of the propositional content.

Speaker guesses that the hearer shall reach Darsoori with in an hour.

**Functions of ‘paṛ’**

In English ‘will’, ‘shall’, ‘must’, ‘have to’, ‘have got to’ are used to express insistence, obligation and compulsion of various kinds. In Hindi ‘paṛ’ is used to express the same semantic categories. There are social situations in which an addressee is bound to impose some obligatory actions on the hearer. The addressee, who may be a senior to
or older than the addressee, uses his authority or superior rank and position to impose some obligatory action on the hearer.

In Indian social system, obligations are generally imposed by a person who has the official or legal authority to do so or by an elder who is bestowed authority by the society or the family. ‘par’ is also used in Hindi to express some of the compulsions that the addressee or the addressee had to undergo in the past or shall have to bear in the future, ‘par’ is used in Hindi when the speaker arrives at a logical conclusion which is inferred from some known premises or information.

In English ‘must’, ‘have to’ and ‘have got to’ are used to express the semantic notion of insistence. In Hindi like ‘gā’, ‘par’ is also used to imply the same notion.

20. **ghanṭe bhar ke bād mujhāi calā jānā paṛegā**

   an hour after I go will have to.

   I will have to go after an hour. (**sīndūr kī holtī**)

**Context of the Utterance:**

**murārīlāl (apne nokar māhir āli se): kahāṁ cale gaye the jī, sāṛhai nau**

Murarilal (his servant Mahir Ali to): Where gone had you, 9:30

*ho rahā hai. āj mukadme adhik haim ghanṭe bhar ke bād*

is. Today cases a number of have an hour after

*mujhe calā jānā paṛegā aur tumhārā patā nahīṁ*

I go have to shall and you untraceable

Murarilal (To his servant Mahir Ali): Where had you gone. It is almost 9:30 now. To-day, we have a number of cases. I shall have to go after an hour and you were untraceable.

**Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:**

Meaning: Inference, logical necessity.

Illocutionary Act: Assertive.
I infer that I have to go after half an hour as I have to attend more cases today.

Illocutionary Function: Collaborative.

Attitude of the Speaker: The speaker believes in the truth of the propositional content as it is inferred from the circumstantial evidence available to him.

21. lāj sharam choñkar sarkār ko yah sab karnā pañtā

shame setting aside government this all do has to

hai. tāki eṅs ke peshenṣ pedā na ho.

so that aids of patient born not are.

The government has to do all this setting aside all shame so that the patient of aids are not born. (subah jarûr ñeygī)

Context of the Utterance:

dādājī desh videsh me vigyān me itī pragati huī

Grandfather our country foreign in science in a lot of progress been

hai. yahā tak ki insān cānd tak pahurāc gayā hai kyā eṅs

has. So much so that man moon even reached has. aids

kā ilāj nahīṁ nikālā jā sakā

of treatment not find can.

Grand Father: There has been a lot of progress in science in our country and in foreign countries too, so much so that man has reached the Moon. Can’t we find the treatment of aids?

śākṭar: nahīṁ bābūjī, āe din ham dekhte hai ki T.V. par

Doctor: No babuji, everyday we see that T.V. on

nīrodh, kaṅṭom ke vigyāpan khuleāṁ dikhāe jāte hai. lekin

condoms, condoms about advertisement openly shown are. But

is rog ki bhayāvahatā kī vajah se lāj sharm choñkar

this disease of the terrors of because shame setting aside

sarkār ko yah sab karnā pañtā hai, tāki eṅs ke peshenṣ

the govt. this all do has to, so that aids of patients
Doctor: No, Babuji, everyday we see that the advertisements about condoms are openly shown on T.V. But because of the terrors of this disease, the government has to do all this setting aside all shame so that the patients of aids are not born.

**Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:**

Meaning: Strong necessity.

Illocutionary Act: Assertive.

I assert that in order to prevent aids it is very necessary for the government to exhibit advertisements of condoms and other means of safe sex.

Illocutionary Function: Collaborative.

Attitude of the Speaker: The speaker believes in the truth of the propositional content as it is based on the reasons given in the context.

22. *yahā use har ek ka ādar karna partā he, har ek se here she all people respect has to all dabnā partā he.*

Here she has to respect all people, has to yield before all. (*sukhī dāli*)

**Context of the Utterance:**

*dādā:* *mujhe yah jānkar baṛā dukh huā hai ki choṭī grandfather I this to know very unhappy am that younger bahū kā man yahā nahīṁ lagā. vah ek baṛē ghar kī daughter- in- law mentally here not happy. she a high family of beṭī hai bahut paṛī-likhī hai. yahā use har-ek kā ādar karnā daughter is highly educated is. here she all people respect partā hai, har-ek kā hukam mānnā partā hai - yahā uskā has to, all of the orders follow has to - here her vyaktitav dabkar rah gayā hai*
personality suppressed been has.

Grand-father: I am very unhappy to know that the younger daughter-in-law is not mentally happy here. She is the daughter of a high family, and highly educated too. She has to give respect to all people living here; has to follow the orders of all; her personality has been suppressed here.

**Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:**
Meaning: Compulsions in the present.
Illocutionary Act: Assertive.
I affirm that here she has to give respect to all the people and to follow the orders of all.
Illocutionary Function: Collaborative.
Attitude of the Speaker: The speaker is sympathetic towards the hearer due to the compulsions imposed on her.

23. *cittaur kī rakshā me tumhe talvār ke sāth hī sonā paṛegā.*
Chittor of the defence for you sword with sleep have to shall.
For the defence of Chittor, you shall have to sleep with your sword. *(dīp dāṅ).*

**Context of the Utterance:**
*udaysing (rūthe hue svar me): maiṁ talvār ke sāth hi so jaūgā.*
Udai Singh (angry voice in) : I the sword with sleep shall.
Udai Singh (In an angry voice) : I shall sleep only with my sword.
*panna abhī vah samay nahīṁ āyā, kuṁwar.*
Panna : so far that time not has come, Kumwar.
*cittaur kī rakshā me tumhe talvār ke sāth hī sonā paṛegā*
Chittor of the defence in you sword with sleep have to shall
Panna : That time hasn’t come so far, Kunwar. For the defence of Chittor, you shall have to sleep with your sword.

**Sociological and Pragmatic Parameters:**
Meaning: Obligation.
I order you to sleep with your sword for the defence of Chittor.

Illocutionary Function: Competitive.
Attitude of the Speaker: Speaker insists that the hearer performs the action described in the propositional content.
Speaker wishes the hearer to sleep with his sword in order to defend his country.

Conclusions

The analysis of the above samples extracted from the one-act plays of Hindi substantiate our premise that context of utterance that includes the socio-cultural and background knowledge is very essential to understand the semantics of Modals. The theory of Speech-Act selected for the present study and the pragmatic parameters used by us help us in understanding the real intent of the speakers and in exploring the various communicative acts and functions performed by the modals.

The paper shows that modals in Hindi are not only multi-propositional but also multi-functional. The study shows that when ‘sak’ and ‘pā’ semantically refers to possibility and ability as we see in examples No. 4, 6, 7 and 9, they perform assertive act as the speaker simply states/predicts about the ability/possibility of the action or event described in the propositional content. The illocutionary function is collaborative as the illocutionary goal remains neutral towards the social goal. In examples No. 11, 19, 20, 21 and 22 when ‘cāhiye’, ‘gā’ and ‘par’ are used to imply inference, prediction, necessity, and compulsion, they perform the assertive act as the speaker expresses inference/ guess or affirmation about the truth of the propositional content.

Since the illocutionary goal is neutral towards the social goal, the illocutionary function performed is collaborative. When ‘sak’ is used for making request for permission as in example No. 1 and ‘cāhiye’ for making suggestion, recommendation, advice (moral obligation) as in examples No. 10, 12and 13 and ‘par for obligation as in example No. 23,
they perform directive act as the speaker requests/wishes/directs/recommends the hearer to follow the instructions/suggestions/recommendations given in the propositional content.

Since the illocutionary goal competes with the social goal, the utterance perform competitive function. On the other hand, when ‘sak’ is used to express offer as in examples No. 2 and 5 and ‘gā’ is used to express the semantic categories of assurance, promise, threat, determination and wish as in examples No. 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18, they perform commissive act as the speaker commits himself to perform the action described in the propositional content.

Except the semantic category of ‘threat’ as we see in example No. 17 where the illocutionary function is conflictive as the illocutionary goal is conflicting with the social goal, in examples No. 14, 15 and 16 the illocutionary function is convivial as the illocutionary goal is performed in the interest of the hearer and hence matches the social goal.

Lastly, when in example No. 18, ‘gā’ implies determination; it performs collaborative function as the commitment of the speaker is neutral towards the social goal. Thus, the study shows that modals in Hindi perform various communicative acts and functions depending on the socio-cultural context in which they are used by the interlocutors.
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