Research Journal of English Language and Literature (RJELAL)
A Peer Reviewed (Refereed) International Journal
Impact Factor 6.8992 (ICI) http://www.rjelal.com;
Email:editorrjelal@gmail.com; ISSN:2395-2636 (P); 2321-3108(O)

Vol.14.Issue 1. 2026 (Jan-March)

REVIEW ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD SERIAL NUMBER INDIA
2395-2636 (Print):2321-3108 (online)

Pragmatics and Narratology: Using Contextual Clues to Decode Narrative Structures

Dr. R. Pavithra
Assistant Professor of English, Sona College of Arts and Science, Salem – 636005, Tamil Nadu, India
Email: drpavithraraman@gmail.com
DOI: 10.33329/rjelal.14.1.214

Article info
Article Received: 23/01/2026
Article Accepted: 22/02/2026
Published online: 27/02/2026

Abstract

This paper advocates for integrating pragmatic linguistic theories into literary pedagogy to overcome the limitations of traditional historical and biographical approaches. Emphasizing the study of fictional discourse through pragmatic frameworks—such as speech act theory, cooperative principle, interactional sociolinguistics, ethnography of communication, conversation analysis, politeness theory, and variation analysis—the paper demonstrates how these models deepen understanding of character utterances by situating them within socio-cultural and interpersonal contexts. Pragmatic analysis enhances students' interpretive skills, encouraging critical engagement with language use, character development, and narrative dynamics. The paper argues that a pluralistic pragmatic framework enriches literary hermeneutics and should be incorporated into teaching and research.
Key Words: Pragmatics, Literary Pedagogy, Speech Act Theory, Cooperative Principle, Conversation Analysis, Politeness Theory, Fictional Discourse.

Introduction

The history of literature pedagogy, particularly in India, shows that teaching literature in colleges and high schools has predominantly focused on history and biography, with tasks mainly being annotative. Actual language use was often overlooked or undervalued. Consequently, the reader's subjective engagement and the text's autonomy were negatively impacted. One effective solution to this problem could be adopting a linguistic approach to literary texts. As Short's points out, fictional and dramatic texts should not be viewed merely as a series of communicative acts or as arrangements of phonetic, syntactic, and lexical features. Instead, fictional discourse can be more effectively analyzed through pragmatic theories, such as speech act theory, the cooperative principle, conversation analysis, and the politeness principle. Applying discourse stylistics within these frameworks can reveal the deeper meanings intended by the author. This pragmatic interpretative approach allows students to uncover the true significance of characters' speech and gain fresh insights into

literary communication, insights that traditional methods of analysis have often failed to provide.

This paper argues that interpreting novels and dramas solely through biography and history offers a limited and narrow perspective on the meanings and underlying layers of communication, especially when compared to the broader, multi-level insights provided by pragmatic models of discourse stylistics. It highlights the lack of pragmatic interpretative strategies in literary analysis as a significant pedagogical limitation that restricts deeper appreciation and critique of literary works. The paper contends that applying pragmatic interpretation can enrich the study of novels and dramas and enable students to experience a more engaging and intellectually rewarding exploration of fictional and dramatic discourse.

Furthermore, pragmatic approaches to language help heighten students' awareness of discourse patterns in everyday life, since literature often reflects the social and cultural contexts of its people. At the same time, this approach offers a valuable testing ground for evaluating discourse models themselves.

Against this pedagogical background, the paper aims to show how the challenges of integrating pragmatic constraints into literary interpretation can be addressed positively, thereby expanding and enhancing the semantic analysis of literary discourse in novels and dramas through pragmatic strategies. It proposes practical pragmatic methods for analyzing fictional discourse that can help students develop comprehensive and nuanced discussions of literary texts and explores the potential scope and future directions of these models within literary hermeneutics.

To gain a comprehensive understanding of a pragmatic approach to fictional discourse, it is important to explore how discourse is analyzed and interpreted using various models of analysis.

Major Approaches to Discourse

The pragmatic analysis of fictional discourse has become an increasingly popular area of study, attracting scholars not only from linguistics but also from various fields within the social sciences and humanities. As a result, different approaches to discourse have emerged, each with its own theories and methodologies. Although no single approach has become dominant, they all seek to address fundamental questions such as how language is organized into coherent units larger than sentences and how these coherent stretches of language serve various functions.

To gain a comprehensive understanding of discourse studies, it is important to examine how discourse has been analyzed and interpreted through different analytical models. Six major approaches to discourse include the speech act approach, the interactional sociolinguistic approach, the ethnography of communication approach, the conversation analysis approach, the Cooperative Principle Approach, and the Variation Analysis Approach.

i. The Speech Act Approach

The Speech Act Approach to discourse originates from the work of philosophers John Austin (1962) and John Searle (1969), who formulated speech act theory and integrated it into linguistics. This theory emphasizes that, language is used to perform communicative actions and focuses on what people do through language—that is, its functions.

This approach examines the knowledge of the conditions necessary for producing and interpreting acts through language. An utterance can perform multiple actions simultaneously, with context helping to distinguish these different functions. Speech acts are considered successful and effective when they meet specific conditions. These conditions rely on linguistic knowledge and world knowledge, which shape how certain linguistic elements express illocutionary force.

World knowledge refers to social norms and expected behaviors. Both linguistic and world knowledge together form a speaker's competence. These conditions are fundamental to recognizing, classifying, and understanding speech acts, as well as how a single utterance can serve multiple functions.

By treating utterances as acts, speech act theory provides a way to analyze discourse by breaking it into segments with identifiable communicative functions. These speech acts not only start but also respond to other acts, creating expectations for subsequent replies. In other words, each act opens up possible next moves in a conversation, forming a local, evolving structure for discourse. The relationship between one form and multiple functions adds flexibility to communication: if one interpretation of a speech act is not responded to, another may be. This flexibility has important implications for meaning, indicating that a sequence of utterances may reflect a broad range of underlying functional relationships. Consequently, issues like direct and indirect speech acts, multi-functionality, and context dependence make speech act theory critical to discourse analysis.

ii. Cooperative Principle Approach

The Cooperative Principle Approach in pragmatics is grounded in the philosophical work of Grice (1968, 1975) on the cooperative principles of conversation. Grice proposed that general maxims of cooperation guide listeners in inferring a speaker's communicative intentions. He emphasized the importance of distinguishing between the literal meaning of a sentence and the meaning it conveys when used in a particular context.

Fasold explains that communicative conduct, guided by rational principles of cooperation, enables speakers to organize and present information in ways that listeners can understand. These principles work in conjunction with background knowledge of the world and awareness of the immediate social context to facilitate the expression and interpretation of meaning. As a result, discourse structure reflects sequential dependencies, where each part is influenced by general communicative principles that shape how meaning is expressed at different moments. The cooperative principles therefore account for the regular patterns one observes in discourse, allowing individuals to draw on both text and context as shared resources for communication. In this way, Gricean pragmatics contributes to discourse analysis by showing how participants' assumptions about cooperative communication shape meaning and help generate the sequential flow of conversation.(128)

The maxims of conversational behavior are frequently and deliberately flouted in ways that are obvious to all participants. When this happens, listeners rely on inference and contextual knowledge to construct additional meanings from what is said. Grice refers to these implied meanings as conversational implicatures. This process of deriving meaning helps explain why interpretations of texts can differ, and it also clarifies what literary critics mean when they suggest that literature conveys meanings hidden between or behind the lines.

iii. Interactional Sociolinguistic Approach

The interactional sociolinguistic approach to discourse arises from the fields of sociology, anthropology, and linguistics, drawing on their shared concerns with culture, society, and language. According to Schiffrin (1994:133), this approach brings together the ideas of anthropologist John Gumperz and sociologist Erving Goffman. Research influenced by Gumperz emphasizes that while people from different cultural backgrounds may share the same grammatical knowledge of a language, they often interpret and contextualize utterances differently, which can result in varied meanings and understandings. In this sense, speakers constantly use language to signal their identity and intentions. On the other hand,

approaches shaped by Goffman focus on how language use is embedded in specific social contexts, highlighting its role in creating different kinds of meaning—expressive, instructional, structural, institutional, or interactional. Goffman's framework illustrates how social and interpersonal contexts provide the assumptions necessary for interpreting meaning, showing that all communicative activity is socially organized on multiple levels. Meanwhile, Gumperz underscores the critical role of context, especially the immediate situation in which speech occurs, in shaping interpretation.

iv. Ethnography of Communication Approach

The ethnography of communication is an approach rooted in both anthropology and linguistics. It was largely inspired by Del Hymes' (1972) critique of Noam Chomsky's emphasis on linguistic competence, which defined competence mainly as knowledge of abstract grammatical rules. Hymes instead introduced the concept of communicative competence, which highlights the social, cultural, psychological, and linguistic knowledge that shapes the appropriate use of language—going beyond grammar alone. This perspective expanded the boundaries of analysis by encouraging researchers to explore new forms of data, pose different questions, and develop theories that connect communicative patterns with cultural knowledge and behavior.

As Schiffrin notes, cultural ideas about communication are inseparable from notions of personhood, values, and worldviews, meaning that acts of communication always carry traces of the cultural systems within which they occur. This underscores both the diversity of communicative practices (cultural relativity) and their integration into the broader framework of beliefs and actions that define membership in a specific community. In other words, the ways people organize and carry out their lives through language are not only relative to other possible communicative practices but are also deeply embedded in the cultural frameworks that guide meaning-making within their communities.(8)

From this perspective, communication cannot be treated as a universal constant across cultures. The ethnography of communication, therefore, examines a broader range of communicative behaviors than other approaches, and it intentionally remains open to discovering the varied forms, functions, and cultural associations through which communication operates in different ways of life.

v. Conversational Analysis Approach

According to Schiffrin conversation analysis approaches discourse by focusing on what is actually said. It treats speech as the primary source of data, evidence, and explanation. This focus ties the method closely to the text itself. However, this does not imply that communication is understood only through words spoken in the moment (278). Ethnomethodologists emphasize that speech is not merely a reflection of a broader social world; it simultaneously constructs and reconstructs that world. Moreover, utterances cannot be separated from the shared assumptions that both guide and are reaffirmed by them. Even so, text remains central to conversation analysis because it provides the foundation for uncovering taken-for-granted social realities. In other words, text serves as the means through which both analysts and participants recognize the contexts that speech both shapes and emerges from.

Conversation analysis shares common ground with interactional sociolinguistics in its exploration of social order and the ways in which language functions within and through social contexts. It also aligns with the ethnography of communication in its interest in human knowledge. All three approaches emphasize close analysis of actual spoken exchanges. Nonetheless, conversation analysis distinguishes itself by offering its own

distinctive assumptions, methodological framework, and theoretical orientation.

vi. Variation Analysis Approach

Variation Analysis Approach looks at how people use language differently depending on their background, like where they come from, their social class, or who they are talking to. In stories, this helps us understand characters better by noticing how their way of speaking changes. For example, a character from a rural village might use different words and expressions than a city person, showing their unique identity. By studying these differences, one can learn more about who the characters are and the social world they live in.

Considering the diversity of the field and the contested nature of criteria for discourse analysis, I have explored six major approaches through which discourse has been studied and interpreted. Each approach is inherently multidisciplinary, accompanied by its own debates and contradictions, and can at times be positioned in opposition to, or in dialogue with, one or more of the others. Nevertheless, each remains distinct enough to provide its own preliminary framework for definition.

The Application of Pragmatic Approaches: Pedagogical scope and directions

Readers of novels and dramas move from interpreting the words spoken in conversations to forming judgments about the personalities of characters. As Thakur notes, such judgments are often grounded in anecdotal references within the text and therefore tend to remain tentative. Against this backdrop, the present paper seeks to demonstrate how the principles of interpersonal pragmatics and pragmatic interpretative strategies, as advanced by pragmatic approaches to discourse, can be employed to uncover deeper meanings and insights in character utterances. These insights emerge particularly through culturally marked discourse features in conversational exchanges shaped by personal motives and socio-cultural contexts of the characters. Such an approach may enable readers to arrive at more refined judgments about different aspects of character development in novels or dramas. (5-15)

From an applied perspective, the insights of conversation analysis developed by ethnomethodologists can prove valuable for studying dramatic and fictional discourse. Using Herman's (1998) framework, the analysis of turn-taking patterns in dialogue can shed light on both situations and characters within plays. Examining who speaks to whom, the length of turns, pauses, and interruptions allows us to see how such choices shape a reader's interpretation of character speech. Going beyond linguistic strategies, Weber's framework invites us to analyze exchanges and turn patterns in relation to social and cognitive contexts. Here, the social context highlights power relations, while the cognitive context draws on "schemata" to show how meaning is constructed. This approach reveals how readers build the cognitive worlds of characters and how their interpretations of dialogue are influenced by their own assumptions. Weber further suggests that while a text may direct readers toward a particular view of power, a critical reader can challenge and reconfigure the assumptions supporting that view. (112-127)

Another useful model comes from Grice (1981), whose interpretative framework explains how inferences operate in conversation. Applying this to dramatic discourse enables us to trace inferential chains that shape how one understands characters' roles. Pragmatic analysis, especially one based on Grice's cooperative principles, shows how conversational inferences interact with genre and cultural conventions to generate multiple interpretations. As Benson emphasizes, a pluralistic approach that brings together different linguistic frameworks is essential if one is to capture the complexity of characterization. Concepts from pragmatics and discourse analysis—such as turn-taking, turn length, and topic shifts—combined with Grice's cooperative principles and Brown and Levinson's politeness

theory, can provide persuasive insights into how and why characters' behaviors shift. A further approach draws on speech act theory, as outlined by Austin. (67)

Another significant way to uncover the deeper meanings of characters' utterances is to examine how speakers employ politeness strategies—what they choose to say or avoid saying, and how they soften potentially impolite actions in order to maintain social harmony. As Culpeper points out, the role of impoliteness in dramatic dialogue is equally important, since it creates conflict and disharmony between characters, sustains reader interest, and propels the plot forward. This kind of analysis can therefore provide valuable insights into characterization and highlight the complexities of individual characters. (83-95)

When studying fictional discourse, the analysis of speech acts, the exploration of politeness, and the principles of conversational cooperation often intersect. It is frequently observed that the norms of speech act theory and cooperative principles are influenced, and at times even overridden, by considerations of politeness. By combining speech act analysis with an examination of politeness strategies and cooperative principles, one gains a clearer understanding of how conversational exchanges are interpreted. Such patterns of dialogue not only shape meaning but also reveal the interpersonal dynamics and relationships among characters in novels and plays.

Conclusion

This paper explored the importance of studying the language of literary texts in fiction and drama through pragmatic interpretative strategies, as opposed to traditional history- and biography-based methods, which often limit the scope and meaning of character utterances. It highlighted the effectiveness of pragmatic theories in interpreting literary texts and reviewed various pragmatic approaches to analyzing narratives in fictional discourse. Specifically, it discussed six key approaches: the speech act approach, the interactional sociolinguistic approach, the ethnography of communication approach, the conversational analysis approach, the cooperative principle approach, and the variation analysis approach. Each of these models, with their respective theories and methodologies, was shown to offer valuable insights into the meanings of character utterances, particularly in relation to the ways characters follow or deviate from socio-cultural principles and norms that govern interaction. Building on this, the paper argued that a pluralistic interpretative framework—one that integrates both traditional and modern pragmatic approaches—provides a deeper, more comprehensive understanding of meaning. Such an approach allows for a richer critical examination and appreciation of characters' conversational behaviors in fictional discourse. Accordingly, the paper recommends the adoption of pragmatic models in the teaching and research of literary hermeneutics.

Reference

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Harvard University Press.

Benson, N. (1998). Accessing characters through conversation. In C. Jonathan, M. Short, & P. Verdonk (Eds.), *Exploring the language of drama* (pp. 83–95). Routledge.

Cicourel, A. (1973). Basic and normative rules in the negotiation of order. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 229–258). Free Press.

Culpeper, J. (1998). (Im)politeness in dramatic dialogue. In C. Jonathan, M. Short, & P. Verdonk (Eds.), *Exploring the language of drama* (pp. 83–95). Routledge.

Fasold, R. (1990). *The sociolinguistics of language*. Blackwell.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Behavior in public places*. Free Press.

Grice, H. P. (1968). Utterer's meaning, sentence meaning, and word meaning. *Foundations of Language, 4*, 1–18.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.

Grice, H. P. (1981). Presupposition and conversational implicature. In P. Cole (Ed.), *Radical pragmatics* (pp. 183–198). Academic Press.

Herman, V. (1998). Turn management in drama. In C. Jonathan, M. Short, & P. Verdonk (Eds.), *Exploring the language of drama* (pp. 19–33). Routledge.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–293). Penguin.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Blackwell.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.

Short, M. (1989). Discourse analysis and the analysis of drama. In R. Carter & P. Simpson (Eds.), *Language, discourse and literature* (pp. 139–168). Unwin Hyman.

Thakur, V. S. (2011). Management of face in Vikram Seth's *A suitable boy*: A socio-semantic study. *Labyrinth, 2*(2), 5–15.

Widdowson, H. G. (1975). *Stylistics and the teaching of literature*. Longman.