

Pragmatic Analysis of Mitigation Expressions in Some Selected English Texts

Asst. Instructor Alaa Khaled Nsaif

French Department/ College of Arts / Al-Mustansiriyah University

Alaakhaled@gmail.com

And

Asst. Instructor Taisir Bashar Zaidan Al-Jadiri

General Directorate of Education in Baghdad Al-Karkh 2

tab.aljadiry@gmail.com

Abstract

This research investigates an important linguistic phenomenon called mitigation. Mitigation is the process whereby the sender (speakers) soften in different ways their speech to reduce the danger of opposition in any kind of communication. This study attempts to analyze the different strategies used to reduce and soften the communication process. It also identifies types of mitigation strategies used in the selected texts. The study tries to show how pragmatic analysis facilitates understanding the purpose and the communicative intention of the texts.

The research concluded that mitigation is used whenever the sender (speakers) try to minimize possible negative illocutionary effects on the audience or when he wants to reduce their commitment to the truth of a proposition being conveyed. The analysis also showed that the utilization of indetermination, evasion, subjectivization, and politeness are essentially directed towards realizing the mitigation function. Also, mitigation is a considerable interpersonal method in communication, since it is utilized to guarantee polite and friendly interaction between interlocutors.

Keywords: Mitigation, expression, Pragmatic, analysis, kinds

Introduction

It is very important in any study of linguistic phenomena, is an obvious definition of the topic being investigated. Naturally, this is no easy job considering the abundance of literature related to this particular subject. Mitigating, as categorized by the linguistic community, may take the shape of anything ranging from broad conversational implements to strategic

means in scientific documents and argumentative. Mitigating is the procedure when the speakers soften their statements to minimize the risk of opposition and reduce the threat to face that go under every act of communication (Salager-Myers, 2000:3)

Blisset (1972: 141) adds that "If a scientist is articulate, persuasive if he goes to the heart of the matter, he is open to attack." As a result, everything

must be tuned down writers can be made but it must be apologized for to achieve this purpose specialist have different linguistic means available which can go under the general term "mitigates". in the same consideration, Lakoff (1972:195) is the first writer who uses the concept 'mitigate ' as a linguistic term when mentioning :

"For me, some of the most interesting questions are raised by the study of words whose meaning implicitly involves fuzziness-words whose job it is to make things fuzzier or less fuzzy. I will refer to such words as 'mitigates'"

Furthermore, Swales (1990: 175) states that mitigates functions as rhetorical devices which can be used for "projecting honesty, modesty and proper caution in self-reports and for diplomatically creating space in areas heavily populated by other researchers".Crystal (1997:182) asserts that a mitigate is employment in pragmatics and discourse analysis of a general sense of the universe. Similarly, Brown and Levinson (1987:50) identified that " mitigate is a particle word, the phrase that modifies the degree of membership that is private, or true than perhaps might be expected". Holmes (1984:4) mentions that there are many linguistic means through which a speaker could indicate a wish not to impose, (i .e) mitigates decrease the power of the utterance.

In the same regard. Hyland(1998:79) states that "[mitigates] represent an important means by which authors appear in their texts to adjust claims

and anticipate audience response, allowing writers to make distinctions concerning the certainty they give to their propositions, such that a statement without qualification is probably not a statement of new knowledge. In essence, mitigates are rhetorical means for projecting due caution, modesty and humility when making statements, and their removal is a major linguistic means of conferring greater certainty on propositions".So that, the term mitigating is a complex concept that it's closely related to the different field such as logic, semantic pragmatics and linguistic. pragmatically speaking mitigating closely related to politeness phenomena so, the most important terms that cut across the area of mitigates are those of 'modality', 'vagueness', 'mitigation' and 'evidentiality'.

Modality

Modality considers as the closest concept to the field of mitigating, in this respect Halliday (1980:336) defines modality as linguistic means which "express various types of modulation of the process expressed in the clause; modulation in terms of permissions, obligations and the like". Moreover, Lyons'(1977b:797) defines epistemic modality as "any utterance in which the speaker explicitly qualifies his commitment to the truth of the proposition expressed by the sentence he utters, whether the qualification is made explicit in the verbal component.... in the prosodic or paralinguistic component, is an epistemically modal or modularized utterance"

Preisler ((1986: 92) cited in Markkanen & Schroder, 2003: 6) points out that “even when modal forms convey speaker-external meanings, these are often given interpersonal significance by the particular context in which they appear, usually as part of a tentativeness strategy”. Mitigating is connected with epistemic modality because both epistemic modality and mitigating illustrate the degree of the speaker's confidence in the proposition said. Hyland (1998:2) discusses the relation between mitigating and epistemic modality by explaining that authors' judgments about the statement and their possible effects on interlocutors are the result of mitigating.

Vagueness

Vagueness is another term related to mitigating, and it explains the use of words like about, sort of, i.e. expressions that show the impreciseness of quality, quantity, or identify, the same as the idea of Lakoff's "fuzziness". The vagueness of a concept is shown by providing "borderline cases" i.e. individuals to which it sounds impossible either to use or not to use the concept. Thus, vagueness is often indicated, more or less clearly, by some statements that situations are potential in which its use is 'doubtful' or 'ill-defined' that is individuals don't know how to use it or in which it is impossible either to confirm or negate its application (Black, 1966:30).

Vagueness can cover two communicative functions. First, it can show the degree of knowledge. Secondly, it can give a specific representation of reality. It precisely or present certain facts in areas which are characterized by constant reformulation and reinterpretation, such as those situated within the scientific field.

Mitigation

Mitigation is a pragmatic concept that is used in communicative devices to soften the strength of the proposition, called attenuation, it considers a very important device because it's the only strategy used to soften the strength of the illocutionary force of the speech acts. (Brown and Levinson, 1987:250).

Salager-Meyer(2002:3-5) identified that mitigation might be gained by mitigating which means that it's a subtype of mitigating. Holmes, (1984b: 348) adds that the speaker tries to soften the force of the speech acts for two reasons. Firstly to report the speaker's attitude to the proposition and secondly, to show the affective meaning or the speaker's attitude to the listener or the reader in the context of utterance.

Grice's Maxims.

The success of any interaction depends on some essential points, and one of the most important factor to make a successful interaction is that each person in the interaction must be cooperative. This factor called co – cooperative principles. Grice (1975: 45-6) points out that there are

specific rules that guide a successful interaction, these rules come from basic rational regards and help in leading the active as well as the functional use of language in a discourse, to more cooperative communicative discourse.

Concerning the cooperative Principle Yule (1996: 37) states that "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged". Grice explains four basic maxims of communication which altogether illustrate a general cooperative principle: quantity, quality, relevance and manner.

Mitigating Maxim

According to Grundy (2000:79-80), the mitigating maxim is averting to produce a rude statement. Maxims are mitigated when the information is not precise but seem well found, informative and relevant. The important issue about maxim mitigate is that none of them adds truth-value to the utterance to which they are connected (Holmes, 1984:3).

Yule (1996: 38) states that by using mitigate in the spoken or written language, this utterance will be comprehended as maxim mitigating of **quality**. This utterance illustrates that the speaker is not certain of the information produced. As for maxim mitigating of **quantity**, the speaker tries to tell the receiver that the amount of the information conveyed in his utterance is restricted. Grundy (2000:79) argues that mitigates are

markers linked to the expectation of the maxim of quality, quantity, manner, and relevance. Mitigate can be used in normal conversation intentionally or unintentionally for their important role in communication, it helps the speaker and the writer to communicate exactly in the degree of accuracy and truth in assessment.

Classification of mitigating types

There are different classification of mitigating types which is divided, from the point of view, of some researchers in the notion of mitigating, and they are :

1. Salager – Meyer classification

Salager – Meyer (1997:152) classification depends on the idea that mitigating can be explained by using the following strategy stereotypes:

1. Modal auxiliary verbs: the most common ones are: can, could, would, should, may, might for example :

- Such marks **could** be changed after hard study.

2. Nominal modal phrases, adverbial, Adjectival and:

a-Nouns e.g. possibility, assumption, claim, suggestion, estimate.

b.Probability adjectives e.g, probable, un/likely ,possible.

c.Adverbs (which could be considered as non-verbal models) e.g., possibly, perhaps probably, likely, presumably, practically, virtually.

e.g: Ali is **likely** to leave his job.

3. Speech act verbs (Modal lexical verbs) are verbs used to describe and perform acts such as evaluating and doubting, for example, propose,

speculate, to believe, to assume, to suggest, e.g.

- The sciences **suggest** that the earth is round.

4-Approximators of quantity, frequency, degree, and time e.g., roughly, about approximately, generally, often, usually, occasionally, somehow somewhat, a lot of. e.g.:

- Pragmatics **generally** is the study of language use.

5-If clauses e.g. if anything, if true. For example:

- **If true**, then, bring some new materials.

6- Compound mitigates: These are phrases consist of various mitigates, their forms are:

a- A modal auxiliary linked with a lexical verb with a mitigating content e.g., it would appear.

b- A lexical verb followed by a mitigating adverb or adjective e.g., (probably, it seems reasonable).

7- Introductory phrases such as "to our knowledge, I believe ", such phrase explains the author's direct participation and doubt e.g:

- **We believe** that it is a difficult situation.

2. Prince classification:

Prince *et al.* (1982:88) classify mitigating expressions into two groups approximators and Shields. they are used when the sender is trying to link or relate a specific situation with some general situation, where the mitigating suggest that the immediate situation is close to but not exactly the term modified.

1.Approximators this type affect the interpretation of the utterance, that its works on the propositional content .there are two subclasses:

a. Adaptors which belong to class membership; e.g, *somewhat, sort of, almost describable as, some, a little bit.*

- He recognized that she was *sort of* yellow.

b. Rounders is used when the expression is typical, for example, *something around, about, approximately* .etc.

- Her weight was *somewhat* 4.2 kilograms.

2. Shields creates a degree of uncertainty to the interpretation of the propositional content by the speaker for the speaker's commitment, there are two kinds.

a.Attribution Shields this type relates the responsibility of the message to someone other than the speaker, usually by rational reasoning e.g, such as *presumably, according to her estimates, at least to X's knowledge*, etc.,

- He was not very ill, *according to his doctor.*

b. Plausibility Shields are expressions that indicate doubt, such as *I take it, I think, probably, I had to believe, I don't see that* etc. e.g - *I think* he can play golf well.

3. Hyland classification of mitigate

Hyland (1996a: 439) recognizes that mitigating devices can be affected by some factors such as "the degree of specification, verification, agentivity, and cooperation." The specification is concerned with the accuracy of description and mitigates in this type are called "attribute mitigates." Illustrating the degree of authors' reliant, verification can be explained as an indication of uncertainty about the truth value of the proposition and is categorized as "reliability mitigates." Gentility shows the nature of the connection between the writer and the utterance and falls into the category of "writer oriented mitigates."

The last function, cooperation, is a feature that shows the degree of readers' engagement in interpreting the writers' claims, which is called "reader-oriented mitigates." thus, according to Hyland (1996a, 1998a), there are two main categories of "content-oriented" and "read – oriented mitigating." Content-oriented mitigates are also sectioned into two subclasses of "accuracy-oriented" (the propositional content) and "writer-oriented" (writer's commitment toward the content) mitigates. As for accuracy-oriented mitigates, Hyland puts two subclasses which are "reliability mitigates" (against the accuracy of content) and "attribute mitigates" (used to ensure accuracy of the statements).

4. Rounds classifications

Rounds (2008:14) discuss that mitigation can be accomplished in different ways employing different linguistic and non-linguistic strategies.

He tries to explain the multi-functional nature of mitigates which able them to have a range of meanings at the same time. Mitigates according to him can be divided into content-oriented and reader-oriented mitigates

1. Content-Oriented Mitigates (mitigates and truth-representation)

Content-oriented mitigates soften the relationship between propositional content and the real context. They mitigate what the writers explain about the world and what the real world is. The impulse for these mitigates fall into two classes, they are accuracy-oriented mitigates and writer-oriented mitigates (Skelton,1988:22).

2.Writer-oriented mitigates (mitigates and writer commitment)

This type belongs to a wider category of participant oriented mitigates which is concerned with the writer. The major function of this type of mitigating is defensive; these words do not modify the propositional content of the utterance. What is changed is the directness or the relation between the writer and his claim. Even though it is obvious that it is the writer who is, really, responsible for the content of the text (Hyland, 1996a:67).

3. Reader-Oriented Mitigates

Reader-oriented mitigates enable readers engaged in a conversation and address to react and evaluate the truth value of the utterance. Such a kind of mitigating asserts the subjective attitude of the speaker towards the proposition. (ibid)

Introduction

The data limit upon which the present study is based, have been selected from an American novel (The Green Mile) by Stephen King. This section is devoted to analyzing, pragmatically, the data collected from "The Green Mile". It represents the empirical part of this study. The model adopted for this study is an eclectic model which consists of two levels: the first level investigate, types of mitigates (formal) and functions (functional) of mitigates. And the other level investigates different mitigating devices and analyzing them pragmatically based on the various types of mitigating discussed in the previous section.

Text (1)

"Old Paul Edgecomb: I think Mr Jingles happened by accident. I think when we electrocuted Del, and it all went so badly... well, John **can** feel that you know... and I think a part of... **whatever** magic was inside of him just lept through my tiny friend here. As

for me, John had to give me a part of himself; a gift the way he saw it so that I could see for myself what Wild Billy had done. When John did that; when he took my hand, a part of the power that worked through him spilt into me".

The analysis:

Old Paul Edgecombutilizes epistemic verbs to show the power of his proposition also, to reduces the force of his speech that is, using epistemic verb **think** in this sentence is to show his psychological status as well his uncertainty. In the same text,Old Paul Edgecombuses the modal verb **could** and **can** their meaning are contextually determined, he also uses twopersonalization device which is the personal pronoun **I** and indetermination device which is the modal verb **would**. These two devices are used to soften the power of the utterance. later on, the speaker uses the introductory phrase "as for me" which indicates his direct involvementand personal doubt through the conversation.

Table (2.1)Mitigating device in Text (1)

	Mitigating device	Proposition	Realization
1	Epistemic verbs	- think Mr Jingles happened by accident - I think when we electrocuted Del, and it all went so badly	Indicate how the speaker confident about the materials he conveys.
2	Modal verbs	that I could see for myself what John can feel that you know	Indicates the addresser's attitude toward the utterance.

3	Introductory phrases	As for me, John had to give me a part of himself	It used for the sake of involving the hearer in the subject.
---	----------------------	--	--

Table (2.2) Formal and functional level in Text (1)

	Mitigating device	Formal level	Functional level
1	Epistemic verbs	three illocutionary force mitigate, epistemic verbs (think)	Subjectivization
2	Modal verbs	two illocutionary mitigates, Modal verbs (can, could)	Indetermination
3	Introductory phrases	illocutionary force mitigate, Introductory phrases (as for me)	Subjectivization

Text (2)

"John Coffey: You tell God the Father it was a kindness you done. **I know** you hurtin' and worryin', **I can** feel it on you, but you **ought** to quit on it now. .. **Mostly** I'm tired of people being ugly to each other. I'm tired of all the pain I feel and hear in the world every day. There's **too much** of it. It's **like pieces of glass in my head** all the time. **Can you understand?**"

The analysis:

In this text, John Coffey express that he doesn't feel sorry for himself because he is tired from all the pain and hate in the world, his supernatural power makes him see, feel and perceive everything going around him. He finds that the electric chair seems like a relief for him. he uses the epistemic verbs " know" to represent an overt means of displaying the subjectivity of the epistemic source and it marks less than full commitment

to the truth of a proposition. The verb "**know**" expresses the speaker intention to subjectivize his viewpoint to mitigate its force. then in the same text, he uses the model verb can and ought to indicates their meaning are contextually determined it indicates the speaker's attitude toward the proposition made. Approximations of degree "**too much**" is utilized here for forcing and assertion the idea of his death is a relief for him and to he ends his speech with a rhetorical question which doesn't need any answer but it used to reflect his emotional state and to create a perlocutionary effect on the listener

Table (2.3) Mitigating device in Text (2)

	Mitigating device	Proposition	Realization
1	Epistemic verbs	-think Mr Jingles happened by accident - I think when we electrocuted Del, and it all went so badly	Indicate how the speaker confident about the materials he conveys.
2	Modal verbs	that I could see for myself what John can feel that you know	Indicates the addresser's attitude toward the utterance.
3	Introductory phrases	As for me , John had to give me a part of himself	It used for the sake of involving the hearer in the subject.

Table (2.4)
Formal and functional level in Text (2)

	Mitigating device	Formal level	Functional level
1	Epistemic verbs	illocutionary force mitigate, epistemic verbs (I know)	Subjectivization
2	Modal verbs	two illocutionary mitigates, Modal verbs (can, ought to)	Indetermination
3	Approximators of degree	illocutionary force mitigate (too much)	Assertion
4	Adverbial phrases	illocutionary force mitigate, an adverb (mostly)	Indetermination
5	Metaphor	illocutionary force mitigate, an adverb (like)	Mitigation
6	Rhetorical question	Can you understand?	Assertion

Text (3)

"Arlen Bitterbuck: Do you believe that **if** a man repents **enough** for what he did wrong then he'll get to go back to the time that was happiest for him and live there forever? Could that be what

heaven's like? Paul Edgecomb: I **just about believe** that very thing".

The analysis:

In this text, Arlen Bitterbuck starts his speech with a question, he is not actually seeking an answer for his question but rather he wants the

listener (Paul Edgecomb) to understand his inner feeling and to perceive him. In the same line he uses the Approximators of degree **enough** to mitigate what he wants to convey, the hearer Paul Edgecomb utilizes treble mitigates which is adverbial modal phrases, approximators of degree and epistemic verbs to mitigates and asserts the speaker idea of happiness as a reflection of his repentance. Moreover,

metaphor is used here to express something difficult to communicate in literal speech for, literal words are implicated sometimes or to make a great effect on the hearer by presenting an exaggerated image of the idea. Finally, in the last part of this text, treble mitigates is used to perform a politeness function.

Table (2.5)Mitigating device in Text (3)

	Mitigating device	Proposition	Realization
1	Approximators of degree	a man repents enough for what he did wrong	convey how the truth-value of a proposition is perceived
2	If clauses	Do you believe that if a man repents enough? for what he did wrong, then he'll get to go back	illustrating uncertainty about the extralinguistic knowledge
3	treble mitigates adverbial modal phrases, .Approximators of degree and Epistemic verbs.	I just about believe that very thing	Express assertion and mitigation of the speaker idea

Table (2.6)formal and functional level in Text (3)

	Mitigating device	Formal level	Functional level
1	Approximators of degree	illocutionary force mitigate, Approximators of degree (enough)	Indetermination
2	If clauses	illocutionary mitigates, conditional clause (if)	Mitigation
3	treble mitigates 1.adverbial modal phrases. 2.Approximator	illocutionary mitigates,adverbial modal phrases(just), Approximators of degree (about), Epistemic	Assertion

	s of degree (about), 3.Epistemic verbs.	verbs (belief)	
--	--	----------------	--

Text (4)

"Old Paul Edgecomb: They **usually** call death row the Last Mile, but **we** called ours the Green Mile because the floor was the colour of faded limes. **We** had the electric chair then. **Old Sparky**, **we** called it. I've lived **a lot of** years, Ellie, but 1935 takes the prize. That was the year I had **the worst** urinary infection of my life. That was also the year of John Coffey and the two dead girls".

The analysis:

In this text, Old Paul Edgecombe uses three adverbial "models" old Sparky, the worst and usually, which

express a high degree of indetermination and, so, softens the illocutionary force of the utterance to make it more favourable. He also uses Approximates of degree "a lot of" to render fuzziness about quantity and to avoid commitment to propositions which they may want to withdraw from. Moreover, Edgecomb uses the pronoun "we" to indicate depersonalisation which is used for avoiding direct reference to the speaker, and try to make the hearer interprets the speech as being not his thoughts or personal view but its general view and most people agree on it.

Table (2.7) Mitigating device in Text (4)

	Mitigating device	Proposition	Realization
1	Approximators of degree	I've lived a lot of years	convey how the truth-value of a proposition is perceived
2	Adverbial modal mitigate	- Electric chair then Old Sparky . - I had the worst urinary infection. - They usually call death row	showing the speaker indetermination of the proposition uttered

Table (2.8) formal and functional level in Text (4)

	Mitigating device	Formal level	Functional level
1	Approximators of degree	illocutionary force mitigate, Approximators of degree (a lot of)	Indetermination
2	Adverbial modal mitigate	illocutionary mitigates, adverbial mitigate (Old Sparky, the worst and usually)	Mitigation
3	Depersonalisation Pronoun	Two illocutionary mitigates, the pronoun (we)	Evasion

Text (5)

"Paul Edgecomb: **We**'ll be doing this for **real** tomorrow night and I don't want nobody to remember **some** stupid joke like that and get it going again. You **ever** try to not to laugh in church when something funny gets

stuck in your head?"

The analysis:

In this text, the Adverbial modal mitigate is widely used by Paul Edgecomb as a mitigate to express his

personal opinion and avoid commitment. saying indeterminate viewpoint could be understood as an invitation to others to illustrate their viewpoints. It has an effective function which makes the speaker get more confirmation of his viewpoint. He also uses the depersonalization pronoun "we" to soften his speech and to avoid his total responsibility for the utterance conveyed. So, the sender softens his proposition by mitigating its force. Approximators of quantity "some" and time "ever" is the suitable choice to mitigate the potentially undesirable effect of the proposition.

	Mitigating device	Formal level	Functional level
1	Depersonalisation Pronoun	illocutionary mitigates, the pronoun (we)	Evasion
2	Adverbial modal mitigate	illocutionary mitigates, adverbial mitigate (real)	Mitigation
3	Approximators of quantity	illocutionary force mitigate, Approximators of quantity (some)	Indetermination

4	Approximators of time	illocutionary force mitigate, Approximators of time (ever)	Indetermination
---	-----------------------	---	-----------------

Table (2.10) formal and functional level in Text (5)**Text (6)**

"John Coffey: **You know**, I fell asleep this afternoon and had me a dream. **I** dreamed about Del's mouse.

John Coffey: **I** dreamed he got down to that place Boss Howell talked about, that Mouseville place. **I** dreamed there were kids, and how they laughed at his tricks! .. **We** all watch Mr Jingles roll that spool, and how we did laugh. Fit to burst, we were".

The analysis:

John Coffey, in this text, is speaking with Paul Edgecombe the supervisor of prison, he is the only one who knows the sensitive and non-violent character of Coffey. Coffey supernatural power enables him to know everything around him. Here, he uses the depersonalization pronoun "we" to avoid referring to the real speaker, he uses this strategy

frequently in his speech, which is related to his sensitive personality and his tendency to mitigate and soften his speech. Later on, when he is expressing his proof of innocent "his dream" (the character supposed to have supernatural power, which enables him to see and perceives everything).

In his dream, he saw the real person who is responsible for the murder of the two blond girls. And he told the supervisor of prison, he uses subjectivization strategy. Here, the use of the first personal pronoun "**I**" assures the subjective function of the verb and his strong belief in the real responsible for the murdering. At the beginning of the text, we find that he uses the introductory phrases "you know" to make Paul Edgecombe cooperates with him in the conversation.

Table (2.11) Mitigating device in Text (6)

	Mitigating device	Proposition	Realization
1	Depersonalisation Pronoun	- We all watch Mr Jingles	Avoiding direct reference to the speaker.

2	Introductory phrases	You know , I fell asleep this afternoon	It used for the sake of involving the hearer in the conversation.
3	Subjectivization	- I fell asleep this afternoon. - I dreamed	Assure the subject function of the verb.

Table (2.12)formal and functional level in Text (6)

	Mitigating device	Formal level	Functional level
1	Depersonalisation Pronoun	illocutionary mitigates, the pronoun (we)	Evasion
2	Introductory phrases	illocutionary mitigates,(you know)	Involving communicating
3	Subjectivization	illocutionary force mitigate, pronoun (1)	Commitment

Text (7)

"Stephen King: But people love a hypocrite, **you know** they **recognize** one of their own, and it **always** feels so good when someone gets caught with his pants down and. **I think** that's what people most **always** do with the stuff they can't make out just forget it".

The analysis:

In this text, the speaker utilizes the introductory phrase "you know" to soften the possible strong effect of his utterance and, to involve the listener to cooperate in the conversation, then he uses Modal lexical verbs "recognize" to emphasise a great deal of uncertainty and tentativeness. So that, the sender is not committing himself to the truth value of the proposition of the

utterances. Moreover, The use of the verb "think" in this phrase is to show his psychological status, and it expresses the speaker intention to subjectivize his viewpoint to mitigate its force. The speaker also utilizes the introductory phrase "you know" which express the speaker's uncertainty concerning aspects of the linguistic expression of the proposition. It also reflects the speaker's awareness that the utterance is not encoded as precisely as it might be so, it serves as an appeal to the addressee for tolerance while the speaker searches for the appropriate lexical item then introduces more specific and precise information.

Table (2.13)Mitigating device in Text (7)

	Mitigating device	Proposition	Realization
1	Epistemic verbs	I think that's what people do	It shows, how the speaker confident about the data he conveys.
2	Introductory phrases	know they recognize one of their	It used for the sake of forcing the hearer to cooperates in the conversation.
3	Approximators of time	-and it always feels so good - what people most always do	convey how the truth-value of a proposition is perceived
4	Modal lexical verbs	-they recognize one of their own.	Illustrating the speaker attitude toward the utterance

Table (2.14)formal and functional level in Text (7)

	Mitigating device	Formal level	Functional level
1	Epistemic verbs	illocutionary force mitigates, the pronoun (think)	Subjectivization
2	Introductory phrases	illocutionary mitigates,(you know)	Involving communicating
3	Approximators of time	illocutionary force mitigate, pronoun (always)	Indetermination
4	Modal lexical verbs	illocutionary force mitigate, pronoun (recognize)	Evasion

Text (8)

"Stephen King: Time takes it all, whether you want it to or not. Time takes it all, time bears it away, and in the end, there is **only** darkness. **Sometimes**we find others in that darkness, and **sometimes**we lose them there again. Working with him was **sort of** like trying to defuse a bomb with somebody standing behind you and **now and then** clashing a pair of cymbals together. In a word, upsetting".

The analysis:

In this text, the speaker uses Depersonalisation Pronoun "we" twice using this strategy reveals that the speaker avoiding direct reference to him and trying to soften his speech also to avoid his total responsibility of the utterance conveyed. So, the sender softens his proposition by mitigating its force.

The speaker utilized approximators of time "some time" for the sake of

emphasizing his idea and to soften the effect of his speech. The speaker also uses "sort of" which functions both, as a marker of the speaker's lack of commitment to the propositions, and

also as a more direct marker of the work the speaker is doing in ongoing speech, searching to find a word or phrase which expresses what they are trying to say.

Table (2.15) Mitigating device in Text (8)

	Mitigating device	Proposition	Realization
1	Depersonalisation Pronoun	- we find others in that darkness. - we lose them there again	avoiding direct reference to the speaker
2	Approximators of time	- Sometimes we find others. - sometimes we lose them - now and then clashing a pair	Illustrates how the truth-value of a proposition is perceived
3	lexical adverbs	- there is only darkness	By limiting the speaker degree of liability
4	Propositional mitigates Tentative	- Working with him was sort of like trying to defuse	marker of the speaker's lack of commitment to the propositions

Table (2.16) Formal and Functional level in Text (8)

	Mitigating device	Formal level	Functional level
1	Depersonalisation Pronoun	illocutionary force mitigates, the pronoun (we)	Subjectivization
2	Approximators of time	illocutionary force mitigates, (Sometimes)	Indetermination

3	lexical adverbs	illocutionary force mitigate, (only)	Indetermination
4	Propositional mitigates	illocutionary force mitigate, (sort of)	Evasion

Section Three

Conclusions

In this study, an attempt has been made to identify and analyze different means and strategies of mitigating utilized in "The Green Mile". The study has sought to examine the strategies by which the speakers show their detachment to their propositions, and whether these devices are affected by the language used or not. The study also identifies formal and functional level in the selected text. Regardless of the difference attributed to strategies, mitigates, as the previous sections show, serve many connected functions which vary in their value from one context to another. In the light of the above discussion, the study has come up with the following conclusions:

First of all, the study clarifies that The meaning of mitigating is governed by extralinguistic factors, such as subject and the recipient design; moreover, mitigating principle functions is soften or mitigating claims; protecting the speaker against any possible criticism; avoiding hurting others feelings (using euphemism); requesting the listener' involvement; and expressing politeness. It also, avoiding direct criticism and direct incitement.

The analysis of the texts has shown that theutilization of indetermination,

evasion, subjectivization, and politeness are essentially directed towards realizing the mitigating function. Also, Mitigating consider as a considerable interpersonal procedure in the conversation, since it is used to ensure smooth and friendly conversation among interlocutors. This concluding statement stems from the fact that all mitigating devices, to a greater or lesser degree, do convey politeness. Moreover, the study finds that the maxims are flouted when the sender doesn't follow some conversational maxims when using the utterances in the form of rhetorical strategies, metaphor, irony, and rhetorical question. Furthermore, the study has found that conversational maxims are, mitigate d when the data is not specific or vague but seems informative and relevant.

The study also concluded that, Mitigates function interpersonally. They work whenever speakers try to reduce possible negative illocutionary effects on the audience or when they want to mitigate their commitment to the truth of a proposition being conveyed.

Bibliography

1. Black, M. (1966). *Language and Philosophy: Studies in Method*. London: CornellUniversity Press.
2. Blisset, M. (1972). *Politics in Science*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
3. Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Channell, J. (1990). "Precise and Vague Expressions in Writing on Economics". In W. Nash (ed.), *The Writing Scholar: Studies in Academic Discourse* (pp. 95-117). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
5. Crystal, D. (1997). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Blackwell PublishersLtd.
6. Grice, P. (1975). '*Logic and Conversation*'. In P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics (vol.3)- Speech Acts* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
7. Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.Hahn, W. V. (1983).Fachkommunikation: Entwicklung, Linguistische Konzepte, Betriebliche Beispiele.Berlin: de Gruyter .
8. Halliday, K (1980). "*Modes of Meaning and Modes of Expression: Types of Grammatical Structure and their Determination by Different Semantic Functions*". In D.J. Allerton (ed.), *Function and Context in Linguistic Analysis*. Cambridge: CambridgeUniversity Press.
9. Holmes, J.((1984). 'Mitigating your Bets and Sitting on the Fence: Some Evidence for Mitigates as Support Structures'. *Te Reo*, 27: pp. 7-62.
10. Hyland, K (1996a). "*Writing without Conviction: Hedging in Science Research Articles*".
a. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(4): pp. 433-54.
11. Hyland, K. (1998). *Hedging in scientific research articles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
12. Lakoff, G. (1972). "*Hedges: A Study of Meaning Criteria and the Logic of Fuzzy Concepts*". *Papers From the Eighth Regional Meeting*, (pp. 183-228). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
13. Lewin, B. (1998). *Hedging: Form and Function in Scientific Research Texts*. In Fortanet,
a. I.,Posteguillo, S., Palmer, J. C. & J. F. Coll (Eds.), *Genre Studies in English forPurposes.Vol Academic. 9Filología. Universitat Jaume I: Col·lecció Summa*, pp. 89-108

14. Lyons J. (1977b). *Semantics*. Vol. (1) and (2). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
15. Preisler, B. (1986). *Linguistic Sex Roles in Conversation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
16. Prince, E., Frader, J. and Bosk, C. (1982). *On Hedging in physician-physician discourse*. In R. J. Di Pietro (ed.), *Linguistics and the professions. Proceedings of the second annual Delaware symposium on language studies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 83-97.
17. Salager-Meyer, F. (2000). *"Procrustes Recipe: Hedging and Positivism"*. *English for Specific Purposes*, 19: pp. 175-187.
18. Salager-Meyer, F. (1997). *"Language is Not a Physical Object"*. *English for Specific Purposes*, 17: pp.295-301.
19. Skelton, J. (1988). *"Comments in Academic Articles"*. In P. Grunwell (ed.), *Applied*
 - a. *Linguistics in Society* (pp. 37-43). London: CILT/ BAAL.
20. Swales, J. 1990. *Genre Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
21. Yule, G. (1996) *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.