ABSTRACT

Most of the human linguistic communication takes place in the form of conversations. Every kind of conversation involves a speaker and one or more listeners. The speaker conveys his/her intentions and the listeners respond with the help of language. Language is divided into two parts: Semantics and Pragmatics. The former deals with the sentence meaning and the latter deals with the utterance meaning. The intentions of the speaker as well as the listener are brought out through the field of pragmatics. The present study deals with the pragmatic analysis of Girish Karnad's *Nagamandala* and Vijay Tendulkar's *Silence The Court is in Session*. The intentions of the characters as well as the playwrights are made known to the readers with the application of the concepts of pragmatics.

**Chapter One** deals with the origin and the development of pragmatics as an important branch of linguistics. The major proponents of pragmatics like Austin (1962), Searle (1969), Leech (1975), Brown and Levinson (1978) and their theories like speech act theory, cooperative principle and politeness principle are being discussed in detail. In addition to it, more pragmatic principles like deixis, presupposition, turn taking and implicatures are defined in this chapter. Literary pragmatics has come into prominence in literary studies as argued in the 1980s. These studies were concerned with literature as a discourse; they focused on its interactional and social contexts. It also looks at the linguistic features of texts that arise from the
real interpersonal relationships between the author, text and reader in real socio-cultural contexts. As the present study is based on literary works, the relationship of pragmatics and fiction is mentioned. Various works by eminent scholars like Zedin Patil and Ashok Thorat which deals with literary pragmatics, are being mentioned. The relationship between pragmatics and drama is being brought into focus. Works of Pinter, Karnad which are subjected to pragmatic analysis are being mentioned. Various other works done in this field are also reviewed in this chapter. The second segment of the introduction deals with the research hypothesis, the aims, objectives and significance of the study, followed by the limitations that are present in the analysis. The summary of the two plays are given, along with the methodology and the organization of the work, and the chapter is wrapped up with a conclusion.

Chapter Two deals with the speech act analysis of the two plays. The model of speech act theory that has been used here is the taxonomy of Searle as it is most appropriate for dramatic discourse. Searle has classified the speech acts into five categories, assertives, commissives, directives, expressives and declaratives. The plays under consideration are analysed by using this framework. Instances of assertives, commissives, directives, expressives and declaratives in both the plays are scrutinized in this chapter. These speech acts help in bringing out the intentions of the characters in the plays. Assertives suggest what the speaker believes in and how the world is according to that person. Characters make use of assertions, to convey their convictions to
the other characters and the readers also. Assertives can take interrogative and imperative forms, like rhetorical questions which are asked not to request information but to emphasize the force of the utterance.

Commissives, like promises, vows, pledges etc play an important role in propelling the plays towards culmination. The promises made by the characters to each other, reveal the intensity of their relationships. Threats are also one kind of commissives that are used by the characters. Some commissives are uttered without any intentions.

Directives form the major part of plays, as the characters are either asking for information or giving instructions to each other. Characters like Kurudava, Appanna, Mr.Kashikar etc make use of these set of speech acts to impose their authority over others. Expressives become an essential part of the conversations among the characters, as these speech acts bring out the humanness in them. Complaints, apologies and compliments belong to this category.

Declaratives, the last category of speech acts, are least used in both the plays as they occur in the contexts of legal institutions. Each play has an instance, which change the world of the characters. The order of the village court transforms the life of Rani, and Kashikar’s sentence also transforms the life of Benare. Hence one can see that the above mentioned speech acts are inevitable in both the plays, which bring out the intentions of the characters as well as the playwrights.
Chapter Three focuses on the violation of the maxims of the cooperative principle, by the characters. This segment of the present study deals with the manner in which the intentions of the characters are being conveyed to the readers and to the other characters in the plays with the help of the cooperative principle. The four maxims of cooperative principle: quantity, quality, relevance and manner, keep up the coherence in conversations, as propounded by H.P Grice. But as it is difficult to abide with the four maxims all the time, the speakers violate them, without interrupting the flow of the conversation.

The characters give more information than required or withhold information from their counterparts, thereby violating the maxim of quantity. The characters Kurudava, Naga, Rani in Karnad’s play violate this maxim by giving more information than necessary, The characters like Benare, Mr and Mrs. Kashikar in Tendulkar’s play violate this maxim, by talking more than required. Legal discourse, a part of this play, is based on exaggeration that violates this maxim.

The next part deals with the violation of the quality maxim by the characters. It is not possible to stick to the truth all the time. A lie is used for defensive purposes, protective mechanism, an excuse, an exaggeration. The characters in both the plays tell lies according to the circumstances. In certain cases, the metaphors used by the characters, violate this maxim as they compliment as well as complain to others.
The third maxim of relevance is being violated by the characters, as well. Even though the conversations between them lack coherence, the context and the situations help the other in comprehending the speaker’s intentions. Rani, Naga, Benare etc, speak incoherently to others, but attain an understanding between the other addressees.

The last of these four maxims, the manner maxim, calls for clarity in the speaker’s utterances. But like all the other violated maxims, this maxim is also subjected to violation by the characters. The characters in the plays exploit the resources of euphemisms, indirect speech acts and lies and do not seem like flouting the maxim. Indirectness is used by them to avoid certain circumstances. In certain instances, the characters speak ambiguously to themselves; like the protagonists in both the plays. Their incoherent soliloquies violate the manner maxim but are understood by the other characters as well as the readers, without any difficulty. The chapter ends with a conclusion.

Chapter Four focuses on the methods in which the intentions of the characters are being revealed. The major tool used is the principle of politeness. Brown and Levinson, the major proponents of this principle talk about the positive and the negative face. People use positive politeness strategies as well as negative politeness strategies to save the ‘face’ of others. This chapter emphasizes on these politeness strategies employed by the characters to convey the intentions of the characters. The positive politeness strategies include complimenting, congratulating, expressing concern for others, reciprocating,
promising, cooperation etc which are performed by the characters in both the plays. These strategies persuade the listeners to be happy.

Negative politeness strategies like conventional indirectness and use of deferential modes like honorifics avoid threats to the negative face of the addressee. Characters make use of them to maintain harmonious relationships between themselves. Instances in both plays are being highlighted.

The extent of politeness in the language of both the playwrights is brought out by the use of aggravating language by the characters. The chapter concludes by pointing out that Karnad has dealt with the aggravating language in a subtler way than Tendulkar. One can see that the strategies used in the plays by the characters show the extent of familiarity, sincerity and reciprocity that bonds them together, and brings out a (polite) dimension in the Indian society.

Chapter Five emphasizes on more methods used for conveying the intentions of the playwrights as well as the characters, namely turn-taking and implicatures. It also sheds light on the different writing styles of these two eminent playwrights, with the help of the turn taking techniques used by the characters. The chapter which is divided into two parts initially mentions about the features of turn-taking in natural conversation and dramatic conversation. The conversations in the two plays, show that Nagamandala has more leanings towards dramatic conversation and Silence! The Court Is in Session.
belongs to the category of natural conversation. The second part deals with the various examples of implicatures, employed by the characters in the plays which portray the Indian culture in two different ways. Karnad’s play depict a rural India with its rituals and beliefs while, Tendulkar’s play depict the urban India with its hypocritical attitude of the Indian society. The implicatures in this play show the insinuations that the characters use to barb each other, which is commonly found in urban India.

Chapter Six is the conclusion of the present study. The findings of the previous chapters are being summarized in this final segment of the analysis. It focuses on how the study moves from conveying the intentions of the characters as well as the playwrights with the help of speech acts. Then it goes further to show the manner in which these intentions are being conveyed, through the violation of the cooperative principle. The methods used for conveying these intentions, significantly the politeness principle, are emphasized, and more methods like turn taking and implicatures which also bring out the writing styles of both the playwrights are given importance.