CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.0 Preliminaries

The present study has grown out of the researcher's interest in bringing out the levels of communication that occur in a literary work with the help of pragmatic analysis. The introductory chapter provides some preliminary remarks on the study in general. First it gives an introduction to pragmatics specifically mentioning the major principles of pragmatics. Then the review of literature is emphasized. The relationship between pragmatics and literature is provided with special focus on the field of drama. Then it presents a research hypothesis, followed by the aims and significance of the study. The limitations of the study are also highlighted. The summary of the two plays, Girish Karnad's *Nagamandala* and Vijay Tendulkar's *Silence! The Court Is In Session* is also presented. The chapter also tackles in brief, the methodology, to be followed by the organization of the work.

1.1 An Overview

Language is used as the major tool in communication. Unlike other living beings, humans make use of language to communicate their intentions and desires to one another. All normal human beings can produce and understand any number of new words and sentences. They use the multiple options of
language often without thinking. Most of the human linguistic communication takes place in the form of conversation. The conversations usually take place face to face. Every kind of conversation, involves a speaker and one or more listeners. The speaker conveys his intentions and desires to the listener. This act of communication is completed when the listener responds to what the speaker says. As language plays a role in conversations, one cannot rule out the presence of linguistics, which consists of two parts, semantics and pragmatics. Pragmatics shares the interest in the study of meaning with semantics, but widens the scope. Semantics is concerned with sentence meaning, while pragmatics is concerned with utterance meaning. The emphasis is given to the intentions of the speaker as well as the response of the listener.

There are many definitions for pragmatics. “It is the study of all those aspects of meaning not captured in a semantic theory” (Levinson: 1983:12). Pragmatics studies the factors that decide our choice of language in social interaction. It looks at the social rules that affect our choice. It looks at the meaning of speech acts and the intention of the speaker and includes the information about the social status of the speakers, cultural features like politeness and formality and both explicit and implicit linguistic features. Pragmatics is concerned with the meaning that comes from the contextual and interpersonal situation which includes speaker and listener.

Consider the mini dialogue:

A: Is there any shopping to do?
B: We’ll be away for most of the weekend.

It is clear that B does not just mean that they will be away for most of the weekend. It is clear that what he means in addition to this cannot be regarded as a part of the meaning of the word he utters. There can be a number of assumptions on the hearer’s part. It can be a) If we are going away for the weekend, then we won’t be able to go shopping. b) If we are going away for the weekend, then we won’t need food.

Although pragmatics is relatively a new branch of linguistics, research on it can be dated back to the ancient Greece and Rome where the term ‘pragmaticus’ is found in late Latin and ‘pragmaticos ’ in Greek, both meaning ‘of being practical’. Modern use and current use of pragmatics is credited to the influence of American philosophical doctrine of pragmatism. The pragmatic interpretation of semiotics and verbal communication studies in Foundations of The Theory of Signs by Charles Morris (1938) for instance, helped neatly expound the differences of mainstream enterprises in semiotics and linguistics. For Morris, pragmatics studies ‘the relation of signs to interpreters’, while semantics studies ‘the relation of signs to the objects to which the signs are applicable’, and syntactics studies the ‘formal relations of signs to one another’. Further he is the view that “it deals with the biotic aspects of semiosis, that is with all the psychological, biological and sociological phenomena which occur in the functioning of signs” (p: 108).
In the recent history of linguistics, the generation that followed Bloomfield, linguistics meant phonetics, phonemics, but syntax was considered so abstract beyond the horizon of discovery. All this changed after Chomsky, in the later 1950s, who discovered the centrality of syntax, but like the structuralists he still regarded meaning as altogether a mess for serious contemplation. Katz and his collaborators began to find out how to incorporate meaning into formal linguistic theory, and it was not long before the ‘California or bust’ spirit led to the conquering of pragmatics. Lakoff (1971) with others was soon arguing that syntax could not be legitimately separated from the study of language use. So pragmatics was henceforth on the linguistic map. Thinkers like Firth with his early emphasis on the situational study of meaning and Halliday (1974), with his comprehensive social theory of language initiated a new outlook to pragmatics. Then there were influences of philosophy also. Ross and Lakoff staked a claim on pragmatics in the late 1960s. In fact, the more lasting influences on modern pragmatics have been those philosophers; notably in recent years, Austin (1962), Searle (1969) and Grice (1975). Austin’s and Searle’s theories of speech acts led to a new dimension of ‘meaning’ in utterances. Practical concerns helped the pragmatists to shift their focus to explaining naturally occurring conversations which resulted in hallmark discoveries of cooperative principle by Grice and the politeness principle by Leech. In the beginning of the nineties, pragmatists like Green (1989) defined pragmatics as natural language understanding which was echoed by Blakemore (1990) in her *Understanding Utterances: The Pragmatics of Natural*
Language followed by Peter Grundy (1995) in his *Doing Pragmatics* contributed to this field. The impact of pragmatics had led to cross-linguistic international studies which resulted in Sperber and Wilson’s (1986) relevance theory which explains how people comprehend and utter a communicative act. In the present times, the study of pragmatics has been expanded and enriched with the involvement of researchers like Verschuren (1987) and Jacob Mey (1993) from countries such as Netherlands and Belgium. Some of the other aspects of language studied in pragmatics include turn taking, implicatures, deixis, presuppositions etc which came to be developed later. The following paragraphs give a detailed description of these principles of pragmatics.

1.2 Speech Act Theory

"In attempting to express themselves, people do not produce utterances containing grammatical structures and words; they perform actions via those utterances" (Yule: 1996:47). Actions performed via utterances are generally called speech acts, and in English are commonly given more specific labels, such as apology, complaint, compliment, invitation, promise, and request. For eg; ‘I’m sorry’. This utterance has the force of an apology, and the act of apologizing takes place by this utterance. These speech acts help in communicating the intentions of the speaker to the hearer. The intentions are recognized by the hearers. Both the speaker and the hearer are usually helped in this process by the circumstances surrounding the utterances, which are called speech events. The major proponents of speech acts are
J.L Austin, Searle, who have created new dimensions in the field of speech acts.

1.2.1 Austin’s Approach

The work of J.L Austin (1962), particularly How to Do Things with Words, led the philosophers to pay more attention to the use of non declarative sentences in language. The terminology he introduces especially the notions of ‘locutionary act’, ‘illocutionary act’ and the ‘perlocutionary act’ are classified as ‘speech acts’.

Locutionary acts: Equivalent to uttering a certain sentence with a certain ‘meaning’ in the traditional sense.

Illocutionary acts: Utterances which have a certain (conventional) force, like ordering, warning, undertaking etc.

Perlocutionary acts: What we bring about or achieve by saying something, such as persuading, convincing, surprising etc.

For example: Peter says ‘The ground is slippery’. Here Peter is warning Mary to be careful. The locutionary act is the utterance ‘The ground is slippery’, the illocutionary act of warning and the perlocutionary act is the act perceived by Mary in being careful.

Austin focuses on illocutionary acts, maintaining that here we might find the ‘force’ of a statement and demonstrates its performative nature. He named the illocutionary acts as performative utterances and these he characterizes by two features:
1) First to utter one of these sentences is not to just say something, but rather to perform certain kind of an action. eg: ‘I pronounce you husband and wife’

   Here the action of marrying the couple takes place by these words.

2) Second, these sentences are not true or false, rather, when something goes wrong in connection with the utterance, then the utterance is ‘as he puts it’ is ‘unfelicitous’ or ‘unhappy’

1.2.2 Searle’s Approach

   John Searle (1969), student of Austin later on developed the theory of speech acts. He classifies the speech acts into five categories.

1) Directives - If an utterance is directive, then the speaker wants the listener to do something. Eg: Ordering, commanding, requesting, advising, recommending etc

   E.g. ‘Don’t talk’, ‘Will you sing’?

2) Commissives - if an utterance is commissive, then the speaker indicates that she/he will do something in future. E.g.: promising, vowing, offering etc.

   Eg: ‘I will marry you’, ‘I swear I didn’t do anything’ ...

3) Expressives - If an utterance is expressive; the speaker expresses his/her feelings of emotional response.
Eg: thanking, praising, condoling, blaming, congratulating, pardoning etc.

Eg: ‘You are beautiful’, ‘You stole my pen’!

4) Assertives- if an utterance is assertive, the speaker expresses her/his belief about the truth of a proposition. Eg: stating, suggesting, boasting, complaining, reporting etc. Eg: ‘The earth is round’, ‘I hate him’...

5) Declarations- if an utterance is a declaration, the speaker’s utterance results in a change in the external non-linguistic situation.

E.g.: resigning, dismissing, christening, naming, appointing, sentencing, excommunicating, etc.

E.g.: ‘I pronounce you husband and wife’, ‘The accused is guilty’...

Apart from the speech act theories propounded by these two stalwarts, Austin and Searle, Grice’s (1974) work is one of the foundations of the modern study of pragmatics. He is remembered for his contributions to the study of speaker meaning and linguistic meaning of utterances and the interrelations between these two phenomena. In order to explain how these utterances can be understood, he further postulated the existence of a general cooperative principle in conversation, which is being dealt in the following section.
1.3 The Co-operative Principle

Paul Grice proposes that in ordinary conversations, speakers and hearers share a co-operative principle. Speakers shape their utterances to be understood by hearers. In a conversational discourse, whatever the speaker says 'makes sense to the hearer' even though there are certain missing links in it. To Grice and his followers, this is due to Co-operative principle.

According to Grice, co-operative behaviour in a conversation can be described in terms of four conversational maxims.

1) The maxim of Quantity: where one tries to be as informative as one can possibly be, and gives as much as information and no more.
2) The maxim of Quality: where one tries to be truthful and does not give information that is false or that which is not supported by evidence.
3) The maxim of Relation: where one tries to be relevant and says things that are pertinent to the discussion.
4) The maxim of Manner: when one tries to be as clear as brief and as orderly as one can in what one says and where one avoids obscurity and ambiguity.

1.4 The Politeness Principle

People constantly try to establish and maintain cordial relationships to avoid any sort of discord in any of their relationships with others. Language being the means of communication between them, they employ certain politeness
strategies, so that they can interact harmoniously with each other. And moreover, they would like to be appreciated than criticized. But this is impossible all the time. The principle of pragmatics, help them to achieve their intentions without hindering the feelings of the other. Linguists like Geoffery Leech (1983), and Brown and Levinson(1978) are the major proponents of politeness principle.

1.4.1 Geoffery Leech’s Approach

Geoffrey Leech (1983:132) has proposed a way of explaining how politeness operates in conversational exchanges. Leech defines politeness as forms of behaviour that establish and maintain comity, ie is the ability of the participants in a social interaction to engage in interaction in an atmosphere of relative harmony.

He categorizes the Politeness principle into 6 maxims

1) Tact Maxim- minimize cost to other,( maximize benefit to others).
2) Generosity Maxim- minimize benefit to self, (maximize cost to self)
3) Approbation Maxim-minimize dispraise of other(maximize praise of others)
4) Modesty Maxim-minimize praise of self,(maximize dispraise of self)
5) Agreement Maxim- minimize disagreement between self and other ( maximize agreement between self and others)
6) Sympathy Maxim-minimize antipathy between self and other (maximize sympathy between self and others)

There are different approaches to Politeness, like face wants and politeness strategies. ‘Face’ refers to a speaker’s social and linguistic identity. Any speech act that imposes a threat to the ‘Face’ is face threatening. Positive politeness redresses the threat (that attends the positive face). Politeness means being complimentary and gracious to the addressee. Negative politeness is found in ways of mitigating the imposition.

1.4.2 Brown and Levinson’s Approach

Perhaps the most thorough treatment of the concept of politeness is that of Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson, which was first published in 1978. In their model, politeness is defined as redressive action taken to counter balance the disruptive effect of face threatening acts (FTA). In every conversation, there is a desire of the conversationalists to preserve ‘face’. Face can be defined as the ‘public image that every member wants to claim for himself’ [Brown and Levinson, 1987:16] It consists of two dimensions: ‘positive face’ and ‘negative face’. The former is linked to the desire to be appreciated and win approval. Negative face is concerned with freedom of action and freedom from imposition. Some acts that threaten interlocutor’s positive face as mentioned by Brown and Levinson are: criticism, disagreement, irreverence, bringing of bad news, raising of divisive topics etc and those that threaten the negative face are orders, requests, advice, threats, warnings etc. Positive and negative strategies in politeness are being used
by humans to convey their thoughts to others without hurting the feelings of the others.

1.5 Concepts of Pragmatics under Study

As mentioned earlier, pragmatics can be defined in many ways. The preceding topics focus on the meaning of speech acts, the intention of the speaker, the social status of the speaker which determine cultural factors like politeness, cooperation among the speakers. The following concepts of pragmatics deal with the meaning that comes from the contextual and interpersonal situation which includes the speaker and the listener like implicatures, deixis and presupposition. The social rule that governs the conversation like turn-taking is also being looked into in this chapter.

1.5.1 Implicatures

The term implicatures was first introduced by the British philosopher H. Paul Grice in a series of lectures he delivered in Harvard in 1967. It was intended to serve the function of explaining the phenomenon of how in a conversational interaction speakers mean more than what they actually say. The term implicature signifies what a speaker implicates (as opposed to what he actually says) and its approximation arrived at by the hearer by making use of certain inferencing mechanism. For instance:

Marie: Have you cleared the table and washed the dishes?

Helen: I’ve cleared the table.
In the utterance above, Marie asks Helen whether she has done both the actions of clearing the table and washing the dishes. To which Helen replies that she has cleared the table. The latter’s response indicates that she has cleared the table, but has not washed the dishes. She does not verbally express it, but Marie infers that Helen has not washed the dishes. Hence the meaning is conveyed from what is being ‘unsaid’.

Implicatures play a major role in conversational activities. Various intentions can be conveyed without saying it, which the listener understands and the flow of communication is not interrupted. Grice has divided the implicatures into various categories which will be discussed in the chapters to come.

1.5.2 Deixis

The single most obvious way in which the relationship between language and context is reflected in the situation of languages themselves, is through the phenomenon of deixis. Deixis refers to “pointing in language to elements in the situation of utterance, either to speaker, hearer or others, or time relative to that utterance or place relative to speaker and/ hearer”. (Dillion 1977:125) Examples are now vs then, here vs there, this vs that, me vs you, go vs come etc.

1.5.3 Presupposition

In pragmatics, a presupposition is an implicit assumption about the word or background belief relating to an utterance whose truth is taken for granted in discourse. For example:
a) Do you want to do it again?

(Pre): You have done it already, at least once.

b) Jane no longer writes fiction.

(Pre): It is assumed that Jane once wrote fiction.

A presupposition must be mutually known or assumed by the speaker and addressee for the utterance to be considered appropriate in context.

1.5.4 Turn-Taking

Turn-taking, being a collaborative work requires two participants and their identity changes from time to time. The length of turn varies. A turn may consist of just a word or a continuous verbal response of a long duration. E.A Schegloff (1968:1076) seems to claim that turn may be anything from a single “mm” to a string of complex sentences including pauses. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson’s (1974) basic assumption is that turn-taking is rule governed. They mention various aspects of everyday conversation such as, speaker changes occur and reoccur, variable turn size, length, order, slight gaps and overlaps. In any conversation, we observe the following facts, as given by George Yule (1996:116).

1) Speaker-change recurs, occurs.
2) Overwhelmingly, one party talks at a time.
3) Occurrences of more than one speaker at a time are common,
   But brief.
4) Transitions (from one turn to next) with no gap and no
Overlap are common. Together with transitions characterized by slight gap or slight overlap, they make up the vast majority of transitions.

5) Turn order is not fixed, but varies.
6) Turn size is not fixed, but varies.
7) Length of conversation is not specified in advance.
8) What parties say is not specified in advance.
9) Relative distribution of turns are not specified in advance
10) Number of parties can vary.
11) Talk can be continuous or discontinuous.
12) Turn-allocation techniques are obviously used. A current speaker may select a next speaker (as when he addresses a question to another party) or parties may self-select in starting to talk.
13) Various ‘turn-constructional units’ are employed; turns can be one word long, or they can be sequential in length.
14) Repair mechanisms exist for dealing with turn-taking errors and violations; e.g., if two parties find themselves talking at the same time, one of them will stop prematurely, thus repairing the trouble.

The different topics in pragmatics are equally important in language but because of its vastness, the present study will only focus on speech act theory, co-operative principle, the politeness principle, turn-taking and implicatures which are accommodated within the plays Nagamandala and Silence! The Court is in Session.
1.6 Review of Related Literature

Before we probe into the actual processes of analyzing the concepts of pragmatics in relation to the texts in question, it would only be appropriate to make a brief survey of literature related to the study. Under this rubric we will discuss in brief, pragmatics with reference to literary works like fiction and drama.

1.6.1 Pragmatics and Fiction

As mentioned earlier pragmatics is the study of linguistic meaning in context. Some linguists believe that the distinction between pragmatics and semantics is unnecessary. Halliday (1974), inspite of the belief that meaning in language should be analyzed in context, holds the view that a separate pragmatic component in linguistics is not essential as many issues in pragmatics can be dealt within the semantic or grammatical framework. But there is a borderline difference between both, which makes pragmatics a different discipline. Research has shown that principles of pragmatics cannot be categorized under semantics. It has its own flavours and ingredients.

It is at this point that the subject of pragmatics and literature can be analyzed. Just as it dominates the day- to day communication, pragmatics also occupies a significant position in literary communication also. Literary communication maybe of different kinds which includes fiction, drama, poetry etc. Literature being the repertoire of interactional discourses, is a fertile ground for the application of pragmatic principles.
A major part of pragmatics deals with speech and speech events. Although the pragmatics of written language does exist, it appears that speech is paradigmatic in pragmatics, and written language is less significant. Jon Adams (1985) in his book, *Pragmatics and Fiction* holds the view that the meta functions of language also play a part, like the ideational meta function (the addressee and addressor's intentions) does seem to be a factor in the analysis of speech acts and Gricean implicatures. In addition to the interpersonal metafunction, the textual meta-function does play a part in the ethnomethodological approach as this approach puts a high premium on the structure of discourse, at the expense of speaker's intentions and the sociocultural framework of interpersonal interaction. Due to the interpersonal meta-function in pragmatics, it is productive to pragmatically analyze interactive dialogues in literary works.

Considerable research has been done in the field of literature, using pragmatics. The conversational exchanges in the literary works have been analyzed and the principles of pragmatics have been applied to it. The dialogues between the characters in the text consist of utterances and hence the analysis of the intended meaning in them cannot be avoided. Pragmatics helps in bringing out the meaning in context. And the genres of literature like poetry, fiction and drama, cannot be devoid of these utterances. As Roger Fowler (1981:80) states: "To treat literature as a discourse is to see the text as mediating relationships between language users, and not only relationships
of speech but also of consciousness, ideology, role and class. The text ceases to be an object and becomes an action or process.”

Hence one can see that literary works do have life and the context mostly consisting of conversations are also alive like the real life conversations between human beings. Searle (1979:66) argues that fiction is a pretending use of language, so that “an author of fiction pretends to perform illocutionary acts which he is not in fact performing” The major difficulty for this speech act analysis of fiction is in trying to form a coherent account of the special or “pretended” speech acts. For example, when the fictional characters talk, their conversations are real only in the context of the linguistic discourse. Beyond the literary discourse, the speech acts performed by the characters are ‘pretended’ speech acts by the author. But when one analyses the text in whole, one cannot avoid the interference of the author. The author is performing a speech act in conveying his intentions to the reader through the context of the text.

In William Blake’s poem Tyger one can apply the theory of Austin and Searle. Felicity conditions are obviously broken. In general, the requirement of a normal communicative channel is not fulfilled. One cannot expect a civil answer if one puts questions to the tiger, and no answers are expected. The speaker asks:

“What the hammer? What the chain?

In what furnace was thy chain?

What the anvil? What dread grasp?
Dare its deadly terrors clasp?

No creature, no man or cat can be expected to give a reliable first hand report on the circumstances of its creation. These unanswerable questions bounce off the tiger towards the reader of the poem, and so a discourse is established. The reader recognizes rhetorical questions which are really directed to persuading him of the terror and the inscrutability of power and beauty. Speech act theory in this case initiates a formal explanation of our recognition of the force of the questions our creative disorientation in the face of a battery of infelicitious illocutions. Here the writer has a direct verbal interaction with the reader.

There are conversations between the characters which pave the way for an accurate interpretation of the literary text. The speech acts used in the conversations of the fictional characters bring out the entire varied personalities in human beings and give a new face to their intentions and desires which are conveyed to the other characters. There are limitations to this kind of study, like the authenticity of the pragmatic analyses, as analyzing a real life conversation using pragmatic principles is more convincing, than the analysis of a literary work. But even then the analysis can be done as it brings out the socio-cultural network of relationships between the characters which is similar to real life.

Eminent scholars like, Ashok Thorat (2000), Z.N Patil(1994) etc have conducted studies on pragmatic analysis on fiction, drama, poetry, etc. Both the eminent scholars in India
have brought in a new kind of pragmatic analysis giving importance to the linguistic discourse in literary works. Z. N. Patil (1994) in his book *Style In Indian Fiction In English: A Study in Politeness Strategies*, brings in various strategies of politeness by which conversations take place successfully. He writes about certain aspects of politeness strategies, like circumlocution, formality, responsiveness, cultural relativity. Then he moves on to the politeness strategies employed by the characters in Indian fiction. The backdrop of the book is formulated on Brown and Levinson’s politeness principle. The types of politeness—negative and positive politeness are described in detail, which are applied to Indian Fiction. The book also speaks about various devices like exaggeration, in-group identity markers, expressions of sympathy approval and agreement with the addressees, (positive politeness) hedges, impersonalization, apologies, passivization, nominalization and deferential address forms (negative politeness) used by the characters. The book can be considered as one of the major resources of politeness principle and fiction.

The former Indian scholar Ashok Thorat (2000) deals with three major principles of Pragmatics: The Speech Act Theory, The Co-operative Principle and The Politeness Principle. His book named *Five Great Indian Novels: A Discourse Analysis*, is all about the application of the three principles mentioned above to five major Indian novels in English, like *Untouchable, Kanthapura, Azadi, Train To Pakistan* and *Inside The Haveli*. He brings in various direct and indirect speech acts performed by the
characters in the above mentioned novels, and how the speech acts play a role in their communication. He then focuses on the various politeness strategies like the different kinds of address forms, greetings, blessings, complimenting, which are used by the speakers in these novels to convey their intentions to each other. Lastly he brings in the co-operative principle and writes about how the maxims are being violated and twisted according to the whims of the participants of verbal interactions in these five novels. This book is indeed one of the prominent works in the field of pragmatics and fiction.

The dissertation titled A Study of Politeness in Indian Fiction in English by Sabhiha Sheikh deals with the politeness strategies that the characters use in their social and interpersonal relationships. Strategies like indirectness, honorifics, kinship terms, code-mixing, code switching hybridization are being employed in this study. It brings out the politeness strategies appropriate for Indian ethos and Indian culture.

Research has been conducted on the pragmatic analysis of translations of literary works of different languages. The politeness phenomena have been applied to the field of poetry, e.g. The works of Eliot, Yeats etc, focusing on the politeness of the language used by the poets. Hence literature and pragmatics share a bond, like any other discipline.

1.6.2 Pragmatics and Drama

One of the major criticisms that the linguists have about applying pragmatic principles to literary texts is that the
contexts of meaning in literary texts may in effect, be more elusive than spontaneous speech. Other features which maybe scant or absent in written literary texts, are the paralinguistic and kinesic elements or indicators which may help to clarify the more exact meaning of the utterances. This issue is being rectified regarding the dramatic discourse. When a dramatic text is being analyzed using the pragmatic principles, the above mentioned paralinguistic and kinesic elements are being taken into account. Elements like stage directions, gestures, facial expressions, asides, monologues, etc which form a part of drama makes the analysis easier, hence arriving at an accurate interpretation of the text.

The relationship between drama and pragmatics begins almost with the studies of language and literature. Drama being a genre of literature has been subjected to pragmatic analysis, but only a handful of researches have been done. The work of Karl Popper The Three Worlds, (1972) talks about the existence of three worlds and how they interact with each other thereby showing that physical and mental states interact. Leech’s Fourth World [1983] describes the dramatic communicational world of the script. Plays of Shakespeare, Pinter, Ibsen, Osborne etc have been analyzed using this perspective.

According to Jon Adams(1985:12), “pragmatic structure of fiction is the relationship among all the language users of the text: particularly between the writer and the fictional speaker and hearer, on one hand, and the reader and the fictional speaker and
hearer on the other”. This pragmatic structure is illustrated with a diagram €

\[ W(S \text{ (text) } H) R \]

W = writer, S = speaker, H = hearer, R = reader

Here the writer and the reader are real people, whereas the speaker and the hearer are fictitious. The term ‘text’ is independent of the speaker and hearer. One justification for this distinction is that it explains how the text varies from reader to reader. The pragmatic structure of drama can be based on the same lines. Here the diagram would be

\[ D(A \text{ (text) } A) R \]

D = dramatist, A = addressor, A = addressee, R = Reader

Here the dramatist and the reader are real people and the addressor and the addressee are fictitious, but the speech acts that the latter group performs are real. The text holds the source for speech acts. Even though the above stated pragmatic structure brings out the pragmatic unity of fiction\ drama phenomena like talking animals, mental telepathy, supernatural beings- the presentation of such a world is constrained by the pragmatic structure of fiction. The dramatic discourse rectifies the whole situation. Such phenomena become real size characters, (addressors and addressees) and converse with each other, thereby transforming such supernatural beings as conversationalists with speech acts to perform.
As Keir Elam (1980:157) states "The social, interpersonal, executive powers of language, the pragmatic ‘Doing things with words’ is dominant in drama". His work brings out the various dimensions of drama, like the entire communicative process between the characters, the aspects of drama like the actors, the use of lights, the music, the special costumes, the props etc. Besides these, he has not forgotten to mention about the illocutionary forces in the dialogues, the conversational rules and implicatures, which are very much evident in drama. The works of Indian playwrights have also been taken as a subject of this kind of research. Researchers like Umesh Jagadale (2007), have focused on the communicative content of drama based on the model of communication of drama by Ernest, W B Hess-Lutich. His detailed study deals with the various kinds of communication that takes place between the characters and the supposedly psychological relationship between the implied reader and the implied playwright. They have focused on how the background accessories like paralinguistic forces, play an important role in conveying the message of the playwright to the audience.

To many critics and playwrights, the word ‘Drama’ consists of a whole range of entities. Some totally agree that the drama does not stop with the script and the communication between the playwright and the reader, but the performance of it plays a big role in it. As Aparna Bhargava Dharwadhker (2005) says “Theatre is performative rather than discursive and textual”. According to Vijay Tendulkar (2000), “Play writing ... is a
highly technical medium... where you have to adhere to certain technical demands and function within limitations... you have to adjust to specific situations, visualize three dimensionally... I can't think of the play as a literary activity in solitude, I must constantly test how it sounds, where it will be staged...” As one can see, the script of the drama, is not only the source of communication, but the other factors also pitch in the communicational activity. But as Jagadale (2007) puts it... “The script of drama creates a communicational world, which is neither absolutely social, nor absolutely theatrical, nor absolutely literary, but includes all of them”. Hence the dramatic discourse consists of speech events, where one can easily bring out the speech acts in them. It also helps in the interpretation of the text to be easier with many linguistic features – paralinguistic and kinesic.

There have been a lot of researches done in the field of pragmatics and drama. The following chapters focus on the written text of drama and how the narrator’s intentions can be analyzed by applying the principles of pragmatics, through the conversations of the characters. In Beckett’s *End Game*, Clov uses the sentence when he says to Hamm “I’ll leave you” (Beckett: p 39). If we see Clov as promising or threatening when he says this, then we assume that he is obligating or otherwise committing himself to leaving and in doing so attempts to have some effect on Hamm, either to please Hamm if we think that Hamm wants Clov to leave or to displease him if we think Hamm does not want Clov to leave. If we see Clov predicting, then we
assume Clov is not planning to leave but that he believes his leaving will simply happen, which suggests a more fatalistic attitude on Clov’s part. Or we may see that Clov is, in saying ‘I’ll leave you’, performing a ritual, a ritual in which Clov wants to leave and says he will leave but has no belief or expectation that he will leave - knows that Hamm knows this: it is a ritual for the two of them to get on and get through the day. Whatever we assume Clov is doing in saying ‘I’ll leave you’ we now know that he is doing something and we know we must infer some particular speech act in order to interpret what he is doing. The categories of speech acts overlap with each other and depend on the contextual situations, as we have seen in the example above.

Austin in his theory emphasized on the felicity conditions as the apt environment for speech acts. Conditions like preparatory conditions: the speaker must be authorized to perform the act, sincerity conditions: the speaker must mean what he says believe it to be true and essential conditions: he is obliged by a promise to undertake the action indicated. Drama is structured precisely on the abuse of these conditions, and thus on the production of speech acts known to be defective to the audience but accepted as ‘happy’ by the dramatic interlocutor. (Elam1980:163). The most familiar instance is Iago’s deceiving of Othello in scene (III. Act Three ) Iago abuses all the ‘felicity conditions’ in equal measure; the preparatory conditions since he has no evidence for his insinuations; the sincerity conditions, since he knows what he is insinuating to be false; and the essential conditions, since he is plainly not committed to the fact
that the advice he gives—‘Look to your wife; observe her well with Cassio—is in any way of benefit to his interlocutor.

The co-operative principle has also been one of the major principles to be analysed in the plays. Harold’s Pinter play *The Caretaker*, has been subjected to pragmatic analysis by Lesley Clark (1997). The intra and inter-personal dimensions of the characters in the play are revealed by their treatment of the co-operative principle:

Aston: “I went into the pub the other day. Ordered a Guiness. They gave to me in a thick mug. I sat down, but I couldn’t drink it. I can’t drink Guiness from a thick mug. I only like it out of a thin glass. I had a few sips, but I couldn’t finish it. Davies: If only the weather could break! Then I’d be able to get down to Sidcup.”

(*The Caretaker*: 19)

Here Davies’ change of topic shows his disregard and disinterest in what Aston has to say and replies back with a totally different answer which is not pertaining to the context. Davies is seen flouting the maxim of relation.

Even the linguistic features of adult-child exchanges are seen in this play, in which Mick (adult) uses directives to Davies (child).

“Don’t get too perky” (Pg: 35), “Don’t get out of your depth” (Pg: 35). “Don’t get too glib” (Pg: 50).
Hence one can see that their characters’ motives, fears, strengths, and weaknesses of the characters are revealed through the treatment of the co-operative principle.

Punjabrao Ronge in his thesis, titled Turn Taking in Absurd Plays, brings out the phenomenon of turn taking in Harold Pinter’s *The Caretaker* and *Enter a Free Man*. The study focuses on how the characters organize their turns to negotiate, explore, construct, reinforce, or change the interpersonal relation through interactions. It shows how the characters communicate using one word turns, interrupt each other, overcome the interruptions by repairing them, etc.

A lot more researches have been done in the field of pragmatics and drama. With pragmatic analysis, a whole new dimension of the analysis of plays is being brought into focus. The intentions and motives of the characters are almost similar to real life people. The following chapters focus on the written text of drama and how the narrator’s intentions can be analyzed by applying the principles of pragmatics, through the conversations of the characters.

1.7. Research Hypothesis

The study focuses on the pragmatic analysis of two plays, Girish Karnad’s *Nagamandala* and Vijay Tendulkar’s *Silence! The Court is in Session*. The hypothesis is that the principles of pragmatics, like speech acts, co-operative principle and the politeness principle, turn taking and implicatures play a major role in assessing the intentions of the playwrights. It focuses on
how they convey their intentions to the audience-reader thereby extracting the response they expect. This is done by analyzing the conversations between the characters, and the additional information like the stage directions, the gestures, asides etc., in these two plays. It also hypothesises that the findings of the analysis can explain the strategies used by these two writers, to bring about an effective communication with the audience-reader.

1.8. Purpose, Aims and Significance of the Study

Most of the studies that have been done on the interpretation of literary works are subjected to an impressionistic evaluation. Linguistics has been given the privilege of being scientific and objective by eminent scholars. Pragmatics being a part of socio linguistics has the dual personality of being objective as well as subjective. Hence a pragmatic analysis of any work will bring out the advantages of both. This study is therefore a combination of objectivism and subjectivism.

The study attempts to achieve the following aims:

- The pragmatic analysis of the two plays will bring out the different kinds of verbal exchanges between the characters (with their varied personalities), which are very similar to daily conversations between real life people.
- The use of pragmatic principles, shows that plays do not stop with their performances as such but go beyond it and reveal what the dramatist intends to tell the reader. This is done through the
strategies employed by the playwrights to achieve their intentions.

➢ This study opens up new vistas regarding the relationship between drama and pragmatics. The analysis of the dramatic discourse with the help of the principles of pragmatics becomes the main source of various literary interpretations like style, theme etc.

➢ To provide better understanding of the two plays to the students of literature.

➢ To see to what extent the approach which is followed in the analysis is applicable and helpful in the teaching methodology at the under graduate level.

1.9. Limitation of the Study

➢ This study is limited to the analysis of Vijay Tendulkar’s Silence! The Court is in Session and Girish Karnad’s play Nagamandala respectively.

➢ Since the scope of the study is limited, only selected concepts/principles of Pragmatics are applied to the plays.

➢ It is limited to the two written texts i.e. the script of the above mentioned plays, thereby sidelining their theatrical performances.

➢ It is limited to the theory of Pragmatics, whereas the two texts are open to a variety of interpretations in linguistic as well as in non linguistic fields.

1.10 About the Author- Girish Karnad

Born on May 19th, 1938, Girish Karnad one of India’s literary genius earn international praise as a playwright, poet,
actor, director, critic and translator. He earned his Bachelors
degree from Karnata University, Dharwad and with a Rhodes
scholarship in hand, he went on to receive the Master's degree
from the University of Oxford. His first play *Yayati* (1961) was
written in his adopted language Kannada. The play chronicled the
adventures of mythical characters from the Mahabharata, which
was an instant success and was translated into various languages.
His best loved play, *Tughlaq* (1970), a compelling allegory on
the Nehruvian era, modeled on the life of a fourteenth century
emperor, Tughlaq.

Karnad’s second English play, *Hayavadana* (1972) is
based on Thomas Mann’s *The Transposed Heads*. In it Karnad
uses the folk art form of ‘yakshagaana’ to examine the modern
problem of the body/intellect divide. The character Padmini
searches for the complete man who must have the best attributes
of body and intellect and finally she realizes that it is the intellect
that is supreme and always determine what a man is and what he
will become. *Taledanda* (1990) deals with the rise of
Veerashaivism, a radical protest and reform movement in the 12th
century Karnataka, and the struggle between the forces of
reaction and protest. His most recent play *The Fire and the Rain*,
foregrounds the social context of individual conflict through the
character of Aravasu. His contributions to the literary field, has
given him a number of national awards like the Karnataka
Sahitya Academy Award, the Padmabhushan and the Padmasri
awards etc. *Nagamandala* (1988), is subjected to pragmatic
analyses in the following chapters, and hence the story of the play is given below in a nutshell.

1.10.1 The Summary of *Nagamandala*

Karnad weaves two Kannada folk-tales together, in this play. The first one comments on the paradoxical nature of oral tales in general: they have an existence of their own, independent of the teller, and yet live only when they are passed from one story-teller to another. The appearance of the Flames in the prologue and how they tell the story of Rani, the protagonist of the play, to a playwright who must be awake for a night so that he does not die. The second story is about Rani, married to Appana who does not care about her as he lives with his mistress. She is left alone, locked in the house. Rani makes up tales to fill the void in her life. Kurudava, an old woman comes to meet her and gives her three magical roots, to lure Appana back to his wife. But the magic potion has been given accidentally to Naga, a cobra who falls in love with her. He attains the form of Appana and visits Rani. The young wife unaware of this fact becomes pregnant. Her husband accuses her of infidelity and she is forced to prove her innocence. Naga rescues her and she is proved innocent in front of the villagers, who consider her a Goddess as she has passed the test.

1.11 About the author- Vijay Tendulkar

He is one of the most renowned playwrights of the Marathi theatre. Born on Jan 6, 1928 in Kohlapur, Maharashtra, Tendulkar’s early struggle for survival and living in Mumbai
chawls provided him a first hand experience about the life of urban lower middle class which was reflected in his writings. He is the author of several famous, though controversial plays like Giddha (1961) Khamosh-Adalat Zari Hai (1967) Sakharam Binder (1972) Ghaisiram Kotwal (1972). Tendulkar’s writings rapidly changed the storyline of modern Marathi theatre in the 1950s and the 60s with experimental presentations by theatre groups like Rangayan. His provocative socio-political plays which relentlessly and ruthlessly explore the human psyche and the society never fail to raise a storm. This multifaceted writer has short stories as well as one act plays to his credit and is a recipient of many national awards.

His play, Gidhade (1961) (The Vultures) was set in a morally collapsed family structure and explored the theme of violence. Sakharam Binder (1972) dealt with the topic of male domination. The main character, Sakharam Binder is a man devoid of ethics and morality, and uses the society for pleasure. The hypocritical attitude of the Indian society is shown in the play. Tendulkar’s most acclaimed play was Ghaisiram Kotwal (1972) (Ghaisiram, the Constable) which dealt with political violence. The play is a political satire created a musical drama, which is set in eighteenth century Pune. It combined traditional Marathi folk forms with contemporary theatre techniques, creating thus a new paradigm for Marathi theatre. Silence! The Court is in Session (1967) is one of the plays taken for this study and the summary is being presented in the following paragraph.
1.11.1 The Summary of *Silence! The Court is in Session*

The play and its structure revolve wholly round the idea of a game, that is being enacted by the members of a theatre group, who have assembled to perform a play. The main protagonist is Benare, who is a school teacher and is a member of this troupe. The other characters that are involved are Sukhatme, Karnik, Balu Rokde, the couple, Mrs and Mr. Kashikar and Samant. The whole lot of them try to needle Benare but at least in the first half of the play she outsmarts them. The name of Prof. Damle who has failed to turn up, hovers in the air, giving rise to some inexplicable uneasiness.

They have plenty of time to kill before the performance. So they pick on the expedients of initiating the local chap Samant into the intricacies of Court procedure and later using him as a replacement. Benare will be on trial; after all it is nothing more than a harmless game. But before long the game begins to assume a grim aspect. The accusations against Benare are based on conjectures, partly on hearsay. But the truth comes out and Benare is accused of being an unwed mother, and the sentence meted out to her is savage: the infant in her womb must be destroyed; she must lose her teaching job, her only source of livelihood. The play ends with the protagonist rendering a monologue about her misery, her fate and the cruelty of the patriarchal society.
1.12. Methodology

The aim of the present study is to bring about the Pragmatic analysis of Vijay Tendulkar’s *Silence! The Court is in Session* and Girish Karnad’s *Nagamandala*. The conversational exchanges between the characters in both the plays are being analysed using speech act theory, cooperative principle, politeness principle, turn taking and implicatures.

First, the highly marked speech acts in the plays which fall in the respective categories will be analyzed. The model of speech act theory that is being applied here to the plays, is the one presented by Searle, namely assertives, commissives, directives, expressives and declaratives. The objective is to demonstrate that each utterance in the plays, which is a part of conversational discourses mentioned above, can be classified under one of these major speech acts. The function of each utterance will be discussed in relation to the contexts in which it occurs.

Then the plays will be analysed from the co-operative principle’s point of view and the violation of the maxims of the co-operative principle, by the characters in the plays is being analysed. Here the chief concern would be to bring out the various instances of violation of the maxims as well as the instances, where the maxims were not broken, in the plays. The violation of the maxims of the co-operative principle, by the two playwrights to provide a context for their utterances to the audience/reader is the major focus.

The plays will be analyzed using the politeness principle provided by Brown and Levinson. Their notion of negative face and positive face is being applied here. The various politeness strategies employed by the conversationalists (characters, readers, playwrights) to convey their
messages to each other without hampering the 'face' of the other, will be highlighted. The use of aggravating language, by the characters to impose their will on others will also be discussed. The extent of politeness that the dramatists employ to get their message across, as well as the response of the audience/reader which is the success of the two plays will also be emphasized.

The style of writing of the two playwrights, Karnad and Tendulkar will be dissected using the tools of pragmatics like turn-taking and implicatures. The narrative style, with which the two playwrights have handled their respective plays, will also be emphasized.

Finally, different ideas and points emerging from the preceding chapters will be synthesized in the form of conclusions.

Above all, this study brings out another perspective of rendition of plays, where the plays, rather than being performed on stages, are being ensconced in the texts at the undergraduate level. The readers then become the only audience and the responses are their critical reviews. Hence it brings out another reading of plays, without lights, stage, actors and applause.

1.13. Organization of the Work

This study is organized systematically into five chapters. Chapter One offers a review of literature available on the studies and research which are closely related to the study under focus. It looks at the birth and the development of Pragmatics, a branch in sociolinguistics. It also deals with the relation between this branch of linguistics and literature in general. It finally gives an understanding into the relation between pragmatics and drama and the research conducted in this area.
It also introduces the research hypothesis and shows the background of this hypothesis, defines the purpose, aims, significance, and limitations of the study. It also gives a short summary of each of the two plays under investigation.

Chapter Two deals with the application of speech act theory to *Nagamandala* and *Silence! The Court is in Session*. The model is based on the speech act theory offered by Searle, in which he distinguishes five broad classes of illocution, that are representatives, directives, commissives, expressives and declarations. With the help of the above mentioned illocutions, the chapter points out the above stated instances of speech acts, in the conversational interactions between the characters, the playwrights’ persuasion in exacting the response he expects from the reader.

Chapter Three is about the application of the co-operative principle to the above mentioned plays. It shows that how the violation of the maxims of co-operative principle by the characters in their conversations does not hinder the flow of communication between them. This chapter focuses on the perspectives and how the two playwrights’ get their expected responses from the reader by violating the maxims.

Chapter Four is devoted to the politeness principle. This chapter is based on Brown and Levinson’s theory of politeness principle. It brings out the strategies of politeness used by the characters in their conversations. It shows how they achieve their intentions without threatening the ‘face’ of the other. The chapter also deals with the extent
of politeness in the language that the two playwrights have used to convey their message to the readers.

Chapter Five speaks about the additional tools of pragmatics like turn-taking and implicatures that present the manner in which the playwrights have handled their respective themes. It gives more insight on their narrative style, their different perspectives in using drama to reach out to their readers.

Chapter Six is the concluding Chapter of the study. It sets out the findings of the work. It mainly summarizes the results of the analytical procedure. In addition, it presents in brief, conclusions, recommendations and ends with a concluding word for further research.

1.14 Conclusion

The introductory chapter is devoted to a review of related literature which provides a platform for the present study. It offers a foundation for the pragmatic analysis, by showing the development of the branch of pragmatics, the major proponents of pragmatics, like Austin, Searle, Grice, Leech etc. It also offers some significant remarks on literary works and pragmatics, the relationship between pragmatics and drama, on which rests the analytical model of the study. It mentions the various works done in this field. It also sets clearly the aims, limitations and significance of the study. It exposes briefly the analytical model followed in the study.
However, this chapter draws a clear sketch for the development of the theoretical basis of the theoretical framework of the present study which will be discussed in the chapters to follow.