CHAPTER THREE
Cooperative Principle

3.0 Preliminaries

Conversation is the major form of communication between human beings. As stated earlier in the second chapter, conversationalists achieve their intentions by performing certain speech acts, which are recognized by others. If speech acts brought out the thoughts of the speakers, this chapter deals with the manner in how these conversations take place. People usually cooperate with each other in their daily interaction by observing certain rules and maxims. To put it in other words, if the participants in conversation want to achieve their goals jointly, they must agree implicitly on an orderly method for talking. If there is no order in the manner of speaking, then the conversations would be rendered meaningless, and disorganized. Speakers talk in audible voices, use languages they believe their listeners know, and adhere to phonology, syntax and semantics of those languages. But the manner as to how it is being expressed is also equally important. Put concisely, the speakers try to be informative, truthful, relevant and clear. In other words they follow the Cooperative principle.

But in certain cases, it is difficult to be truthful, informative, relevant and clear. It leads to the violation of the
maxims. This chapter is concerned with how the characters of these two plays violate the maxims in their conversation, in order to convey their intentions across to the other characters. The instances in the above mentioned plays that highlight the violation of the maxims, are categorized under their respective headings.

3.1 An Overview

H.P Grice was the first person to talk about the Cooperative principle. He says that conversations are not made up of series of disconnected remarks; rather they are characteristically rational, cooperative events (Grice:1975). He claims that the participants in a conversation will recognize a common purpose or a set of purposes, which may evolve during the conversation and may be more or less definite.

“ But at each stage, some possible conversation moves would be excluded as conversationally unsuitable. We might then formulate a rough general principle which participants will be expected to observe namely: Make your conversational contributions 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: 1975:45).

This general principle of conversational interaction, helping to organize participants’ contributions around a common purpose, Grice refers to as the Cooperative principle. He proposes a general principle which communicators will be expected to observe:
He classifies it under four maxims:

Quantity:

1) Make your contribution as informative as is required.

2) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Quality:

1) Try to make your contribution one that is true.

2) Do not say what you believe to be false.

3) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Relation:

1) Be relevant.

Manner:

1) Be perspicuous.

2) Avoid obscurity of expression.

3) Avoid ambiguity.

4) Be brief. (Avoid unnecessary prolixity)

We usually assume that people will provide us with appropriate amount of information, tell us the truth, talk relevantly and try to be as clear as they can. Thus, with the assumption that people are informative, truthful, relevant, and clear in their verbal communication, we interpret what they say. The major proponents of pragmatics also follow the Gricean
principles and they all say that their primary function remains fundamentally the same: that of constraining the participant’s behavior so as to make conversations orderly, purposeful, and maximally efficient. But conversationalists, being humans with minds of their own and with more intelligence than other living beings do not strictly follow such rules. The rules are broken. When one or more maxims are violated then the hearer, in an attempt to preserve the assumption that the speaker is still following the Cooperative principle, will try to deduce some unstated proposition that the speaker wished to convey by flouting a maxim. This proposition, Grice calls as ‘implicature’. His theory provides an account of how an utterance may be interpreted as communicating more propositional knowledge than the literal meaning of its words and syntactic form would suggest.

Imagine a conversation between a mother and a daughter:

M: What did you have for lunch today?

D: 1) Baked beans on toast.

2) Food

3) I had 87 warmed up baked beans (although eight of them were slightly crushed) served on a slice of toast 12.7 cm. by 10.3 cm. which had been unevenly toasted...

Answer (1) is a ‘normal’ answer (2) gives too little information, thus contravening the first part of the maxim; (3) gives too much information, and contravenes the second part of the maxim.
One can see that out of the three answers that is given, the first one is informative enough for the enquiry, but if the daughter had to use the second or the third one, she would have been violating the maxim of quantity. Thereby, resulting in the breakdown of the flow of communication between both of them. The latter two answers would have made the mother angry and irritated, thereby hindering the normal events of communication.

Even then we usually do not observe these maxims very strictly, and in fact no one normally speaks like that the whole time. One can so often notice the breach of one maxim or more in an utterance. Although we might violate these maxims on the surface of our conversations, yet we actually adhere to them at some deeper level of communication, the pragmatic level. It is the recognition of this fact that leads the hearer, faced with an apparently irrelevant utterance, to search for relevance somewhere beyond the surface level. An example should make this clear:

A: Have you seen Mary today?
B: I'm breathing.

According to the relation maxim, what B says has to have relevance with A's question. On the surface, there seems to be no connection between the question and the answer. On close examination, however, one could see that B has supplied an apt answer. After hearing B's response, A has to assume that B is
cooperative, but the latter did not mention anything about seeing Mary, that day. If B had seen Mary, he would have mentioned it for he would be adhering to the quantity maxim. Thus assuming that B is cooperative and at the same time noticing that B is not observing the maxim of relevance, A has to dive deeper in order to explore the unstated meaning or the implicature conveyed by B's utterance. By mentioning that he/she was still breathing B is giving an indirect answer, that B has not seen Mary. B is also implying about Mary's character, in the utterance. In this way B has communicated more than what he has actually said via "conversational implicatures". In order to draw the implicatures from the utterance, A has to go through some "inference or inferential procedure". It is notable that the inference selected by A preserves the assumption of cooperation.

Hence one can see that conversational implicatures flout the maxims of cooperative principle. In the above illustration, one can see the utterance being an indirect speech act as well as the presence of a conversational implicature in it. This is generally how people communicate to each other. Even though the maxims are being flouted at the surface level, the point is driven across to the other person. This type of flouting of maxims can be seen in the fictional texts also.

As mentioned in the introduction of the study, fictional texts are filled with such kinds of conversational implicatures and indirect speech acts which flout the maxims of the Cooperative principle. Hence one can come across instances of the maxims
being flouted in the conversations between the characters of fictional dialogues.

In the discourse analysis done by Thorat (2000:184-185), one can come across such an instance where the quality maxim is being violated. Mulk Raj Anand’s Novel Untouchable, Lakha tells his son a lie because he wants his son to do his work for him. This is how the talk between the father and the son progresses:

‘I have a pain in my side,’ said the old man to his son.

‘Is your pain very bad?’ asked Bakha ironically, to make his father conscious of his bad temper. ‘I will rub your side with oil if you like.’

‘No, no,’ said the old man irritably, turning his face to hide the shame which his son’s subtle protest aroused in him. He had no pain at all in his side, or anywhere, and was merely foxing, being in his old age ineffectual, and excusing himself from work like a child. (34-35)

Lakha has worked very hard as a sweeper all his life. The social set up and the indiscrimination done to him by the upper caste makes his life miserable. In his old age, he wants to get rid of this public humiliation and hence wants his son to take over from him. Lakha uses his authority as a father and makes his son Lakha work. But when he realizes that the son was not paying heed to him, he makes use of a lie to get the job done. Hence one can see that Lakha violates the maxim of quality in his conversation with his son.
In the famous handkerchief scene in Othello, we see the protagonist haunted by jealousy. His wife, Desdemona advocates Cassio’s case, but Othello is deaf to her pleas because the only object that occupies his mind at the moment is the handkerchief which, for him is a symbol of chastity and faithfulness. In the scene, he is conversationally non-cooperative by replying to her in monosyllables. From the above examples, it is clear that even though adhering to the maxims of Grice is indeed difficult, the meaning is being inferred accurately by the other person. Sperber and Wilson (1986:162), two early proponents of the Gricean perspective in pragmatics argue that conversationalists do not in fact really follow Cooperative principle and its maxims.

“It seem to us to be a matter of common experience that the degree of cooperation described by Grice is not automatically expected of communicators. People who don’t give us all the info, we wish, they would and don’t answer our questions as well as they could, are no doubt much to blame, but not for violating principles of communication.”

These two pragmaticians did come out with the relevance theory, thereby refuting the Gricean principles, but as the present study is not concerned with the theory, it is not being discussed here. But the point that is made here is that it is indeed difficult to uphold the maxims of the Cooperative Principle.

The present study is about the violation of the maxims by the conversational participants in Karnad’s Nagamandala and Tendulkar’s Silence! The Court is in Session. The characters in
the two plays, achieve their illocutionary goals by implementing various interactional strategies. The flouting of the maxims is one of them. The situations that they are in, also persuade them to use the maxims according to their whims and fancies, yet achieving their goals.

3.2 Violation of the Quantity Maxim

When the characters in the above mentioned plays, converse with each other, they violate the maxims of the cooperative principle. Their intentions and thoughts are being conveyed by means of the violation of the quantity maxim. Though it is required of the conversationalists to adhere to the maxims, they either give more information, or withhold information, from their counterparts. Their contribution to the conversation will always be inappropriate. In *Nagamandala*, the character of Kurudava, gives more information about her son than required, while speaking to Rani.

Kurudava: “My son, Kappanna. Oh, don’t let his name mislead you. He isn’t really dark. In fact, when he was born, my husband said: Such a fair child! Let’s call him the Fair One! I said: I don’t know what Fair means. My blind eyes know only the dark. So let’s call this little parrot of my eyes the Dark One! And he became Kappanna” [Act One: 12].

In the above scene, Kurudava is describing her son to Rani. To Rani’s enquiry, as to who is with the old woman, the latter gives a detailed description. The fitting reply to this would
have been an answer, ‘That’s my son Kappanna’, but Kurudava goes on talking about her son. The question that Rani asks Kurudava is a simple one, and does not need more information. But the above illustration shows her love and affection towards her only son Kappanna. Her words and her voice carry the emotion of pride in them. She admires her own son so much that, she gives the history of the naming of the child. Though the son has grown up to be a young man who carries her around, the mother still considers him to be a child, hence the explanation of how he came to be called Kappanna. The old woman has violated the maxim of quantity. The information given by her is more than required, but it does not affect the flow of conversation. Rani takes the comment in its stride, and asks her the next question, thereby continuing with the conversation.

In Act Two, there is another instance of the violation of the maxims. Here it is the character Naga, who violates the maxim. Naga and Rani are discussing about sexual acts. Rani is shocked at Naga’s overt behavior of embracing her. She is shocked and says that her parents would be angry with Naga, and that they do not have a polygamous mating nature like the dogs. Naga replies to this;

Naga: (laughs) “What have dogs done to deserve sole credit for it, you silly goose? Frogs croaking in pelting rain, tortoises singing soundlessly in the dark. Foxes, crabs, ants, rattlers, sharks, swallows— even the geese! The female begins to smell like the wet earth. And stung by her smell, the king Cobra starts searching for his Queen. The tiger bellows for
his mate. When the flame of the forest blossoms into a fountain of red and the earth crack and open at the touch of the aerial roots of the banyan, it moves in the hollow of the cottonwood, in the flow of the estuary, the dark limestone caves from the womb of the heavens to the dark netherworlds within everything that sprouts, grows, stretches, creaks and blooms everywhere those who come together, cling, fall apart lazily! It is there and there, everywhere” (Act Two: 25)

Naga flouts this maxim. He replies to the angry outburst of Rani. It is not necessary for Naga to give an explanation like the above instance. But Naga, due to his overwhelming passion for Rani declares the procedures of mating in this manner. He is so taken up by her beauty, that he talks about the nature in general and how the living creatures show their mating instincts. Naga, being a reptile and not a human can express his love only in the language of the animals. Thereby it results in Naga exclaiming about the wonders of the animal kingdom. Even Rani exclaims about Naga’s lengthy rhetoric.

Rani: “Goodness! Goats have to be sacrificed and buffaloes slaughtered to get a word out of you in the mornings! But at night- how you talk! ...” (Act Two: 25)

On one hand, we have Naga flouting the quantity maxim by giving more information than necessary, and on the other hand, Rani’s husband Appana flouts it by talking in monosyllables.
Appanna: “What is there to be scared of? Just keep to yourself. No one will bother you. Rice!

Rani: Please, you could -

Appanna: Look I don’t like idle chatter. Do as you are told, you understand?” [Act One: 7]

Appanna does not even want to hear what Rani has to say. He becomes non-cooperative in his conversation with her. Being the wife of Appanna, Rani has the right to speak lovingly to her husband. In the play, the couple has been portrayed as newly weds. And the utterances of Appanna are definitely not of a besotted husband. He does not like talking to Rani, and avoids any situation that calls for a conversation between both of them.

The flouting of the maxims by the two male characters, in their own ways, is evident in the plays. The only difference is that when Naga’s lengthy description does not break the flow of the conversation, Appanna’s hesitation to talk and to give information, brings in a distance in the husband-wife relationship.

People also flout the conversational maxims if they are not in a proper mental frame. Rani violates this maxim of quantity when she is in an anguished condition. She tells Naga about her pregnancy, and when Naga does not respond positively to her news, she becomes distraught and tells Naga:

Rani: “I am pregnant (He stares at her, dumfounded)
Why are you looking at me like that? There is a baby in my womb. (He stares blankly.) We are going to have a baby.

(Pause) It doesn’t make you happy?

(Anguished) What am I going to do with you? Laugh? Cry? Bang my head against the wall? I can never guess how you’ll act. I thought you would dance with joy on hearing the news. That you would whirl me around and fondle me. Feel my stomach gently and kiss me. All that (Pause) Actually, I was afraid you might not do anything of that sort. That’s why I hid the news from you all these months. I can’t make any sense of you even when it is just the two of us. Now a third life joins us! I didn’t know if that would be too much for you. So I was silent.

(Her eyes fill up)

What I feared has come true. What kept me silent has happened. You are not happy about the baby. You are not proud that I am going to be a mother. Sometimes you are so cold-blooded—you cannot be human.

(Forcibly puts his hand on her belly)

Just feel! Feel! Our baby is crouching in there, in the darkness, listening to the sounds from the world outside—as I do all day long [Act Two: 31].

From the above passage it is clear that Rani is speaking with Naga. But there are no responses from his side. He is not
participating in the conversation. Here Rani is trying to awaken the feeling of fatherhood in Naga. She expresses her emotions, in the hope that he would be happy with the news. But Naga does not reciprocate her happiness. In her anguished state, she rambles on about the baby and about his cold-blooded nature. It does not occur to her that she is ranting about her condition to Naga, so that he changes his mind about the baby.

In Tendulkar’s Silence! The Court is in Session, the protagonist Benare is shown as a woman who talks a lot and unnecessarily. In the first act, Samant, only an acquaintance of Benare asks her as to why she is wandering about, and advises her to sit down, to which she replies:

Samant: (obediently) “All right. (He lowers his hand. Then suddenly comes forward, picking up a chair, and puts it down near her) Why are you wandering about? Do sit down. Your feet will hurt”. Benare: I’m used to standing while teaching. In class, I never sit when teaching. That’s how I keep my eye on the whole class. No one has a chance to play up. My class is scared stiff of me! And they adore me too. My children will do anything for me. For I’d give the last drop of my blood to teach them. [In a different tone]. That’s why people are jealous. Specially the other teachers and the management. But what can they do to me? What can they do? However hard they try, what can they do? They’re holding an enquiry, if you please! But my teaching is perfect. I’ve put my whole life into it-I’ve worn myself to a shadow in this
job! Just because of one bit of slander, what they can do to me? Throw me out? Let them! I haven't hurt anyone. Anyone at all! If I've hurt anybody, it's been myself. But is that any kind of reason for throwing me out? Who are these people to say what I can or can't do? My life is my own— I haven't sold it to anyone for a job! My will is my own. My wishes are my own. No one can kill those— no one! I'll do what I like with my self and my life! I'll decide... [Act One: 5].

In the above passage, one can see that Benare has not upheld the maxim of quantity. The first sentence of her reply, "I'm used to standing while teaching", is more than enough information to his question, but she goes on and on, talking about her life and the injustice done to her by the school authorities. She does it unintentionally. From her reply, it is obvious to the readers that she has a personal problem in her life, and that people around her are harassing her. Samant does not ask for this part of the information. But Benare unknowingly tells him about her life and her decisions. This brings a break in the conversation. Till then, both of them converse about the ordinary events. The sudden outburst of her personal life, tells us that there is some problem that is plaguing the mind of Benare. The playwright makes use of this violation to create a sense of curiosity in the minds of the readers.

Gossiping about others, have always being the main fodder for conversation. To talk about others, about their lifestyles, and to talk about their behaviour, is something which is
not new to the conversational manner of the Indian society. The characters, Benare, Sukhatme, Karnik, Ponkshe talk about Mr. and Mrs. Kashikar. From the reader’s point of view, this conversation is a total violation of quantity.

Benare: “… I say, who’s noticed something about Mr and Mrs. Kashikar?

Rokde: (with instinctive, unconscious interest) What?

Ponkshe: (re-entering) Yes, what?

Sukhatme: I’ll tell you. But no, I won’t. You tell us…

Benare: You haven’t understood a thing, Sukhatme. Don’t give yourself those meaningless legal airs! Well, although our Kashikar is a social worker and Mrs. Kashikar is quite uneducated and so on- of course, I don’t think that education has any connection with a person’s intelligence- well, although Mrs. Kashikar is not so educated, they are both so full of life! I mean. Mr. Kashikar buys garlands for Mrs. Kashikar. Mrs. Kashikar buys readymade bush shirts for Mr. Kashikar … it really makes one feel nice about it”[Act One:12].

The troupe members discuss about the relationship between the couple Mr and Mrs Kashikar. But the protagonist Benare gives a lengthy description about them. She does it because gossiping brings the conversationalists’ bond closer. The general nature of human beings is to be curious about the personal information of other people. Hence Benare’s portrayal
of the relationship between the old couple with her own additional comments and unnecessary details about them makes the subject between the speaker and the listener more interesting. But according to Vijay Tendulkar, the maxim of quantity is not being violated. He makes Benare break the maxim of quantity, so that he could give information about the paradoxes in the relationships between married people. The romantic relationship that she has depicted for the other troupe members is not the kind of relationship that Mr and Mrs Kashikar share but the opposite of it, which becomes clear from their dialogues in the play.

Language is of paramount importance in legal discourse as it is the medium through which all interpretations are carried out in the field of law. Legal professionals often engage in disputes about the ways words are to be interpreted. David Mellinkoff (1963) rightly calls law ‘a profession of words’. Lawyers are interested in language as it is the greatest tool of social control. Words play a very significant role in the testimonies of the witnesses. Legal language is known for its complexity and generally it is incomprehensible to a lay person. For instance Tiersma in his book *The Nature of Legal Language* brings out the complexity in legal discourse by arguing that even a simple sentence like ‘I will give you that orange’ when written by a lawyer, would be something like the following:

I will give all and singular, my estate and interest, right, title, claim and advantage of and in that orange, with all its rind, skin, juice, pulp and pips and all right and advantage therein, with full power to bite, cut, suck and otherwise eat the same, or
give the same away as fully and effectually as I the said A.B am now entitled to bite, cut, suck or otherwise eat the same orange, or give the same way, with or without its rind, skin, juice, pulp and pips, anything hereinbefore, or hereinafter, or in any other deed, or deeds, instrument or instruments of what nature or kindsoever, to the contrary in any wise, notwithstanding.[Quoted in Gokhale,2006:154].

According to the research conducted by Madhuri Gokhale,[2006:155] legal discourse does violate the maxims of the cooperative principle like the quantity principle. And one of the reasons for the violation of the maxim of quantity can be that the basis of English laws is the Roman law. The Roman law made an extensive use of Latin terminology and complex sentence patterns, and this seems to have continued in the case of English. In the past it was obligatory to make use of highly formal diction in the king’s court and the same system seems to have continued for a long time.

As Tendulkar’s play is about a mock trial, this feature of the legal language is present in the arguments presented by Sukhatme, who enacts the role of a lawyer. The characters in the play are actors who have assembled in a hall for a dramatic performance. In the course of the rehearsal, they engage in a false conviction of Benare. Even though the play is based on a mock trial, the court proceedings are imitated in an exact manner. There is a judge, the lawyers for the accused and the defense, the ushers, the oath taking etc, are being played to the part. Hence this play is no less than a court trial in the real world. Sukhatme,
like any other lawyer violates the quantity maxim, in order to emphasize his case. His speech towards the close of the play is one good example.

Sukhatme: [Now the counsel for the prosecution]. ‘Milord, the nature of the charge against the accused, Miss Leela Benare, is truly dreadful. The woman who is an accused has made a heinous blot on the sacred brow of motherhood- which is purer than heaven itself. For that, any punishment, however great, that the law may give her will be too mild by far. The character of the accused is appalling. It is bankrupt of morality. Not only that. Her conduct has blackened all social and moral values. The accused is public enemy number one. If such socially destructive tendencies are encouraged to flourish, this country and its culture will be totally destroyed. Therefore, I say the court must take a very stern inexorable view of the prisoner’s crime, without being trapped in any sentiment. The charge against the accused is one of infanticide. But the accused has committed a far more serious crime. I mean unmarried motherhood. Motherhood without marriage has always been greatly considered a very sin by our religion and our traditions. Moreover, if the accused’s intention of bringing up the offspring of this unlawful maternity is carried to completion, I have a dreadful fear that the existence of society will be in danger. There will
be no such things as moral values left. Milord, infanticide is a dreadful act. But bringing up the child of an illegal union is certainly more horrifying. If it is encouraged, there will be no such thing as the institution of marriage left. Immorality will flourish. Before our eyes, our beautiful dream of a society governed by tradition will crumble into dust. The accused has plotted to dynamite the very roots of tradition, our pride in ourselves, our culture and our religion. It is the sacred and imperative duty of your Lordship and every wise and thoughtful citizen amongst us to destroy that plot at once. No allowances must be made because the accused is a woman. Woman bears the grave responsibility of building up the high values of society. ‘Nastri swatantryamarhati ‘woman is not fit for independence’, That is the rule, laid down for us by tradition. Abiding by this rule, I make a powerful plea. ‘Na Miss Benare swantantraryamarhati’ ‘Miss Benare is not fit for independence’. With the urgent plea that the court should show no mercy to the accused, but give her the greatest and severest punishment for her terrible crime. I close the argument for the prosecution [Act Three: 71].

In this closing argument of Sukhtame, Benare’s crime is blown out of proportions. The counsel for the accused is required
to give a lengthy argument, as it is the last opportunity for the lawyer to state his arguments and thereby win the case. Depending on the length and also the conviction with which the lawyer has given his closing argument, the judge would give an appropriate sentence to the accused. Although Sukhatme is enacting the role of a lawyer in the play, the procedure that he follows is that of a real one. He talks about the sin of motherhood without marriage as being the greatest crime in the society. He closes his argument by pleading for a befitting punishment for Benare. Benare is depicted as a criminal, and his words have proven this point. Towards the end of the play, Kashikar, the judge gives the sentence of killing Benare’s unborn child. Hence one can see that the legal language that Sukhatme has used is important for the conviction of Benare, thereby violating the maxim of quantity.

Expressing one’s opinions, unnecessarily when, not needed, can lead to the violation of this maxim. Mr and Mrs Kashikar do that in order to emphatically express their opinions about the society in general. The questions which are asked in court proceedings are mostly close ended questions, which should be answered with a Yes or a No. Here to Sukhatme’s question, Mrs. Kashikar gives an unnecessary answer, so as to let everyone know what her opinions are.

Sukhatme : “You mean that Miss Benare didn’t want to-

Mrs.Kashikar : ‘What else? That’s what happens these days when you get everything without marrying.
They just want comfort. They couldn’t care less about responsibility! Let me tell you- in my time, even if a girl was snubnosed, sallow, hunchbacked, or anything and could still get married! It’s the sly new fashion of women earning that makes everything go wrong. That’s how promiscuity has spread throughout our society’ [Act Three: 54].

Here in the middle of the cross questioning, Mrs. Kashikar goes on telling the court about how girls who earn their money, become irresponsible and live immorally without marriage. These lines show her contempt for modern girls and she voices it in the witness box. In the court proceedings, the witnesses are not allowed to give their opinions, rather they should answer accordingly. But she digresses from what she is supposed to inform the court, which would help in the trial. Stating one’s opinions unnecessarily, can be termed as an assertive speech act. Mrs. Kashikar’s opinions fall into the category of assertive speech acts, as mentioned in the previous chapter.

All the examples discussed above show that the characters, in the plays under investigation, violate the maxim of quantity. They are more informative than they are required to be; but they differ in their intentions and purposes. Some of them are unnecessarily informative because they want to please the hearer; others are so because they want to be emphatic; still others are so because they want to express their opinions to the hearer. But the playwright does this intentionally so that he can keep up with the
flow of the play. Thus the motives for the violation of the maxim of quality differ from person to person and situation to situation.

3.3 Violation of the Quality maxim

Grice’s quality maxim deals with the principle of telling what you believe and thereby furnishing evidence for it. In certain circumstances, it is not possible to stick to the truth all the time. People tell lies on different occasions and for different purposes. A lie is mostly used for defensive purposes, in order to save one’s own skin. But a lie can also be used as a protective mechanism, an excuse, an exaggeration etc. There is one instance in *Nagamandala*, where Appanna and Kurudava, lie to each other for their own intentions.

Kurudava: “I heard you had brought a new bride. Thought I would talk to her. But she refuses to come out.

Appanna: She won’t talk to anyone. And no one need talk to her.

Kurudava: If you say so” [Act One: 14].

This is a very interesting piece of dialogue, where the conversationalists lie to each other. Appanna is a cruel husband who locks his beautiful wife in the house, and goes away to his concubine. Kurudava is aware of this fact, as she has already spoken to Rani. But she tells him that Rani does not want to come out. Here the old woman uses the lie as a protective measure. If Appanna comes to know that she has spoken for a long time with her, he would get angry. She lies, to make it appear that, she has just met his wife, whereas she has already
advised Rani. Appanna replies with a lie that there is no need of Kurudava to speak to Rani. His lie is an excuse, as he does not like anyone talking to his wife. So by lying that Rani does not talk to anyone, Appanna avoids Kurudava and warns her to keep her distance from Rani. The old woman promises to do so, but does not act accordingly. From the later part of the play, it can be seen that, Kurudava does not keep her word. Hence we see Kurudava and Appanna violating the quality maxim.

Rani also uses lies as a protective mechanism. In the end of the play, she lies to Appanna, so that she can save the life of Naga. She misleads Appanna, by telling him that the cobra has gone to the bathroom, whereas in reality, the snake is coiled up in her hair.

(Appanna comes in with a stick).

Rani: “It went that way – towards the bathroom”[ ActTwo: 45].

Here Rani saves the life of her lover, the Naga. The cobra comes to see her, and Appanna rushes to kill it, but Rani lies to him, so that Naga would get enough time to coil up in her hair. Thus in the end by doing this, she makes Naga as well as Appanna happy. Though Rani violates the quality maxim, she does this for a good purpose.

Alan Cruse in his book *Meaning in Language* (2000) gives certain circumstances regarding the violation of the maxims. There can be deliberate flouting of the maxims in circumstances in which a) it is obvious to the hearer that the maxims are being flouted b) it is obvious to the hearer that the
speaker intends to be aware that the maxims are being flouted, and c) there are no signs that the speaker is opting out of the cooperative principle. The hearer is thus given a signal that the utterances are not to be taken at face value, and that some sort of extra processing is called for. For instance, Naga violates the maxim of quality when he describes the beauty of Rani.

Naga: “Rani! My queen! The fragrance of my nights! The blossom of my dreams!...

(Moves to her swiftly. But stops)

No. I can’t. My love has stitched up my lips. Pulled out my fangs. Torn out my sac of poison…” [ActTwo: 42].

None of the utterances above is likely to be literally true, but equally, none of them, is likely to mislead the hearer. Naga comes into the bedroom of Rani and gazes at her beauty, while exclaiming these words. Naga does not literally mean that Rani is his queen, and that she is the fragrance or blossom of his dreams. Rani is a human being and he is a snake. Belonging to two species, how can one become the queen of the other? The reader is aware of the fact that Naga literally does not mean that Rani has become a snake and that Naga says this out of his passion and love for Rani. Hence the reader is not misled by the speaker, and there are no outward signs of the speaker violating the cooperative principle.

In Silence! The Court is in Session, we come across various instances where the characters lie in order to save themselves from embarrassment. As pointed out earlier in this
study, this play is about the mock trial of Benare. Even though it is just a mock trial, the proceedings are the same as in a real court. The witnesses are asked to swear on their respective religious texts, and they give false testimonies. In this case, Karnik tells the lawyer, that Rokde has seen Benare in compromising situations. But here Rokde denies it.

Sukhatme: Mr. Karnik- (with sudden fervour) Have you, in any circumstances, on any occasion, seen the accused in a compromising situation? Answer yes or no. Yes or no?

Karnik: Not me. But Rokde has.

Rokde: (confused) Me? I don’t know a thing! [Act Two: 36].

Rokde has been brought up on the charity of Mr and Mrs. Kashikar. As a result he has been in the shadow of the couple and is shown as a person with no opinions of his own, and as being dominated by others. As everyone knows, that Rokde is an orphan, adopted by the old couple; they do not see him as an adult. His denial is a result of this intimidation by others. He does not want to be involved in a serious matter like Benare’s life, and he denies the fact, even though he has seen Benare and Prof. Damle together. He is not courageous enough to say anything against Benare.

The other characters, Ponkshe and Karnik also violate the maxim of quality, in various instances. Throughout the play, they know that the mock trial is taking a serious turn. Even then they keep insisting that it is just a game.
Ponkshe: (to Karnik) I say, did he see?

Karnik: Who says he did? I was just joking, that’s all. You passed the buck to me, I passed it to him. The game has to go on, hasn’t it? Sukhatme’s, I mean— [Act Two: 37].

Ponkshe asks Karnik, as to whether the former statement of his, that Rokde has witnessed something is true. But Karnik replies in this manner, saying that he is just kidding and that he does not know anything about it. But from the following dialogues in the play, it is quite apparent that Karnik is lying. He knows that Rokde has witnessed Benare and Prof.Damle together. He does it intentionally as to add more spice to the trial. He knows that further questioning of Rokde would pressurize the latter to say about the incident. In this instance, one can come across an example of conversational implicature too. By emphasizing the last part of the dialogue, Karnik is trying to mislead Ponkshe. He says that it is Sukhatme’s game, and that it was not a real game. But later on, one can see that Karnik is fully conscious of the fact that it is a real game, and the implication can be seen in the line ‘The game has to go on, hasn’t it?’ By asserting it, with a question tag, Karnik is confirming that it is a real game. Hence Karnik violates the quality maxim by lying to Ponkshe. He does not divulge anything about the incident.

Later on, the same incident is repeated, but with both of them emphasizing it. Kashikar asks Sukhatme, whether all the
facts pertaining to the mock trial are true. Karnik and Ponkshe answer for Sukhatme.

Kashikar: “But Sukhatme, to what extent is all this within the jurisdiction of the case?

Karnik : This is just a rehearsal, in any case, just a rehearsal.

Ponkshe: This is just a game. A game, that’s all! Which of us are serious about the trial? Its fun, Sukhatme! Do go on…” [Act Two: 40].

Everyone knows that the mock trial is a real one. The excitement in flushing out the secrets of Benare in the process of the mock trial is enjoyed by everyone. They don’t want the game to stop, hence they are assuring Kashikar to continue with the court proceedings. They are violating the cooperative principle intentionally. Lies are used as a defensive, protective, face saving act, etc but in this play, lies are used as a face threatening act. If Karnik and Ponkshe had not encouraged Kashikar, Benare would not have been humiliated. Kashikar would have stopped the trial immediately, if it had crossed the limits of the mock trial. But the opposite happens, because of their denial.

Apart from the denial, that he does not know anything about Benare’s relationship, Rokde fabricates the information that he had slapped Benare, when she had persuaded him to marry her.

Sukhatme: “So Rokde, the accused threatened to harm you somehow. What next? What happened then?”
Rokde: (Unconsciously raising one hand to his cheek). I —
slapped her! [Act Three: 57].

The statement that Rokde tells the court is incorrect. In the following dialogues that follow, we can see that no one can believe that Rokde has slapped Benare. Rokde is aware that all the others in the room consider him as being cowardly. When he is asked to give his testimony, he is shown as being afraid. But when he sees that Benare is being silent, he becomes courageous enough to utter the lie. He knows that this is the only opportunity, where he can prove to others that he is aggressive, by telling the lie. But later on, Karnik testifies against Benare, and in the process, says that he has witnessed Benare slapping Rokde and not the other way round. Rokde’s lie is then contradicted by Karnik’s testimony. Hence we see Rokde violating the quality maxim.

As said earlier, deliberate flouting of the maxims, in which it is obvious to the hearer that the speaker has not violated the cooperative principle, can be seen in the violation of the quality maxim. For instance, when Rokde is asked to narrate the incident that he witnessed in Prof. Damle’s house, he describes it in one sentence.

Sukhatme: Mr. Rokde, what did you see in certain circumstances, on a certain occasion? Answer me please!

Rokde: (with difficulty) I saw — hell! [Act Two: 39].

It is quite apparent from this utterance that Rokde uses the word ‘hell’ literally. He does not witness the roaring fire and
the misery as one is supposed to experience in hell. All the other characters assume that he has seen something that is equivalent to the experience of being in hell. Rokde has violated the cooperative principle, on the surface level. But where pragmatics is concerned, he has not violated it, because, the hearer is totally aware that it is a metaphor that he has used in this context in conveying his feelings to others.

The different instances examined, reveal a variety of aspects of the phenomenon of lying. We realize that everyone is prone to lies, including the old and the young. There are several reasons why people tell lies in order to deceive others, protect others, and conceal the truth, to save the face of somebody, to get things done for their own purposes, to exaggerate and to make the hearer happy. The intention for lying may be benevolent or malevolent or neutral but nevertheless a means of conveying one’s thoughts to others.

3.4 Violation of the Relation Maxim

After having assessed and critically evaluated the violation of the maxims of quantity and quality, let us now consider a few examples of violation of the maxim of relation. The maxim demands the interlocutors to make their contribution relevant. In any kind of communication, it is important that the participants in a conversation should be clear and relevant in their expression of their thoughts. And in the case of human interaction, this is not always the case. One cannot adhere to the Gricean quantity maxim all the time. There are various factors that come in the
way of upholding the maxim of relation. The situations and the context help the interlocutors to connect their apparently disjointed utterances into a coherent discourse. But sometimes, when contexts and situations do not help, then the conversation between them become chaotic. Had we been robots, we would have produced conversations which strictly observe the maxims of cooperative verbal interactions. The examples that we are going to discuss will show us that characters in the plays violate the maxim of relation. Let us look at this example in *Nagamandala*:

Kappana: "... Now you have insomnia- and I have a backache.

Kurudava: Who’s asked you to carry me around like this? I haven’t, have I? I was born and brought up here. I can find my way around.

Kappanna: Do you know what I ask for when I pray to Lord Hanuman of the Gymnasium every morning? For more strength. Not to wrestle. Not to fight. Only to carry you around.

Kurudava: (pleased) I know, I know.” [Act One: 8].

In the above sequence of dialogue, one can see that the mother is scolding the son, by telling him that inspite of her blindness she does not need any help in moving around the place as she had been born and brought up there. Kappanna’s reply is totally irrelevant. He tells her about his prayers every morning to
Lord Hanuman, regarding his strength. At first glance, his reply does not make sense, but then towards the end, we see the son’s love for his mother. He makes a reference to the prayers, so that he could inform her about his concern and love towards her. Kurudava’s reply tells us that she is aware of the fact, and she is immensely pleased about it.

In another instance of the play, we see the understanding between the lovers, Naga and Rani. The situation in which their conversation takes place is highly tense. Rani is rambling about her condition and the ways to rectify it.

Rani: “... What shall I do? Shall I have an abortion?

(Naga stares blankly).

I may find a sharp instrument in the kitchen- a ladle, a knife or I can ask for Kurudava’s help. No, its too late. It is five months old. Too big to be kept a secret. Forgive me. I know its my fault but the secret will be out whatever I do.

Naga: Its almost morning. I must go.

Rani: (Waking up) What?

Naga: I have to go.

Rani: (Gently) Go.” [Act Two: 32].

Naga responds to Rani’s question in a different way. Instead of giving her an appropriate answer regarding her abortion, he simply says that he needs to go as it has become
morning. And Rani understands that he cannot stay for longer, once it becomes morning, and allows him to go. The reply that Naga gives her is not relevant. In fact he digresses from the subject. Even then communication takes place between the two. There is no need of an explanation between these two people. Rani knows that Naga is helpless as she is, because he had told her earlier that his transformation during the day and night cannot be explained.

Towards the end of the play, the Man and The Flames discuss about the possible endings of the play. In the dialogue, we can see that there is no connection between what they say.

Flames: “Is it really over?... Oh! What a lovely tale! Etc...”

Man : (Looks out) No sign of light yet!

Flame 3: Pity it has to end like that.

Flame 4: Why can’t things end happily for a change?

Man : But death! It’s the only inescapable truth, you know.

Flame 5: Don’t be so pompous!

Flame 1: (Sharply) Then why are you running away from it?

[Act Two: 44].

It is clear from the first exclamation that they are talking about the story of Rani. But later on the topic changes to the discussion of the possibilities of different endings to the story. The man talks about death being an inescapable truth. And the
other flames naturally assume that he is talking about the death of Naga as well as his own impending death. There is no break in the flow of the conversation, even though the sentences seem to be disconnected. The characters are aware of what their co-interlocutors are trying to say. It seems to the readers that there has been a violation of the maxim of relation, but the flames and the man are totally unaware of it.

In Tendulkar’s play, characters are not completely free from the violation of the maxim of relation. They equally violate the maxim, but the meanings of the sentences are understood by their counterparts and the readers. The intentions behind their violation of the maxims become clear in the course of the play. The central character Benare, also is prone to the violation of the maxims. In the beginning of the play, Benare is seen chatting with Samant, whom she knows only for a few moments. In her effort to strike up a conversation with him, she makes use of different strategies.

Benare: “... And I felt more wonderful coming here with you. I’m so glad the others fell behind! We rushed ahead, didn’t we?

Samant: Yes, indeed, I mean to say, I’m not in the habit of walking so fast. You do set a very lively pace, very lively.

Benare: Not always! But today, how I walked! Let’s leave everyone behind! I thought, and go somewhere far, far, away- with you!
Samant: (in confusion) with me?

Benare: I like you very much.

Samant : (terribly shy and embarrassed) Tut-Tut ha ha! Im hardly...

Benare: You are very nice indeed! And shall I tell you something? You are a very pure and good person. I like you.

Samant: [incredulously] me? [Act One: 2].

It is very obvious that Samant is totally confused about Benare’s behaviour. They have just met, and Benare is already telling him that she likes him. There is no sense in what Benare is trying to say to Samant. Initially, Benare’s compliment is taken at face value, but later on, one can see that her compliments carry an intended meaning. She desperately needs a father for her unborn child, and she is even ready to marry a stranger. She violates the maxim of relation by expressing her fondness for Samant. In the midst of the conversation, about the hall and its conveniences, Benare suddenly turns around the conversation. Eventhough, it appears to be senseless, it becomes relevant in the course of the play.

Sometimes it is difficult to draw a line of demarcation between the violation of the maxim of relation and that of quantity. When one gives information that is not elicited, one flouts not only the maxim of informativeness but also that of relevance. This is what seems to happen in Silence! The Court is
in Session, when Benare goes on giving details that are not relevant to the conversation between herself and Samant.

Benare: “... Kashikar can’t take a step without a Prime Objective! Besides him, there’s Mrs Hand-that Rocks-the-Cradle. I mean Mrs Kashikar- What an excellent housewife the poor woman is! A real Hand-that-Rocks-the cradle type! Mr Prime Objective is tied up with uplifting the masses. And poor Hand-that-Rocks-the Cradle has no cradle to rock!... Mr Kashikar and The Hand-that-Rocks—the-Cradle, in order that nothing should happen to them in their bare, bare, house—and that they shouldn’t die of boredom! – gave shelter to a young boy. They educated him. Made a slave out of him. His name is Balu Rokde! Who else... Well, we have an expert on Law. He is such an authority on the subject, even a desperate client won’t go anywhere near him! He just sits alone in the barrister’s room at court, swatting flies with legal precedents! And in his tenement, he sits alone killing house flies! ... And there is Hmm! With us [puts an imaginary pipe in her mouth] Hmm! Scientist! Inter failed! ... And we have an Intellectual too. That means someone who prides himself on his book learning. But when there’s a real – life problem, away he runs! Hides his head...” [Act One: 8].

Samant enquires about the play that they are going to perform and Benare gives a detailed description of all her group
members. He enquires about the details of the play that they would be performing that night, but Benare talks about Mr and Mrs Kashikar, Sukhatme, Ponkshe, Rokde, Karnik and Damle. Samant has not asked for the information, and Benare’s answer is totally lengthy and unnecessary. Benare has violated the maxim of quantity where their conversation is concerned. But Tendulkar, the author of this play, has made Benare violate the maxim of quantity and relevance. By making her digress, from the real topic, the dramatist has given an introduction to these characters in the play. Thereby, playing his own game of creativity here. Hence, even though this information appears to be out of context, it is appropriate in its own place.

In a courtroom situation, very often irrelevant material is cited in support of the case and thereby the maxim of relevance is violated. Sometimes cases are diverted by putting irrelevant statements and questions in court as the last chapter in the Indian Evidence Act comprising of sections 135-166 permits various kinds of examinations, and one of them is the cross-examination [as quoted in Gokhale:2006:155]. Some of the questions asked during the cross-examination may seem illogical to a common man, but at a deeper level they are certainly relevant. Sukhatme, who enacts the role of the lawyer in the mock trial, asks irrelevant questions to the witnesses.

Sukhatme: “Let that pass. If you had to give a definition of a mother, how would you do it?

Karnik: (after he has thought about it over) a mother is one who
gives birth.

Sukhatme: Mr. Karnik, who is the mother—the woman who protects the infant she has borne—or the one who cruelly strangles it to death? Which definition do you prefer?

Karnik: Both are mothers. Because both have given birth.

Sukhatme: What would you call motherhood?

Karnik: Giving birth to a child.

Sukhatme: But even a bitch gives birth to pups! [Act Two: 36]

The mock trial is about the conviction of Benare for infanticide. In the process of cross questioning Karnik, Sukhatme asks questions which are not relevant to the case. Witnesses are called to give a narration of the incidents as they have witnessed, in or not in favour of the accused. But here, Sukhatme, takes a totally different method of questioning. He asks the opinion of Karnik regarding the definition of motherhood. The sequence of dialogues are not in connection to the case. They talk about dogs giving birth, and that they are mothers too. But, unlike the humans, who are endowed with emotions, which make infanticide a punishable offence. In emphasizing the grave nature of the crime, this seemingly irrelevant legal language in fact helps Sukhatme to prove his point. Hence he digresses from the usual round of cross questioning, and takes the roundabout way. This violation of relation is necessary in the proceedings of the case, so that the accused is given an appropriate sentence.
3.5 Violation of the Manner maxim.

The maxim of manner demands that conversational partners observe the principles of economy, clarity and processibility. A communication partner’s message should be brief, economical, clear, unambiguous and processible. Use of ambiguous, and vague language, makes the message more difficult to understand. There is no denying the fact that, verbal clues and non-linguistic contexts assist the hearer in decoding prolix messages. One observes that violation of the maxim of manner is a resource on which dramatic performance depends. This is the reason why some of the characters are remembered for their witticisms, conceits and word plays. The characters in the plays under study exploit the resources of euphemisms, indirect speech acts and lying and do not seem like flouting the maxim.

In an instance from Nagamandala, Kurudava makes use of indirect speech acts, while conversing with Rani.

Kurudava: “… Take it! Grind it into a nice paste and feed it to your husband and watch the results. Once he smells won’t go sniffing after that bitch. He will make you a wife instantly[Act One:13].

In the above sentences, one can see that Kurudava gives instructions to Rani, regarding the magical root, that would act like an aphrodisiac, in their marriage. But she refrains from referring directly to the sexual union between a husband and wife. The Indian society, being conservative, is uncomfortable in using words that refer to sexual acts. Kurudava, belongs to the
rural India, where overt mentioning of the sexual acts is taboo. Hence she uses metaphors to bring out her meaning. The reference to the dogs is a very popular Indian expression. The mating behavior of the dogs is likened to the mating behavior of humans, as human beings belong to the superior race of the animals. Though Kurudava violates the maxim of manner, the hinted meaning of her utterance is understood by the hearers who are familiar with the Indian phrases and expressions. But these phrases are meaningless to non-native speakers of the Indian languages.

Later on in the play, Naga also behaves in a strange manner, when he is questioned by Rani, regarding his mysterious behavior towards her. He avoids the questions, and camouflages his answers by being vague and apologetic.

Rani: “Why do you tease me like this? I am sick of being alone. And then tonight, I was terrified you might not come- that what I remembered from last night may be just a dream. I was desperate that you should come again tonight. But, what am I to say if you spin riddles like this?

Naga: (seriously) I am afraid that is how it is going to be” [Act Two: 25].

Rani thinks that her husband Appanna is playing games with her, by showing her two different faces, one in the day, and the other in the night. What she does not know is that, the Appanna that comes in the night is actually Naga, who assumes the form of her husband; hence she is baffled by this
change. On the other hand, Naga does not want to reveal that he is not Appanna, in the fear that Rani would stay away from him. So he talks vaguely to Rani. The character Naga, violates the maxim of Manner, but he does not have any other choice. This breaks the flow of communication between the both of them. But it does not seem to be a violation of the manner maxim to the readers as Karnad has revealed the metamorphoses of Naga in the initial scenes of the play.

In Silence! The court is in Session, the characters also violate the maxim of manner, in various circumstances. Ponkshe violates this maxim. When Sukhatme questions Ponkshe, about the character of the accused, he tells about it in an ambiguous manner.

Sukhatme: Mr. Ponkshe, how would you describe your view of the moral conduct of the accused? On the whole like that of a normal unmarried woman? You at least should take this trial seriously?

Benare: But how should he know what the moral conduct of a normal unmarried woman is like?

Ponkshe: [paying no attention to her] It is different.

Sukhatme: For example?

Ponkshe: The accused is a bit too much.

Sukhatme: A bit too much-what does that mean?

Ponkshe: It means- it means that, on the whole she runs after
men too much” [Act Two:33].

In the above sequence, one can see that initially, Ponkshe does not directly talk about Benare’s licentiousness. He just answers, that ‘the accused is a bit too much’ thereby indirectly referring to it. Only after Sukhatme’s persistence, that normally happens in the court, does Ponkshe says that Benare runs after men too much. Thereby one can see that in the Indian society, people find it difficult to express their opinions and make use of substitute words, like in the case of Ponkshe.

The same strategy is used by Mrs. Kashikar, in the final part of the play. She is also called by the court to give her testimony, in the mock trial of Benare.

Sukhatme: “You said that this is what happens if you get everything without marrying.

Mrs. Kashikar: Yes, I did.

Sukhatme: What do you mean by ‘everything’? Give me an instance.

Mrs. Kashikar: Well, really! (She looks embarrassed).

Kashikar: (Picking his ear) Come on, don’t pretend to be shy, at your age Just answer his question. You’ve grown old, but you haven’t grown any wiser!

Mrs. Kashikar: My age has nothing to do with it!

Kashikar: Answer him!
Mrs. Kashikar: ‘Everything’ means – everything in this life!

[ActThree: 54].

In the former example, Ponkshe answers Sukhatme’s question, directly after a lot of persuasion. But in the case of Mrs. Kashikar, one can see that she does not give in to the cross questioning. By the term ‘everything’, Mrs Kashikar, means, premarital sex. Women are generally indirect in their discourse, and when it comes to talking about issues about sex, they tend to be more evasive about it. And that is what happens in this utterance of Mrs. Kashikar. Eventhough she has become old, and married for a long time, she is reluctant to use the word ‘sex’. Inspite of the admonition from her husband Kashikar, she does not utter the word. In this way, one can see that Mrs. Kashikar violates the manner maxim, but the utterance meaning is comprehensible to the other conversationalists.

The protagonist Benare also appears to be talking uncomprehendingly, to herself. She wants to express her emotions to the others, but her feelings choke her and she speaks in an incoherent manner.

Benare: “... Don’t be ungrateful. It was your body that once burnt and gave you a moment so beautiful, so blissful, so near to heaven! Have you forgotten? It took you high, high, high above yourself into a place like paradise. Will you deny it? [Act Three: 75].

Benare’s word does not make sense in the literal way. She is filled with so much anguish and sorrow that she cannot express it directly. She makes use of metaphoric language to portray her
feelings. In the above sentences, Benare speaks about the ecstasy that she experiences during sex. The flowery language that she uses to refer to the act shows that she considers sex as sacred. When Ponkshe and Mrs. Kashikar, by their respective utterances, show discomfort, Benare talks about it effortlessly, but in a different manner. Tendulkar, the author of *Silence! The Court is in Session*, brings in this violation of the maxim effectively. By making Benare speak in this manner; he brings out the reality in the world. Many would shy away from describing sexual acts, as being blissful and fulfilling. They consider it as an shameful act. But Tendulkar, who exposes the world as it is, is not afraid to give his opinions through the medium of his plays.

3.6 Conclusion

The analysis of the violation of the four maxims by different characters in the novels brings to the forefront certain behavioural patterns of Indian society in general. The examples of lying that we discussed under the violation of the quality maxim, reveal their various intentions. The characters tell lies to please others, avoid other’s presence, to protect someone else etc.

The analysis of the violation of the other three maxims, by the characters in the plays, is probably a result of Indians’ roundabout way of talking, and this study deals with it in detail. Hence the cultural context of the society and their mindsets are emphasized. This chapter also looks into the minds of the playwrights and how they have also violated the maxims, to reveal their intentions through the characters, acting as their mouthpieces.