CHAPTER FIVE

Style of Writing in Girish Karnad's Nagamandala and Vijay Tendulkar's Silence! The Court is in Session

5.0 Preliminaries

The preceding chapter focused on the manner with which the conversations were conducted in the above mentioned plays. Some of the characters used various kinds of politeness strategies to interact harmoniously with others, while some of them used aggravating language to impose their dominance over others. The politeness strategies can also be seen in the style of writing of both the playwrights. When Girish Karnad made the readers comfortable in their surroundings, Vijay Tendulkar made them squirm in their seats, with how they dealt with their respective themes. Politeness in language was one of them, but there are many other factors that reveal much more to the style of writings of the two playwrights. Where the literary analysis is concerned, the breaking down of the various themes and the structure of their writings can be done with the analysis of the texts, the background of the playwrights, the literary influence of the earlier playwrights on our dramatists etc. As the study deals specifically with the pragmatic analysis of the two plays, as the earlier chapters have emphasized, the style of writing of these dramatists is further dissected using other tools of pragmatics.

The term 'other tools of pragmatics would include turn taking, and conversational implicatures. And as the present study
is the analysis of dramatic discourse, these pragmatic principles are important to the understanding of the plays through the reader’s point of view as well as the perspective of the playwrights. This chapter is divided into two parts. The first part would deal with the principle of turn taking, in the conversations of the characters, the second part focuses on the conversational implicatures that leads to the writing styles of the two playwrights.

5.1 Turn-Taking

Turn-taking is a unique feature of ordinary, everyday conversations. The kind of talk differs according to the contexts of interaction. However, the structure of the talk, the basic pattern of ‘I speak- you speak- I speak- you speak’, will derive from that fundamental kind of interaction used most often. George Yule (1996) has spoken about one of the widely-used analytic approaches used as an analogy for conversation structures, and that is the analogy with the workings of a market economy. In this market, there is a scarce commodity called floor which can be defined as the right to speak. Having control of this scarce commodity at any time is called a turn. In any situation where control is not fixed in advance, anyone can attempt to get control. This is called turn-taking. Because it is a form of social action, turn taking operates in accordance with the local management system that is conventionally known by members of a social group. The local management system is essentially a set of conventions for getting turns, keeping them, or giving them away. This system is needed most at those points where there is a
possible change in who has the turn. Any possible change of turn point is called a Transition Relevance Place, or TRP. This type of analytic metaphor provides us with a basic perspective in which speakers having a conversation are viewed as taking turns at holding the floor.

As stated in the preceding chapters dramatic discourse is similar to the natural conversation. Hence the same can be applied to the characteristics of turn-taking too. But there are certain differences between the two, and the feature of turn-taking brings out the disparity between them. The major differences are stated in the following two paragraphs.

5.1.1 Turn-Taking in Natural Conversation

1) Natural conversation is spontaneous and every participant is involved in it. Since contents of turns are spontaneous, the numbers of participants vary and probably they are occasionally added in and deleted from natural conversational activities. Although turns are not specified in advance interlocutors have ample options in taking turns.

2) Turns are generally syntactically incomplete and structurally fragmentary in natural conversation. The average length of turns is shorter and their order as well as their size is not fixed in it. Simultaneous turn, as well as overlapping, pauses, backchannels are typical of natural conversation.

3) Nonverbal behavior is inevitable in natural conversation. Conversationalists make use of gestures, facial expressions,
silences etc to convey their message across. According to Poyatos (1990) natural conversation is fully unhindered conversation, which is produced by all speakers exploiting verbal and non-verbal behavior.

5.1.2 Turn-Taking in Dramatic Conversation.

1) In dramatic conversation, turns are self-sufficient and syntactically complete components with a coherent turn order and proceed in an orderly and systematic way. Since the conversation principle used in the dramatic conversation is one-dramatic-person-one-time there is little interruption in taking turns.

2) One of the significant features of the structure of dramatic conversations is that turns are exchanged between characters; audience or reader observes or reads respectively and participates by smiling, applauding, becoming serious and even shedding tears.

Diagrammatically, we may represent the above mentioned phenomenon of taking turns among dramatist (D), characters (C) and audience (A) or Reader (R) as shown:
3) Another typical feature of taking turns in dramatic conversation is that the dramatis personae do not have options for selecting turns. The average length of turn is generally longer. A longer turn can be as long as one page or more. Turn size, order, length and content are decided by the dramatist. Major characters are provided more talking space, maximum turns, and his/her turns are normally not interrupted. Since turns in dramatic conversation are prespecified, prescribed and purposeful, there are not very many errors, gaps, overlaps, encroachments and interruptions. If they are there, they are charged with some definite implicature in the dramatic context. Though the dramatist tries to make the conversation like the natural conversation, problems of turn allocation, turn transfer, turn distribution, turn management and so on have already been solved by the dramatist because they are allotted by him/her. There is no genuine competition for floor securing (as in natural conversation). Characters wait till the end of the turn completion. Due to limited competition in floor acquisition turns are longer in drama.

4) In dramatic conversation there is a common kind of gesticulation. Lapses, gaps and silences have implicit meaning. Gaps are left deliberately for eliciting audience responses. Interruptions and encroachments are kept at the minimum in dramatic conversation as compared to natural conversation.

5) Turns are made up of linguistic units such as words, phrases, clauses and utterances and non-linguistic units like gaze, facial expressions and body movements. All these elements which go into making of a turn, are called turn construction units.
Gestures, stage directions, facial expressions, other non-linguistic units in dramatic discourses, are also a part of the plays. They become an important part in pushing the play forward.

6) In addition to all this, the phenomenon of turn-taking is exploited by characters in soliloquy, monologue and choral talk.

Hence one can see that there are certain differences between the discourses. Generally plays or dramas belong to the second category. They have all the characteristics that have been mentioned. This is where the significance of this analysis steps in, which brings out the differences in the writing styles of the two playwrights. Being conversation based, turn-taking is inevitable in both the plays. But they are treated differently in their own respective ways. The first half of the chapter brings out the differences in both the plays, where turn-taking is concerned.

5.2 Turn-Taking in Nagamandala

This play consists of two acts. The characters in the play are few, and the dialogic interactions between them fit the bill of dramatic discourse. The turns are essentially complete components, and the turn allocation techniques are obviously used. The common method of a current speaker selecting a next speaker (as when he addresses a question to another party); or parties may self-select in starting to talk can be seen in the following analysis of the play.

5.2.1 Conversation One

Kappanna: The house is empty.
Kurudava: Of course it is, silly! How can anyone be inside when there is a lock outside the door? Tell me, can you see clothes drying inside? What kind of clothes? Any saris? Any skirts? Or is it only men’s clothes?

Kappanna: I can’t see a thing!

Rani: Who is it? What is that outside?

Kappanna: Oh my God!

( lifts Kurudava and starts running).

Kurudava: Stop! Stop, I tell you! Why are you running as though you’ve seen a ghost?

Kappanna: There is someone inside the house- a woman!

Kurudava: You don’t have to tell me that! So what if there is a woman inside the house? We have come here precisely because a woman is supposed to be in the house.

Kappanna: Mother what does it mean when a man locks his wife in?

Kurudava: You tell me.

Kappanna: It means he does not want anyone to talk to his wife.

Rani: (Comes to the window). Who is it?

Kappanna: Let’s go.

( starts running again. Kurudava hits him on the back).
Kurudava: Stop! Stop! (to Rani) I am coming, child! Right now!
Don’t go away! (to Kappanna) He keeps his wife locked up like a caged bird? I must talk to her. Let me down- instantly! (he lets her down) You go home if you like.

Kappanna: I’ll wait for you under the tree. Come back soon.
Don’t just sit there gossiping [Act One:10].

The above illustration is the conversation between the mother and the son in the play, Nagamandala. Kappanna is seen carrying the blind Kurudava to Appanna’s house so that she could meet the latter’s wife. One can see the ‘current speaker selects next’ technique, in the above lines. When Kappanna says that the house is empty, Kurudava scolds him by instructing him to peep inside and find out more about the occupant of the house. The primary exchange pattern of turn-taking in drama, ‘I – You, You- I’ is being employed here. Kappanna selects the next speaker, and his mother takes up the hint to reply and the conversation continues systematically in this manner. They argue about it and Kappanna tells her that Appanna does not want anyone meeting his wife. Rani interrupts both of them by asking a question as she hears voices outside her room. The minimal use of interruptions between the dialogue of two participants is employed here. Hence only one-dramatic –person speaks to the audience. Even the action of Kappanna running away carrying his mother is presented in the form of stage directions which becomes the information that is being provided by the playwright. The stage directions do not hinder the flow of the
conversation, and the characters ‘self-select’ their turns when it is required.

5.2.2 Conversation Two

Naga: Why should I not take a look? I have given her everything. Her husband, her child. Her home. Even her maid. She must be happy. But I haven’t seen her ... it is night. She will be asleep. This is the right time visit her the familiar road. At the familiar hour (laughs) hard to believe now I was so besotted with her. (Goes into Rani’s bedroom. Rani is sleeping next to her husband, her head on his shoulders, her long loose tresses hanging down from the edge of the cot. Her child is by her side. There is a quiet smile of contentment on her face. Naga looks at the group and recoils in sudden anguish. Covers his face as though he cannot bear to see the scene).

Naga: Rani! My queen! The fragrance of my nights! The blossom of my dreams! In another man’s arms? In another man’s bed? Does she curl around him. As passionately every night now? And dig her nails into his back? Bite his lips? And here I am - a sloughed-off skin on the tip of the thorn. An empty sac of snake skin. No. I can’t bear this. Someone must die. Someone has to die. Why shouldn’t I kill her? If I bury my teet into her breast now, she will be mine- mine forever (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. Withdraw your veils of light, flames. Let my shame float away in the darkness. Don’t mock, gecko. Yes, that is it. A grass snake. A common reptile. That’s what I am, and I had forgotten that. I thought I could be human. Turn into my own creation. No! Her thighs, her bosom, her lips are for one who is forever man. I shed my own skin every season. How could I even hope to retain the human form? For me- yes, only her long locks. Dark jet-black snake princesses.” [Act Two:42].

The dramatist exploits the mechanism of turn-taking in the above lines. This feature which is typical of dramatic discourse is seen in the monologue of Naga, the lover of Rani. He has come to see Rani, when she is asleep in her husband’s arms. He watches her from a distance, and speaks of his agony of not being able to be with her. He speaks about the beauty of Rani, the times that they had spent together and his incapability of achieving her again, and also the ultimate reality, that he is just a snake, and nothing else. The thought processes are being manifested in the form of a monologue. In a play, when a character utters a monologue that expresses his private thoughts, it is called soliloquy. In the midst of the conversation between the Flames, the Story and the Man, the scene shifts to Naga’s visit, and his soliloquy is being highlighted in the last act of the play. This takes place in dramatic discourse, and the playwright makes use of this technique to emphasize on the characters.
5.2.3 Conversation Three

Naga: What is it?

Rani: Thank God.

Naga: Why?

Rani: All these days I was never sure I didn’t just dream up these nightly visits of yours. You don’t know how I have suffered. When I saw your scowling face in the mornings, I would be certain everything was a fantasy and almost want to cry. But my real anxiety began as the evening approached. I would merely lie here, my eyes tight shut. What is there to see after all? The same walls. The same roof. As the afternoon passed my whole being focused in my ears. The bells of cattle returning home- that means late afternoon. The cacophony of birds in a far-away tree- it is sunset. The chorus of crickets spreading from one grove to another- it is night. Now he will come. Suppose he doesn’t tonight? Suppose it’s all a dream? Every night the same anxiety. The same cold feeling deep within me. Thank God. That’s all past now [Act Two:31].

Another feature of the dramatic discourse where the significance of turn-taking comes is the length of the turns being allotted to each character. As pointed out earlier, the major characters are being given more importance than other minor ones. Rani is given a major part of the conversation, with other
characters who converses with her, whether it is Kurudava, Appanna or Naga. In the example given above, Rani tells her feelings to Naga. She talks about her doubts, fears and anxieties, as to whether Naga’s visits were apparitions or not. She is not interrupted by Naga who listens patiently to her. She secures and holds the floor for a longer period of time than Naga. The dramatist does this to define the character of Rani. Though the play is titled as Nagamandala, which means snake dance that might lead us to think that the play is about Naga. But it is Rani who takes the limelight of the play, and this achieved by the importance given to her in her share of dialogues.

5.2.4 Conversation Four

Naga: What is it? What is it, Rani?

(He gently shuts the mirror – box and pushes it away. Rani turns and looks at where he had been sitting).

Rani: When I looked into the mirror, I saw there- where you were sitting- instead of you, I saw a-

(Mimes a cobra hood with her fingers)sitting there.

Naga: What? A cobra?

Rani: (silencing him) Shh! Don’t mention it. They say that if you mention it by name at night, it comes to the house …

Rani : Oh no! What am I to do with myself? In all this, I forgot to put the ointment on your wounds.
( She tries to get up. He forces her down. She gently touches his wounds. Shivers). Your blood is so cold. It’s the way you wander about day and night heedless of wind and rain-

( Stares into his eyes. Suddenly shuts her eyes and clasps him).

Naga: What is it now?

Rani: (Looking up). Since I looked into the mirror I seem to be incapable of thinking of anything else. Father says; if a bird so much as looks at a cobra-Naga: There! Now you said ‘cobra’. Now he is bound to come-

( He mimes a cobra’s hood with his hand). [Act Two: 23-24].

The body movements are a part of the turn-taking process. The stage directions that are given by the playwrights are one of the main sources of this kind of information. When the play is staged, the stage directions are not written down, as in the dramatic script, but the instructions are being followed by the actors, and it becomes a part of the action. For instance, the conversations between Naga and Rani, consist mainly of stage directions. The transformation of Naga into Appanna, is relayed to the audience through the means of stage directions.

In the entire illustration, the turn-taking takes place by juggling both the linguistic as well as the non-linguistic elements. But as pointed out earlier, stage directions do play an
important role in play-acting. The passage above is just one instance of stage directions taking up the role of the ‘next speaker’ technique. When Rani tries to get up, Naga pulls her down, and the stage directions show that she shivers at the contact with Naga, and tells him that his blood is cold. The playwright then writes about how she looks at him for an instant and covers her eyes. That gesture, signals Naga to take his turn in asking the reason for her sudden reaction. When she says that she cannot stop thinking about the cobra, he mimes a cobra’s hood with his hand. These non-linguistic elements are equally significant in the understanding of the play as well as in interpreting the motives of the playwright. Speaking about stage directions, Girish Karnad, does not make much use of information. Though drama cannot sustain without stage directions, one can see that the playwright make use of less information, and leaves it to the readers to make their own assumptions, and stage it accordingly to their innovative ideas.

The above illustrations taken from Karnad’s play, fit the characteristics that are attributed to dramatic discourse. The author speaks to the audience, through the portrayal of his characters and their conversations. As this study focuses on the written script of the plays, the reaction of the audience like applauding, and booing cannot be incorporated. And the reactions that are received from the readers range from person to person which can also not be precisely described. Even then the reactions of the readers, can be predicted from the conversations between the characters. Even the interruptions, that are made by
the Story in the last two acts, signifies the unbroken flow of storytelling, as the Story narrates Rani's story to the other characters. Hence it is seen that *Nagamandala* is a perfect example for dramatic discourse.

Many of the features which characterize the turn-taking system of conversation are invested with meaning by their users. It can be called the conversational style. The conversational style that has been employed by Kamad in *Nagamandala*, in regard with turn-taking, in which the speakers use a slower rate, expect longer pauses between turns, do not overlap, and avoid interruption or completion of the other's turn. This non-interrupting, non-imposing style is called a high-considerateness style, where there is considerateness for the other party. The characters make use of this style in the play, thereby giving a complete, coherent infrastructure to the play.

5.3 Turn-Taking in *Silence! The Court is in Session*

In this play, the characters follow a chaotic order of turn-taking in their verbal interactions. The turn-taking features that Tendulkar employs in this play resemble natural discourse. This is where the difference of writing between the playwrights comes in. Tendulkar makes an exception in not following the usual type of dramatic discourse, and thereby opting for a more natural conversation between his characters. The play consists of three acts, and the characters are the protagonist Benare, Mrs and Mr. Kashikar, Sukhatme, Ponkshe, Karnik, Rokde and Samant. The characters comprise of various people, and the conversations that
take place between them are more or less simultaneous. This type of natural conversation is evident in this play.

5.3.1 Conversation One

Rokde: (suddenly remembering, comes and stops Mrs.Kashikar)

Madam, Professor Damle hasn’t arrived yet!

(Benare who had been talking to Mrs.Kashikar, suddenly falls silent and motionless. Then she goes by mistake to Ponkshe, and stands talking to him in an artificial air. He is silent).

Mrs. Kashikar: Well he’ll come late as usual. He told me on the phone that he wouldn’t be able to catch our train. He was doing a symposium -or something- in the university. I’ve told him about this twice. Benare, did you meet him?

Benare: (who was speaking to Ponkshe) Whom?

Mrs. Kashikar: Professor Damle.

Benare: No, I didn’t.

Rokde: (after consulting Samant, to Mrs. Kashikar) But madam, Samant here says that the next train doesn’t reach here till nine p.m. How will that do? It’ll be too late!

Ponkshe: (in the gap of the conversation) what happened afterwards to that friend of yours, Miss Benare? That girl- the one in trouble whom you found me to marry...
(Benare confused. In her confusion she goes to Samant).

Mrs. Kashikar: There was a train in between, wasn’t there? (to Kashikar) dear, Balu here says there’s no train in between-

Mr. Kashikar: (interrupting his argument with Karnik) In between what?

Rokde: (to him) Samant says that there is no train now before the show!

Sukhatme: There’s one afterwards, isn’t there? That’s good enough!

Mr. Kashikar: But my dear Sukhatme, how will Professor Damle get here? He’ll arrive late. If he comes at all! There is no train in between.

Karnik: Then he won’t come at all. I’m telling you. Professor Damle is quite calculating that way. When you talk of being late, he just cancels the programme, and sits comfortably at home. [Act One: 15-16].

The characters talk about their co-actor Prof. Damle. The conversation begins with Mrs. Kashikar and Rokde. When Rokde informs her about Prof. Damle’s absence, she replies to the whole group, that he had missed the train and he would be coming later and she selects Benare as the next speaker, and then Rokde comes in with his output that there are no trains after 10 p.m. Ponkshe then interferes, and asks Benare about the story of her
friend, but she does not reply and moves away. Mrs. Kashikar then self-selects her turn to speak about the trains by inviting her husband to give his opinion. To his query, Rokde replies, Sukhatme then comes with his opinion, Kashikar then tells him that it would be too late, and Ponkshe winds up by saying that Prof. Damle is calculating and that he wouldn't turn up for the show.

It is quite confusing to allocate different speakers, as there is more than one party taking up the floor. If the analogy of turn taking is about taking the floor in the market economy, and turn is the scarce commodity in hand, then one can see that the characters in this play have control over the scarce commodity at the same time. The turn allocation techniques are used here, and the characters self-select in starting to talk. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson’s (1974) third rule in which the turn-so-far is constructed as not to involve the use of a ‘current speaker selects next’ technique, then current speaker may, but need not continue, unless another self-selects. Most of the time, the characters self-select their turn, and speak their minds according to their thoughts causing a chaotic situation. The spontaneity in their verbal exchanges is similar to the conversation that happens naturally. Every participant is involved in it. The ‘I-You, You-I’ verbal exchange is not followed here. Every character is important, and there are no major characters and minor characters in the play. Their dialogues are equally important which propel the play towards culmination.
5.3.2 Conversation Two

Sukhatme : Mr. Rokde, you have already taken the oath. Well, Mr. Rokde, in the course of her evidence, Mrs. Kashikar has made a most disturbing statement about you and the accused.

( Rokde begins to shake his head)

Mrs. Kashikar: Balu! Didn’t you tell me so?

Sukhatme : Mr. Rokde, whatever happened after the performance that night, good or bad, pleasant or unpleasant, tell it all to the court. That is your duty. The performance ended. What happened then?

Rokde : ( feebly) I - I –

Sukhatme : After the performance all of us left the hall. Then-?

Karnik : And only these two remained behind.

Mrs. Kashikar: Then it seems, she took his hand- Balu’s, I mean

Ponkshe : Gosh!

Sukhatme : And then what did she do, then Rokde? What more did she do? What next?

Mrs. Kashikar: I’ll tell you.

Mr. Kashikar: No, you won’t. Let him tell it. Don’t interrupt all the time! [Act Three: 57].
The actual proceedings of a court trial involves cross-questioning, where the lawyers ask questions to the witnesses and they reply to them. It is not a conversation, by the normal standards, nevertheless it consists of clear cut turn-taking. The legal language in court requires the witnesses to give answers which are pertinent to the question. No other person, other than the witness is allowed to speak. Hence, according to Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson’s (1974) first rule, the mode of cross examination is being strictly followed in a court trial. The participants are given opportunities to speak, that involves the judge, the lawyers and the witnesses. The example that is being drawn here is definitely not the usual questioning and answering rounds of the lawyer and witness that happen in the court. Sukhatme who enacts the role of a lawyer, questions Rokde about an incident that happened earlier. But instead of Rokde’s answer, we see the other characters interrupting and replying to it, which is not a part of the interrogative procedures followed by the court.

The trial which has shades of the original proceedings of a court, do not stick to the question-answer, question-answer, pattern. Being a mock trial, and devoid of seriousness, the conversation with its consequent turn-takings resemble natural conversation. Mostly all the characters do not wait for the current speaker to select the next speaker, but self select their own turn. Simultaneous organization of turns occurs and results into overlaps, encroachments or interruptions, which is very evident in the play.
5.3.3 Conversation Three

Sukhatme: (to Kashikar) Milord, the occurrence as it has been related speaks vividly for itself that there is hardly any need to add anything over and above it. This entire statement should be noted down as part of evidence against the accused.

Kashikar: Request granted.

Benare: Note it down. Note everything down! Just take down note after note!

(Her eyes are suddenly full of tears. Her voice is choked. She is agitated. Then with tearful defiance)

What can you do to me? Just try! (tears flow freely from her eyes. Exit into the wings) (Deeper silence! Except for Samant, everyone's expression changes. A peculiar and cautious excitement breaks out on each face)

Samant: Dear, oh dear! Whatever's happened so suddenly to the lady? [Act Three: 47].

The stage directions that describe the emotions on Benare's face become a part of the turn-taking in the cross-questioning of the accused. These facial expressions, the gestures reveal the emotional turmoil that Benare experiences. She cannot restrain the tears, as she realizes that the truth has already being exposed in such a humiliating manner. Her actions, which are turn construction units, prompt Samant to ask everyone the
reason for her tears. The description of the excitement on the faces of the other characters reflects the sadistic pleasure of the middle-class Indian society in tormenting a woman. The information about the excitement of the other characters given by the playwright, sets the tone of the play, and emphasizes the theme of suppression of women.

As stated earlier, *Silence! The Court is in Session!* is a typical example of natural conversation, where there is no logical coherence in the pattern of turn-taking in the conversations. But even then there are some exceptions where the play slips back into dramatic discourse. For instance, the soliloquy of Benare, at the end of the play, is a characteristic of dramatic discourse. She speaks about the injustices and the sufferings throughout her life. This reference comes in chapter three, where, it is taken as an instance of violation of quantity maxim. But where the turn-taking is concerned, the turn to speak in the court is allotted by the fake magistrate, Mr. Kashikar. The play becomes serious, towards the end, and the proceedings become more or less similar to a real court. She speaks in defense of herself, which not only violates the quantity maxim but exploits the turn taking by securing the floor. Nevertheless her soliloquy can be justified as an opportunity for the accused to defend her case without any time restriction, which is being granted by the court.

Another point of contention as to whether Tendulkar’s play can be categorized under natural discourse is when the turns taken in conversations are being allotted by the dramatist. Problems of turn-allocation, turn-transfer, turn-distribution,
turn-management and so on have been already penned down by the dramatist. This is not a characteristic of natural conversation but that of the dramatic discourse. Tendulkar has portrayed the realities in a natural manner, and thereby is quite akin to natural conversation.

Tendulkar has made his characters speak in a high involvement style. To define it, one can say that some individuals expect that participation in a conversation will be very active, the speaking rate will be relatively fast, with almost no pausing between turns, and with some overlap or even completion of the other’s turn. This is one type of conversational style which is being used where the characters of this play is concerned. This no-nonsense attitude, and the refusal to offer legal remedies to social problems or to pin his faith on a change of heart of men, makes his plays very naturalistic, where other works of fiction, solve the uncertainties portrayed in them, which becomes unnaturalistic.

Karnad and Tendulkar, are two playwrights writing in different styles. The analysis of the methods in turn-taking in their respective plays, bring out the stark differentiation in their playwriting. The turn-taking methods used by the characters in both the plays are different, and can be categorized under natural discourse and dramatic discourse. But there are certain parts in both plays where differentiation becomes difficult, where the discourse is concerned. Nevertheless, one can come to the conclusion that Nagamandala leans more towards the dramatic discourse, and Silence! The Court is in Session has more features
of natural discourse. In the next section, the conversational implicatures that are used by the characters, also contribute to the different styles of writing of the playwrights, who belong to different backgrounds.

5.4 Conversational Implicatures

Implicatures are usually connected with the cooperative principle, as both have a relationship as propounded by H.P. Grice (1965). The basic assumption in conversation is that, unless otherwise indicated, the participants adhere to the cooperative principle and the maxims. But in certain cases, the participants are seen as violating the quantity maxim by not divulging much information. In the example below, Dexter may appear to be violating the requirements of the quantity maxim.

Charlene: I hope you brought the bread and cheese.

Dexter: Ah, I brought the bread.

After hearing Dexter’s response, Charlene has to assume that Dexter is cooperating and totally unaware of the quantity maxim. But he does not mention the cheese. If he had brought the cheese, he would have said so, because he would be adhering to the cooperative principle. He must intend that she infer that what is not mentioned was not brought. In this case, Dexter has conveyed more than he said via conversational implicature. It is important to note that it is speakers who communicate meaning via implicatures and it is listeners who recognize those
communicated meanings via inference. The inferences selected are those which will preserve the assumption of cooperation.

The definition of implicatures being discussed, it is important to point out the reason behind the separation of the cooperative principle and conversational implicature. As both the theories are propounded by the same pragmatist, Grice, it is only fair to combine both in the second chapter. But there are various kinds of implicatures that are found in both the plays that contribute more to the analysis of the style of writing of both the dramatists. As the present chapter focuses on the similarities and dissimilarities in the writing styles of Karnad and Tendulkar, the topic of conversational implicatures become pertinent, as they reveal more about the two different cultural backgrounds in which the plays are written.

There are two kinds of implicatures, according to Grice: conventional implicatures and conversational implicatures. Conventional implicatures are not a very interesting category. The main focus of Grice’s analysis is to identify and explain ‘conversational implicatures’. And it is this category that we are concerned with here. Conversational implicatures are divided into two. Generalized conversational implicatures and particularized conversational implicatures. In some utterances, no special background knowledge of the context of utterance is required in order to make the necessary inferences. Such conversational implicatures are called generalized conversational implicatures. Most of the time, conversations take place in very specific contexts in which locally recognized inferences are
assumed. Such inferences are required to work out the conveyed meanings which result from particularized conversational implicatures. As an illustration, consider the following example where, Tom's response does not appear on the surface to adhere to relevance. (A simple relevant answer would be 'Yes' or 'No'.

Rick: Hey, coming to the wild party tonight?

Tom: My parents are visiting.

In order to make Tom’s response relevant, Rick has to draw on some assumed knowledge that one college student expects to have. Tom will be spending that evening with his parents, and the time spent with parents is quiet. Because they are far more common they are typically just called implicatures. As the dramatic discourse is modeled on daily conversation, the analysis of the plays will be based upon particularized conversational implicatures. In the present study, one comes across such implicatures in both the Indian plays.

5.4.1 Implicatures in Nagamandala

This play is based on folk tales, which are oral tales. They exist for ages independently and yet depend upon the story teller to keep them alive by passing them on to other story tellers. Hence we can see that Rani’s story is being narrated by the Story to the Man. The Story tells the dramatist, that he should pass on the story and one can see a play evolving within another play in Nagamandala. The plot of the play being based on a folk tale is set in a rural background, where, the Village Court system still prevails. The villagers are illiterate and superstitious. Karnad has
taken a village as the backdrop of the entire play, and hence the play is filled with Indianness. This play being in a folklore element eventually revolves around the very basic human character of juxtaposing the real and fictional worlds.

Hence conversations take place between the human world and the non-human world, and it is normal to find a snake conversing as well as falling in love with a woman. From such a typical setting, implicatures are less when compared to the urban setting. The naivety as well as the illiterateness of the villagers results in less implicatures in their verbal exchanges. Only a few examples can be pointed out in this play.

When Kurudava asks Rani whether Appanna has talked to her, the latter misunderstands the term ‘talk’ and takes the literal meaning of it. But the older woman’s utterance has another shade of meaning and that does not carry the expected meaning.

Kurudava: Does he… talk to you?

Ran: Oh, that he does. But not a syllable more than required. ’Do this’, ‘Do that’, and ‘Serve the food’.

Kurudava: You mean—? That means- you are- still- hmm! Has he…? [Act One:10].

In the above lines, Rani gives a direct answer that he does not talk anything else other than certain instructions. Although Rani gives a direct answer, without any insinuation attached to it, Kurudava draws inferences from that simple statement. Endearments are common in the conversations between newly
weds. But this is not the case with Appanna and Rani. This is recognized by Kurudava, due to her old age and experience, and she draws conclusions that, there has been no physical relationship between the couple. Moreover, the contextual information, of Rani’s imprisonment also adds to the inference. Without any intentional implication, Rani’s naïve answer implies that the marriage has not been consummated.

This kind of implicatures is seen throughout Nagamandala. The Indian society that has been portrayed in the play is conservative, and they consider sex as something shameful. The utterances that are taken from the play are drawn on the same lines of implicatures. They talk about sexual contact but in different ways. The playwright makes use of Indian expressions and phrases that become metaphorical for sexual relations, Kurudava makes such implicit remarks about the same topic various occasions, in the course of the play. When she comes to meet Rani the second time, her son tells her about the locked door. She arrives to the conclusion that Appanna has taken Rani to the fields.

Kurudava: I can’t believe it. The lock is still there! (thinks)
Perhaps he has taken her out to the fields or the garden! (laughs) [Act One: 15].

This is an implicature commonly used in the Indian context. By saying that Appanna has taken Rani to the fields, Kurudava implicates that they have gone there, so that they can consummate their marriage. In olden times, in India, lovers used
to meet in the fields to consummate their relationships. One of
the main reasons behind this commonality in those times is the
concept of large families. The husband and the wife never used to
meet each other, inspite of living in the same household. So for
sexual reasons, husbands and wives used to meet in the fields or
in secluded places. Hence Karnad portrays the real picture of the
Indian villages with their customs.

Throughout the play, there are implicatures that hint at the
sexual acts between the characters. The implications in the
sentences are specific to only the Indian context, and will be
unintelligible to the non-Indian readers. In the last act, Appanna
is seen accusing Rani of infidelity.

Appanna: “Are’nt you ashamed to admit it, you harlot? I locked
you in, and yet you managed to find a lover! Tell me
who it is. Who did you go to with your sari off?

Rani: “I swear to you, I haven’t done anything wrong! [Act
Two: 33].

In the above lines, Appanna accuses Rani for
becoming pregnant without his knowledge. It is certain to him
that it is not his child, which is in Rani’s womb. So he shouts at
her for being adulterous. Here Appanna does not explicitly use
the word ‘sex’. Instead he says, “Who did you go to with your
sari off?” This utterance has a meaning in the Indian context.
Sari is the traditional costume of Indian women. Appanna’s
threat implies that he believes that Rani has had sex with some
one, and demands it of Rani to say the truth. Belonging to the
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same society, Rani understands what he says and replies that she has not done anything wrong. The dialogue would leave the non-Indian readers confused. Their non-familiarity with the Indian phrases, would make them wonder about the relationship between adultery and the sari.

There are instances of implicatures in the conversation between the Flames. In the course of their description of their masters, one of the flames talks about its master and his young wife. Nothing explicit is been said, in these lines, but it is recognized by the readers and the other flames as to what Flame Four is hinting at.

Flame 4: “... Naturally, I stayed back too. The old lady died this morning, leaving behind my master and his young wife, young and juicy as a tender cucumber. I was chased out fast (giggles) [Prologue3].

In the above lines, there is no direct inference to the physical intimacy between the flame’s master and his wife. But by just hinting at the physical description of the wife as young and juicy, and that the flame was chased out fast, the unsaid is obvious. When the old woman was alive, the master and the wife could not have any sort of privacy in their married life. But with the death of the mother, the couple finally have the nights together.

Most of Karnad’s plays are based on the myths in the Hindu religious texts. The characters that have been portrayed are based on people in India, and their weaknesses and strengths are
being showcased in his plays. One can come across Indian attitudes and Indian lifestyles, mostly that of rural India in his plays. The mindset of the people is traditional, and this is seen in the implicatures. Most of the examples that are drawn from the play are implications on sexual acts. The people of the village find it uncomfortable to talk about sexual intimacy, and this is seen in their use of language. They use various Indian expressions and proverbs to imply what they avoid directly referring to; showing that a lot can be said, without actually saying it. Tendulkar’s play also hold a lot of implicatures, but are different from the ones in Nagamandala.

5.4.2 Implicatures in Silence! The Court is in Session

The utterances that carry the implicatures in this play are totally different from what we have seen in Karnad’s play. The play itself belongs to the modern times, it is harsh, raw and quite a scathing play. The language that has been used in this play, is filled with insinuations, that can be applied to the conversations that take place every day. Although the play is also based on the Indian society, it shows India of the recent times, and the ideologies that are propagated are relevant in today’s world. Hence the implicatures in Tendulkar’s play, have similarities with the implicatures used by the middle-class society in their conversations.

The play revolves around a mock trial that takes place and the implicatures highlighted in the play reveal the double standards of the middle-class Indian society. The utterances are
context-bound, and one can come across generalized conversational implicatures within them. These implicatures add to the curiosity that takes the play till its denouement.

Act Two, focuses on the court proceedings of the mock trial of Benare. Kashikar assumes the role of the judge, Sukhatme takes up the role of the lawyers, and the other characters become witnesses in the trial. In the initial stages, Benare is in a cheerful mood and she teases the others. Samant, who is new to the group, is in awe of Benare’s enthusiasm, and compliments her. But the reply of Ponkshe, gives us the first character analysis of Benare.

Samant: (enthusiastically to Mrs. Kashikar) Ha ha! Miss Benare is really amazing!

Ponkshe (seriously) In many respects [Act Two: 29].

Normally such an utterance would seem to be crystal clear without any implications. Ponkshe’s reply echoes Samant’s admiration and nothing is being hinted. When Samant enthusiastically speaks in awe of Benare, Ponkshe is expected to respond with the same feeling. But the word ‘seriously’ in the stage directions speaks volumes of implications. His opinion of Benare being amazing, is not in the positive sense of admiration, but rather in the negative sense that she is capable of doing many other things. This does not become clear, immediately but the readers come to know of it later in the play. When the intention behind Benare’s desperation to find a father for her unborn child, comes out, the relevance of Ponkshe’s utterance becomes clear. Nevertheless, Ponkshe’s statement persuades the readers to
notice the presence of implicatures in the sentence, which fuels their curiosity as to know the implication of Ponkse’s words. These implicatures make the play more interesting.

Most of the implicatures that are present in this play are connected to the situation of Benare. In the first two acts, there is a feeling of secrecy in the utterances of the other characters when they speak about Benare. Their verbal interactions hint at something that they know about her, but are not being quite honest about it. The readers are led, by these implicatures till the end of the play. Karnik, Sukhatme and Ponkshe are the ones who speak about Benare in this manner. In another instance, one can see that Karnik also makes a similar remark about Benare, like his co-actors.

Sukhatme: Mr. Karnik, think carefully, before you answer my next question. What is your opinion of the prisoner’s conduct?

Karnik: (after striking two or three tremendous ‘thinking’ poses) Do you mean, in this mock trial or in real life?

Sukhatme: In real life, of course.

Karnik: That’s right, isn’t it? Then it doesn’t matter. I don’t know anything about the moral conduct of the accused.

Sukhatme: Nothing? Are you sure?
Karnik: Nothing at all. Nothing where the trial is concerned.

( Benare’s expression is tense) [Act Two: 36].

In this entire dialogue, there are overtures of implicatures. In the midst of cross-questioning Karnik, Sukhatme, asks the former’s opinion about the moral conduct of Benare. He replies with a question, as to whether the question is related to the mock trial or real life. Everyone is aware that it is a mock trial, and inspite of knowing it, Karnik asks this question which is not required. From this utterance it is implied that there is something that he knows about Benare’s life. When Sukhatme persists in asking him the same question, he confirms it by saying that he knows nothing where the trial is concerned. Hence he implies that he knows nothing about Benare’s conduct regarding the mock trial, but knows something about her conduct in real life. The stage directions that tell about Benare’s tense expression, also confirm it. Later on, the secret comes out in the course of the play.

In another situation, the same kind of implications arise where Benare is concerned. The mock trial is about infanticide and Benare is accused of it. It is Samant’s turn to take the witness stand. He is the only one who is unaware of the inside happenings among the theater group. When he is asked to give his version of the incident in Prof Damle’s room, he makes up a fictitious story, which unfortunately becomes accurate to the tiniest detail. When he tries to make things more clear to the
judge, Sukhatme, Karnik and Ponkshe tell him that the case is imaginary, and certain things should be taken for granted.

Sukhatme: “Mr. Samant, for the sake of the trial, we’re taking things for granted.

Karnik: The crime itself is imaginary… that’s what it is.

Ponkshe: Only the accused is real!” [Act Two: 43].

Samant is confused, and wants to give a fair description of the incident that took place in Prof. Damle’s house. But due to the others’ impatience he is not allowed to do so. Karnik assures him that the case is imaginary, and that it is alright if Samant does not give an accurate description. But then Ponkshe says that only the accused is real. From this implicature it is evident that Ponkshe knows that Benare is pregnant. From the testimonies that take place in the last part of the play, it is revealed that, Benare has attempted to commit suicide, as she would be disgraced in the society, if the truth comes out. She confides this earlier to Ponkshe, and this information is what prompts Ponkshe to imply that the accused is real. Hence one can see that implicatures express what is being unsaid. Ponkshe does not reveal the secret of Benare, but the truth is being deciphered from this implicature in the utterance of Ponkshe. With this utterance, it is clear to the readers that Benare is in the similar position as the accused, and is guilty of infanticide.

The above examples can be called implicatures, because a lot of meaning has been implied, even if the information is not conveyed directly. But the implied meaning is being understood.
by the others. The characters other than Samant are keepers of Benare's secret in different versions, and the mock trial is the venue in which the versions are put together as a whole. The readers who are a part of this play, along with the characters are invited by the playwright to make their own surmises. And these implicatures more or less facilitate accurate interpretations in the course of the play.

The implicatures that Tendulkar uses in his plays are certain strategies that render the play more interesting. It also brings out the double standards of the Indian society. It is often said that Indians are conceited and are masters of double language. Tendulkar brings out the truth, in this play through the characters of Sukhatme, Karnik and Ponkshe. When Karnad makes use of implicatures to bring out the Indianness of the people in rural India, with their conservative approach, Tendulkar brings out the mindset and the thought processes of Indians in urban India.

5.5 Conclusion

The two segments in this chapter reveal a lot of the writing styles of Karnad and Tendulkar. The turn-taking techniques highlighted in the plays become devices through which both the playwrights convey their message to the readers. The turn-taking features in natural conversation are more similar to the narrative style of Tendulkar, whilst the features in dramatic discourse, similar to that of Karnad. The second part which deals with implicatures in both the plays, bring out the two kinds of portrayal of the attitudes of the Indian society - rural and urban. In
Nagamandala, the naivety of the Indians is shown while in Silence! The Court is in Session the crafty nature of Indians is portrayed.