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Chapter-IV

Social Interactions in the Plays

All speech has a pattern. In real life if we listen to people talking we notice that there are many speech patterns, composed of words of course but they are not any words. There is a choice of particular words. Certain words and combination of words repeat in a speech, certain others come once in a while but in a striking manner. These words and combination of words make a speech sound particular; it does not sound like any speech but the spontaneous expression of the person.

(Vijay Tendulkar Preface xxviii)

Hudson defines speech as "shorter or longer strings of linguistic items uttered on particular occasions for particular purpose" (106). The focus, here, is on 'Face to face interaction' as the select plays, predominantly comprise of such interactions. It has already been established in the previous chapters that the knowledge of linguistic items and their meanings are essentially social as language is learnt by listening to others, although each individual's language is unique because of his different individual experiences. Speech, crucial in social activities including socialization, is essential for communication and, communication is a social activity.

Speech allows communication at a much more sophisticated level than would otherwise be possible. For an effective communication, the social constraints on speech which are a part of the language, are usually taken into consideration. Choosing words carefully while addressing a person to show the existing social relations is an aspect of socialization. An analysis of the lingual behavior of the characters to show how the social
constraints are being obeyed, flouted or reflected through their response has been done in the chapter. It is interesting to study and discover how 'language' and 'social constraints on speech' merge and the constraints apply not only to speech but also to the social behavior in general. The plays of Vijay Tendulkar are perfect for such a study because of the social realism portrayed in them. A social critique with a merciless gaze, Tendulkar takes note even of the slightest detail and faithfully presents a mirror image of a typical middle class Indian society only through 'words'. To quote the playwright himself: "My characters are not cardboard characters; they do not speak my language; rather I do not speak my language through them; they are not my mouth-pieces; but each of them has his or her own separate existence and expression. This is felt more in the original versions of my plays because of the nuances and variations of speech I attribute to my characters" (Preface x).

Almost all the characters in the select plays are a part and parcel of the Indian society who delineate life in its true sense and, the brilliant playwright Vijay Tendulkar discovered something extraordinary about these ordinary people and stated that extraordinary with ordinary words i.e. only through designing the interactions in a desired manner.

4.1. The Social Nature of Speech:

The famous sociolinguist Hudson explains the social nature of speech as "The accepted term for aspects of behavior through which people influence and react to each other is 'social interaction', and speech is only one aspect of such behavior, closely meshed with other aspects" (108). Tendulkar has so designed the dialogues that even the unsaid or the veiled intentions of the speaker are clearly manifested. In an interview to Mukta Rajyadyaksha, Tendulkar admits that he usually furnishes a lot of details while writing his plays because as a writer he wants to express whatever is there in his mind. Apart from the
stage directions, he even specifies the utterances made by the characters which is in coherence with the sociolinguists who also believe that every utterance adopts a stance of some kind in relation to its recipient. In addition to 'stating' or 'informing' which is the most obvious kind of action performed by utterances, the everyday random bits of verbal communication can insult, acknowledge, apologize, greet, command and request a recipient. Michael Argyle, a social psychologist and one of the leading investigators in this field describes:

One achievement of recent research has been to establish the basic elements of which social interaction consists; current research is concerned with finding out precisely how these elements function. It is now agreed that the list consists of various signals: verbal and non-verbal, tactile, visible and audible- various kinds of bodily contact, proximity, orientation, bodily posture, physical appearance, facial expression, movement of head and hands, direction of gaze, timing of speech, emotional tone of speech, speech errors, type of utterance and linguistic structure of utterance. Each of these elements can be further analysed and divided into categories or dimensions; each plays a distinctive role in social interaction, though they are closely interconnected. (qut. in Hudson 108)

4.1.1. Speech Acts:

As discussed earlier, speech plays many different roles in social interaction. The anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski claimed that, "in its primitive uses, language functions as a link in connected human activity, as a piece of human behavior. It is a mode of action and not an instrument of reflection" (Hudson 109). Utterances, indeed are capable of
performing a wide range of actions which includes diverse activities like 'warning',
'complimenting', 'complaining', 'commenting', 'challenging', 'disputing', as well as those
mentioned earlier. Significantly, it is difficult to find out any other alternative to perform
these actions except in words.

This can be also be illustrated by contrasting the kinds of speech used by people while
performing different functions. For instance, the utterances implied in shifting furniture,
where the speech acts as a control on people's physical activity in contrast to a lecture where
its function is to influence the thoughts rather than the actions of the listener, are of
completely different nature but in both the cases the actions are being performed. Speech is
also used to establish and reinforce social relations. The discussion on the classification of
speech will remain incomplete without a reference to the approach based on 'speech acts'
developed in the main by philosophers and linguists following the British philosopher J.L.
Austin.

Austin argued that the study of meaning should not concentrate on bold statements
such as 'Snow is white, taken out of context, since language is typically used, in speech, for
many other functions-when we speak we make suggestions, promises, invitations, requests,
prohibitions and so on. Indeed, in some cases we use speech to perform an action, in the
extreme sense that the speech is itself the action which it reports . . . Such bits of speech are
called "performative utterances".(Hudson 109)

The work on speech acts has drawn attention to the extensive vocabulary that ordinary
English provides for talking about utterances-verbs like say, promise and persuade, manner of
the utterance-saying, shouting, whispering and others. The select plays also exhibits different
kinds of speech acts being performed during the course of action and Tendulkar, has clearly
mentioned the types of utterances, supplemented with proper adverbs which specify the
functions that they are performing, in parenthesis. Each of these utterance actions represents a specific alignment or a counter alignment to be adopted by one speaker towards the another. This assists the speakers to define and assume their roles in an interaction and shape their relations in terms of myriad reciprocal interchanges of such utterances.

The story and plot of *Silence! The Court is in Session* has been completely weaved by such performative utterances. The instances that can be traced in the plays are:

general: aloud (8), screaming (118), writhing (119)
manner: in a flamboyant lawyer's voice(63), mock seriousness (77), conspirational whisper (81), melodramatic manner (98), dramatically (109)
source: recite (62), mimics (65), crooning (58)
speaker/hearer evaluation: teasing (65), irritated (66), pathetically (66) taunting (69), intimidating tone (80), miserably (80), grumbling (80), wretchedly (85), provoking (81), apologetic tones (89), threatening tone (93), sympathetically (94), sarcastically (105), whining tone (109).

The examples traced in *The Vultures* are:

general: loudly (212), crying loudly (215), tipsily (221), screaming (229), cries (231),
talk(240),
manner: muttering (209), shouting (214), drunken tones (217), hiccuping (218), tormentedly (224), bellowing like a bull (228), wheedling tone (229), growling (259)
source: retreating (213), imitating (226), recite (240),
speaker/hearer evaluation: suspiciously (220), furiously (235), scornfully (236).
In Sakharam Binder the following examples are traced:

general: loudly (129), talking (136), low voice (168),

manner: roars (125), shouting (128), whining (140), sleepy tone (141), drowsily (141), chant
(143), whimpers (148), sleepily (151), muttering (153), drunken slur (169), hoarsely (175),
pleading (178),

speaker/hearer evaluation: scared (134), fumbling (134), grumbling (136), warning (137),
despairing tone (140), moans (144), sarcastically (148), impatiently (153), sorrowfully (178),
viciously (182).

Ghashiram Kotwal gives the following examples of the performative utterances:

general: cries out aloud (381),

manner: hum (367), chant (369), bleating (396), groans (400), bellowing (409)

source: singing (362), mimes (395)

speaker/hearer evaluation: moaning (374), sarcastically (408)

The speech acts performed in Kamala are:

general: loud (16),

manner: threatened (8), emboldened (15), confidential tone (17), mutters (19), growling (31),
thoughtfully (35), emphatically (44)

speaker/hearer evaluation: casually (10), sourly (10), warily (16), angrily (21), sarcastically
(23), eagerly (23), annoyed (38).

The performative utterances in Kanyadaan is as follows:
general: almost shouting (497),

manner: mutters (498), softly (502), soft caressing voice (515), abruptly (517), mock whisper (519), sharply (521), gently (530), undertone (533), quivering voice (535), coldly (561), acidly (561), harsh voice (562), pathetic tone (566).

speaker/hearer evaluation: hesitantly (500), soberly (505), coolly (517), gravely (519), sarcastically (523), overwhelmed (529), dryly (537), anxiously (538), firmly (541), calmly (541), wearily (544), angrily (551),

In *Encounter in Umbugland*, the following examples can be figured out:

general: loudly (284)

manner: aghast (278), official tones (287), low murmuring (301), muttering (301), frightened (336)

source: mimicking (270)

speaker/hearer evaluation: hastily (276), fearfully (276), glibly (277), annoyed (281), angrily (281), anxiously (281), Happily (285), embarrassed (297), shrewdly (305), insincerely (320), glumly (323), joyfully (356).

*A Friend's Story* exhibit following types of utterances:

general: Guffaws loudly (433),

manner: humming (427), with unexpected cruelty (430), weakly (436), listless voice (438), sharply (453), harshly (458), merrily (462), gloating (471), dry tone (474), fumbling (474), cuttingly (476), sincerely (476), mechanically (485),

speaker/hearer evaluation: embarrassed (422), startled (424), Baffled (424), angrily (427),
stunned (427), disbelievingly (442), agonised (448), pleading (463), spontaneously (469), Belligerently (473), obviously lying (474), with contempt (474), with biting sarcasm (476), seriously (478), uncontrollingly (490), casually (493).

These examples show that there is no single basis for classification. Speech acts can be classified on the basis of: manner of speaking (whispering vs. shouting), flow of information (asking vs. telling), source (acting vs. spontaneous speech). Two or three of these basis can be combined to classify a speech act, for example lecturing can be defined both by its manner and by the flow of information. Even the length of speech acts varies vastly—from complex category of preaching which consists of long stretches of speech to whispering which may be comprised of a single word. The variation of the speech acts is socially very important as it is vital to know whether the speaker is serious or cracking a joke, telling a fact or asking for information and so on. Above all, this is a fact that people's behavior varies according to the kind of speech act they consider themselves to be performing and that some of these variations are systematic and deliberately done which make the act of speech a skilled work.

The present section has traced such 'performative utterances' in the plays. The play *Silence!* exhibits a brilliant execution of such utterances. All the characters hail from a middle class background and to assault a woman, verbally or physically, is against its values. Such kind of behaviour would present a 'negative face' of the speaker so the mock trial has been used as an armour by Benare's attackers. They deliberately design their utterances in a manner that causes maximum damage to Benare and, at the same time 'save their faces'. This is even asserted by Benare when she says, "These are the mortal remains of some cultured men of the twentieth century. See their faces- how ferocious they look! Their lips are full of lovely worn-out phrases! And their bellies are full of unsatisfied desires" (117).
In *Silence! The Court is in Session* these utterances are implied for the psychological molestation of Miss Benare, in *Sakharam Binder* these utterances or rather abuses acts as soldiers who protect Sakharam's kingdom against any sort of encroachment, in *The Vultures* the utterances are a naked display of moral, cultural and economical degradations, in fact, in *Ghashram Kotwal* the utterances are the main cause of the whole action. Ghashiram gets humiliated because of verbal and physical assaults, he 'vows' to make Poona, a kingdom of pigs and, to execute this, he barters his daughter for power and inflicts the same verbal and physical violence that he received earlier to the city of Poona. In *Kamala*, a single utterance by Kamla, 'How much did he buy you for? (34)' changes the complete identity of Sarita, in the play *Encounter in Umbugland* the whole political encounter between the cabinet and the queen is of verbal shots. *A Friend's Story* these utterances give voice to the inner turmoil of Mitra and in *Kanyadaan*, it is only through the utterances that grave issues like caste and culture divide, gender, patriarchy and ideological failures are portrayed successfully only in the small drawing room of Nath Devlalikar. To quote the playwright: "They are not written words but a total and spontaneous expression of the mind and the personality of the character which include not only the words but also the eloquent silence in between the words. Also the order of the words is at times grammatically wrong. Broken sentences. And the subtle emphasis on certain words"(Preface xi).

4.1.2. Speech Communities in the Plays:

The concept of speech community will be helpful in analyzing and relating the utterances made to the speaker who is a part of the existing social group. The concept of speech communities has already been established in chapter II and a satisfactory definition has been arrived at on the basis of which the social groups in the select plays will be
analyzed. The approach which is going to be followed is advocated by Robert Le Page. The approach is as follows:

Each individual creates the systems for his verbal behavior so that they may resemble those of the group or groups with which from time to time he may wish to be identified, to the extent that

a. he can identify the groups,

b. he has both opportunity and ability to observe and analyze their behavioral systems,

c. his motivation is sufficiently strong to impel him to choose, and to adapt his behavior accordingly,

d. he is still able to adapt his behavior.

This definition avoids the term speech community but refers to groups in society which have distinctive speech characteristics as well as other social characteristics. The existence of the similar types of groupings can be traced in the select plays. These are the groups which the individual speaker perceives to exist and which might not be necessarily discovered by a sociologist through his objective methods. The groups mentioned here need not exhaust the whole population, but may represent the clear cases of certain social types. The above approach also endorses the view that individuals 'locate themselves in a multidimensional space', as discussed in social functions of language in chapter II, the dimensions being defined by the groups they can identify in their society.

These groups can overlap on the basis of sex, age, geography and race, and each grouping may contribute something to the particular combination of linguistic items which they select as their own language. The select plays are a translated version of Tendulkar's
plays which were originally written in Marathi as the playwright himself hailed from the state of Maharashtra. There are glimpses of Marathi and Hindi words which are left non translated by the translators partly for the sake of impact and partly due to the lack of lexicon in English for the culture specific words, which will be dealt with in the upcoming section. This aspect of the plays offers a broader perspective to be covered under the sociolinguistic study. However, the 'personal groups' occurring in Le Page's approach are identified as 'speech communities' by Dwight Bolinger: "There is no limit to the ways in which human beings league themselves together for self -identification, security, gain, amusement, worship, or any of the other purposes that are held in common; consequently there is no limit to the number and variety of speech communities that are to be found in society" (Hudson 26).

Bolinger's statement endorses the existence of a very large number of speech communities in any population (whether of a city, a village, or whole state) with overlapping memberships and overlapping language systems. Moreover, different speech communities can be identified in the same population according to the person whose viewpoint is being taken. Another aspect of the notion of speech community is that the social groups that are clearly relevant to a person's language are their family, friends, neighbours, colleagues at work, any clubs or local organizations they belong to and are the most important sources of linguistic influences. The select plays clearly manifest such social groups which will be analyzed in the light of the above statements by Le Page and Bolinger. The plays by Vijay Tendulkar usually have a limited number of characters i.e. from 5 to 8 characters in them so it will be appropriate to address them as social groups rather than speech community as they are far more smaller than the speech communities that linguists have tended to invoke. The members of this social group definitely belong to some speech community with whom they identify themselves.
The social group presented in *Silence! The Court is in Session* is that of amateur theatre artists who have 'leagued themselves for the common purpose' of performing a play for social enlightenment. The characters in the play are: 1) Miss. Leela Benare. 2) Sukhatme. 3) Ponkshe. 4) Mr. Kashikar. 5) Mrs. Kashikar 6) Balu Rokade 7) Karnik 8) Samant 9) Servant 10) Local resident.

All the characters, except Samant and the local resident are the members of an amateur theatre group called 'The Sonar Moti Tenement (Bombay) Progressive Association'. The first eight are the major characters and the rest two are the minor characters in the play. Tendulkar's characters mostly hail from the typical Indian middle class society, *Silence!* being no exception to it. The first seven characters are educated and have an urban background where as Samant is a typical rustic character, a local villager. Miss Benare and Mrs Kashikar are the female characters. Miss. Benare is a working woman of around 34 years who works as a school teacher whereas Mrs. Kashikar is housewife. When the play begins, Miss Benare is shown as mocking at Sukhatme, Ponkshe, Karnik and Balu Rokde. Later in the play her mockery boom rings at her when all the others group together to hunt her down. Even Mrs Kashikar, the only other female, chooses to be on the other side in attacking Benare.

The eight characters are divided among themselves, as Ponkshe, Sukhatme, Karnik, Balu Rokade, Mr and Mrs Kashikar form a group against Benare and each of them 'creates the systems for his verbal behaviour so that they shall resemble those of the group' whereas Benare remains secluded as she could not identify herself with the group, and continue to be at their target. They grab each and every chance to expose the weaknesses of others. Unable to cope up with them and her motivation 'being sufficiently strong to impel her to choose and adapt her behaviour accordingly', she prefers to cocoon herself within her silence as no verbal system could come for her rescue. Mrs Kashikar, instead of being compassionate to her,
prefers to remain against her and 'creates her verbal behaviour so as to resemble those with whom she wished to be identified'. Samant, being equally stranger to both Benare and the other group, 'has both opportunity and ability to observe and analyse their behavioural systems' and 'is able to adapt his behaviour'. He is impressed by their 'urban background' and chooses to be at their beck and call. Despite uniting against Benare, Ponkshe, Sukhatme, Karnik, Balu and Kashikars remain sarcastic towards each other and continue their verbal assaults.

The social group presented in *The Vultures* is the basic unit of society- a family. The whole drama has been enacted within the 'Pitale family' with the following characters:

1) Pappa- Hari Pitale 2) Sakharam, his brother 3) Ramakant [Ramya], his eldest son 4) Umakant [Umya], his second son 5) Rajaninath, his youngest and illegitimate son 6) Manik, his daughter 7) Rama, Ramakant's wife

As stated earlier, one of the most important sources of linguistic influence on a person's language is his family. All the members of the Pitale family, except Rajaninath and Rama, are very rude, selfish, violent and full of vulturine instincts, consequently, the language assigned to them is very coarse, vulgar, obscene and full of abuses i.e. a low prestige language. As Rajaninath and Rama do not directly belong to them (are not one of them), Rajaninath lives in the garage and Rama, an outsider, being married to Ramakant, do not share their cultural background and so do their language and instincts. In other words, they do not identify themselves with the group of vultures whereas Hari Pitale's children are a true copy of their father.
PAPPA. My stupidity . . . yes! to produce bastards like you!

RAMAKANT. Pappa, pappa! As the seed, so the tree! Did we ever ask to be produced? (211).

The members of the Pitale family create the systems of their verbal behaviour so that they may resemble those of the group with whom they wish to be identified. The 'vultures' equally use swearing and abuses to maintain dominance over one another whereas Rama and Rajaninath share a solidarity relationship.

The play \textit{Sakharam Binder} has only five dramatis personae in it. 1) Sakharam Binder 2) Lakshmi 3) Dawood Miyan 4) Champa 5) Fouzdar Shinde. Sakharam, Lakshmi and Champa have leagued themselves for the sake of security. All the characters of the play hail from the lower middle class section of the Indian society. None of them except Fouzdar Shinde, who worked in police, is educated. Sakharam ran away from his home when he was eleven years old and 'grew in open like a cactus'. Champa used to sell liquor with her mother. Lakshmi has been left by her husband and takes refuge in Sakharam's house as there is nowhere else she can go. No one of them has been told to have a strong cultural background. Most of them have been assigned a low prestige language by Tendulkar particularly Sakharam whose language is full of swearing words. Champa's language is equally abusive which is result of her childhood environment: "And mother used to sit in the tobacco shop. We did good business. Oh, yes! And we used to sell liquor too. . . ."(158)

The play \textit{Ghashiram Kotwal} is Tendulkar's thesis on power politics which has been enacted against the backdrop of Maharashtra of eighteenth century and has the appropriate
language and setting. The social group existing in the play has leagued itself for mutual benefit and the members adapt their linguistic behaviour to resemble those in the group. The characters are not so much stratified on the basis of education or background as on the basis of power. The play has the following characters: 1) Ghashiram Savaldas 2) Nana Phadnavis 3) Sutradhar (narrator) 4) Lalita Gauri 5) Gulabi 6) Ingraz (British Officer) 7) Pariparshwak (main singers) 8) Brahmins (chorus) 9) Brahmini

The play *Ghashiram Kotwal* is a musical historical which is interlarded with music and dance. From the sociolinguistic point of view, the playwright has made use of ample folk forms whose origin can be traced in the culture of Maharashtra. Folk forms like *lavani, abhanga, kirtana* belong particularly to the Marathi culture and, as per the setting, are beautifully employed in the play. The language and dialogues take one back to the history in the Peshwa regime and offer an interesting study of the stratification of Indian society in the dimensions of power, caste and regionalism. The British officer has been addressed as 'Ingraz' (Angraz for English man) in the play which tells how they were addressed in those times.

Most of the characters in the play, except Nana and Ghashiram, are nameless entities who are rather differentiated on the basis of their caste, region and profession. Female characters have not been given much dialogues. In coherence with the folk structure, the vocabulary and utterances have a rustic flavour. The verbal give and take is predominantly between Nana and Ghashiram which mainly is an exhibition and strive for power. The chorus of Poona Brahmans has been assigned dialogues suiting to the purpose. Solidarity is also exhibited at times, as per the convenience of Nana and Ghashiram, to save their respective 'face'.
In *Kamala*, the social group chosen by Tendulkar for the enactment of the drama is once again the social unit of family. The following are the characters in the play:

1) Kakasaheb 2) Sarita 3) Kamalabai 4) Jaisingh 5) Kamala 6) Jain

Jaisingh Jadhav is a well-known young journalist working as an Associate Editor in an English-language daily. Sarita, his wife hails from a reputed family and is highly educated. They belong to the elite class of Indian society. Kakasaheb is Sarita's uncle, a sixtyish gentleman born in an aristocratic family, has lived his life simply under the inspiration of Mahatma Gandhi. Kamala is completely uneducated and hails from a remote village of Bihar. Kamalabai is also uneducated and works as a maid at Jaisingh's house. She has come from Sarita's mother's place, Phaltan. Jain is Jaisingh's friend and colleague. The language, each of them speaks is in coherence with their background. The most striking feature is that when Sarita identifies herself with Kamala, her verbal behaviour is adapted accordingly. When Kamala asks her that for how much she has been bought by Jaisingh, Sarita sits down beside her signifying solidarity and replies, "For seven hundred." (34) The following conversation takes place between the two:

KAMALA. My god! Seven hundred.

SARITA. Why? Was it too little?

KAMALA [Pauses]. It was an expensive bargain, memsahib. If you pay seven hundred, and there are no children . . . (34)

Thus when Sarita identifies herself with Kamala 'her motivation is sufficiently strong to impel her to choose, and adapt her behavior accordingly.'
The social group in the play *Kanyadaan* is the family of Nath Devalalikar, a social activist. The master stroke of the playwright is the dialogues and language through which he has dealt with the debatable issues of caste, gender and culture in the drawing room of the Devlalikar family. The characters in the play are: 1) Nath Devlalikar 2) Jyoti 3) Jayprakash 4) Seva 5) Arun Athavale 6) Hameer Rao Kamle 7) Vamnesh Nevargaonkar

The first five are major characters. Nath Devlalikar is an active man approaching sixty. Seva, his wife is also a social activist. Jyoti, going on twenty and twenty-three year old Jayprakash are their children. The family is quite educated and cultured. Both Nath and Seva believe in freedom of thought and allow their children to express themselves freely. The play offers a perfect example of low prestige vs. high prestige language difference. For instance Arun's vocabulary is full of abuses, he says, "...I am a great scoundrel, rascal, motherfucker, ...I ...I beat her ..." (538) whereas when Jayprakash, Nath's son, calls Arun a 'bastard', Nath protests saying, "Prakash, take that word back." (548) and Jayprakash apologises.

As Bolinger mentioned earlier, 'human beings league themselves' for a variety of common purposes, consequently unlimited number and variety of speech communities tend to exist in society. Among these innumerable speech communities Tendulkar's vision caught sight of a particular kind of social grouping which is described by the man himself in the interview to Gauri Ramnarayan: "Human beings are like Micky Mouse and its kin, fighting for survival... In this battle one mouse kills another. Many mice gang up... and end up ruthlessly destroying one another"(168).

Almost in all of the plays, the existence of such kind of social group can be traced which superficially has leagued themselves for a very decent and dignified purpose but underneath behave like mice. The excellence of the playwright lies in the fact that the linguistic items assigned to the characters are a perfect match to their intentions. This is in
accordance with Joshua A. Fishman's observation in *Speech Community in Current Trends in Linguistics* that: "In general the verbal repertoire of a speech community is a reflection of its role repertoire" (qut. in Chaturvedi-44).

The social group in *Encounter in Umbugland* is completely different from the rest of the plays under study. The play has been written with a fictitious background of the royalist regime of Umbugland with the following characters: 1) Vichitravirya, King 2) Vijaya, Daughter of Vichitravirya 3) Aranyaketu 4) Bhagadanta 5) Karkashirsha 6) Pishtakeshi 7) Vratyasom 8) Prannarayan, Attendant 9) Two 'pen bearers' 10) Other attendants 11) Painter 12) Maid-servant

The first nine are the major characters from the linguistic point of view. King Vichitravirya is the old king celebrating his sixtieth coronation anniversary. His daughter, Vijaya is a young girl with childish attitudes. It is interesting to note that her linguistic behaviour transforms accordingly when her transformation from a young, immature girl to a mature powerful queen takes place. Vratyasom, Bhagadanta, Karkashirsha, and Pishtakeshi are described by the playwright as, 'All are old; all are bored.'(272) and Aranyaketu as 'a middle aged man who looks old before his time'. The language used in the play is highly diplomatic, full of political overtones and satires, elegantly sarcastic as per the need of the royalist background. For instance: 'A true politician can be loyal only to himself. (288) and Prannarayan's utterances like:

Promises in love and promises at the court are of different species, Your Majesty. Promises in love are made unrestrainedly and have to be kept through restraint. Promises at court are made with restraint, and are usually broken unrestrainedly. That is one's experience. Love promises are made in
secret, and have to be kept publicly. Political promises are made publicly, but usually have no witness but history when they're broken. (295)

"To hiss when you are stung is one kind of behaviour. To bluster when you are stung is a politician's behaviour" and ". . . Politics means sweetly-smiling enimity and the experience of sacrifice. A show of sacrifice is always profitable in politics" (306).

Prannarayan, a person belonging to the third gender, is an attendant to Vijaya and is the most intelligent among all the others. The two pen bearers act as media reporters and hence their language echoes that of the media persons.

As the name suggests, the social group existing in the play *A Friend's Story*, is of five friends. All of them are young girls and boys studying in college. Out of them, Bapu the narrator has been described as 'anywhere between 18 and 30 years old'. The language employed in the play is quite informal as the conversation that takes place is among friends. The characters of the play are : 1) Bapu 2) Sumitra (Mitra) 3) Nama 4) Dalvi 5) Pande. The language assigned is particularly of college going young students like 'Are you folks are from Sangli? (422), Arey Bapu, come clean, what's this lafd you've got into? (426), Brother, take care, what does a blockhead like you know about these chakkars? . . . (426), . . . My heart is ready to burst. What a presence, what a stride! The way she carried herself! With every step he bitch dropped challenges. Ifel like . . . (437), I swear on my mother, I'll feed you chicken, take you to film show, I'll do whatever you want . . . please, please take me to her. (438), . . . Bapu, I see her, she's always in my dreams, in my text book, in my notebook, on the black board, a he gym, on the cinema screen, everywhere. . . (450) and Shame on you. So you can't fight a war, but can't even fuck a woman? Not a single one? (478).
4.1.3. **Culture Specific Lexicons and Kinship terms**: 

It has been established that, just like grammar and vocabulary that make language, speech is also controlled by rules that are learnt as a part of culture. It is neither a reflex action nor a spontaneous expression of emotions but is a skilled work. The society affects the language, and the physical and social environment is reflected in language. Peter Trudgill also believes that there exists a relationship—the effect of society on language, and the way in which environment is reflected through language. Firstly, there are many examples in which the physical environment in which a society lives is reflected in its language, normally in the structure of its lexicon—the way in which distinctions are made by means of single words. The best example that exhibits this is that English has only one (or two if 'sleet' is included) for 'snow' whereas Eskimos have several as it is essential for them to be able to distinguish efficiently between different types of snow. Their distinction of this sort is lexicalized - made by means of single words.

Similarly, the cultural environment in which a society lives is also reflected in its language- in the structure of its lexicon-the way in which cultural concepts are expressed by means of single words. There are ample culture specific terms exhibited in Tendulkar's plays:

In *Silence! The Court is in Session*, the culture specific words are: *bhajan* (56), *beedi* (79), *Ganapati puja* (64), *Bible* (70), *Bhagavad Geeta* (70), *masala pan* (75). Similarly,

In *The Vultures*, the culture specific words are: *tulsi-vrindavan* (201), *beedi* (208), *tamasha* (222) and the Mythological references are *Gopi-Krishna* (209), *Ram and Lakshaman* (226).

In *Sakharam Binder*, the general culture specific terms are: *dhoti* (125), *bidi* (125), *saris* (125), *mridanga* (128), *dharmsala* (129), *chilum* (130), *ganja* (130), *bhakris of jowar*
(131), chutney (131), chaturthi (134), choli (135), prasad (142), aarti (142), tamasha (149), dholki (157), namaskar (164), Dassera (174), mangalsutra (187) and Mythological references are: Bam Bhole (131), mangalmurti morya (141), Krishna (143), Sitaram (187).

Physical environment expressing words are: Shravan (177), Bhadrapad (178).

The play Ghashiram Kotwal has a folk structure and so the play is full of cultural specific lexicons. Some general examples are: Kotwal (the title), Bhatji buwa (362), Bhatji Maharaj (363), Bavannakhani (364), raga Bhupali (371), Sindur (365), Sardar (368), Peshwa (368), dakshina (372), kotwali (391), tulasi (394), rangoli (395), pandit (408), dharmsala (408), chatushringi (409), Kaliyuga (410). Other examples related to folk forms are: sutradhar (362), kirtan (366), lavani (366), kirtankar (377), Haridasa (377), abhanga (377), tamasha (381). The musical instruments referred are: dholki (366), mridanga (368), shehnai (377) and Mythological references abound: Ganpati (361), Saraswati (361), Lakshmi (361), Shri Ganaraya (361), Ganapati Bappa morya (362), Vishwamitra and Menka (366), Mathura avatarali (368), Radhakishna Hari, Govinda Murali (368), Pundalika Varda (395), Agni (395). Physical environment is expressed by: Shravan (394).

Kamala, written in a naturalistic mode uses the following culture specific terms: Namasteji (3), biryani (4), Mohitewada (5), pallu (9), Hai dayya (20), mandap (21), matka (22), mal masala (23), tamasha (24), adivasi (28). Owing to its theme, the play Encounter in Umbugland has used only one culture specific word; burkha (355). Namaste (421), gillidanda (422), kabaddi (422) are the culture related words used in A Friend's Story.

Kanyadaan, though a play based on cultural differences, does not give any prominent example of cultural lexicon.

Secondly, the social environment is also reflected in language and often has an effect on the structure of the vocabulary. For instance, a society's kinship system is generally
reflected in its kinship vocabulary. As Bram endorses: "All languages identify sets of interacting relatives and provide terms describing them with reference to each other: father-son, husband-wife, aunt-niece, and like" (qtd. in Misra 70). Kinship is a social factor which enables people to live together and cooperate mutually to lead an orderly social life. Families, clans and tribes exist on the basis of kinship. Prof Ram Baksh Misra also observes: "Languages differ considerably the way communities give terms to their kin and the way they group them. A kinship system is a network of social relations and is intimately related to the language of that society" (70). For instance, the important kin relationships in English speaking societies are those that are signaled by single vocabulary items as the distinction between 'maternal' and 'paternal' is not important in English society and is therefore, not reflected in the English lexicon whereas the Indian society clearly maintains a distinction between the two. This point can be amplified when the kinship vocabulary of the Indian society is analyzed.

The socio-cultural structure of a society determines and acknowledges the interpersonal relationship or bonds that can exist between persons. These bonding, in turn, regulate the social behavior of the people. The most suitable example to be quoted here is from the play *Silence! The Court is in Session* where Benare's attraction towards her maternal uncle has been labeled as 'incest', where as in some South Indian communities this relationship is considered as perfect for marital bonds. Muslim community also allows marriages between cousins. This is further explained by Bram's observation: "The discovery of kinship pattern completely divergent from our own . . . gains additional significance when we realize that such differences are not only formal and terminological, but that wide areas of human behaviour are governed by kinship blue-prints which are an integrated part of different social structure" (qtd.in Misra71).

As already discussed in Chapter III, the select plays have debunked the myth of
family as a place of security instead it has been portrayed as site of inevitable destruction. As an artist of social realism, Tendulkar's has painted the detrimental state of social affairs through derogatory portraiture of kinship specially in *The Vultures* and *Ghashiram Kotwal*. Equally pungent is the depiction of husband-wife relations in *Kamala, Kanyadaan, Sakharam Binder* and *Silence!*. Relationships like Benare's fascination for her maternal uncle and her unwed pregnancy by Damle, Rama's pregnancy by her brother-in-law Rajaninath, Mitra's unconventional love for Nama are termed as a revolt against middle class social structure and had to face litigations for not conforming to the social structure. The unconventional treatment of the relationships is highlighted by the way in which characters address or refer to their kin. It is significant to study such terms because Redcliffe and Brown A R and Daryll Ford in the introduction to *African System of Kinship and Marriage* observes: "A kinship system is a network of social relation which constitutes part of that total network of social relations which is the social structure. The rights and duties of relatives to one another are part of the system and so are the terms used in addressing or referring to the relatives" (qut. in Chaturvedi-110).

In *Silence! The Court is in Session*, the kinship terms used are : wife (56), sister-in-law (56), nephew (56), husband (64), mother (79), Anna (103), brother (103), cousin(110), maternal uncle (110). Here it is interesting to note that the word 'sister-in-law' in English translates at least seven relationships in Indian society for each of which Hindi has a definite lexicon. The play has a role based traditional description of motherhood which behind the shield of glorification of motherhood puts entire responsibility on the shoulder of the women. The description is
Motherhood is pure. Moreover, there is a great-er-a great nobility in our concept of motherhood. We have acknowledged woman as the mother of mankind. Our culture enjoins us to perpetual worship of her. 'Be thy mother as god' is what we teach our children from infancy. There is a great responsibility devolving upon a mother. She weaves a magic circle with her whole existence in order to protect and preserve her little one. (79)

In *The Vultures*, the kinship terms are employed in such a way so as to highlight the hollowness of the existing relationships. The kinship terms used in the play are: sister-in-law (203), brother (203), Pappa (208), sister (208), husband (208), *Bahu* (208), brother-in-law (209), wife-children (210), *Bhaiya* (213). As the play is about a morally degraded family which has no values for kinships, the manner in which relations are described underlines the prevailing moral and cultural degradation. Here are a few examples:

- MANIK. . . . but who wants a sister round here? Since the division, your (Rama's) husband even charges me board and lodging! (208)

- PAPPA. . . . Or else the old man's corpse will lie rotting up there all day. While his *Bahu* 'waits for him to get up!' (209)

- RAMAKANT. Hear that! *Our* mother was no relation of *his*!

- PAPPA. My enemy she was! She died. She left you with me! (211)

- RAMAKANT. . . . My brother-but a lifelong blood enemy! . . . (213)

- UMAKANT. A mangy dog would have made a better father! (213)

- RAMAKANT. . . . A kept woman's bloody son! A bastard! . . . (216)

- RAMAKANT. Poor Uncle! They're both equal bloody swindlers, brother. Pappa 'n' Uncle. (218)
RAJANINATH. . ."It's better not to know your father. Your father, your
brother. So cruel they'd put the wolves to shame. . . . Your (Rama's)
husband is not my brother! It humiliates me to call such low people my
brothers! And such a corrupt man my father"and He's Pappa's brother, all
right. The same type. A vulgar man. . . .(223,224)

UMAKANT. Great man, Uncle! Cheers to Pappa's father! And mother, of

of course.

RAMAKANT. Of course. Need a mother as well, brothers.(226)

PAPPA. . . . Please don't kill me! I'm your father, you pimps! Your father!

(230)

RAJANINATH. I'm your husband's brother, after all.(239)

RAMA. . . . You don't have to act like that in front of your big sister-in-law . . .

For many years that's all I saw you in! (240)

Umakant says for his brother's child that : . . .You'll [Ramakant)]have a monkey. With
a donkey's ears. And three legs. . . .And it'll be born dead.(246)

The play Sakharam Binder has only five characters who, except fouzdar Shinde and
Champa, do not share any specific and socially recognized kinship. The play was charged as
a jeopardy for the institution of marriage, hence, is full of references of husband wife relation,
exhibiting particularly the power a husband possesses in Indian context. Sakharam, while
describing the sixth woman, gives the following description : "She used to worship her
husband's shirt. The man was out to kill her, but, as far as she was concerned, he was God! . .
. .She worshipped his shirt for full two years. . . . and when she died . . .I gave her her last sip
of water, but the name on her lips was her husband's" (128,135). When he asks Laxmi, her
husband's name, she is silent. To this Sakharam reacts : ". . .A good wife is not supposed to
utter his name? . . .He kicks you out of the house; he is out to squeeze the life out of you. But he's your God. . . " (133).

Sakharam, whenever brings a new woman to his house, gives a list of code of conduct to be followed by the woman and he ends up saying : " . . you'll have to be a wife to me. Anyone with a little sense will know what to make of that" (126). When he asks Laxmi to sit near him she sits keeping a distance to which Sakharam reacts : " . . Not like a wife! Closer!" (137)

The play Ghashiram Kotwal, has only two major characters, hence there are not many kinship terms discussed except for Gauri, Ghashiram's daughter, whom he barters for power. Lord Ganapati has been addressed as 'bappa' (362), which means father. When Nana approaches Gauri in a lustful manner, she protests saying, "You are like my father!", to which he replies, "Only in age. . . .My dear, you are like a daughter to us-someone else's" (378). When Ghashiram sends her daughter to Nana, he laments, "Oh, you people. Look! I've given my beloved daughter into the jaws of that wolf! Look. Look at this father. Putting the child of his heart up for sale. Look at my innocent daughter-a whore. . . ." (381). Then there is mention of Nana having "six wives" (401).

The play Kamala does not offer much scope for kinship terms to be analyzed. The only kinship other than Jaisingh and Sarita is between Sarita and her uncle whom she addresses as kakasaheb which in Indian kinship terminology signifies 'father's younger brother'. The other term used is Bhabhiji (elder brother's wife) which Jain uses to address Sarita. Kanyadaan, though refers to kinship terms like father-in-law and son-in-law, but the theme of cultural differences has overshadowed the kinship. Encounter in Umbugland exhibit only one kinship, that is of Vichitravirya and his daughter Vijaya. The play A Friend's Story does not show any noticeable use of kinship terms.
Studying and analysing the kinship terminologies is significant as Prof Ram Baksh Misra observes: "For the fact, that it reveals our socio-cultural relationships, their recognition and implementation in behaviour in many ways, and above all the social organisation of the community, the study of kinship terminology offers a promising field of study for the students of sociology, anthropology and sociolinguistics" (Misra 70).

The kinship in the select plays is a manifestation of the complexities of human mind, a quest for individual existence and sometimes a challenge to the socio cultural ethics of the Indian society

4.2. **Structure of Speech:**

It has been established that speech is a skilled work. 'Work', as it requires effort and its degree of success depends on the effort that is made. It is a fact that the speech act types are learned as a part of socialization, thus making it an acquired skill. This raises an important question that: why do people willingly accept their society's social rules? Why do they willing accept the restrictions placed on them by society? Why do people bother to say things that help them to get the things they want?

4.2.1. **The Concept of Power and Solidarity**

Hudson observes that the answer is based on the theory of 'FACE', developed by Erving Goffman, an American sociologist, who called the work needed to maintain face, 'face-work'. The term 'face' may be used in the sense 'to lose face' or 'to save face', meaning something like 'self-respect' or 'dignity'. Hudson explains the basic idea of the theory: "We lead unavoidably social lives, since we depend on each other, but as far as possible we try to
lead our lives without losing our own face. However, our face is a very fragile thing which other people can very easily damage, so we lead our social lives according to the Golden Rule . . . by looking after other people's faces in the hope that they will look after ours" (114).

The principle is described as follows in a standard sociology text-book:

Much of what we usually call 'politeness' or 'etiquette' in social gatherings consists of disregarding aspects of behaviour that might otherwise lead to a 'loss of face'. Episodes in an individual's past, or personal characteristics that might produce embarrassment if mentioned, are not commented on or referred to . . . Tact is a sort of protective device which each party involved employs in the expectation that, in return, their own weaknesses will not be deliberately exposed to general view. ( 114)

From sociolinguistic point of view, the most relevant discussion of face is by Brown and Levinson, who distinguish two kinds of face. They called them 'positive' and 'negative' but Hudson has assigned them the terms 'solidarity-face' and 'power-face' to show their close link to the important concepts of 'power' and 'solidarity' which will be dealt with further. These concepts have been explained in detail by Hudson:

Both kinds could be described as 'respect', but this word has a different sense in each case. Solidarity-face is respect as in 'I respect you for . . . , ' i.e. the appreciation and approval that others show for the kind of person we are, for our behaviour, for our values and so on. If something threatens our solidarity-face we feel embarrassment or shame. Power-face is respect as in 'I respect your right . . . , ' which is a negative agreement not to interfere. This is the basis for most formal politeness, such as standing back to let someone else pass. When our power face is threatened we feel offended. Each kind of face is
the basis for a different kind of 'politeness'. Solidarity-politeness shows respect for the person, whereas power-politeness respects their rights. (114)

If one observes, it is interesting to note that how much of language is geared to looking after the two kinds of politeness- for solidarity-politeness there are a wide range of ways showing intimacy and affection, words for addressing the other person like mate, darling, dear, referring a person by his first name and others. Whereas for showing power-politeness there are different address words like sir, please, and all sorts of euphemisms. The theory of face is a part of a larger theory of social interaction, in which speech is only one component. The theory starts by distinguishing 'unfocussed' and 'focussed' interaction according to whether or not people concerned consider themselves to be 'together' in more than a purely physical sense. The main consideration in unfocussed cases is to preserve each other's power face in contrast to focused interaction which has been the basis for social groups since the earliest of times. It is focused interaction that provides most of the face even in modern societies, so it also provides most of the serious threats to face. This is where solidarity-face becomes so important because people care about what their friends and family think of them and power-face can be threatened in many ways.

It will now be possible to explain why so much effort is put into the skilled work of speech. Hudson explains this as, "We need to save our own face by saving the face of everyone we talk to, so we need to manage our behaviour, both verbal and non-verbal, very carefully." (115). Each society recognises its own norms for saving face, so the face-work consists in recognising these norms and applying them effectively. The consequences of failure in face work have been dramatically described by Goffman: "A person who chronically makes himself and others uneasy in conversation and perpetually kills encounters is a faulty interact; he is likely to have such a baleful effect upon the social life around him that he may just as well be called a faulty person" (qut. in Hudson 116).
Thus, both skill and motivation for speech are due to the society in which a person lives. Skill in speaking depends on a variety of factors, including a knowledge of the relevant rules governing speech. Such rules are of various types, dealing with different aspects of speech. Different societies have different norms governing speech which can be explained by reference to other aspects of their cultures. To sum up, it can be said that society controls speech in two ways: firstly by providing a set of norms governing speech and secondly, by providing motivation for adhering to these norms which is explained by the theory of face work.

The concept of power and solidarity has been established earlier. The present section will explore the concept further in relation to the plays under study. Speech reflects the social relations between the speaker and addressee, particularly that of power and solidarity manifested in that relationship. Hudson comments: "Power' is self-explanatory, but 'solidarity' is harder to define. It concerns the social distance between people-how much experience they have shared, how many social characteristics they share (religion, sex, age, region of origin, race, occupation, interests, etc.), how far they are prepared to share intimacies, and other factors" (122).

**Linguistic signals of power and solidarity:**

The linguistic signals of power-solidarity are explained by Hudson as follows:

1) via the expression for Speaker/Addressee/Referent

The linguistic expressions that a speaker can apply to an addressee/referent include not only names but personal pronouns and ordinary common nouns. The choice is always controlled by general principles rather than left to the speaker's whim, and one of the
controlling questions is the nature of the power-solidarity relationships between them. The choice always gives information about power-solidarity, but the details vary from society to society according to how power and solidarity are balanced against each other. Calling a person by a given name can show solidarity, affection and so on; but it can also show dominance; and conversely the use of a role-based name can show respect but it can also deny a person's individuality, which is a denial of both solidarity and power. The Indian society shows a wide variety of practices: for example, some communities in Mumbai call mothers exclusively by a name based on their motherhood (for example, X's mother, where X is her first child), in Maharashtra and some other cultures like Sindhi culture wives are given a new name on marriage—an interesting example which presumably shows how naming a person can be used to assert dominance over them. The choice of expression for the speaker—in other words, by alternatives for 'I' or 'me', though less widespread, gives information about power and solidarity.

Power and solidarity relations as signaled by the expressions for speaker/addressee/referent in, *Silence! The Court is in Session* reveals that the only solidarity relationship in the play is of Samant and Miss Benare. As discussed already, except the relationship between Samant and Benare, all the others exhibit power relationship with one another. Firstly there is Miss Benare who refers her co-actors mockingly in the following manner: Mr Kashikar as 'Mr Prime Objective', Mrs Kashikar as 'Hand-that-Rocks-the-Cradle', Balu Rokde as 'slave' to Kashikars, Sukhatme as an 'Expert on the Law', Ponkshe as 'Hmm!Scientist! Inter-failed!'(59) and Prof Damle as an 'Intellectual' (60). When Benare addresses him as 'Balu' he replies in anger, "Don't call me Balu!" (78) denying any sort of solidarity. Mrs Kashikar pretends a solidarity relationship with Mr Kashikar by addressing him as 'dear' (68). Benare's self confidence is reflected when she declares, "Forget about the sage Tukaram. I say it—I, Leela Benare, a living woman, I say it from my own experience. Life is not meant for
anyone else. It's your own life. It must be. It's a very, very important thing. Every moment, every bit of it is precious-" (61).

The play *The Vultures* is full of foul language, each page has at least 8-10 swear words. More importantly, to be noticed here is that all the characters are blood relatives i.e. belong to one family, which means that the swear words are directed against one another. Their inter-relationship is completely hollow. The only solidarity relationship is between Rama and Rajaninath. All the others in the play make 'a pack of vultures' sharing the same vulturine instincts, Ramya and Umya are each other's blood thirsty but stand united against others. Pappa calls Ramakant "the lord and master," for himself he says: ". . . If I die, I'll become a ghost. I'll sit on your chest! I won't let you enjoy a rupee of it. . ." (209).

Ramakant has concern for Rama as he calls her "Rama dear" (212), "Rama darling" (237), "Our madam Rama" (237) and Her majesty (249). When Ramakant and Umakant conspires against Manik, they call each other 'brother' (236) exhibiting high solidarity.

In *Ghashiram Kotwal*, Ghashiram has constantly been referred as "foreigner" (370) by Gulabi and Nana (384) showing lack of solidarity. Moreover, Nana's arrogance of power is highlighted when he refers to Lord Ganapati as : "That idol of holiness? That all holy Ganapati? The maker of Good? Look he has two wives. One on this side, one on that side. If you sit on our lap, he won't say anything" (378).

Nana addresses Ghashiram as 'Ghashya' manifesting solidarity. It is interesting to note that this show of solidarity begins when Nana asks for Gauri for a second time and Ghashiram denies. While convincing him, Nana uses "Ghashya" (383) for the first time.

In *Sakharam Binder*, Sakharam believes himself to be the autocratic ruler of his world and introduces himself to the woman he brings in the following manner : ". . .It's Sakharam
Binder's house. . . I'm hot headed. When I lose my temper, I beat the life out of people. . . I'm the master here. . . May be I'm a rascal, a womanizer, a pauper. . . This Sakharam Binder-he's a terror. . . He's not scared of God or of God's father!" (125/126). He has a strong solidarity with Dawood and calls him, "a real friend"(145). He describes his childhood saying, "I grew up like a cactus-out in the open"(172).

Champa has left her husband and calls him, " . . . that clownface husband of mine. He was a fouzdar, but even a thief wouldn't have pissed on his face" but she refers thrice to Dawood as "He's nice!"(158,160). Fouzdar Shinde is attached to Champa and accepts that: "She's my wife . . . even though she left me" (164) Champa couldn't develop bonding with Sakharam as she refers to him as "Your Sakharam" when Laxmi is back whereas Laxmi raises him to the level of 'God'(181,182). She says: " . . . let him kick me; if I have to die, let me die on his lap-in full glory like a married woman"(187). The presence of Laxmi and Champa at the same time results in a sort of conflicting situation. Champa blames: " . . . You are not a man-not since she came. She's made an impotent ninny of you. Don't have the guts to take me before her. You turn into a corpse-a worm"(193).

The perfect example of male dominance in Indian society can be found in the play Kamala where Sarita refers to Jaisingh, her husband, "as the master of a slave" when she talks to kakasaheb about her relation with Jaisingh: "I am going to present a man who in the year 1982 still keeps a slave, right here in Delhi. Jaisingh Jadhav. I am going to say: this man's a great advocate of freedom. And he brings home a slave and exploits her. . . . The other slave he got free - not just free - the slave's father shelled out the money-a big sum. Ask him what he did with it" to which Kakasaheb replies: "Jaisingh is no different from other men. He's not unusual. . . ." (46).

When Jaisingh tries to convince Kamala to come to the press conference but she
denies. Unable to persuade her he uses the power of being her master to take her there. The following conversation takes place between the two. Jaisinghsingh orders, "You will have to come, Kamala" she replies, "I'm your servant, master" (20).

Solidarity between kakasaheb and Sarita—calls her, "My dear" (6) and lovingly calls her "Oh you silly girl!" (38). Kamalabai's repulsion for Kamala is marked when she calls her "That creature. The one Sahib brought here this morning." (25)

The play *Encounter in Umbugland* has a very clearly demarcated arrangement of power. The King and the Queen are powerful, the ministers are subordinates and Prannarayan is the attendant. The most interesting relation is the solidarity between Vijaya and Prannarayan. Vijaya says, "... Sometimes I think of as my mother... and Very often your words are those of a man, but your viewpoint is a mother's". She has a political ambition and a longing for power which is evident when she says that the Kadamba upliftment plan, "... will make everyone understand that I am not just my father's daughter, nor a puppet ruler..."(316,317).

Nana in *Ghashiram Kotwal*, King Vichitravirya and Queen Vijaya in *Encounter in Umbugland* constantly uses a plural pronoun for themselves, the effect of which is explained below: "The second effect of using a plural pronoun is to pretend that the person addressed is the representative of a larger group ("you and your group"), which obviously puts them in a position of greater power"(Hudson 124).

It is interesting to note that Vijaya, as a princess constantly uses singular pronoun 'I' but immediately after becoming the Queen she starts referring herself as 'We'. Before becoming queen she says: "I'm asking about the pigeon... and... I myself will have that intensely private thing..."(270,272) but later on Queen Vijaya says "... We are the queen of this island" (301).
The relationships of power and solidarity are quite clear in *A Friend's Story*. The solidarity relationship is between Bapu and Mitra, and between Bapu and Pandey. This evident through the way Mitra addresses Bapu. She calls him: "silly boy" (422), "idiot" (424), "innocent baby" (424), "baby" (425), "reverend greybeard" (425), "Baapya" (428), "you are an ass!" (429), "donkey" (431), "An owl called Bapu" (433), "humped like a frog" (439), "squatting like a tortoise all rolled up?" (439). Bapu calls Pandey "Guru" (422) and Pandey refers himself "Your (Bapu's) guardian and guru"(459).

The play *Kanyadaan* is based completely on cultural differences and the power solidarity relations are decided by caste and culture. The aspect of caste and culture is more relevant to be dealt with in Chapter V.

2) via the verb

In addition to the nouns and pronouns used to address or to refer to a person to express information about speaker's relationships to the addressee or referent, there is another possibility which is particularly interesting for a grammarian, and which is even better evidence for the inseparability of sociolinguistics and grammar. This is the information located in the main verb of the sentence concerned because the verb is also the collecting point for all the other information in the sentence (for example, tense, negation, questions and commands are typically shown in the verb, and some are restricted to the main verb).

*Silence! The Court is in Session* provides some interesting examples particularly of this kind especially by Mr Kashikar, who while taking to his wife, exhibits power of patriarchy. The following are the utterances of Mr Kashikar for Mrs Kashikar:

"What do you mean, exactly? Hold your tongue. Can't say a word! . . ." (72).

"She can't get among a few people without wanting to show off! Shows off all the time!"
"Of course! I suppose they're just about to make you a judge of the Supreme Court!" (73).

"Can't shut up at home, can't shut up here!" (77).

"That's eagerness for you! You've hardly called her, and there she is!" (99).

"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!" (100).

Even Mrs Kashikar realises that Mr Kashikar keeps on: "Scolding me at every step! (78)". Humiliated, Mrs Kashikar exhibits her pretence of power over Balu Rokde by saying that, "Balu, you won't have another chance. Answer him at once! How dare you be so scared! Shouldn't a man have some guts about speaking up in public? . . ." (86). Benare accuses others that," You've all deliberately ganged up on me! You've plotted against me!" (93)

In The Vultures, verbs play a key role in manifesting the existing degraded state of the Pitale family. Here are few examples of power and solidarity exhibited by verbs. Manik, for her family members, says: " So you can come and strangle me, all of you? It's because I take care that I've survived in this house! Think it's human beings that live here?" (207) and "these bastards'll (her brothers) burn me alive one day! They'll poison me, they'll slit my throat" (215).

UMAKANT. "Go and see if that cow's (Manik) had her bath yet! Goes and rolls over town, the cow! And then sits scrubbing herself. . . ." (214)

PAPPA. " . . .You're devils, you pimps! You're going to kill me! You're going to murder me . . . murder! I don't want to die! . . ." (229)
RAMAKANT. Don't bloody let her (Manik) go, Umya! Drag the bloody money out! Look how she's wriggling! Squash her bloody neck! (235)

The solidarity relationship between Rama and Rajaninath is asserted by Ramakant's statement that: "...Likes her brother-in-law better than her husband. She'll take him tea. Even if he says no to it. She'll force it on him! And if he won't drink it, she'll feed him too. ..." (216). Moreover, Rajaninath's comment for Rama: "If you took mud in your hand, it'd turn to sweetmeats." (239) and his response that: "Why did you tell all this to someone whose own life's a burden to him? Someone as barren as yourself? What are you hoping for?" (243) when she shares her agony with him, endorses the solidarity relationship between the two.

When Ghashiram blames Nana for his daughter's death, Nana retaliates: "...Are you thinking clearly, Ghashya? To whom do you speak with such insubordination? The Peshwa's chief minister stands before you, Ghashya- " but suddenly realizing that the fault is his, he tries to convince Ghashiram in the following manner: "...All merges into Ganga. Thou shalt not grieve over what is gone. The Vedas have said that..." and "...No one belongs to anyone. No one is anyone's daughter. No one is anyone's father. ..." He tries to distract Ghashiram by saying that: "...I am the Chief Minister. You are the Kotwal. These are our duties. So go, go to your duty. There is a great trust given to you, Ghashya. The responsibility of all Poona is yours alone. ..." (405)

In Sakharam Binder, Sakharam controls the women by commanding them. He orders to Laxmi: "...You heard me? The custom here is-to have my legs pressed before I go to sleep. They came and they went, but the custom hasn't changed. And it won't change, either!" (132) Moreover, when Laxmi was in agony, he compels her to laugh: "Sleep later. Laugh first. Laugh...the way you laughed when the ant was crawling on you" and "Laugh! Laugh this minute. Or I'll twist your arm. I will. I'll get the belt. Laugh" (145). Later on, for Laxmi
he realizes that: "... I had six before you, but I refused to put up with any nonsense from them. I kept them. They worked for me. I told them to go-they went. You are different. Still waters run deep, they say. Not just deep. They're damned dangerous. ...". Further, he confesses to Dawood that: "There have been many women here, but this one left a mark before she went away" (151,153).

With Champa, Sakharam is totally overshadowed by her sexual power. He says: "Couldn't fix my mind on work" and "Last night . . . was great fun" (170) whereas Champa doesn't "remember a thing" (170). He comes back early from the press and says to Champa: "It was great fun. All day I could think of nothing else. So I came home"(170). He forces Champa to satisfy his 'itch' saying '. . .'.it' first.' and when Champa denies to this, he says: "...My orders have to be obeyed. I can turn nasty otherwise. . ." (171)

He believes that falsehood is the biggest sin and is convinced that he, himself, is an honest man and, so, he is not afraid of God. He talks to the Ganapati idol in the following manner: "... Relax. Eat, drink and be merry. You have your mouse with you for company, all ready to pounce on . . ." and when Laxmi protests to this, he reacts: "... did I say something wrong? You tell me. Did I refer to his paunch? Or make fun of his tusks? Did I even mention his trunk? Tell me" (142).

There is an unusual solidarity which Laxmi has with ants and crows. She talks with ants: "... You eat sugar and I get the scolding. Nobody believes me. Ants, sparrows, crows-they all talk to me. Why do you talk to me? Why must you talkee-talkee to me? Go on . . . tell me. . . You naughty little fellow. . . Tell me. . ." (139). She refers to crow as "Crowie dear " (152) and when an ant falls into a cup of tea, she says:"... A tiny little tummy and he wanted to drink all that tea. Wait a second. Don't run away. Let me wipe you dry. Come here- . . . Promise me you won't jump into other people's tea again! . . ."(180)
Champa shows a strange kind of solidarity with Laxmi by standing between Sakharam and her saying "Hit me" (183) when he is about to hit her. Laxmi develops a solidarity with the other weakling fouzdar Shinde. When he comes to see Champa, she feeds him and says, "Poor man. You've got nothing inside you!" When Champa comes to know this she warns Laxmi, "Don't double cross me. I warn you" (189,191).

In Kamala, Jaisingh says angrily to Sarita, "... I tell you, don't give her a thing without asking me'.(21) Moreover, when Jaisingh tries to embrace Sarita, she throws him aside with a single shove. Jaisingh, hurt, says,"... Why are you making a face like that/ Why did you push me away/ You've never done that before"(32). Later in the play he reminds Sarita, "... It's I who takes decisions in this house, and no one else. Do you understand..." (42). The suffocation Sarita is going through is evident from the following conversation:

SARITA. Aren't I allowed to have a will of my own?

JAISINGH [Sarcastically]. Never noticed any signs of it before... (45)

She describes her relationship with Jaisingh in the following manner:

... I saw that the man I thought my partner was the master of a slave. I have no rights at all in this house. Because I'm a slave. Slaves don't have rights, do they, kakasaheb? They must only slave away. Dance to their master's whim. Laugh, when he says, laugh. Cry, when he says, cry. When he says pick up the phone, they must pick it up. When he says pick up the phone, they must pick it up. When he says, come to a party, they must go. When he says, lie on the bed - they... (46)

The episode during which Sarita identifies herself with Kamala endorses their solidarity. While talking Sarita sits down besides Kamala and Kamala says, "...both us may
stay here together like sisters. . ." (35)

In *Encounter in Umbugland* the solidarity between Vijaya and Prannarayan is reflected when she says to him: "I feel like lying down with my head on your lap. and . . . I feel as this lap is the only support I have got in the world. I feel as if it's only here I can relax unafraid. . ." (307)

3) Power and Solidarity via general vocabulary level

Sometimes a list of lexicon provides a large number of meanings. The function of style levels is to signal the power-solidarity relations between speaker and addressee/referent, and specifically to build a 'wall of behavioural formality' to protect the addressee's power-face. The higher the style level, the more walls there are to protect the addressee against the encroachment that any communication inevitably makes on privacy. English uses register distinctions of vocabulary in somewhat similar ways, for instance the continuous use of the word "Milord" (77) in the play *Silence!*

In *Silence! The Court is in Session!* Samant addresses Ponkshe as "sahib" (65) and Karnik as "Sir" (77). Balu Rokde addresses Mrs Kashikar as "Madam" (68). When Karnik calls the mock judge, "Milord", Mr Kashikar reacts as, "Order! what do you think you are? A lawyer? Just say 'Your lordship' like any other witness!" (110) as he wants his power face to be saved even in the mock trial.

Solidarity between Benare and Samant asserted when Benare comments for Samant: "This gentleman? Not bad-I think he's lovely!" (69). Samant also describes as, "... this lady behaved in a most exemplary manner" and "She's a very nice lady" (88,89) whereas, others, taking shield of the mock trial call her: "accused" (81), "runs after men too much" (81), "lunatic" (83), "this lady" (83). She has been continually referred to as "Prisoner Miss
Benare" and "Prisoner Benare" (96,97). Sukhatme even calls her "Leela Damle" (97) publically endorsing her illicit relationship with Prof Damle. They all group up against Benare and call themselves, a group of "thoughtful people" (94) and each one agrees at this point, thus showing high solidarity among themselves.

*The Vultures* does not provide any prominent example of such kind of power-solidarity relationship. *Ghashiram Kotwal*, the play exhibits ample example of such kind of power relationship as it is set against the backdrop of Peshwai where, while addressing someone, caste ascendency and the power of the ruler have to be taken good care of. The Power of Caste is exhibited when, the Brahmans, the caste in power, are addressed as:

"O priestly Brahman, O lordly Brahman, O honoured Brahman" (364).
"Aho, gentlemen! Moneyed men! Mansioned men! Carriaged and horsed men!" (365)

Nana Phadnavis, the Peshwa's deputy, a powerful person has been addressed using all sorts of euphemism as : "The great man, Nana, hurt his ankle", "Your Highness" (369), "Nine Court Nana", "Nanasahib" (371), "Your Majesty", "Majesty" (379), "Highness" (383), "Sir" (393).

Ghashiram, after having been decreed as the Kotwal of Poona is addressed as : "my lord" (388), "Your Honour" (394), "Ghashiram raj is here" (398). The most prominent example of Nana executing his power is when Ghashiram, after discovering his daughter's death, come to Nana to enquire about it and Nana says : "... Ghashya, how much more will you grieve? Now be calm. Whatever happened, protocol should not be forgotten. Don't forget that. Whom do you stand before? First you must bow. Now-bow" and Ghashiram, bows like a "tamed animal" Similarly, while convincing him about his daughter's death, Nana reminds him "...Before you go, don't forget to bow..." (404,405). Again, when he leaves : "Stay, Ghashi, you've made a mistake. You forgot to bow, you fool" (406) and Ghashiram bows.
Morepver, there is a constant referral of English man who has been addressed as "Sahib", "sir" (372) and "huzur" (374) by the Brahmans.

The play *Sakharam Binder* is set in an economically weak background with not much differences in the vocabulary level and language of the characters. Therefore any example of such kind of power and solidarity does not exists in the play.

In *Kamala*, Jaisingh, who bought Kamala, is addressed as "Sir" (11), "master" (13), "Sahib" (19) by Kamala and Sarita is addressed as "memsahib" (34)

As discussed earlier, the higher the style level, the more walls there are to protect the addressee's power face. The use of register distinctions of vocabulary in a similar manner is very beautifully done in the play *Encounter in Umbugland*. The different ways in which King Vichitravirya has been addressed are; "His Majesty King", "His Majesty" (269,270), "Your Majesty" and "His Majesty is Umbugland and Umbugland is His Majesty!" (279,277) and :

The Most Mighty Sovereign of Umbugland, the All Virtuous, the All-Eminent, the Warrior Omnipotent, In all Knowledge, Arts and Government Most Resonant, the True-Living, the Truth-Inspiring, the All-Knowing, the All-Discriminating, the Ever-Youthful, the Ever-Pure, The Ever-Living, the Nation, the Holder of the Imperial Dignity, our Saviour from Inquity, the Cleanser of All Sins, His Supreme Majesty King Vichitravirya approaches- . .

.(275)

Even Vijaya calls him "Your Majesty" (281). She herself is addressed as "Your Highness", "Princess" (271), "Her Royal Highness" (294). When the ministers go to meet her and start talking to her directly in informal manner without the observance of the protocol, addressing her as "child", "Viju"she resolutely refuses to respond to saying that, "As from
today, we are Her Most Virtuous Majesty, the Queen of Umbugland" (301). The transformation of Princess Vijaya to Queen Vijaya has begun. She is obeyed, though unwillingly. When Prannarayan addresses her as You Majesty, she asks him to call her Princess Vijaya.

Hudson observes that: "These various signals of power-solidarity relationships can be seen as ways in which speakers can show others how they locate themselves in their social world. Speakers in every language can use language to locate themselves in relation to the people they are talking to and also in relation to people they are talking about" (131).

4.2.2. Role Relationship

Society provides a set of concepts for thinking and talking about. The speakers adjust themselves in relation to the social groups that they want to identify with in the world around them. In one group they swear, shout and argue, and in another they hardly talk at all. They also adjust their linguistic items as they switch their roles. As Labov puts it: "We must somehow become witness to the everyday speech which the informant will use as soon as the door is closed behind us: the style in which he argues with his wife, scolds his children, or passes the time of day with his friends" (qut. in Hudson 104).

This change of role of a person according to the group he is in is termed as 'role-relationship' in sociolinguistic. There are ample examples of role relationship in the select plays.

In *The Vultures*, the way Ramakant talks to Rama is different from that when he talks to his father:

RAMAKANT. . . .So far, we've kissed the feet of at least twenty swamis. In
other words, we should've twenty kids, at least! Rama dear, it's all luck, you know. Man proposes, God disposes. But let's just go, this evening. . .

To his father:

RAMAKANT. Just watch your words when you join our conversation, Pappa. I won't have you butting in when my better half and I are talking. Old man. . .ought to bloody sit quiet . . . fat chance! Give him an inch, and he'll swallow us all. (212)

In *Sakharam Binder*, the way Sakharam talks to Laxmi is quite different from the manner in which he behaves with Champa. When Laxmi is hurt by a burning coal, Sakharam reacts as: "Good! I hope these coals roast your feet-roast them, nice and brown. I don't feel a bit sorry" (140) Whereas when Champa is hurt, he reacts as: "Let me see. Are you hurt? Where? Tell me. Where does it hurt? Come, show me. . ." (174).

In *Ghashiran Kotwal*, the manner in which Nana convinces Ghashiram after his daughter's death is completely in contrast with what he says after his death. In the first instance he tries to develop a solidarity face so that his own weakness might not be exposed whereas in the second instance he resumes his power face and talks like a deputy of the Peshwa. Nana to Ghashiram:

. What has happened, has happened. All the world need not know. Your good name. Your reputation is our reputation. Anyone's saying strange things about the Peshwa's Kotwal would be unbrahmanical. Every care should be taken that no one anywhere speaks of this. If you hear a gossip-monger, don't wait a second longer-cut off his head! This shall not come to the Peshwa's ear- that is my responsibility. . . (406)
Nana, to the people of Poona, after Ghshiram's death penalty:

. . . A threat to the great city of Poona has been ended today. . . A disease has been controlled. The demon Ghashya Kotwal, who plagued all of us, has met his death. Everything has happened according to the wishes of the gods. The mercy of the gods is with us always. Let the corpse of sinful Ghashya rot. Let the wolves and dogs have it. Let the worms have it. . . We have commanded that there be festivities for three days to mark this happy occasion. (416)

In *Kamala*, the lingual behaviour of Jaisingh's friend Jain is interesting to observe when he talks to Jaisingh and afterwards to Kakasaheb. Jain to Jaisingh says, " . . . Tu chup rah be! Sale, . . . He's a first class rascal, I tell you, Bhabhi. Sala, hiding secrets from your friends! Hiding them! But I salute this rascal. Because he's a maha rascal, not an ordinary one". When Jain is introduced to kakasaheb, he says, "Pleased to meet you, Kakasaheb. It's the second time we've been introduced-but never mind." (27).

In *Encounter in Umbugland* the way Vratyasom talks in presence of Vijaya as a minister is completely different from what he is behind her back. In front of Vijaya, he says: "Viju really looked perfect in that imposing coronation ceremony, didn't she? Eh, Bhagadanta?" (300) whereas he says: "This is rebellion on the part of that bitch!" and " . . . Honeyed words are not going to make that bitch any wiser" (331). In *Kayadaan*, when Nath is disillusioned by Arun's behaviour he says: " . . . his visit has polluted this drawing room, this house, and this day . . . It stinks . . . I feel like taking a bath, like cleaning myself! . . . Why did I have to come into contact with a man like this? . . . " (553). These are his real feelings but due to his social obligation as a father in law he appreciates Arun's book in a public discussion on it. Afterwards he confesses: "The views I expressed happen to be the exact opposite of what I feel about that book. I hate that book" (556).
According to Bernstein: "A social role can then be considered as a complex coding activity controlling both the creation and organization of specific meaning and the conditions for their transmission and reception" (Chaturvei-58). The plays under study do not offer much scope for a detailed analysis of role relationship as interactions take place amongst a limited number of characters without frequent switching of roles and, there is also not much variation in the settings, still it is interesting to trace how lingual behavior alters with an alteration in the role.

4.3. Code Switching in the select plays:

The collection of linguistic items are compartmentalized into separate varieties-each with its own social links. Code-switching is an inevitable consequence of bilingualism. Anyone who speaks more than one language chooses between them according to circumstances. As Elgin observes that speakers: "move back and forth among languages, dialects and registers with ease, as demanded by the social situation or their own inner necessities." (qut. in Misra 112) The first consideration, of course, is which language will be comprehensible to the person addressed; generally speaking, speakers choose a language which the other person can understand. But in case of community multilingualism i.e. community where everybody speaks the same range of languages, different languages are used in different circumstances, and the choice of language is always controlled by social rules. Thus, each individual is expected to switch codes (i.e. language) several times in a day. The term 'code switching' is preferred to the term 'language switching' in order to accommodate other kinds of varieties like registers and dialects.

Halliday thinks code-switching as a : "code shift actualized as a process within the individual: the speaker moves from one code to another and back, more or less rapidly, in
course of a single sentence". Code-switching is a communicative strategy in a linguistic situation where two or more languages co-exist or are kept in constant contact. Dipietro defines it as "the use of more than one language by communicants in the execution of a speech act. (qut. in Malik 3). It is generally observed that speakers use expressions from second language even when its equivalents are available in the first language as they feel that these expressions come to them naturally. Sociolinguists have proposed various reasons for code switching which are of course valid but for the present purpose it would be appropriate to accept Carol Myres Scotton's explanation that all the reasons for: "code-switching are valid, they all can be subsumed under an explanation, which views a desire to attain as high rewards as possible and as low costs as possible as the determining factor in any language." (qut. in Chaturvedi 9)

The select plays also exhibit certain instances of code-switching. The play Silence! The Court is in Session employs the use of certain words from the repertoire of Sanskirt language. Mr Kashikar says, Adhikasya adhikam phalam. (76) Janani janmabhumishcha svargadapi gariyasi. (79) Sukhatme states, Na stri swatantryamarhati. (115), moreover he says, Na Miss Benare swatantryamarhati. (115). They take refuge in the use of a classical language to justify their orthodox patriarchal attitude. The use of the language of intellectuals will act as support to assert their traditional way of thinking. Later on Leela Benare reiterates the same when she says, Na jeevan jeevanamarhati. (116). Here, she sums up what her experiences have taught to her.

In Sakharam Binder, the manner in which Sakharam greets his Muslim friend Dawood can be cited as an example of code switching:

DAWOOD. Salaam Walekum!

SAKHARAM. . . Walekum Salaam! Come, sit down! (129)
Here, Sakharam greets his friend in accordance to the Muslim culture.

In Kamala the following examples of code switching can be traced:

JAISINGH. "Hello Jaspalji, main Jaisingh bol reyae. I've just come back. Mission accomplished! . . ." (9)

JAISINGH. " . . . And the government-oh they're pure and lily-white. They say, Shantam Papam-perish the thought. . . ." (14)

KAKASAHEB. " . . . This new journalism of yours-if money making is not the object of it-then it's a vandhya-sambhog" (24).

The example of code switching in Encounter in Umbugland is given by Prannarayan when he says: " . . . Crisis! Prathamgrase makshita patah. Obstacles right from the start. . . ." (297). The play A Friend's Story does not give any example of code switching. In Kanyadaan, there is a reference of a Marathi song: " . . . Uthao jhanda bandaacha- 'Hold high the flag of revolution!'" (503)

In modern and industrialised communities there is a frequent and fluid change from one role to another and from one variety to another in a rapid succession. Fishman's observation, in this context, is quite relevant:

Intra language and Inter language switchings are socio-linguistic universals.

No urban community is limited in repertoire to a single variety of code.

Bilinguals and Bidialectals use code-switching as a verbal strategy. Code-switching in multilingual setting is regulated by the topic of discourse and socio-cultural setting and participants. The implication of topical regulation of language choice is that certain topics are somehow handled better or more appropriately in one language than in another in particular multilingual
The study in the foregoing pages reveals Tendulkar's genius in portraying the social issues and cultural deformity successfully. Like the playwright, his characters are outspoken and bold. His theatrical language is unpretentious, simple and without any sort of 'theatrical overtones'. To achieve such heights of artistry, one needs a perfect command on language and clarity regarding content. His dialogues suited the characters realistically, rather than being theatrical. The sociolinguistic concepts like performative utterances and speech community have proven fruitful in the analysis of the select plays. Tendulkar exploits his subconscious knowledge of the restrictions that membership in a particular speech community places on linguistic behavior, in order to characterize the dramatis personae of Leela Benare, Sakharam, Ghashiram and Mitra as outsiders who flout the regular conventions of discourse and set themselves up in a speech community of one, despite the demands of the social network in which they are forced to operate.

The concept of performative utterances show how an author can manipulate the characters of his work to be sometimes subtle, sometimes obvious and aggressive at times. They become rough with foul words like Sakharam, simple middle class as in Silence!, sharp and cosmopolitan as in Kamala, or lyrical, brahminical and stylized to suit the music as in Ghashiram Kotwal. The open reference to issues like sexuality through his dialogues, aroused a huge outcry which endorses that his characters really flouted the social norms. The kinship terms, concept of power and solidarity assisted in probing deeper into the recesses of human psyche, analyzing and interpreting the complex psychological states of the characters. The sociolinguistic concepts supplemented a complete understanding of the plays and proven their relevance in contemporary scenario as nothing has changed considerably since the plays were written.
Chapter - V Social Inequality and Language

5.1. Social Class 206
   5.1.1. Swearing and Abuses 207
   5.1.2. Registers 212

5.2. Caste and Culture 217

5.3. Gender: Male Female Differences in Speech 224