CHAPTER III

OBSERVANCE AND VIOLATION OF CP AND PP IN UNTOUCHABLE

3.1 Preliminaries

In the part one of this chapter, an effort is made to discuss the highly marked examples taken from the novel Untouchable with respect to observance of Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principle. The discussion is centered on the maxims of both the principles. The characters in the novel under consideration observe some or all the maxims or violate them with some illocutionary force in them. The intentionality of the character is determined by the selection of the words the character makes. Therefore, studying the utterances applying both the principles is vital to the understanding and interpreting the novel. Here, in this chapter, an effort is made to study observance of Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principle in the novel.

In the part two of the chapter, categorically selected utterances of the prominent characters related to the violation of Cooperative
Principle and Politeness Principle is thoroughly discussed. The analysis is made of the utterances on the basis of the Indian socio-cultural background as it is relevant for the discussion. The social as well as the interpersonal relations of the characters are taken into account while analyzing the utterances in the context with a view to establishing authenticity of the characters. The speech situations and speech events are repeated at certain places deliberately, to emphasis the importance of the background in which the conversation take place.

3.2 Part I: Observance of CP and PP

In the fatal morning of that day Bakha is awakened by the abuses flung at him by his father. Still, he lay in bed leisurely and wanted to have a more sleep covering his face and body in a blanket. As soon as he was dozing off again, he heard Havildar Charat Singh's loud call using the diminutive expression with abusive language. He shouts:

‘Oh! Bakhya! Oh, Bakhya! Oh, you scoundrel of a sweepers son! Come and clean a latrine for me!’(Havildar Charat Singh-Bakha)(P.7)

Havildar Charat Singh summons Bakha to come to his house and clean the latrine. He was a famous hockey player of 38th Dogras regiment. The above-addresser is a master and the addressee is a
servant. Therefore, the social relationship between the two has to be taken into account for the proper interpretation of the conversation that took place between the two. Bakha is the hearer of the said utterance. Bakha's reply in this context is:

‘All right, Havildar ji, I will get one ready for you at once.’ (Bakha-Havildar Charat Singh) (P.7)

The addresser of the above utterance is Bakha, who comes from the lower strata of the society. He observes the Quantity and Quality Maxims of Cooperative Principle in order to show profound respect to the addressee. Bakha, the protagonist of the novel makes it clear that he is socially related to the hearer of the utterance in the context. Bakha also observes the Politeness Principle to show the respect thinking that the Havildar would be pleased to address him in this fashion. Here, Bakha uses the Tact Maxim of Politeness Principle and addresses him as ‘Havildarji’. This Tact Maxim minimizes the cost to the hearer or the interlocutor of the utterance in the context. It also maximizes the benefit to the Havildar because his latrine is getting ready to be used at the earliest. Therefore, one can say that both the speaker and the hearer are on the cooperative terms, very friendly and follow the principles of communication as they are the members of the society. Bakha and Charat Singh share servant master relationship because Bakha who is a servant uses the honorific term ‘Havildarji’. The suffix ‘ji’ is used in the Indian
context to show reverence and respect for the elderly people in the society or the masters.

Bakha is a young boy of eighteen, belongs to lower caste, and his work is to clean the latrine. This class of society has certain limitations of their living standard. But this young boy likes upper class society and tries to imitate their life style. In the fine early morning, while performing his duty as a scavenger, he is gentlemanly dressed. Charat Singh on seeing the dress code of Bakha is surprised. Commenting on his dress, he says:

‘You are becoming a gentleman, ohe Bakhya! Where, did you get that uniform’ (Havildar Charat Singh-Bakha) (P.08)

Here, the addresser is Charat Singh who comes from an elite class and who is kind to the person addressed. He compliments Bakha for his strange appearance. Bakha is pleased to hear the word ‘gentleman’ used for describing his outward personality. Here, it is amply clear that Charat Singh observes the Approbation Maxim of PP because he praises Bakha. In other words, the speaker of the above utterance minimizes the self-praise and maximizes the hearer's praise. The perlocutionary effect on Bakha is that he begins to feel shy because he knows that such dresses are made for upper class people only. The address term 'Bakhya" indicates that both the speaker and hearer are intimately associated with each other and
they have shared knowledge of the speech situation of the utterance in the context. But, here, Bakha smartly uses the Relation Maxim and replies:

‘Huzoor it is all your blessing.’
(Bakha- Havildar Charat Singh) (P.8)

In Indian context, the word ‘Huzoor’ is used for addressing an elderly person. It is also used for addressing a respectable person or a person of high rank and file. Here, Bakha, the utterer is trying to please Havildar Charat Singh by using the word ‘Huzoor’. He further adds that due to the blessings of the addressee he is able to wear such clothes. Bakha knows that he belongs to the lower class of the society and his master Charat Singh comes from the upper class. In India, it is assumed that whatever good happens, it happens with the blessings of elders. Bakha observes the Approbation Maxim of PP. In the above utterances, Havildar Charat Singh and Bakha mutually observe the Principles of Politeness and Cooperation.

Havildar Charat Singh is a very kind hearted person. He knows that Bakha is a hard working and sincere boy. He compliments Bakha for his clothes and appearance. In reply, Bakha politely gives credit to him by saying that ‘it is all with your blessings’. By this remark, Charat Singh feels sympathetic and articulates:
In the above linguistic expression, the speaker observes Sympathy and Tact Maxim. Charat Singh feels sympathetic for a downtrodden young boy who cleans latrine for him. He knows that the boy is interested in hockey and is best player of the regiment. Thus, he decides to call him in the afternoon of that day and offers him a hockey stick as a gift. The generous promise of Charat Singh astonishes the adolescent boy. Being the down-trodden, the helpless servant, Bakha is delighted to receive the surprise gift. For Bakha, Havildarji is an angel sent by God to fulfill his secret desire. Bakha is so amazed that he salutes Havildar in the customary style.

There, are many speech situations in the novel where, both the principles are operative.

In one of the speech situations, Sohini, Bakha’s sister went to fetch water from the public well, which is meant for the high caste people. The outcastes were not allowed to mount the platform surrounding the well, because if they were ever to draw water from the well, Hindus of the upper castes would consider the water polluted. Lower class people had no well of their own. When Sohini reached the well, there, were already about ten outcastes
waiting in a queue. Gulabo, the washerwoman, noticed that Sohini was approaching. Gulabo ridicules:

‘Go back home.’ ‘There, is no one to give you water here! And, at any rate, there, are so many of us ahead of you!’ (Gulabo-Sohini) (P.16)

The addresser of the above utterance, Gulabo, is middle aged beautiful and fair complexioned woman, Gulabo. Once she was the most beautiful woman in the village, but now her face is covered with wrinkles. She belongs to lower class society, but superior to every other outcaste. She claims a higher place in the hierarchy of the castes among the low castes. Now, Sohini being of the lowest caste among the outcastes would naturally be looked down upon by Gulabo. The delicate features of Sohini’s rising beauty had added fuel to Gulabo’s anger. Gulabo is jealous of Sohini’s slender beauty. Therefore, she mocks at the latter and violates Tact Maxim, Agreement Maxim, and Generosity Maxim of PP. But the woman observes the Quality and the Quantity Maxims. In reply, Sohini smiled evasively, and then recognizing an elderly man in the company, she modestly drew her apron from her head a little over her eyes. And she sat still, crouching at her pitcher. Here, her body language shows that she is modest in her behavior.

Sohini, being lower in the hierarchical order of the low castes observes the Maxims of CP and PP. She tries to avoid picking up a
quarrel with Gulabo fearing that her reputation in the society would be in danger. Gulabo is responsible to evoke the feeling of anger in Sohini because she abuses Sohini in a filthy language by using the words such as ‘bitch’, ‘prostitute’, ‘wanton’ and ‘slut’. Then, she thinks that she cannot tolerate Gulabo’s abuses. But still she holds her breath and requests her conversational partner to be mindful of her language. Sohini says to Gulabo:

‘Please don’t abuse me. I haven’t said anything to you.’ (Sohini- Gulabo) (P.17)

In the above utterance, Sohini observes the Maxim of and the Maxim of Manner even though she is angry. Her anger is not transformed into either verbal abuse or physical fight. She maintains her cool and makes a request to Gulabo not to abuse her publicly. Sohini observers the above-stated maxims because she knows that Gulabo is elder enough to her mother’s age and she belongs to upper class society as compared to her caste. Despite maltreatment, Sohini politely requests Gulabo not to abuse her in front of other women of the low castes. Indian cultural context implicitly states that one should respect the elders in the respective speech community even though one is badly treated by them.

At the same time, Pundit ji came to the well. Pundit ji recognizes Sohini as a sweeper’s daughter. He had seen her before, noticed her as she came to clean the latrines in the gullies in the town. He says:
‘Oh, you Lakha’s daughter, come here,’ ‘you have been patient, and the reward of patience, say the holy books, is supreme.’ (Pundit ji-Sohini) (P.21)

In the above utterance, the addressee is Pundit ji who is a high caste Hindu and the addressee is Sohini from the lower caste. He becomes sympathetic towards Sohini because he has evil intentions in his mind. If one notices the utterance of Pundit ji, one comes to know that superficially his utterance is related to Sympathy and Generosity Maxims. However, at the deeper level of communication, his utterance indirectly speaks about his immoral intentions. The address term used for Sohini is very peculiar as far as Indian socio-cultural context is concerned. In Indian context, if one does not remember the proper name of the person addressed, one is likely to say ‘oh, a daughter of Lakhya’. In reply to Pundit ji’s offer, she says ‘But Pundit ji!’ Here, it is clear that Sohini hesitates the favour not because she divined the Brahmin's admiration, but because she was afraid of all those who had come before her. The reply given by Sohini speaks volumes about her modesty and honesty. She observes the Maxims of Manner and Relation since she is orderly in the use of language and speaks connectedly in the on-going conversation.
In another episode, Ram Charan’s sister is getting married. Bakha goes to attend the same. Bakha comes to Ram Charan’s house and waits at a long distance curiously looking at the event of marriage. He greets Ram Charan. He likes the new clothes of Ram Charan and admits:

‘Oh, is that why you are wearing such nice clothes to-day!’ ‘I see! What a fine waistcoat that! Only a bit frayed that gold thread on the velvet. And oh, I like that chain! (Bakha-Ram Charan)(P.26)

The conversation takes place between Bakha and Ram Charan. Here, it is important at this point to establish the relationship between Bakha and Ram Charan. The interpersonal and social relations play a big role in the interpretation of the above utterance of Bakha, which is aimed at Ram Charan. Both the speaker and the hearer of the utterance in the context are very good friends but on the social scales one is placed higher than the other. Bakha belongs to lower class society in comparison to the caste to which Ram Charan belongs. The interpersonal relations of the interlocutors are so strong that they are likely to make lighthearted comments of the appearance of each other. Naturally, Bakha, on seeing Ram Charan wearing fine waistcoat, starts praising him for the good reason. Bakha, the utterer, wants to make his hearer feel elated and pleasant. According to Indian ritual when some ceremony or
function takes place, one should wear new clothes. Therefore, Ram Charan is newly dressed. It is his sister’s marriage ceremony. Bakha is attracted towards the Ram Charan’s dress and he admires it. He observes Approbation and Agreement Maxims of PP. He praises his appearance and his chain. Bakha maximizes the agreement between him and his friend Ram Charan. He also observes the Maxim of Quality of CP when he speaks the truth of his friend's dress.

According to traditional view, in India whatever is the occupation of one’s father, his son should continue with the same occupation. In the same way the protagonist of the novel, Bakha follows the same occupation and the traditional role given to him by the society. Lakha, the father of Bakha, is growing old and all the responsibilities of doing the scavenging work lie with his two sons: Bakha and Rakha. Suddenly, Lakha is taken ill one day. He asks his son Bakha to go and sweep the roads in the town and temple courtyard. Bakha is angry and irritated because he knows that his younger brother is whiling away time playing with his friends. He asks his brother to go home. He says:

‘Oh Rakhia, why did you run away early in the morning? Father is ill and there, is all the work at the latrines to do in my absence. Come, my brother, run back home. Sohini has kept some hot tea for you, too.’ (Bakha-Rakha) (P.28)
The above linguistic expression indicates intimacy between Bakha and his younger brother Rakha. It also shows solidarity because the addressee of the utterance uses the diminutive expression to address Rakha. In Indian context, a younger brother has to obey the command of the elder brother. Here, Bakha calls his brother Rakha to assist him in doing the work of cleaning the latrines and roads as it is customary for the sweepers to work for the Tommies and the high caste Hindus in the town of Balusha. Immediately, Rakha, without hesitation, responds to the call of his brother and starts walking home. While on his way to work, Bakha reminds his brother that Sohini, their sister has kept some tea for him also. An illocutionary force of the call is that Rakha immediately moves towards home. The non-verbal cues indicate that Rakha is observing the Principles of Cooperation and Politeness.

Bakha, the protagonist of the novel, is on his way to sweep the roads in the town. On the way, he encounters one of the high caste Hindus. By mistake, he happens to touch Lalla ji, a high caste Hindu. Lalla ji abuses Bakha profusely in the name of, ‘swine’, ‘son of a dog’, ‘an offspring of a pig’ and ‘dirty dog’. He, in addition, calls him brute. He is terribly angry with Bakha for polluting him in the public street. There are several onlookers who are watching the scene of the quarrel. One urchin comments that Bakha used to beat him unnecessarily. On hearing the words of the urchin, Lalla ji says:
'Now look, look, he has been beating innocent little children. He is confirmed rogue!' (Lalla ji-Bakha) (P.40)

In reply to Lalla ji's accusation Bakha says:

'No, Lalla ji, it is not true that I beat this child, it is not true, have erred now. I forgot to call. I beg your forgiveness. It won’t happen again. I forgot. I beg your forgiveness. It won’t happen again!' (Bakha-Lalla ji) (P.40)

If we study the linguistic interaction between Lalla ji and Bakha, we come to know that the latter is observing the Generosity and Relation Maxims. This instance shows the anger of the upper class towards the lower class society. Lalla ji curses and abuses Bakha for polluting him. Bakha is traumatized and cannot utter a single word in defense in the beginning. He is shocked and with fear automatically his hands are folded for an apology. Since, he belongs to the sweeper class society, he cannot reply angrily to the touched person. On the contrary, he is very apologetic and knew that if he retorted the touched man, he would invite more troubles for himself. Here, therefore, Bakha is compelled to observe the above said Maxims.
The reply given by Bakha is worth studying from the point of view of social relations. Bakha was so frightened and panic-stricken that he could not utter a word. Being nervous, he stood there with folded hands. Bakha repeatedly said that he had not beaten the child. He was very truthful and spoke for the desired purpose of communication. Therefore, he was seen observing the Maxims of Quality and Quantity simultaneously. He was speaking the truth and providing appropriate information to the people standing around him. Bakha was apologizing and begging forgiveness for touching Lalla ji. He came to know his mistake and promised that it would not happen again. The above utterance is an example of Cooperative Principle. It is obvious that Bakha unknowingly touched Lalla ji and defiled him. Lalla ji cursed and abused him badly in the presence of the crowd in the market. Luckily for Bakha, a tonga-wallah came up from the crowd. The crowd dispersed and scattered to safety. The touched man was not yet satisfied. He stood firmly where he was. The tonga-wallah angrily shouted at the touched man ‘Look out, eh, Lalla ji’, in his peculiar style as was required by his profession. When the tonga-wallah arrived on the scene, he heard a sharp, clear slap through the air. By knowing this, tonga-wallah felt sympathy for the poor helpless boy Bakha. He utters:

‘Leave him, never mind, let him go, come along, tie your turban.’ (Tonga-wallah-Bakha) (P.42)
The addresser is a responsible citizen. This means that a poor and lower class person knows the feelings of another lower class person i.e. Bakha. Tonga-wallah, who being a Muhammadan, minimizes antipathy between himself and Bakha, the hearer of the said utterance. Tonga-wallah is also an untouchable from the orthodox Hindu point of view, shared the outcaste’s resentment to a certain degree. He is sympathetic to the boy and supports him emotionally and asks him to leave the matter and move on. By this consolation, Bakha moves aside and by putting his basket and broom down, wraps the folds of the turban. Wiping the tears off his face with his hands, he picks up his tools and starts walking. He has to move on for doing his work.

Bakha was abused, cursed and even physically embarrassed by Lalla ji and other shopkeepers. He accidentally touched Lalla ji and as a result he was slapped by Lalla ji. The slap on the face of Bakha is highly symbolic. It is not just a physical action performed by the caste Hindu but it is the slap on the face of the entire community of Bakha. In those days, defiling a person belonging to the upper caste was an offence. If a high caste Hindu was defiled by the touch of an untouchable, he would purify himself by taking a holy bath. Bakha apologizes his mistake and admits his fault that he forgets to announce his arrival. He picks up his broom and bucket and starts moving. By announcing:
'Posh keep away, posh, sweeper coming, posh, posh, sweeper coming, posh, posh, sweeper coming!' (Bakha-people passing through the street) (P.42)

Now, as he moves ahead he repeats the announcement. Bakha is totally depressed with the experiences he had had throughout the day. He came home; his father noticed his face and asked:

'What is the matter with you today? Are you tired?' (Lakha-Bakha) (P.69)

Bakha hesitated for a moment. Then, in a struggle to maintain the secret, he answered:

'Nothing,' ‘there is nothing.’

‘Nothing! There, is nothing.’ (Bakha-Lakha) (P.70)

In the above linguistic expression, the first speaker is Lakha and the hearer is Bakha, his son. On observing the facial expressions of Bakha, he wanted to know the cause of his worry. However, Bakha tries to hide the secret and then gives a reply. The reply given by Bakha looks a plain answer to the question asked by his father. However, at the deeper level he observes the Maxim of Tact and Maxim of Generosity. Bakha tries to minimize the cost Lakha.
Bakha does not want to disclose whatever had happened to him the whole day. He knows that he was humiliated and maltreated by the caste Hindus. He did not want to tell his father about his sister's molestation by the priest in the temple. He also did not want to tell the insult by the woman of a big house in the silversmith’s gulley who threw the bread at him from fourth storey. Bakha thinks that if he told all the incidents to his father, he would be disheartened and dejected. Therefore, Bakha repeatedly told his father that nothing had happened to him. He observes the Principles of PP and CP to avoid the wrath of his father.

Bakha tried to maintain the secret, but he was touched by the sympathetic tone of his father. He felt suffocated. He felt he couldn’t sustain that mood for long and he burst out with an explosion more suddenly. He started narrating the first incident of the market. Bakha said:

A: ‘They insulted me this morning, abused me because as I was walking along a man happened to touch me. He gave me a blow. And a crowd around me, abusing and cursing and even…’ (Bakha-Lakha) (P.70)

He couldn’t continue. He was possessed by an overpowering feeling of self pity. Bakha expected a support and consolation from his father, but Lakha utters:
B: ‘My son,’ ‘didn’t you give a warning of your approach? ‘Why weren’t you more careful, my boy?’ (Lakha-Bakha) (P.70)

The speaker B is Lakha, who seems angry because according to him, Bakha should announce his arrival. Lakha knows the ethics to be followed in the society. He knows the limitations of untouchables. He says that they are their masters and they are superiors. They should respect them and do what they wish us to do. They should obey their masters' orders. Lakha's philosophy towards the upper class society is totally different from that of Bakha's. Lakha explains this all to his son and wants him to observe and follow class hierarchy. Lakha observes the Maxim of Tact.

Bakha is totally disheartened by different incidents that took place in a day. He expected some relief, sympathy and moral support from his father. But Lakha too blames him for not following the customs of his community. Bakha narrates the market incident in which he was humiliated. His father, Lakha, should have been sympathetic to him but he gets angry for violating the customs of his community. He says to Bakha ‘why don’t you announce your arrival’? Bakha is dejected and agitated to hear the response of his father. Bakha describes how Pundit in the temple molested Sohini and then came shouting: Polluted, polluted’. Bakha also narrates the incident of a woman of the big house in the silversmith’s gulley
who threw the bread at him from fourth storey. The shocking treatment given to Bakha touched Lakha and he questions Bakha:

\[ A: \text{`You didn’t abuse or hit back, did you?’} \]
\[ (\text{Lakha-Bakha}) \ (P.70) \]

In reply to his father’s question Bakha says:

\[ B: \text{`No, but I was sorry afterwards that I didn’t,’} \]
\[ \text{`I could have given them a bit of my mind.’} \]
\[ (\text{Lakha-Bakha}) \ (P.70) \]

The above instance ‘A’ shows Lakha’s sense of fear because he is afraid that his son has committed a crime. Lakha does not want to provoke his son against high-caste men for he knows that these rich people are more influential. He lived his life with the blessings of these upper-class people. In utterance ‘B’, Bakha initially observes the Maxims of Quantity and Relation. But, in the next part of the utterance, he feels sorry that he should have done so. This conveys to the readers that there was a fiery spirit in Bakha. He wanted to manhandle the people who were atrocious to him for no obvious fault of him. However, Bakha cannot hide his suppressed anger. Even if Bakha is angry he seems to be cooperative to his father as communicated in utterance ‘B’. Further, Lakha tries to convince his son in the following manner:
‘No, no, my son, no,’ we can’t do that. They are our superiors. One word of theirs is sufficient to overbalance all that we might say before the police. They are our masters. We must respect them and do as they tell us. Some of them are kind.’ (Lakha-Bakha) (P.71)

Lakha, while in a conversation with his son, tries to convince him that the traditional roles given to the lower class by the society make them polite. Lakha thinks that some of the people belonging to upper caste are kind to them. Thus, Lakha observes the Maxim of Relation. This Maxim of the Cooperative Principle expects the speaker to be relevant in the context. Here, the context is the reality of the Hindu society before Indian independence when untouchability was not a crime. The untouchables were expected to please and obey their masters. They were expected to do the odd jobs for their masters. Therefore, Lakha advises his son to respect them.

We come across an incident where, Sohini was insulted by the temple priest. Bakha, her brother, wanted to know what had happened to his sister at the temple courtyard. She did not want to invite troubles for herself and her brother. Let us consider the following interaction between Bakha and Sohini:

A: ‘Tell me! tell me, that he didn’t do anything to you!’ ‘Tell me, Sohini, how far did he
go? ‘Tell me! Tell me! I will kill him if...’ (Bakha-Sohini)

B: ‘He-e-e just teased me, and then when I was bending down to work, he came and held me by my breast.’ (Sohini-Bakha)

A: ‘The son of pig! I will go and kill him!’
(Bakha-Sohini) (P.54)

In the above conversation between Bakha and Sohini, we come across some expressions containing profane use of language. In the absence of the priest Bakha gets angry. His anger is the result of ill-treatment given to his sister by Pandit Kalinath, the priest. Bakha thinks that the Brahmin priest must have molested Sohini. Bakha’s rage is fully expressed by his flared wild and red eyes, clenched fist, grounded teeth. He feels like killing him but he cannot. He simply abuses him in the name of a ‘dog’ and advances to search for him in the crowd. Bakha asks Sohini, that how Kalinath molested her. He wanted to know exactly how he molested her. In reply, Sohini tells her brother that the priest has just teased her. She further tells him that the priest held her breasts. After listening to Sohini he becomes angry and agitated. In the above conversation we notice that the Maxims of Quality, Quantity, Manner and Relation of Cooperative Principle have been observed. Both the conversational partners are cooperative to each other.
In another episode, we come across the conversation between Chota and Bakha. The speech situation is the marriage of Ram Charan’s sister. Though, Bakha and Chota belong to lower class society, they are not allowed to participate in the marriage. Both the friends are standing outside the tent and waiting for Ram Charan. The trio is having good relation among themselves. There is no hierarchy in their friendship. Ram Charan never fails to bring sugar-plums for them. He was scolded badly after turning towards his friends. A sharp voice of his mother: ‘Are you running away to play with that dirty sweeper and leather-worker on the very day of your sister’s marriage? You ought to be ashamed of yourself, you little dog!’ These words added the misery to Bakha’s worse day. The upset mood of Bakha is clearly read by his friends. Chota enquired:

'What has happened to you? Come friend tell us'. (Bakha-Chota)

In reply to Chota's query Bakha says:

'Nothing, it’s nothing.'

'Come, come, we are your friends.' (Bakha-Chota) (P.88)

The above conversation between Chota and Bakha indicates that both the conversational partners are very good friends. Their
interpersonal relationship is grounded in their communicative strategies. They can understand the emotional world of each other by looking at the facial expressions. Here, Bakha's reply if studied at the deeper level of communication, unfolds that what is communicated is not the entire truth. Bakha sounds cooperative to his friend because he does not want to disclose to his friends how he was ill-treated by the caste Hindus. He observes the Maxims of Tact in order to avoid further complications.

Bakha afterwards narrates the incidents of that day to his friends. After leaving his friends that morning, he went to the market for sweeping the road. While walking through the market, a man touched him and began to abuse him, and summoned a large crowd; and how before he could get away, he had slapped him. He also narrates how the priest tried to molest his sister. He further tells about his humiliation by a landlady. After listening to awful experiences of Bakha, Chota utters:

‘Comrade, we’re sorry,’ ‘Come be brave, forget all this. What can we do? We are outcastes.’ ‘Come’, ‘forget all about it.’ (Bakha-Chota) (P.88)

When Bakha narrated his experiences of the day, his friend Chota felt empathy for Bakha. Chota, in the above utterance uses the term 'comrade' to address Bakha. This shows the solidarity between the
two conversational partners. He tries to console him by using the words ‘be brave’, ‘forget all this’. Chota tells him to forget all the past memories. Chota tries to soothe him and admits that they are outcastes. He further wants to bring to the notice of Bakha that they cannot do anything in this situation. Thus, it seems that both the conversational partners are helpless due to their low position in the society. He wants Bakha to forget all and invites him to play hockey. He observes Sympathy and Relation Maxims.

In the next instance, Mulk Raj Anand creates a speech situation in which hockey match was being played between 38th Dogra boys and 31st Punjabi boys. Chota, Bakha, Ram Charan and other outcastes’ boys are playing under 38th Dogra team, whereas, upper-class boys were playing under 31st Punjabis team. The match was being played among big boys. Chota was leading 38th Dogra team and he had selected 11 players for his team. Babu's little son came to play after the selection but was rejected by Chota. Bakha requested Chota for little boy, but was not successful. Chota discarded him by saying that it was a match of big boys and he was too small. It would troublesome, if he got hurt. His elder brother was one of the members of the 38th Dogra team. He tried to console him along with Bakha. The boy was disappointed.

The match started. The crowd of boys in the field hopped to and fro like grasshoppers. There was no organization in the game. Bakha had rolled the ball dodging, drilling to the goal of 31st Punjabis
boys. But it had been caught, enmeshed, by a throng of defenders of the goal, however Bakha managed to hollow out the ball into the space between the posts. 31st Punjabis were defeated with superior tactics. The goalkeeper of 31st Punjabis spitefully struck on Bakha’s legs. Bakha got badly hurt and there, was a free fight between the teams. In their intense excitement they did not notice a little boy standing near the clothes between them. Big stones started coming to one another. Most of the stones, however, passed high the child’s head. But a bad throw from Ram Charan caught a little boy’s head. Bakha picked him up in his arms and took him to the hall of his house. Unfortunately for Bakha, child’s mother met him face to face. She abused and curses him badly for injuring her son in the following way:

A: 'Give him to me! Give me my child! You have defiled my house, bedsides wounding my son!' (injured child’s mother- Bakha)

The child’s mother maltreats Bakha, without knowing the truth. To defend Bakha, her elder son utters:

B: ‘Mother, mother, what are you saying? ‘It was not he. He didn’t wound him. It was the washerwoman’s son Ram Charan.’ (injured child’s brother- mother) (P.106)
In reply to the mother's blame on Bakha, her elder son very humbly told his mother that Bakha had not done anything to his younger brother. He further informed her that it was Ram Charan who wounded his brother while playing a game of hockey.

The speaker feels sympathy for the poor boy Bakha who is not at fault. The speaker in the utterance ‘B’ is the elder son of angry woman. He is the witness of the incident. Here, the speaker observes the Sympathy Maxim, and all Maxims of CP such as the Maxim of Quality, the Maxim of Quantity, the Maxim of Relation and the Maxim of Manner.

In another incident, a well dressed person exactly like a sahib but, not wearing a round cap came to Bakha and enquired about Bakha's health. Bakha has seen this man in the outcastes’ gulley many times with a number of copies of the Hindustani translation of the Bible under his arm. But this is the first occasion on which he had found himself face to face with him. Bakha was sitting with both hands on his forehead and thinking of the sahib. And again sahib enquired him. The following conversation between Colonel Hutchinson, the Priest and Bakha throws light on the observance on certain Maxims of CP and PP:

\[ A: \text{‘What has happened? Are you ill?’} \]  
\[ \text{(Colonel Hutchinson-Bakha)} \]
B: ‘Nothing, Sahib, I was just tired’. ‘I am sweeper here, son of Lakha, Jemadar of the sweepers.’ (Bakha-Colonel Hutchinson)

A: ‘I know! I know! How is your father?’ (Colonel Hutchinson-Bakha)

B: ‘Huzoor, he is well’. (Bakha-Colonel Hutchinson)

A: ‘Has your father told you who I am?’ (Colonel Hutchinson-Bakha)

B: ‘Yes, Huzoor. You are a sahib.’ (Bakha-Colonel Hutchinson)

A: ‘No, no. I am not sahib. I am like you. I am padre of the Salvation Army.’ (Colonel Hutchinson-Bakha) (P.115)

In the above linguistic conversation, both the addresser and addressee are strangers or have less acquaintance. Though they are not related to each other intimately, they are observing almost all the Maxims of CP and PP such as Tact Maxim, Generosity Maxim, Sympathy Maxim, Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Relation and Maxim of Manner. The conversation takes place between Colonel Hutchinson and Bakha. Colonel is a padre, priest. He is kind in nature and respects all people. He often visited Bakha’s father when Bakha was a child. Colonel enquired about Bakha and his father’s health. Bakha cannot remember him and he
calls him sahib, but colonel says that he is not a sahib, he is like him. Bakha felt confused and embarrassed by the flood of kindness.

The following instance introduces the real intention of Colonel Hutchinson. He starts praising Jesus and His deeds. He says:

A: ‘He sacrificed Himself out of love for us. He sacrificed Himself for us all; for the rich and the poor for Brahmin and the Bhangi’ (Colonel-Bakha)

B: ‘Yes, yes sahib, I understand. Yessuh Messih makes no difference between the Brahmin and myself.’ (Bakha-Colonel)

A: ‘Yes, yes my boy, we are all alike in the eyes of Jesus. He is our superior. He is the son of God. We are all sinners. He will intercede with God, His father, on our behalf.’ (Colonel-Bakha)

B: ‘He is superior to us. We are all sinners. Why, why is anyone superior to another? Why are we all sinners?’ (Bakha-Colonel) (P.120)

In the above conversation, Colonel Hutchinson and Bakha observe the Tact Maxim, the Approbation Maxim and the Agreement Maxim of PP. They also follow the Maxim of Quality, the Maxim of Quantity and the Maxim of Manner of CP.
Colonel Hutchinson is an ardent follower of Christianity. He tries to explain about Jesus Christ and His sacrifices for mankind. He says that for Jesus we are equal. There is no class discrimination between the rich and poor, the Brahmin and the Bhangi. Bakha understands and agrees with Colonel’s views. Padre further says that Jesus was son of a God and he is superior to us. Jesus was a messenger of God and we are all sinners. Bakha asks him a question why we are sinners and why anyone is superior to another. The reason behind asking such question is that he is suffering a lot because of class discrimination.

The analysis of the categorically selected examples taken from the novel *Untouchable* prove that some of the characters observe all or some of the Maxims of CP and PP for the desired purpose of conversations. The conversations between or among the characters are studied against the socio-cultural realities that existed in India before independence. Before the independence the Hindu society was caste-ridden and was dominated by the British bureaucrats. The characters that belong to the lower rung of the Hindu society are inclined to observe certain Maxims depending on the interpersonal and social relationship. The characters that are placed in the higher positions are likely to violate the Maxims of CP and PP. Now it is important to study, analyze and interpret the violation of CP and PP.
3.3 Part II: Violation of CP and PP

In ‘Untouchable’ there, are many instances of the violation of Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principle. Since the novel is based on caste discrimination, hierarchical relations play an important role. The attitude of the high class people has been shown through utterances. Therefore, it is remarkable to analyze the conversations of the characters in the novel under consideration. In part one of the present chapter, the researcher has analyzed the carefully selected examples of observance of CP and PP. Now, let us examine the highly marked pieces of conversations taken from the novel Untouchable with reference to violation of CP and PP and analyze them against the backdrop of existing realities of Indian society which Mulk Raj Anand has depicted in this novel.

For interpreting the interpersonal relationship and social relationship, speech situations and speech events are taken into account. In the beginning of the novel Untouchable, one comes across a speech situation where the father of the protagonist is summoned to get up early in the wee hours of the morning and attend to the latrines of the sepoys. The following conversation is worth studying as it violates the Principles of Cooperation and Politeness:

\[ A: \text{‘Get up, ohe you Bakhya, you son of a pig,’} \]
'Get up and attend to the latrines or the sepoys will be angry, are you up? Get up, you illegally begotten’. (Lakha-Bakha)

B: ‘The bully!’ (Bakha-Lakha) (P.6)

In order to arrive at an authentic interpretation of the above conversation, one must understand the interpersonal relation between the two interlocutors. In the utterance ‘A’ Lakha is the addresser and Bakha, his son, is the addressee. They share father-son relation. Lakha wants Bakha to get up early and perform his duty of cleaning the latrine before Havildar Charat Singh comes to use it. He abuses Bakha in the name of a dirty animal. He uses the abuse ‘son of pig’, either to persuade Bakha to take certain immediate action. Lakha knows that they are outcastes/sweepers and so they need to do their duties in time before the upper class people get angry. Lakha is very harsh in tone and violates the Approbation Maxim, the Tact Maxim, and the Sympathy Maxim of Politeness Principle. The speaker of the first utterance also violates the Maxim of Quality and Quantity of Cooperative Principle.

The illocutionary force of Lakha's utterance is to make Bakha realize his duty to be performed as soon as he is ready in that fatal morning. Bakha is feeling feverish; he is tired and needs more rest. He thinks that the whole day he works without taking a moment’s rest but still his father abuses him, he waits for his father’s call, though he hates this, he still lies in his bed. He just gives vent to his
feeling of indignation by saying ‘The bully’ in the expression ‘B’. Though the expression is impolite, the speakers’ intention can be justified, though this is used as face threatening strategy. However, Bakha observes the Maxim of Relation.

In another speech situation, we come across the conversation between Havildar Charat Singh and Bakha in which the conversational partners violate some of the maxims of CP and PP.

A: ‘Why aren’t the latrines clean, you rogue of a Bakha. There, is not one fit to go near! I have walked all around! Do you know you are responsible for my piles? I caught the contagion sitting on one of those unclean latrines!

(Havildar Charat Singh-Bakha)

B: ‘All right, Havildar ji, I will get one ready for you at once.’ (Bakha- Havildar Charat Singh)

(P.7)

In the utterance A, the speaker is Hawaldar Charat Singh who is the famous hockey player of the 38th Dogra regiment. He expresses his anger using the offensive language. The abuse is battered on Bakha, the sweeper boy for not cleaning the latrine for him. He uses the derogatory word ‘rogue’ to address Bakha. Here, conversational partners are having master and servant relationship respectively. The illocutionary force of the utterance compels Bakha to perform
some kind of action. As the result of the abuse, Bakha quickly picks up his brush and basket and starts cleaning it earnestly without loss of effort and replies ‘alright Havildar ji, I will make one ready’. The result of cleaning it immediately, the abuser compensates his guilt by expressing his goodwill to Bakha and wish to offer the sweeper boy a hockey stick.

The utterance ‘A’ grossly violates the Maxim of Quality, the Maxim of Quantity and the Maxim of Manner at the same time. The conversational principles demand that a person has his/her own negative face. He/she has his own territory and he/she expects that no one should interfere or impose ideas upon him/her. Here, Hawaldar Charat Singh violates almost all the Maxims of Cooperative Principle. The expression “rogue of a Bakha!” expresses the notion of anger. He does not like the dirty latrines, which makes him suffer more from piles and he blames Bakha for his suffering. He thinks that Bakha is not able to fulfill his expectations of cleaning the latrine and therefore, he showers abuses. At the same time, the speaker ‘A’ is seen violating the Maxim of Modesty, the Maxim of Tact and the Maxim of Sympathy. Here, the speaker dispraises the hearer ‘B’. His expressions reflect his attitude to Bakha.

The male characters' use of language does not drastically differ from their counterparts female characters. In fact, both male and female characters of Mulk Raj Anand make use of foul language
which makes the novel a realistic portrayal of the downtrodden and the outcastes. The women folk of Mulk Raj Anand freely and abundantly make use of profane words and expressions to address their hearers. The conversations of the women are typical and fully pragmatically loaded. The women from the lower castes take liberty to abuse each other using the filthy language. Look at the following piece of conversation between Gulabo and Sohini:

A: ‘Think of it! Think of it! You prostitute! Wanton! And your mother hardly dead. Think of laughing in my face, laughing at me who am old enough to be your mother. Bitch! Bitch, why don’t you speak! Prostitute, why don’t you answer me? Ari, You bitch! Do you take me for a buffoon? What are you laughing at, slut? Aren’t you ashamed of showing your teeth to me in the presence of men, you prostitute?’ (Gulabo-Sohini)

B: ‘Please don’t abuse me, I haven’t said anything to you.’ (Sohini-Gulabo)

C: ‘You annoy with your silence, you illegally begotten! You eater of dung and drinker of urine! You bitch of a sweeper woman! I will show you how to insult old enough to be your mother.’ (Gulabo-Sohini) (P.17)
In the above expression, ‘A’ and ‘C’ are uttered by Gulabo to Sohini. Here, we must understand the interpersonal and social relationship between Gulabo and Sohini. Gulabo is a washer woman, a caste superior to Sohini’s caste. Sohini is from the lowest of the low caste. Being jealous Gulabo does not like Sohini’s slender, beautiful and attractive physical features. Therefore, Gulabo expresses her anger by using expressions like ‘prostitute’, ‘bitch’, ‘wanton’, ‘illegally begotten’ ‘eater of dung’ and ‘drinker of urine’ in order to humiliate and dehumanize Sohini, the hearer of the utterances in the context. The context of the utterance in ‘A’ and ‘C’ is that the speaker does not want the hearer to come to the platform of the public well to beg for water. The utterances of Gulabo show that she is not only cooperative but she is also impolite and stubborn. She nurtures ill will against Sohini as if she is her rival and competitor in the town. Gulabo's linguistic expressions are shocking to the hearer. Gulabo is middle aged, beautiful and fair complexioned woman. Once she was the most attractive woman in the village, but now her face is covered with wrinkles. She claims a place in the hierarchy of the castes among the low castes. In anger Gulabo violates the principles of communication in general and CP and PP in particular.

The result of the expression ‘A’, on Sohini is that she simply requests Gulabo not to abuse her. She gives an evasive smile to show her reluctance to accept the abuses in the context. The only fault of innocent Sohini is that she was laughing at that time.
However, Gulabo, the user of the abusive expression takes it otherwise and makes it a point of prestige that Sohini laughs in her face, laughs at her who regards her old enough to be Sohini’s mother. Here, Gulabo, the washerwoman, explodes her anger by using abusive words like ‘Bitch’ and ‘slut’. The behavior of Sohini reflects her meekness and endurance. Moreover, such expressions are shocking for they are not expected to be used by women. The abuses are not justified on the ground that women are expected to use socially better language than their male counterparts. The speaker and the hearer share some background knowledge of the talk exchange in which they are engaged. Gulabo happens to be uneducated and one cannot expect her to address the conversational partner in a sophisticated manner.

Gulabo almost violates all the Maxims of CP and PP. In fact, conversational partners are expected to respond in a positive and amicable manner. But in case of Gulabo we find that she is aggressive and starts raining abuses and curses on Sohini without any reason. The utterance ‘B’ of Sohini indicates that she is cooperative and observes all the maxims of CP and PP. She seems to be obedient and requests her conversational partner not to abuse her because she has not done anything wrong.

Gulabo and Sohini are the members of the same speech community and there, social roles are defined by the caste-ridden Hindu society. Therefore, the social relation of these characters is
unfriendly and uncooperative. The social roles assigned to them dominate their linguistic behavior. Being higher on the scale of caste hierarchy, Gulabo speaks more than what is actually required for the current purpose of communication. She speaks more than necessary and therefore, responsible for the violation of all the Maxims of CP and PP.

In another episode, we come across violation of CP and PP. The following conversation throws light on the interpersonal relationship of the interlocutors. The conversational partners in the following conversation are kith and kin. They are expected to use informal language in the family matters and should behave linguistically well. One is really surprised when family members are seen flinging abuses like stones as a result of which they become uncooperative and sound impolite in the given speech situation. Let us study the following linguistic exchanges in the light of the above comment:

A: ‘I thought you were dead or something, you daughter of a pig!’ ‘No tea, no piece of bread, and dying of hunger! Put the tea on and call those sons of a pig, Bakha and Rakha to me!’ (Lakha-Sohini)
B: ‘Vay Bakhia, vay Rakhia, father is calling you!’ (Sohini-Bakha and Rakha) (P.23)
The addresser of the utterances in ‘A’ is Lakha, the father of Sohini. He abuses Sohini in the name of a dirty animal ‘daughter of a pig’ because he was hungry since morning. Lakha violates the Maxim of Quality and Quantity as far as the Cooperative Principle is concerned. The illocutionary force of the abuse ‘daughter of a pig’ is to persuade Sohini to take certain immediate action of fetching some food for him. Lakha abuses his daughter for not giving food on time as he is hungry. The point to notice here is that the father uses abuses, such as ‘son of a pig’ even for his sons. Lakha orders Sohini to call Bakha and Rakha. She follows the command of her father and gives a loud call ‘vay Bakhia, vay Rakha’. She uses the diminutive expressions to address her brothers who are not in the vicinity. The addressed terms of Sohini seem to violate the Maxim of Tact, the Maxim of Generosity and the Maxim of Quantity at the surface level. But at deeper level of communication we find that she has not violated the above said Maxims because, in Indian context, a speaker gives a loud call to the hearers if they are intimately associated with each other. Here, in case of Sohini, we find that she is doing a favour to her father by calling her brothers with a change of tone of her voice.

Lakha, the addresser, as in ‘A’, uses impolite expressions to address Sohini, the hearer of the utterance. The root cause of his being impolite in this speech situation is that he has neither taken tea nor food. One cannot expect an angry person to use polite forms of language. In the same way one cannot expect him to be cooperative
in a conversation. Though the utterances of Lakha sound impolite, his intention can be justified, on the ground of reality. The fact is that he is angry and irritated for the simple reason that his stomach is empty which results in the use of face threatening strategy. Therefore, Lakha observes the Maxim of Relation but fails to observe other Maxims of CP and PP.

Sohini tries to pacify her father by telling him that the Pundit of the temple wanted her to clean the family house at the temple. She says:

\[ A: \text{‘Father, the Pundit of the temple wanted me to clean the family house at the temple.’} \] (Sohini-Lakha)

\[ B: \text{‘Well then go and do so! Why do you eat my head?’} \] (Lakha-Sohini) (P.24)

Sohini, after finishing her duty of fetching water from the public well, tells her father that pundit Kalinath had asked her to come to his house in the temple courtyard for sweeping the yard. Since, her father knows that it is her duty to go and do the work of sweeping. The hearer ‘B’ is not in a state of listening to the addresser because he has a pain in his side and is very much hungry. Therefore, he is not ready to be cooperative in this conversation ‘A’ with ‘B’. Lakha peevishly tells Sohini to go to the temple courtyard and do the job of cleaning. The speaker of the utterance ‘B’ uses the strategy of
code-switching in Indian context and says that she should not trouble him. The expression ‘why do you eat my head’ is literally taken from the Hindi expression ‘mera dimag que kharab kar rahi ho!’ Here, the context of the utterance ‘A’ and ‘B’ is that the social situation demands Sohini to go to the house of Pundit ji because as it is customary to obey the order of the high caste people. Therefore, Lakha insists Sohini to follow the orders given to her. The interpersonal relationship between the speaker and hearer are based on solidarity principle and thus, Sohini follows the Maxims of CP and PP. However, her father violates the Maxim of Quantity, the Maxim of Relation, the Maxim of Tact and the Maxim of Approbation. The Maxim of Quality has been violated by Lakha because he does not provide Sohini with the truthful answer. It has been also observed that the response given by the father is totally irrelevant which consequently results in the violation of Relation Maxim. Since Lakha is angry and irritated, one cannot expect him to be cooperative. It is generally noticed that angry conversational partner cannot be necessarily cooperative. Therefore, the utterance of ‘B’ is the violation of the Maxims of Tact and Approbation in this context.

In one of the speech situations, we come across Ramanand who is a peevish old black moneylender from the upper strata of the Hindu society. He, being in the higher social hierarchy, gets angry with Bakha on noticing that there, is not a single latrine clean for him to
be used. The following conversation between Ramanand and Bakha is worth studying:

A: ‘There, is not a latrine clean. You must work for the pay you receive.’ (Ramanand-Bakha)
B: ‘Maharaj’ (Bakha-Ramanand) (P.11)

In the linguistic utterance ‘A’ the speaker is the master and the hearer is the servant. The master gets angry with the servant for not keeping the latrines clean. The master is Ramanand whereas the servant is Bakha. The social relationship between the speaker and the hearer is not friendly and cooperative. Ramanand not only brings to the notice of the hearer that the latrine is unclean but he also brings to the hearer’s notice that he must work for the pay he receives. Thus, the utterance of Ramanand falls in the category of warning or summoning. Therefore, Ramanand violates the Maxim of Agreement and the Maxim of Sympathy. Since Ramanand is a black moneylender who holds a high position in the society. He humiliates Bakha by reminding him of his responsibility of cleaning the latrine for which he is paid. The linguistic behavior of Ramanand shows that he is unsympathetic towards Bakha.

On the other hand, Bakha is humble. He only says the word ‘Maharaj’. In this context, Bakha feels apologetic and runs towards the latrines in order to keep himself busy with his job. Thus, Bakha observes the principles of CP and PP. Bakha is cooperative to his
conversational partner because of his low status in the society. He is humbled by the circumstances in which he is put by the writer. The writer deliberately wants to show the discrimination between the high caste and the low caste people. Being influenced by the Marxist Philosophy, Mulk Raj Anand wants to draw attention to the low status accorded to the proletariat or the subalterns. Therefore, one has to understand the nature of society and its problems while analyzing the conversational pieces from the novel. Bakha is a representative of proletariat class and addresses his master using honorific term ‘Maharaj’. It is a Sanskrit term which means the prince or the emperor. In modern terminology, the term ‘Maharaj’ is used to show reverence or deep respect. Bakha shows respect to the moneylender for the simple reason that he is a humble servant. On the contrary, the moneylender violates the Cooperative and Politeness Principles because of his high standard in the society.

A: ‘I want to be your brother-in-law if you will let me’. (Bakha-Ram Charan)
B: ‘Well, she is being married to-day, so you are too late’. (Ram Charan-Bakha) (P.26)

The above interaction between ‘A’ and ‘B’, shows that the relationship between them is friendly. The utterance produced by ‘A’ is of Bakha and the utterance ‘B’ is of Ram Charan. Bakha uses a very intimate form of expression ‘brother-in-law’ to show his happiness in being Chotas’ brother-in-law. Momentarily, Bakha
rejoices the position of being Chotas’ brother-in-law imaginatively. The expression also reflects the happiness in relishing sweets. The use of the expression like, ‘brother-in-law’ is the outcome of ceremonious mood. The speaker violates the Maxim of Tact and the Maxim of Quality. In the utterance ‘B’ by Ram Charan is in lighter vein just with the intention of sharing the situational joke. This expression is transformed into a mild joke based on the fact that Bakha is known to his friend to be an admirer of Ram Charan’s sister.

The above linguistic exchange indicates emotions of happiness and compliments. The use of the expression ‘brother-in-law’ is directed to appreciate the gentlemanliness of Bakha which influences Chota. The utterance of Bakha is to be treated as diminutive because both the speaker and hearer share friendly relationship. The expression ‘brother-in-law’ also reflects the happiness in being Chotas’ brother-in-law. Thus, in this expression, the Maxim of Quality has been violated because the addresser’s intention in using the expression ‘brother-in-law’ is not honest. It is also an example of the violation of the Quantity Maxim, the Relation Maxim and the Tact Maxim.

In another speech situation, we come across the conversation among Bakha, the Urchin and the Touched man. Let us study the following conversation:
A: ‘Ohe, you son of a dog! Now tell how you feel. You who used to beat us!’ (Urchin child-Bakha)

B: ‘Now look, look, ‘he has been beating innocent little children. He is a confirmed rogue!’ (Lallaji-Bakha and other people)

C: ‘When did I bit you?’ (Bakha-Urchin child)

B: ‘Now, now mark his insolence!’ ‘He adds insult to injury. He lies! look!’ (Lallaji-Bakha and other people) (P.40)

One comes to know from the above conversation that the relationship between Bakha and the urchin is not friendly because Bakha had beaten him early. Therefore, the urchin on seeing Bakha being beaten by the Lalaji (Touched man) becomes happy. The Touched man is unfriendly with Bakha because he addresses Bakha as a confirmed rogue. Lallaji accuses Bakha for having beaten innocent children before. He also blames Bakha for telling a lie. Here, in the above conversation among Bakha, the urchin and the Touched man, there, has been a violation of all the Maxims of CP and PP are violated. The reason of violation of all the Maxims is that the two speakers are not satisfied with Bakha’s answer. They do not believe in Bakha because he is from the lowest class of Hindu society. It is due to Bakha’s low status in the society, he always becomes a target of hatred and discouragement.
The Touched man was very much angry with Bakha. Let us examine the following utterance by the Lalla ji:

‘Dirty dog! Son of a bitch! The offspring of a pig? He shouted, his temper spluttering on his tongue and obstructing his speech and the sense behind it in its mad rush onwards’. ‘I ... I’ll have to go-o-o... and get washed -d-d... I ... I was going to business and now ... now, on account of you, I’ll be late.’ (Lallaji-Bakha) (P.38)

In the above instance, Lalla ji is totally uncooperative to Bakha. In other words, he has no sympathy for the sweeper boy. He also becomes impolite to Bakha and therefore, violates the Maxim of Approbation. The abuses ‘dirty dog,’ ‘son of a bitch’ and ‘the offspring of a pig’ indicate the attitude of the caste Hindus towards the untouchables. The relationship between Bakha and Lalla ji (Touched man) is to be studied in the socio-cultural context. The Touched man is a merchant and holds a high position in the society, whereas Bakha is a scavenger boy who holds a low position in the society. Here, the emotive force of the anger is used by the rich Hindu merchant. Bakha is the victim of the caste discrimination. The high caste Hindu merchant shouts at Bakha calling him names. The emotive force of the anger is so powerful that the abuser loses his temper and makes excessive use of abuses.
It is noticed that in India people abuse in the name of dirty animals like pig and dog. Here, the abuse ‘dog’ is addressed to Bakha. The comparison between dog and Bakha clearly indicates the low social status accorded to Bakha. Through the abusive expression, the high caste Hindu merchant shows his superiority of caste. He tries to suppress and condemns the low cast sweeper boy as if it is his privilege to walk on the road. His input of the abusiveness makes us uneasy when he takes the bump so seriously that he becomes furiously abusive. The extremity of the dehumanization and unjust is seen when he threatens Bakha to announce his approach. He expects that the lower caste victim should seriously make an effort to announce his arrival since it is customary. The perlocutionary effect is felt on Bakha. As a result, he subverts the anger silently and walks away, shouting, ‘Posh, posh, sweeper coming’. The effect of emotional abuse adversely affects the sentiments of Bakha. The abuse is indicative of power and control by higher caste to the lower one. The novelist has shown the effect of the utterance of above instance on Bakha. After experiencing this public humiliation battered to him, though fiery he becomes, he cannot take the revenge of the incident. For such ill-treatment Bakha feels the most agonizing mental pain he had ever felt in is body. The speaker seems to have violated all the Maxims of Cooperation Principles and Politeness Principle.
In one of the incidents, a Hindu woman ill-treats Bakha due to her high social standing. The woman gets angry on noticing Bakha sitting on her doorstep. Following conversation is worth studying:

A: ‘You eater of your Masters’, ‘may the vessel of your life never float in the sea of existence! May you perish & die! You have defiled my house! Go! Get up, get up! You eater of your masters! Why didn’t you shout if you wanted food? Is this your father’s house that you come and rest here?’ (Hindu woman-Bakha)

B: ‘Forgive me, mother. I shouted for bread, but you were busy and didn’t hear me. I was tired and sat down.’ (Bakha-Hindu woman)

A: ‘But, you eater of your masters! why did you sit down on my doorstep, if you had to sit down at all? You have defiled my religion! You should have sat there, in the gulley! Now I will have to sprinkle holy water all over the house! You spoiler of my salt! Oh how terrible! You sweepers have lifted your heads to the sky, nowadays! This bad luck on a Tuesday morning too! And after I had been to the temple!...’ (Hindu woman-Bakha) (P.63)
In the above interaction, the high caste woman abuses Bakha profusely. She also curses the boy for having defiled her house by sitting on the doorsteps. The intention of the caste Hindu woman was to humiliate and dehumanize Bakha. Bakha had never come across such experience of untouchability. The tone of her voice was so bitter that it harmed Bakha forever. In other words, the swear words of the woman killed the spirit in Bakha. The woman did not want Bakha to be alive in her world. She says ‘May the vessel of your life never float in the sea of existence’. This curse indicates her attitude towards the low caste people. She goes to the extent and curses the boy in the context saying, ‘May you perish and die’. This curse indicates that Bakha has no right to live in this world.

The abuses and curses shatter Bakha’s emotional and social world. The woman not only holds Bakha responsible for polluting her house but she also holds him responsible for defiling her religion. The language used by the woman shows her high social status resulting in power. The woman in the context becomes powerful due to the Hindu social structure. On the other hand, Bakha begs for mercy and pity because of his low social status resulting in powerlessness. Therefore, the powerful woman violates the Maxim of Approbation, Generosity and Sympathy. The woman in context violates the Maxim of Approbation because she has no respect or regard for the hearer of her utterance. The woman does not minimize dispraise of other. The curses and abuses are the examples of expressive speech act. She also violates the Maxim of
Generosity because she minimizes cost to herself. She also violates the Maxim of Sympathy because she maximizes antipathy between herself and Bakha, the scavenger. Therefore, there is no atmosphere of relative harmony between the interlocutors.

The woman in the context abuses the sweeper boy by calling him ‘eater of master’ and ‘spoiler of salt’. This clearly indicates that Bakha is not loyal to his master who provides him with food and salt. Being disloyal to his master’s salt, means being treacherous to the provider of food.

In another episode, we come across the conversation between the father and the son:

\[ A: ‘Where, is Rakha?’(Bakha-Sohini) \]
\[ B: ‘The rascal has gone to get food at langar in the barracks’ (Lakha-Bakha) (P.67) \]

Here, the addresser in the linguistic utterance ‘A’ is Bakha. He asks his sister Sohini to tell him the whereabouts of his younger brother Rakha. In reply to the question asked by his Bakha, she keeps quiet. However, Lakha their father does not give the answer in a straightforward manner. On the contrary, he uses the offensive language while referring to Rakha. He uses the term ‘rascal’ to refer to Rakha. In normal circumstances, a father is not expected to use such profane word. Therefore, we find that Lakha, the speaker of the utterance ‘B’ seems to violate the Maxims of Quantity, the
Maxim of Relation and the Maxim of Tact. The Maxim of Quantity is violated by the speaker of the utterance ‘B’, because the speaker speaks more than the desired purpose of communication. The answer given by the father is irrelevant and thus causes the violation of the Maxim of Relation. The Maxim of Tact is also violated for the simple reason that the father maximizes cost to him and minimizes benefit to himself.

In one of the speech situations in the novel, we come across again the conversation between the father and the son:

A: ‘Have you brought anything nice to eat? I am just hungering for some pickles, spinach and maize-flour bread’. (Lakha-Bakha)
B: ‘I have bought only two chapattis’. (Bakha-Lakha)
A: ‘You are good for nothing scoundrel! I hope that the rascal brings something nice from the barracks’. (Lakha-Bakha) (P.68)

The speaker ‘A’ is Bakha’s father who was waiting for Bakha’s arrival at home. He was extremely hungry because he had not eaten anything since morning. When Bakha came home, he asked him whether he had brought anything nice for him to eat. He specifically mentioned the names of the eatables such as pickles, spinach and maize-flour bread. In reply to his father’s pointed question, Bakha replied that he had brought just two chapattis only.
The implicature that one derives from Bakha’s utterance is that he has nothing more to offer to his hunger-stricken father. Lakha’s anger is aggravated on hearing Bakha’s reply. Therefore, the father uses foul language to address his son. He addresses his son as a scoundrel and further says that his son is of no use to him. One notices that the father-son relationship is not in harmony. There, is uncooperativeness and impoliteness on the part of his father for not bringing the things that he wanted to eat. Further, he calls his son a rascal and accuses him for not bringing good food from the barracks of the tommies.

In the above expression, some Maxims of CP and PP are violated. For instance, the speaker ‘A’ violates the Maxim of Quantity because the father speaks unnecessarily causing the hearer an insult. He also violates the Maxim of Relation because there are some irrelevant expressions which could have been easily avoided, especially the swear words. One also notices that the Maxim of Tact is also violated by the father because he does not ask Bakha using indirect strategy. On the contrary, he directly holds Bakha responsible for no fault of his. Thus, the speaker ‘A’ sounds impolite and arrogant. The speaker ‘A’ also violates the Maxim of Agreement because he is not satisfied by the answer given by his son. It seems that he is not ready to accept what has been brought for him. Thus, there is strong disagreement between the interlocutors.
In another significant incident, we come across the conversation between Lakha and Hakimji. Lakha had gone to Hakimji in order to get some medicine for his son ailing at home. The conversation takes place between the two at Hakimji’s dispensary:

A) ‘Still there, is a little breath left in my child’s body. I shall be your slave all my life. The meaning of my life is my child, take pity. God will be kind to you’ (Lakha-Hakim ji)

B) ‘Bhangi! (sweeper) Bhangi!’ ‘Chandal! (low caste) by whose orders have you come here,? And when you joined hands and hold my feet and say you will become my slave forever. You have polluted hundreds of rupees worth of medicine. Will you pay for it’ (Hakim ji-Lakha) (P.73)

From the above conversation, one comes to know about the interpersonal relationship and the social relationship between Lakha and the Hakimji. Hakimji comes from the higher social status, whereas, Lakha belongs to the lowest of the low caste in Hindu society. The interpersonal relationship between Lakha and the Hakimji is unfriendly and therefore, uncooperative. The social relationship between the two interlocutors is impolite owing to the differences between the high caste and the low caste.
Bakha’s father went to Hakimji when his son Bakha was seriously ill in his childhood. He wanted Hakimji to come to his house and attend to the ailing patient. When Lakha approached the doorstep of Hakimji, he saw a number of caste Hindus in a queue at the dispensary. Lakha, being an untouchable, was forbidden the entry in the dispensary of the Hakimji. He begged the crowd to call the Hakimji, but to no avail. All his efforts of reaching Hakimji shattered beyond understanding. He was panic stricken because he thought if his ailing son did not get the medicine in time, he would die. Therefore, he mustered all his courage and approached Hakimji unmindful of the social situation in which he was placed. The social situation would not allow him to enter the dispensary. Hakimji was shocked to see Lakha, the scavenger polluting his ‘dawai khana’. He got extremely angry with Lakha for having defiled the whole place. He, therefore, starts raining abuses on his conversational partner.

Hakimji uses the linguistic expressions, ‘Bhangi! Bhangi!’ ‘Chandal’, which are derogatory and cause harm to the addressee. Hakimji is totally uncooperative as the use of language indicates this. He violates the Maxims of Modesty and Sympathy. He also violates the Maxim of Quantity. Hakimji violates the Maxim of Modesty because he is impolite in the use of language. He abuses Lakha, the outcaste for his intrusion in the ‘dawai khana’. His linguistic behavior shows that he has no respect to his conversational partner. Hakimji also violates the Maxim of
Sympathy because he is unsympathetic to his conversational partner. The words ‘Bhangi’ and ‘Chandal’ are highly derogatory and humiliating in the Indian context. The use of the word ‘Bhangi’ is atrocious. The word ‘Chandal’ is used to cause the harm to the hearer. Therefore, there is antipathy between the interlocutors. Hakimji, further, violates the Maxim of Quantity because in a spate of anger he flings abuses at his conversational partners. He uses unnecessary words and idiomatic expressions to ventilate his anger.

Within the untouchables themselves, there is no cordial relationship between the family members. The following conversation indicates this:

A: ‘At least you wash your hands, you wild animal!’ (Bakha-Rakha)
B: ‘You mind your own business’. (Rakha-Bakha)
A: ‘Look at yourself in the mirror! What a picture you look!’ (Bakha-Rakha) (P.76)

In the above conversation, the interlocutors are two brothers. The speaker ‘A’ is Bakha, whereas the speaker ‘B’ is Rakha, the younger brother of Bakha. Even though they are brothers, they do not have peaceful and harmonious relations with each other. Bakha, being the elder brother, uses the directive speech act because he orders Rakha to wash his hands on noticing that his hands are not
washed before eating. Bakha goes to the extent and calls his brother ‘a wild animal’. In normal circumstances, a brother is expected to be cooperative in addressing his younger brother. Therefore, Bakha violates the Maxim of Quantity because he speaks more than expected. He could have simply told his brother to wash his hands clean. He also violates the Maxim of Tact because, he uses direct speech act instead of indirect speech act. The command given by Bakha sounds impolite in this respect.

In the similar speech situation in the novel, we come across Gulabo, the washer woman and her son Ram Charan. Both the speakers make use of swear words to address each other. The following conversation is worth studying:

\[ A: \textit{Oh! You illegally begotten!} \textit{Are you running away to play with that dirty sweeper and leather-worker on the very day of your sister’s marriage? You ought to be ashamed of yourself, you little dog!}\]  (Gulabo-Ram Charan)

\[ B: \textit{Shut up, you bitch!}\]  (Ram Charan-Gulabo)

(P.83)

The abusive expression, ‘You illegally begotten!’ is used by the mother for addressing her son. Gulabo, the washerwoman, abuses her son Ram Charan. On seeing Ram Charan going out to play with his friends on the very day of his sister’s marriage, she gets angry.
and irritated. She expects her son to understand his responsibilities. Here, she violates the Modesty Maxim and the Maxim of Sympathy due to the abusive use of language.

The son is also impolite in the use of language. He addresses his mother as a bitch causing the violation of Cooperativeness and Politeness in the use of language. In normal circumstances, one would expect a son to address his mother using politeness strategy of communication. On the contrary, the son makes use of profane language causing harm to his mother. The language used by Ram Charan is shocking and condemnable. Ram Charan seems violating the Maxim of Tact and the Maxim of Agreement. He violates the Maxim of Tact because he directly abuses his mother. He does not use indirect strategy of communication and thus is uncooperative in the above conversation. He also violates the Maxim of Agreement because he does not obey the order of his mother to remain present at the time of his sister’s marriage. There is a strong case of disagreement between the interlocutors of the above conversation.

In another speech situation in the novel, one comes across the discriminatory treatment given to the disadvantaged people in the society. The advantaged people in the society ill-treat the disadvantaged people. The effect of the discriminatory treatment on Bakha the protagonist is evident in the following linguistic exchange:
A: ‘You eater of your masters, you dirty sweeper!’ ‘What have you done to my son? Oh, you eater of your masters! What have you done? You have killed my son! Give him to me! Give me my child! You have defiled my house, besides wounding my son!’ (injured child’s Mother - Bakha)

B: ‘Mother, mother what are you saying? It was not he. He didn’t wound him. It was the washerwoman’s son Ram Charan.’ (injured child’s Brother to his Mother)

A: ‘Get away, get away, you eater of your masters! May you die! Why didn’t you look after your brother?’ (injured child’s mother to her elder son) (P.106)

The above conversation shows master-servant relationship. The son of the high caste mother is injured not by Bakha but by Ram Charan. The woman blames Bakha and holds him responsible for the injury. Her voice reflects the supremacy of being at the higher social position. She, at the same time, also looks down upon him and reminds him of his position as a low-caste. She, therefore, blames him for not being loyal to the master and his failure to protect her son from injury. The fact of the matter is that, Bakha is blamed for no fault of his. His only fault is that he brought her injured son to her in the hope that she would be grateful to him.
Bakha is disappointed to see the strange behavior of the woman in the context.

The expression ‘A’ indicates that the abuser has a control and power over the addressee. This is indicative of the difference between the addresser and addressee as higher and lower respectively. The utterances of the woman certainly break the principles of communication especially conversational principle. The Maxim of Approbation is violated completely in which the unpleasant things are thrust upon the hearer. The speaker’s expressions show the hostile attitude towards the hearer. The utterer also tactfully shows the power and control over the abused. This type of conversational discourse amounts to threatening.

The woman in the context of the above-mentioned conversation violates the Quality Maxim, Agreement Maxim, Sympathy Maxim. The speaker ‘A’ violates the Quality Maxim because she is not speaking the truth. Without knowing the fact, she accuses Bakha for having beaten her son. The injured boy’s brother tries to convince the mother that Bakha has not done any harm to the boy but it was Ram Charan who has inquired the boy while playing hockey. The woman in the context also violates the Agreement Maxim because there is disagreement between the mother and her elder son. Bakha, being the third party in the conversation, observes silence. He does not take part in the conversation for he is afraid that the woman would rebuke and humiliate him. There is also the
violation of the Sympathy Maxim because there is antipathy between the two conversational partners.

It is discovered in the novel that not only the caste Hindus ill-treat the lower caste people but the British people also condemn the socially deprived people. The following conversation throws sufficient light on this fact:

A: ‘Oh is that what you have been doing, going to these blackies again!’ (Mary Hutchinson-Colonel)

B: ‘What is the matter? I am just coming. I am coming.’ (Colonel- Mary Hutchinson)

A: ‘So that the tea should get cold! I can’t keep waiting for you all day while you go messing about with all those dirty bhangis and chamars’, and saying this, she withdrew into her boudoir.’ (Mary Hutchinson- Colonel) (P.123)

The above linguistic expression takes place between the husband and wife who come from the British family. They are the colonizers in British India. Mrs. Hutchinson terribly gets angry with her husband for wasting his time and talking with the boy from the scavenger community. In fact, she wants her husband to come
home for tea at the stipulated time but her husband comes late because he spends hours talking to the boy. The woman uses the abusive language for describing Bakha. She abuses him in the name of caste. She uses the words like ‘blackies’, ‘chamars’, and ‘bhangis’ to indicate Bakha’s low social status. In other words, the low social status of Bakha is indicated by these words. The use of such derogatory words suggests that she has a power over the low caste people like Bakha who is a passive hearer of the woman’s utterance.

The speaker ‘A’ is not in a normal mood of the conversation with her husband. Her husband has arrived late for tea. Therefore, she violates the Maxim of Quantity. She speaks more than necessary in this context. It is to be noticed here, that the speaker ‘A’ is angry and irritated. One cannot expect an angry person to use relevant language in this context. Her utterance is not relevant. Therefore, it is a case of the violation of the Maxim of Relation. She directly assaults her husband. Here, she is arrogant and unyielding. It is noticed here, that she has violated the Maxim of Tact. She could have used indirect strategy of communication to indicate that she was polite. However, she is very much impolite and tries to overpower her husband. On the contrary, her husband seems to be hen-pecked. He just asks her what the matter is. The conversation also reveals that there, is a verbal quarrel between husband and wife. One cannot expect in such a situation that one of the conversational partners would use polite forms of expressions. The
husband sounds polite in the use of language. Nevertheless, the woman does not listen to him. She disagrees with him. Therefore, she violates the Maxim of Agreement to bring to the notice of her husband that he should not have wasted his time talking about trivial things with the boy who comes from the lowest caste of the Hindu society.

Towards the end of the novel, Bakha goes to the railway station where, there, is crowd of people who have come to listen to the speeches the delivered by the poet and Gandhiji. We do not come across conversations. There are speeches of the poet Iqbal and Mahatma Gandhi, which are loaded with philosophy and advice. Both the speakers try to suggest the remedy for the irradication of untouchability. Gandhiji offers three solutions for abolishing the untouchability: flush system, change of religion and changing the mindset of upper class people. Bakha does not understand the message of Gandhiji. The novel ends with the confusion in the mind of Bakha.

3.4 Conclusion

The chapter discusses the novel *Untouchable* with respect to the observance and violation of the Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principle. It has been divided into two parts. In the first
part, an attempt has been made to discuss the relevant examples of the observance of CP and PP. While discussing the selected conversational pieces, socio-cultural aspects of Indian society during the British Raj have been taken into account. Mulk Raj Anand, being the Gandhian follower, has highly criticized the caste system by portraying the character like Bakha. It has been observed that the low caste people are prone to observe the Maxims of Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principle, while in a conversation with the dominant people from the upper rung of the social ladder. The caste factor makes it obligatory for the low caste people to observe the maxims of CP and PP to the maximum extent. While discussing the highly marked conversations of the characters, illocutionary forces have been considered. The interpersonal relations of the characters have been also taken into account while discussing the linguistic exchanges of the characters.

In the second part of the chapter, the researcher has made an attempt to discuss in detail the instances where and why the characters have violated certain Maxims of Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principle. It has been discovered that the characters that are placed in a high social position are prone to violate certain maxims of CP and PP for accomplishing their communicative goals. In fact, for achieving the conversational goals, they have deliberately violated some of the maxims. Another observation is that the characters that come from the low caste are seen observing silence or speaking less while in conversation with the high caste
people. In addition, one notices that the British characters also use profane language to describe the characters that are placed in the low position. The colonizers attitude is also reflected in their conversations with the low class people. They are, sometimes, polite to the people of the low caste only to achieve their communicative goals. Thus, the chapter makes a significant contribution in terms of analysis of the selected novels from the perspective of pragmatics.