CHAPTER IV
A STUDY OF COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN THE SELECTED PLAYS
OF KARNAD AND ELKUNCHWAR

4.0 Preliminaries

Communication is essentially a cooperative conduct. In any conversation, formal or informal, real life or dramatic, discussion should be cooperative for the purpose of achieving the expected goals. People usually cooperate with each other in their daily interaction by observing certain rules and maxims. It means co-conversationalists must agree implicitly on an orderly method for talking. If there is no order in the manner of speaking, then the conversation would cause to be meaningless and disorganized. Speakers talk in audible voices and use the languages which they believe their partners know, and adhere to phonology, syntax and semantics of those languages. At the same time, the manner as to how it is being expressed is also equally important. It means the speakers try to be informative, truthful, relevant and clear. In other words, they follow the cooperative principle. Non-cooperation in communication leads to failure in communication or miscommunication, which cannot necessarily be a purpose of any communication. In most of the situations, the supposition of cooperation is all pervasive. It is stated as cooperative principle of conversation and elaborated in four sub-principles, called ‘maxims’ by H P Grice (1975).

4.1 An Overview

An underlying assumption in most conversational exchanges seems to be that participants are co-operating with each other. Participants in a conversation recognize purpose or a set of purposes, which may evolve during the conversation and may be less or more definite. The cooperative principle is stated by H P Grice (1975:45), in the following way:

“But at each stage some possible move of conversation would be excluded as conversationally unsuitable. We might then formulate a rough general principle which participants will be expected to observe namely: Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of
the talk exchange in which you are engaged.”

This general principle of conversational interaction, helping to organize participants’ contribution around a common purpose, Grice refers to as the cooperative principle. He proposes a general principle which communicators will be expected to observe. Supporting this principle are the four maxims:

1. **The Maxim of Quantity:**

   Make your contribution as informative as is required, but not more, or less, than is required.

2. **The Maxim of Quality:**

   Do not say that which you believe to be false or for which you lack evidence.

3. **The Maxim of Relation:**

   Make your contribution relevant to the aims of the ongoing conversation.

4. **The Maxim of Manner:**

   Be clear, brief and orderly in your conversation.

It is expected that these maxims will be obeyed by the conversational partners in a healthy conversation. These maxims are mutually known to speakers and hearers (Grundy 2000:101). We usually assume that people will provide us with appropriate amount of information, tell us the truth, talk relevantly and try to be as clear as they can. Thus, with the assumption that people are informative, truthful, relevant, and clear in their verbal communication, we interpret what they say.

All the above discussed principles are observed and violated universally in literary works (and in real life communication too) to create artistic and/or linguistic effects and to communicate certain message(s).

While making mind what to say, speaker undergoes certain problems. Selection of linguistic devices, in order to create the intended effect, is not an easy mechanism. For it-
1. Speaker should have adequate knowledge about the listener. 2. Reality principle, here conversational partners assume that their conversation is about comprehensible events and facts. This principle enables fictional characters to communicate effectively. 3. The social context, in which depending on a listener’s status, speaker has to address him/her. 4. The availability of linguistic expressions. In Indian context, culture-specific, culture-bound concepts, modes of reference and address do not have readymade substitutes in English and 5. Cooperative principle. Speaker and listener should share true, informative, relevant and clear message.

While being cooperative in communication, turn-taking and conversational implicatures too should be taken into account. Turn-taking means a systematic passing of the conversational ball from one person to the next. To make communication a successful activity, participants in a conversation must follow an orderly prototype to talk. Each participant must get floor to share his/her point. Only one person should talk at one time. The gaps between turns should be brief. The sequence of speakers and how much each person converses should not be predetermined. As Yule (2011:40) mentions, the basic assumption in conversation is that, unless otherwise indicated, the participants are adhering to the cooperative principle and maxims. In the following example, Husband is shown violating the requirements of quantity maxim.

Wife: I hope you have brought the sugar and the tea powder.
Husband: Ah, I have brought the sugar.

After listening husband’s response, wife has to assume that husband is cooperating and not totally unaware of the quantity maxim. But he didn’t mention the tea powder. If he has brought the tea powder, he would have said so, as he is adhering to the quantity maxim. Husband intends that wife should infer that what is not said is not brought. In this way, husband has communicated more than he said via a conversational implicature.

While communicating, cooperative maxims are not always followed. In case of indirect speech act, a listener has to adhere at some deeper level of communication, pragmatic level, to get the exact message. Following instance will make the point clear.
A: Have you seen Prof. Trivedi?
B: I am searching a book.

According to the relation maxim, B’s response must be in relevance with A’s question. On the surface, no connection is seen between the question and the answer. A close observation will reveal the point that B has supplied an apt answer. After listening B’s answer, A has to assume that B is cooperative. But the latter did not mention anything about seeing Prof. Trivedi. If B would have seen Prof. Trivedi, he would have mentioned so as he is following the maxim of quantity. Thus, assuming that B is cooperative and at the same time not following the maxim of relevance, A has to go deeper to find the unstated meaning or the implicature conveyed by B’s expression. By mentioning that (s)he is searching a book, B gives an indirect answer, that B has not seen Prof. Trivedi. In this way B has communicated more than what he has actually said via ‘conversational implicature’. In order to draw the implicature from the utterance, A has to undergo some ‘inference or inferential process’ preserving the assumption of cooperative principle.

It proves that conversational implicature do flout the maxims of cooperative principle. In the above example, an indirect speech act along with conversational implicature is present. This is the way people have communication.

Fictional texts are full of conversational implicatures and indirect speech acts which violate the maxims of cooperative principle. Instances of the maxims being flouted in the conversations between the characters from the selected plays have been analysed as follows.

4.2 Violation of the Quantity Maxim

When people converse with one another, they may or may not follow the cooperative maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner. The constrictions of situation and context compel people to deviate from these norms. People differ in their nature and attitude. For instance, some are reserved and others talkative. Some are taciturn and others take lot of interest in conversing. Some are precise and others provide information which is not necessary. Different people have different ways of handling situations. Some people feel it easy to be truthful while others make some kind of adjustment to be
truthful. In short, psychological as well as contextual conditions compel a person to be cooperative or non-cooperative in conversation.

“Make your contribution as informative as is required, but not more, or less, than is required” is an underlying assumption of the maxim of quantity. As far as the maxim of quantity is concerned, the researcher comes across certain characters from the selected plays who flout it. For instance, in Hayavadana when Kapila goes to Padmini’s house to get her hand for Devadatta, he happens to meet Padmini at the door of her house. Following conversation takes place between them.

KAPILA: In which case you’ll also know of Devadatta, his only son.
   A poet. A pundit. Knows the Vedas backwards. Writes the
grandest poetry ever. Long, dark hair. Delicate, fair face. Age
twenty. Height five feet seven inches. Weight …

PADMINI: Wait a minute! What’s he to you?

KAPILA: Friend. Greatest in the world! But the main question now:
   What’s he going to be to you?

PADMINI: [blushing as the import of the remark dawns on her]. Mother!

[Runs in. Kapila stands, staring at her.]  (Act 1: 19)

In this piece of conversation, Kapila is flouting the maxim of quantity. He makes a description of Devadatta’s personality in which Padmini is not much interested. She asks Kapila about his relation with Devadatta. To which Kapila answers, “Friend. Greatest in the world! But the main question now: What’s he going to be to you?” The part of answer ‘But the main question now: What’s he going to be to you?’ violates quantity maxim. Kapila provides information which is not at all required by Padmini. The statement by Kapila is conversational implicature. It indirectly states that Devadatta is going to be her husband. And Kapila, Devadatta’s best friend, has come to fix the marriage. Padmini gets or decodes the message properly and her behavioral rejoinder to it shows that she is happy with the marriage proposal.
Karnad’s *Tughlaq* has an instance of the violation of quantity maxim. In scene one, when Tughlaq appeals his citizen to join his mission to shifting his capital from Delhi to Daulatabad, common men before the court begin to doubt his intention. Third Man expresses his disappointment against the decision.

THIRD MAN: This is tyranny! Sheer tyranny! Move capital to Daulatabad!

Such things never happened in his father’s days—may his soul rest in peace. Now he’s got his father’s throne? He isn’t happy with that and -

(Scenario i: 4)

In this speech act, Third man has violated the quantity maxim. While expressing his rage, he has accused Tughlaq for conspiring against his father to get the throne. He has provided extra information and through conversational implicature audience make sense that Tughlaq’s intentions are not just and he is a cunning politician. The people involved in the conversational act do not agree with Third man’s opinion. He advocates his point by supplying information that Sheikh Imam-ud-din, the religious preacher of the state, has been publicly sharing this fact. On which following speech acts take place.

OLD MAN (eagerly): You’ve seen the Sheikh?

THIRD MAN: Why, of course. Only a week ago. In Kanpur. What a man!

What a voice! The audience was spell bound. And he said the Sultan’s guilty of killing his father and brother, he said. He said so many other things too – about Islam and what is happening to it. It was the most inspiring speech I’ve ever heard. The audience went wild and burnt down half of Kanpur. You think he would talk like that if he wasn’t sure?

(Scene i: 5)

In this conversational move too, the Third man has flouted the quantity maxim. He has provided more than necessary information as a response to the Old man’s question. This violation of quantity maxim creates a context helping the audience/readers to understand the situation and circumstances about the incidents happening on the stage. Violation of
co-operative maxim performs an artistic as well as theatrical function of conveying the exact message to the audience. It arouses the curiosity and compels the audience/readers to take interest in the further happenings on the stage.

In scene two of *Wedding Album*, where mother and Vidula are busy in the selection of saris, following dialogue takes place.

**VIDULA**: This one for Indira Aunty, do you think? And that perhaps For Mitrakka?

**MOTHER**: Such a fine sari for Indira? She has never bothered to invite

us home for a meal. Not once in nine years. (Scene ii: 10)

Here, mother is providing information which is not necessary and required by the hearer. Mother could have simply answered in the affirmative or the negative way. By violating this maxim of quantity and through conversational implicature mother has revealed dryness in the relationship with her relatives.

Maxim of quantity is again violated in scene eight where, Ashwin and Vidula meet in a restaurant to discuss whether they can make a perfect ‘made for each other’ or not. He reveals his dual selves to us. He is a confident expat boy who represents the Saraswat Brahmins in the USA. He inherits the trait of Saraswat Brahmins to accord a uniquely high value to marriage and worldly, household life. Ashwin wants his wife to be an honest Hindu Indian wife though he resides in America. A lady that perfectly suits into the roles of mother -wife - daughter.

This type of supply of extra information is a characteristic feature of an interaction that centers on a marriage proposal in Indian context.

In *Old Stone Mansion*, when Sudhir asks Vahini whether Dadi has been informed about the death of her son Vyenkatess or Tatyaji. Vahini answers elaboratively.

**SUDHIR**: Have you told Dadi that Tatyaji’s no more?

**VAHINI**: What do we tell her even if we want to? Her hearing’s gone, her
sight’s gone. Nothing reaches her. That’s how she sits all day, not moving. But every now and then it’s: ‘What time is it? What time is it?’ Actually she’s no trouble at all. Carry her to her plate when it’s time to eat; carry her to her bed when it’s time to sleep. There’s been such a tragedy in the house—her own son’s gone—but do you think she understands? Happy soul. I mean that. Will you have tea at least? Or not even that …

(Act 1, sc i: 140)

Here, Vahini is supposed to answer with ‘yes’ or ‘no’ instead, she answers Sudhir with a question ‘What do we tell her even if we want to?’ Question answered with a question is one of the stylistic features of Indian English. Vahini has indirectly stated the fact that Dadi is not informed about Tatyaji’s death, for telling it to her or otherwise will make no any difference to Dadi. She adds the fact Dadi has lost her sense of hearing and seeing. She goes on describing Dadi’s dotage condition in their family. By giving extra information she wants to tell the fact that Dadi is not in a position to understand any grief or pleasure. She considers her a burden on their family.

One more example of flouting of quantity maxim is in the same scene of Old Stone Mansion. Prabha, the only sister to Bhaskar and Sudhir, complains about Vahini to Sudhir.

PRABHA: When the father dies, the daughter must look out for herself.

SUDHIR: What do you lack?

PRABHA: I must live off whatever crumbs you brothers throw me now. You’re all right. You’ll take your share and go off to Bombay. But let me tell you Sudhir, it’s not even five days since Tatyaji died. Five days. And Vahini has changed already. The house keys moved instantly into her keep. And Aai went instantly into the shadows of the back room. When Tatyaji was alive, you couldn’t hear Vahini’s footfall on verandah.

(Act 1, sc i: 141)

Sometimes people break the quantity maxim to convince the listener. In the above example, Prabha feels insecure as Tatyaji has passed away. In Indian context, generally,
women feel domestically uncomfortable with *vahini* or sister in law i.e. brother’s wife, specially, when she becomes overriding in the domestic matters. Prabha complains Sudhir about Vahini’s attitude. She has no control and has taken all the charges of household activities. Aai, who is supposed to be the chief after Tatyaji, has lost her significance as Vahini has become dominant. She knows Sudhir too will do nothing in this concern. She only shares the fact with Sudhir and comforts herself mentally from the domestic issue.

When Prabha expresses her desire to go to Mumbai with Sudhir and Anjali, following interaction takes place between them.

**ANJALI** (alert): Won’t Aai need someone here with her?

**PRABHA:** Let’s take her along too. It would be a good change for her.

   Didn’t you see? Vahini waited for Aai to take out her money. If she stays here alone, they’ll tear her apart and devour her.

**ANJALI:** Speak to your brother. It’s not for me to say. Whatever he decides …

**PRABHA:** you’re quite under my brother’s thumb, aren’t you!

**ANJALI:** You know his temper. He’s a Deshpande through and through. Plus he has high B.P. *(Pause.*) You think it’s all fun and games for us. But let me tell you, only we know how we manage. Pull the sheet of your head and your feet are uncovered. Pull it down and your head’s uncovered. First it was a battle to find a two-room flat. Now it’s a battle to pay off the loan. At least here you own the roof over your head—and the food comes off the land. *(Act 1, sc ii: 149)*

This piece of communication reveals Anjali’s attitude. She does not want Prabha to be with them at Mumbai. She asks Prabha to discuss it with Sudhir, who is very angry and suffers from high B.P. She asserts the problems they face in the metro life of Mumbai. She emphasizes that village life is all happy. City people have to struggle a lot for a comfortable living. The needs of shelter and food are easily met with. Her intention behind supplying this extra information is that Prabha should make up her mind not to go to Mumbai. It also shows that their relations are dry and unhealthy.
The opening of *Reflection* is an illustration of the violation of quantity maxim. Woman who is the house owner, offers a cup of tea to her paying guest HE. Woman asks HE not to sleep for a long time as it holds up her work. While sweeping the floor she goes on talking that she has to get up early in the morning at four to complete the day’s work. She disapproves of his getting up very late. She asks him to be in discipline as he was in first few days. She again adds that when HE will get married, he has to look after everything. He will serve his wife like anybody else. He will get up early in the morning. Make tea for his wife and fill the water as well as look after house hold work. Woman’s lengthy and scolding speech comforts the mind of the audience to bear the shocking incidents of losing the reflection of the character HE aka blockhead.

In *Sonata*, Aruna violates the quantity maxim. Aruna and Dolon share a flat in Mumbai. Through the window Dolon uses to observe the third floor building flat. A woman in that building has a routine pattern of her activities. Both Aruna and Dolon know it well. While listening the music, Aruna begins to think about the lonely lady in the opposite building. Dolon doesn’t ask anything to Aruna about that lady. Aruna goes on speaking herself as follows.

**ARUNA (as if talking to herself, her eyes half closed):** What’s her name? Who knows? You seem to know. *(Pause.)* She used to wear skirts in the beginning, you remember? Then she started wearing salwar kameez. But her age doesn’t get concealed. *(Sighs.)* Who is she, where from? *(Silence. The music plays on.)* There doesn’t seem to be anyone in her life. *(Pause.)* There is a story by Gorky. Maxim Gorky. There is this woman who never receives any letters. Everybody she knows-her friends, her neighbours-they all get letters. She never does. And then all of a sudden she starts getting them. Every day. Sometimes two, three letters a day. *(Pause.)* Then she dies. It is discovered that she use to write those letters to herself. *(Pause.)* I haven’t even seen this woman talking on the phone. *(Pause.)* She must be having somebody, somewhere. An occasional letter, a casual postcard! *(Pause.)* ‘The roof is leaking Need money for repairs. Mother sinking rapidly.
Losing her vision too. Wonder if you can take her in for a few days?

Bal failed again. We want to send him to a computer class. But where
is the money, with all these expenses? This year Ganesh festival will be
a poor affair. You mustn’t tire yourself and come here.’

(A long pause.)

(Act 1: 255)

In this speech act, Aruna is shown thinking and speaking. Her conversational partner
doesn’t have any communicative requirement. Aruna goes on speaking to herself about
the woman living in the opposite building. Actually she addresses the message to the
audience. With the help of this unwanted information provided by Aruna or the violation
of quantity maxim, audience come to know that more or less Aruna and Dolon too are
living the lonely life like that lady.

All the examples discussed above show that the characters in the plays under study
violate quantity maxim. The motives for the violation of the maxim of quantity differ
from person to person and situation to situation. All these characters differ in their
purposes while violating this maxim. Some characters provide unnecessary information
to please the hearer. Some express their doubt, some do it to reveal the truth, others
explain the problem; some other characters tell their opinion. But the playwright does it
intentionally. In order to make the context and psychology of the character clear to the
audience, the dramatists make use of such communicative strategy.

4.3 Violation of the Quality Maxim

Do not say that which you believe to be false or for which you lack evidence (Grice
1975), is the quality maxim. Be truthful is the idea behind this principle. Conversational
partners are supposed to follow this maxim for making the communicative act fruitful.
But however, contextual and psychological pressure, personal nature, interest and social
phobia can compel communicator to flout this maxim. Many times people tell lie to hide
something which can bring them disgrace. To save the face or maintain the social status
also a lie comes as an handy.
In *Hayavadana*, Devadatta and Padmini decide not to go trip to Ujjain which they have planned with Kaplila. They decide to tell a lie to Kapila that Padmini is not feeling well. When Kapila comes, the following conversation takes place.

DEVADATTA: Kapila, we have to call off today’s trip.
KAPILA [suddenly silenced]: Oh!
DEVADATTA [embarrassed]: You see Padmini isn’t well …
KAPILA: Well, then of course …
[embarrassed]
I’ll return the cart then …
DEVADATTA: Yes.
KAPILA: Or else he may charge us for the day.
DEVADATTA: Uhm.
…
DEVADATTA: Why don’t you sit for a while?
KAPILA: No, no – we might upset sister-in-law more then with our noise.
DEVADATTA: That’s true. So-come again.
KAPILA: Yes, I will.
[Starts to go. Padmini comes out.]
PADMINI: Why are you sitting here? When are we going to start?
[They look at her, surprised.]
KAPILA: But if you aren’t well we won’t …
PADMINI: What’s wrong with me? I’m perfect. I had a headache this morning. But a layer of ginger-paste took care of that. Why should we cancel our trip for a little thing like that?
[Devadatta opens to his mouth to say something but stays quiet.]
[To kapila] Why are you standing there like a statue? (Act 1: 24)

In this segment of conversation, Devadatta, as per the decision made with Padmini, tells a
lie to Kapila that Padmini is not feeling well so the trip should be cancelled. Kapila gets disappointed but agrees to cancel the trip. Devadatta, who is worried about Padmini’s health as she is pregnant, is not willing to go to trip. He convinces her to cancel the trip. Both of them decide to tell lie to Kapila to cancel the trip. Accordingly, Devadatta acts over the plan. When Kapila starts to go, Padmini meddles in and asks to make hurry for the trip. Both Devadatta and Kapila are shocked to see Padmini’s act. Here, Devadatta violates the quality maxim of conversation, because he is worried about Padmini’s health. So to take care of her health, he lies to Kapila to cancel the trip. His intention is noble. However, Padmini, who has told Devadatta to lie to Kapila in order to cancel the trip, changes her approach. When Kapila is about to go, she meddles in and makes hurry to go for the trip. She too doesn’t follow what has been decided with Devadatta and thus disappoints him. Padmini is basically interested in Kapila. She thinks that it is good to go to trip as she will be able to enjoy the company of Kapila while making journey to Ujjain. She lies that she had mild headache and now she is feeling better. Her intention of violating the quality maxim is not noble. Being a married woman she takes interest in another man. She is not loyal to her husband. Flouting of quality maxim by Devadatta is benevolent. It shows his attitude of a caring husband. And Padmini’s act of flouting the quality maxim disappoints her husband. It reveals her dishonest behaviour.

In Tughlaq, Mohammad Tughlaq lies to Sheikh Imam-ud-din. In scene three, the shrewd king invites the saint and the critic of Tughlaq to address a public meeting but he takes enough care so that not a single inhabitant should be able to attend the public meeting. Tughlaq gives a false reason to Sheikh –Imam-ud-din of why Delhi people didn’t come to listen Sheikh sahib as follows.

MUHAMMAD: … Because they suspect you now. The moment they heard that I, the Sultan, was organizing a meeting in which you, my severest critic was going to speak- they became suspicious. Why should the Sultan sponsor his worst critic? They have smelt a trap. And wisely they have stayed away.

IMAM-UD-DIN (stunned): Was this trap?
MUHAMMAD: No, I promise you.
MUHAMMAD: But—you knew this would happen?
MUHAMMAD: I didn’t know. But I half expected it. I know my people.

(Scene iii: 22)

Not a single citizen of Delhi has turned up to listen Imam-ud-din, because people suspect that he is a spy. Tughlaq warns Imam-ud-din that by speaking against Sultan, he has risked his life. People may suspect him as a spy and may kill him. By lying or flouting the quality maxim, Sultan has succeeded in achieving his political aim of winning over Imam-ud-din. When Imam-ud-din says god-by to Sultan and moves down slowly, Muhammad asks Imam-ud-din for his help. He tells Sheikhsahib that Ain-ul-Mulk of Avadh, Tughlaq’s intimate friend, is marching on Delhi. Ain-ul-Mulk is not ready to negotiate with Tughlaq. Tughlaq asks Imam-ud-din to go to Ain-ul-Mulk as his envoy to negotiate and avoid the battle as Tughlaq desires for peace. Imam-ud-din agrees to help Sultan to establish peace. He lucratively manipulates the saint and sends him as an envoy to negotiate the peace with Ain-ul-Mulk, the rebellious warlord. Sheikh Imam-ud-din is elaborately robed to look like Tughlaq. When Imam-ud-din is about to talk peace with Ain-ul-Mulk, Tughlaq’s army waiting in anguish attacks and Imam-ud-din is killed. The thrilled army of Ain-ul-Mulk is temporarily in confusion and exactly at the favourable time Tughlaq attacks Ain-ul-Mulk and destroys his army. Everything is fair in love and war is an age old idiom. And accordingly to win the battle, Tughlaq lies to imam-ud-din by telling him that he urges for peace, but on the contrary, he flouts the quality maxim and grabbing the proper opportunity happens to kill Imam-ud-din on the battle field and defeats Ain-ul-Mulk cunningly.

A lie is categorized into two: black and white. A black lie is a damaging lie. Tughlaq’s lies belong to this category. A white lie is a protective lie. Such a lie saves the face of both the speaker and the hearer.

In scene six, Tughlaq murders Shihab-ud-din. Muhammad comes to know that Shihab-ud-din and Amirs of the state have become rebellious. They make a secret plan of killing Muhammad at the time of prayer, when Tughlaq and his guards will be unarmed and busy in prayers. Mohammad comes to know about it through a letter by Ratansingh. To
execute the plan, Shihab-ud-din, accompanied by Amirs, meets Tughlaq for the Durbar-i-Khas. Tughlaq makes a counter-plan and traps Shihab-ud-din and Amirs red-handed at the hands of Hindu soldiers, when the Amirs step forward towards Tughlaq with daggers in their hands. When Tughlaq murders Shihab-ud-din, following dialogue takes place:

NAJIB: We must do something about Shihab-ud-din’s father.
He is a powerful man and he won’t like this.

MUHAMMAD (regaining control of himself): Don’t worry about him. Make a public announcement that there was a rebellion in the palace and that the nobles of the court tried to assassinate the Sultan during prayer. Say that the Sultan was saved by Shihab-ud-din who died a martyr’s death of defending him. The funeral will be held in Delhi and will be a grand affair. Invite his father to it and see that he is treated with the respect due to the father of a nobleman.

BARANI: Oh God! Aren’t even the dead free from your politics? (Scene vi: 43)

In the above conversation, Tughlaq violates quality maxim by telling the lie about the death of Shihab-ud-din. He puts Shihab-ud-din to death for being rebellious and declares him to be a martyr. Here a lie has been used by Tughlaq maliciously as a protective measure or a defense mechanism in politics. He saves himself and his state from the wrath of Shihab-ud-din’s father.

In scene two of Wedding Album, Rohit nags Vidula to apply for the birth certificate at municipal council which is near the internet café. In that café Vidula spends many hours in searching pornographic sites secretly. When Hema asks Vidula what does she do in the café?, Vidula uses a lie as a protective measure to save her own face.

Hema: Stop nagging her! (To Vidula) What do you do in that internet café?

Vidula: I listen to sermons by Swami Ananga Nath … (Scene ii: 27)

A lie comes in handy, when Vidula is disturbed by two moral tormentors while surfing
pornographic sites in a private room of an internet café. She gets angry and accuses them as fucking rapist, who are there to molest her, which is untrue. She says to attendant:

Vidula: You saw it with your own eyes. They pulled away my dupatta. You saw it—they tried to molest me. The bastards. I was playing games in the cubicles outside. They dragged me here. They tore my clothes. Help! (Scene vi: 71)

Here Vidula transmutes her guilt at being found out into hysterical rage, screaming ‘sexual harassment’ to make her moral tormentors run away. Thus, Vidula maintains secrecy of her behavior.

Wedding Album has one more obtainable example of violation of quality maxim. In scene three, Gopal and Vatsala Sirur and Mohan and Meera Hattangadi visit the Nadkarnis to discuss about Rohit’s marriage with Tapasya Sirur.

ROHIT: No, I’m sorry. My answer is no. I am not interested. (A long pause. Vatsala looks at her husband in bewilderment. Gopal looks dazed.)
GOPAL: You are not? But …
VATSALA: Our daughter …
ROHIT: That’s what I want to know. Why have you brought her here, all the way down from Hyderabad, when I had very clearly—explicitly—said I don’t want to get married? I am not interested.
GOPAL: You had said that? When?
VATSALA: We wouldn’t have brought her here if you knew were really not interested.
(Mohan and Meera become restive.)
ROHIT: You mean … do you mean to tell me … (To Mohan and Mira)
You mean you didn’t tell them what I told you? That I am not …
MOHAN: Listen, listen. No need to get upset. When someone does something it is always done with good intentions. So something good can come out of it.
ROHIT (angry): I told you not once or twice-but-twenty times-every time you came here, every Saturday morning, I said that-not once, but again and again that I didn’t want to get married. And you never conveyed it to them? You told them I was willing?

MOHAN: No, no. We didn’t say that. But there is a difference—or at least we feel there is—between not being interested at all and not being ready for it now. We genuinely felt that although you were hesitant, you were bound to agree in the end. That is why—

ROHIT (to the Sirurs): There you are! I said no in so many words. But they told you what they felt …

MIRA: Besides the Shastriji promised us the relationship couldn’t not materialize. All the stars matched. ‘Don’t have any doubts,’ he said. ‘I have never seen two horoscopes match so perfectly.’

ROHIT: I can’t believe it. Did you hear that? I tell them something and they tell you what their astrologer tells them. (Scene iii: 36-37)

Mohan and Meera Hattangadi frequently visit the Nadkarnis to convince Rohit to accept Tapasya’s proposal. Rohit is in love with Isabel. And infact, he is not much serious about his own marriage. He first thinks of Vidula’s marriage and then of his career. But Hattangadi and Sirur families leave no stone unturned to persuade Rohit to marry Tapasya specially during Vidula’s marriage. Rohit is firm in his decision of not getting married. When Vidula’s marriage is about to be fixed, Sirurs and Hattangadis come to settle the marriage issue. The speech acts, shared by Rohit, make it clear that he is not interested in getting married. He has mentioned it clearly to Mohan and Meera, but they didn’t share the same with the Sirurs. Gopal’s expression ‘You had said that? When?’ and Vatsala’s exclamation ‘We wouldn’t have brought her here if you knew were really not interested’ clear the point that Meera and Mohan have flouted the quality maxim by not telling the truth. Being the mediator, it is the duty of Mohan and Meera to tell everything to Gopal and Vatsala. But they hide the truth and convey the falsified information, which has roused the hopes of Sirurs to get Rohit as their son-in-law. This is the violation of quality maxim. They bring Sirurs to fix and finalise the marriage.
Besides, they support their violation of quality maxim by giving the testimony of Shastriji’s horoscope based opinion. Meera and Mohan are to some extend noble in their approach as they are going to arrange Tapasya’s marriage with Rohit. By hook or crook, they want to fix this marriage. It is a kind of imposition on Rohit, but in Indian scenario, such type of violation of maxims do play significant role in arranging the marriages.

In Old Stone Mansion, Bhaskar plans not to tell Sudhir and other family members about how much gold they possess. Bhaskar is not willing to offer Sudhir’s share in the ancestral property of gold. Bhaskar shows a brass box containing family golden ornaments to Vahini and tells her:

BHASKAR: Look. Everyone’s share is here. Aai’s, Prabha’s, Sudhir’s, Chandu’s and mine. I’m not going to show it all to Sudhir.

VAHINI: You think he doesn’t know how much each one has?

BHASKAR: What can he do if I say Tatyaji sold it? Let him see for himself when I open the safe on the thirteenth day. I put this in the Pooja room day before yesterday. (Act 2, sc ii: 187)

Bhaskar, the elder son of the Deshpande family, is not willing to offer the share of gold to his siblings. He feels that Sudhir and Anjali work in Mumbai, so they are rich enough and there is no need to offer them their share. Aai, Prabha and Chandu are his dependant. Bhaskar has to look after all their needs and necessities so he feels that he alone will possess the gold which can be helpful for him to marry off his daughter. He plans to take away some share from the gold before opening the box on the thirteenth day. He also plans to tell a lie that Tatyaji has sold away the gold. Here, Bhaskar’s purpose of lying is malevolent. He decides to hide the gold from the family members and own it for the self. Unfortunately, when Ranju, Bhaskar’s daughter elopes with her teacher to Bombay, she takes away the box with her. The teacher deceives her and absconds by taking all golden ornaments from her.

Alan Cruse in his book Meaning in Language (2000) gives certain maxims regarding the violation of these maxims. There can be deliberate flouting of the maxims in circumstances in which a) it is obvious to the hearer that the maxims are being flouted
b) it is obvious to the hearer that the speaker intends to be aware that the maxim are being flouted c) there are no signs that the speaker is opting out of the cooperative principle.

The hearer is thus given a signal that utterances are not to be taken at face value, and that some sort of extra processing is called for. Following speech acts in the selected plays are analysed from this point view.

RANJU: Have you seen Amitabh, Sudhir-kaka?
SUDHIR: Sure. He comes to our milk booth everyday to buy milk.
RANJU: What lies!
SUDHIR: Really! Even Jaya comes over to borrow this and that!
RANJU: But the stars are so rich!
SUDHIR: Not as rich as the Deshpandes. Now go and get some tea for your Kaka.
RANJU: Right away. Ji haan. Where’s Rajkamal Studio, Kaka?
SUDHIR: Oh, Rajkamal? Right behind our house! Now go, get that tea!

(Act 1, sc iii: 159-60)

In this piece of conversation, Sudhir is not in a mood to talk with Ranju. Ranju who is mad after bollywood film stars, is asking questions to Sudhir as he is living at Bombay. Sudhir answers her question in the sarcastic manner. He says that Amitabh and Jaya come to the market to buy this and that and Rajkamal Studio is also near their house. Ranju knows that Sudhir is lying. And Sudhir expects that Ranju should understand that the maxim of quality is being flouted. His intention is that Ranju should give up asking such bleak questions and bring a cup of tea for him.

In exaggeration, it is obvious to the hearer that the maxim of quality is being flouted. In Hayavadana, Devadatta who is in love with Padmini makes use of overstatement as follows. Kapila the listener of these speech acts knows that speaker is flouting quality maxim.

DEVADATTA [slowly]: How can I describe her, Kapila? Her forelocks rival the bees, her face is …
[All this is familiar to Kapila and he joins in, with great enjoyment.]

BOTH: … is a white lotus. Her beauty is as the magic lake. Her arms
the lotus creepers. Her breasts are golden urns and her waist …

DEVADATTA: No. No.!

KAPILA: Eh?

DEVADATTA: I was blind all these days. I deceived myself that I
understood poetry. I didn’t .I understood nothing.

Tanvee shyama-

BOTH: … shikharidashana pakvabimbadharoshthi-Madhye kshama
chakitarineeprekshana nimnanabhih

DEVADATTA: The Shyama Nayika-born of Kalidasa’s magic description-
as Vatsyayana had dreamt her. Kapila, in one appearance, she became
my guru in the poetry of love. Do you think she would ever assent to
becoming my disciple in love itself?

KAPILA [aside]: This is new!

DEVADATTA: If only she would consent to be my Muse, I could outshine
Kalidasa. I’d always wanted to do that—but I thought it was impossible
…. But now I see it isn’t at all impossible. (Act 1: 13-14)

Devadatta, who is mad after Padmini, makes hyperbolic statements regarding her beauty
and charm. He describes her by applying various figures of speech. This kind of flouting
of quality maxims adds artistic eminence to the poetic diction. It states the psychological
condition of the speaker.

Similarly in Tughlaq, announcement made by the announcer is an example of exaggeration where maxim of quality is being flouted.

ANNOUNCER: Attention! Attention! The warrior in the path of God,
the Defender of the word of the Prophet, the Friend of the Khalif,
the Just, His Merciful Majesty, Sultan Muhammad Tughlaq.

(Scene i: 3)
Kings and emperors, religious preachers and the people of political, social, judicial and religious significance were given due respect. In the historical era, respect is shown by publically announcing the exaggerative statements to please the distinguished people. The above cited public pronouncements from the historical play *Tughlaq* exemplify the flouting of the maxim of quality and maintain the face of the eminent people. Such type of exaggerations is culture and time specific. In the present era of multiculturalism, such pronouncements are irrelevant.

The different instances examined here reveal a variety of aspects of the phenomenon of lying. It is realized that friends, kings, brothers, sisters, subordinates, servants and almost everyone is prone to lie. There are several reasons why people tell lies - in order to deceive others, protect others, conceal the truth, save someone’s face, and make the hearer happy. The intention for lying may be benevolent or malevolent or neutral.

4.4 Violation of the Relation Maxim

“Make your contribution relevant to the aims of the ongoing conversation” is how Grice (1975) describes the relation maxim. Communication partners should make their conversational contribution relevant is the rationale behind this maxim. In any kind of communication, it is a prerequisite that participants in a conversation should be clear and relevant in their expressions of thoughts. And interestingly, in human conversation, it is not the case. Speakers do not hold on the Gricean maxim of cooperative principles all times. There are various factors which intervene the way of upholding the maxim of relation. Context or situation helps the co-conversationalists to connect their apparently disjointed utterances in to a coherent discourse. But sometimes, when the context or
situation does not help, the conversation becomes chaotic. Had we been robots, we would have produced conversations which strictly observe the maxims of co-operative verbal transactions. The examples discussed below show how fictional characters in the plays violate the maxim of relation. These examples are:

In *Hayavadana*, Kapila goes to Padmini’s house to get her hand for Devadatta. He meets Padmini at the door of her house. He is willing to meet some elder person from Padmini’s house. Padmini asks him, “What are you doing here?” The following conversation takes place between them.

**KAPILA:** I-I can’t tell you.
**PADMINI:** Really! Who will you tell it to?
**KAPILA:** Your father …
**PADMINI:** Do you want my father or do you want the master of this house?
**KAPILA:** Aren’t they same?
**PADMINI** [regaining control of himself]: Listen, my father could be a servant in this house. Or the master of this house could be my father’s servant. My father could be the master’s father, brother, son-in-law, cousin, grandfather or uncle. Do you agree?
**KAPILA:** Er-Yes.
**PADMINI:** Right. Then we’ll start again. Whom should I call?
**KAPILA:** Your father.
**PADMINI:** And if he’s not in?
**KAPILA** [lost]: Anyone else.
**PADMINI:** Which anyone?
**KAPILA:** Perhaps-your brother.
**PADMINI:** Do you know him?
**KAPILA:** No
**PADMINI:** Do you know his name?
KAPILA[desperate]: Please, please-call your father or the master or both, or if they are the same, anyone...please call someone!

PADMINI: No. No. That won’t do. (Act 1: 18)

In this piece of conversation, Padmini’s expressions are not relevant and in accordance to the Kapila’a speech acts. When Kapila meets Padmini, she directly asks him whom he wants to meet. Kapila tells her to call her father or the master of the house. As far as linguistic exchanges are concerned, Padmini dominates Kapila. Her linguistic behaviour violates the maxim of relevance and she asks irrelevant things which makes desperate to both Kapila and the audience. Here, the dramatist deliberately flouts the maxim of relevance through Padmini’s expressions so that audience/readers realize that she is a lady who is very much dominant in her linguistic behaviour. Throughout the play, Padmini remains linguistically dominant over the characters of Devadatta and Kapila.

In scene two of Tughlaq, Muhammad, Step-Mother, Najib and Barani are talking about the political affairs, specially about Ain-ul-Mulk’s marching on Delhi and Sheikh-Imam-ud-din’s public speeches against Muhammad. Muhammad seeks Najib’s advice as follows.

MUHAMMAD: So, Najib what do you propose?
NAJIB: I can’t think of anything right now, Your Majesty - except that the Sheikh has a striking resemblance to you

Muhammad, startled, stares at Najib.

BARANI: What has the Sheikh got to do with this?

MUHAMMAD (slowly): You are a devil, Najib! (Pause. Then briskly).

Good. We’ll think about that. In the meantime, the army should be ready to march. We’ll start for Kanauj the day after tomorrow in the evening. (Scene ii: 16)

In the above conversation, when Muhammad seeks his political adviser, Najib’s advice over the political crises they are facing, Najib answers that he can’t think anything...
clearly but his statement ‘Sheikh has a striking resemblance to you’ seems to be an irrelevant response. Barani’s statement ‘What has the Sheikh got to do with this?’ makes it clear that Najib’s response is not apt to Muhammad’s question. At the superficial level, Najib’s response is an irrelevant or the violation of relation maxim. But at the deep level, Muhammad thinks over the statement and suddenly decodes the hidden message which Najib wants to communicate. Audience/readers like Barani do not understand the hidden message. Later on in scene four when Ratansingh informs about what happened in the war, the audience/readers come to know the fact. Sheikh has a striking resemblance with Muhammad, so Muhammad sends Sheikh as an envoy to discuss with Ain-ul-mulk in order to prevent the war. When Sheikh was on the battlefield a trumpeter on Muhammad’s side sounded the charge. The battle started and Sheikh was killed with the arrows by the army of Ain-ul-Mulk. Muhammad’s army thought that the Sultan was dead. But it was a trap planned by Tughlaq on Najib’s advice. It has benefited Muhammad with double profit. It has killed the Sheikh, who was rebelling against the Sultan and also Muhammad could get victory in the war.

It is difficult to draw a line of severance between the violation of the maxim of relation and that of quantity. When one gives information that is not elicited, one flouts not only the maxim of informativeness but also that of relevance. This maxim demands communicators to make their contribution relevant. In scene eight of Wedding Album, Ashwin’s contribution of information is not relevant where he mentions:

Ashwin: … When I was in college, I was not considered the brightest boy in the class. There were many brighter than me. But where are they now? No one knows, while I have made a fortune. I can buy up the Congress. There is no doubt about it—the US is a land of opportunity. Gods’s own country.

But … and there are a lot of buts.

The fact is, the white man is played out. The hardworking white immigrant is a thing of the past and today it’s we who are keeping the machine ticking. And, of course, making our fortunes. We Indians are right there where the Jews stood once. We shall soon take over the
economy. But by peaceful means. My American colleagues keep
telling me, ‘You Indians. You are honest. Hardworking. Most of all
peace-loving. Not like others. A community that leaves the rest of
the world to itself. Great Guys.’

That’s what the white man still appreciates about us Indians.

(Pause.)

What am I anguished about then? I have drunk life in the US to the
lees. Girl friends, affairs, mistresses, one night stands. And on the
public stage, glamour, success, social connections. I have been through
them all. And I have come to the conclusion that that whole culture
is empty of values now, bereft of any living meaning. It is shallow.
The European Industrial Revolution began by rejecting religion in
favour of material values. But today that legacy is strangling the
West. They have no spiritual moorings left. They are adrift in a
godless, amoral world. … (Scene viii: 80)

Ashwin Panje is the suitable expat Saraswat boy working in USA. Ashwin and Vidula’s
meeting is arranged in restaurant so that they should get a chance to discuss their likings
and dislikings and to think whether they can be a perfect made for each other or not. In
this meeting, Ashwin initiates the dialogue leaving no time and chance for Vidula to
share her views. Ashwin’s prolixity reveals his views about shallow, glittering and
materialistic life in USA, spirituality and morality in Hinduism, his faith in his own
qualities and his expectations from a life partner. He feels to share all these things with
Vidula, in their first real meeting in a restaurant, where Vidula listens Ashwin
expressionless. Ashwin’s flouting of relation maxim has cleared everything from his side.
And Vidula agrees to follow what has been expected by Ashwin. She doesn’t bother,
though she could not share her views.

In Wedding Album, maxim of relevance is violated to create a joke. In scene three, Gopal
and Vatsala Sirur and Mohan and Meera Hattangadi visit the Nadkarnis to discuss about
Rohit’s marriage with Tapasya Sirur.
ROHIT: I don’t make documentaries.
MOHAN: She is also very creative.
ROHIT: You have told me all that. But I can’t.

(Father stands up to go.)
MIRA: You aren’t living, are you, Doctor Uncle? Look, Rohit is refusing to consider. What do you say?
FATHER: What can I say? I have got a wife already.
MIRA: Doctor uncle’s joking. Ha! Ha! (Scene iii: 31)

Mohan and Meera Hattangadi frequently visit the Nadkarnis to convince Rohit to accept Tapasya’s proposal. Rohit is in love with Isabel. And infact, he is not much serious about his own marriage. He first thinks of Vidula’s marriage and then of his career. But Hattangadi and Sirur families leave no stone unturned to persuade Rohit to marry Tapasya specially during Vidula’s marriage. Rohit is firm in his decision of not getting married. When this discussion is going on father tries to get up to go. Meera’s speech act ‘You aren’t living, are you, Doctor Uncle? Look, Rohit is refusing to consider. What do you say?’ is taken by father as an offer to get married. Of course he takes it jokingly and answers, ‘What can I say? I have got a wife already.’ Father has broken the maxim of relation by taking Meera’s expression as an offer for his own marriage and violets the maxim of relevance to crack a joke.

When human beings are worried or restless, they do flout the maxim of relevance. In Wedding Album, mother is restless about Vidula as she has gone to meet Ashwin in a restaurant to discuss their likings and dislikings and whether they can make a perfect match or not. She flouts the relation maxim as follows.

FATHER: Is the boy coming to visit us today?
MOTHER: Who?
FATHER: The boy from America.
MOTHER: Ashwin? Of course not.
FATHER: Then who is coming?
MOTHER: No one.
FATHER: Then why are you changing cushion covers? It’s the third set you have changed since morning.
MOTHER: No one’s coming. I am … I am … I don’t know what else to do.
FATHER: That’s certainly something new.
MOTHER: I’m all jittery. With Vido sitting there with him — all alone — a total stranger. She is so unsure of herself. Timid. I don’t know why she has to be so …

(Scene vii: 72)

Father and Mother are in the living room. He is looking through some old files. She is changing cushion covers and arranging the sofa abstractedly. Mother doesn’t respond father’s question relatively. Being a mother, it is natural for her to feel very much worried and restless about how Vidula will handle the situation. She feels that Vidula is not judgemental and will fail to represent herself properly. Out of confusion and restlessness, she violates the maxim of relevance by answering father’s question absent mindedly.

Sometimes, maxim of relation or relevance is violated to change the subject of ongoing talk. Old Stone Mansion contains some such examples.

BHASKAR: When did the telegram reach you?
SUDHIR: Day before yesterday. We left immediately.
BHASKAR: Hmm. I was wondering what happened. It was already past ten. I thought perhaps you hadn’t got the telegram at all.
SUDHIR: The train reached Amaravati late. The last bus had left by then. We had to take a taxi.
BHASKAR: Tatyaji gave us no time at all. He got up from his evening pooja and collapsed on the spot. I shouted, ‘Tatyaji! Tatyaji!’
But it was all over. (Act 1, sc i: 137)
Bhaskar’s brother Sudhir resides at Bombay. When their father Vyenkatesh passes away, Bhaskar, the elder brother, informs about the sad demise of their father to Sudhir through a telegram. When Sudhir comes from Bombay to Dharangaon, their native place in Amaravati district, above mentioned interaction takes place between them. In this example, Bhaskar initiates the conversation by asking, ‘When did the telegram reach you?’ and accordingly speech acts are exchanged between the conversational partners. Sudhir doesn’t ask for what happened to Tatyaji, even though Bhaskar tells him the incident of Tatyaji’s death. Bhaskar’s flouting of relation maxim exemplifies the change in the topic of ongoing conversation. This change in the topic keeps the ball of conversation rolling. Through this flouting of relation maxim, audience comes to know about the death of Vyenkatesh.

One more example of flouting of relation maxim is obtainable from Old Stone Mansion.

RANJU: Tea for me.
BHASKAR: Tidy that mane first.
SUDHIR: Go and wake Parag.
RANJU: My tea first.
VAHINI: Parag went out early after his tea.
SUDHIR: Some exercise routine or something?
BHASKAR: Sure! Running wild round the village dung-heaps.
VAHINI (changing the subject): Anjali, why don’t you mend that sari?
   That’s a huge tear. She was blessed by the tractor as she came in.

   (Act 1, sc ii: 143)

In this conversational act, Sudhir asks Ranju, ‘Go and wake Parag.’ To which Ranju answers, ‘My tea first.’ This flouting of relation maxim shows that Ranju is not obedient enough to listen what her uncle or Sudhir kaka says. Her demand for tea is an indirect way of stating the intention that first she will take her tea and then proceed to work for what Sudhir has said. Vahini, who is not asked to tell anything, informs that Parag has already taken his tea and gone outside. Sudhir out of curiosity asks whether Parag does
any exercise to which Bhaskar answers sarcastically stating, ‘Sure! Running wild round the village dung-heaps.’ Vahini feels it as an insult to Parag. Vahini loves her son Parag as any mother would do. She doesn’t want her son being insulted in front of Sudhir and Anjali. To save Parag from further insulting statements from Bhaskar, Vahini flouts the relation maxim and changes the topic of their conversation by asking Anjali to mend her sari. It shows that sometimes maxim of relation is violated to save the face and maintain the status of the speaker himself or the person strongly associated with the speaker.

*Sonata* opens with the flouting of relation maxim as follows.

ARUNA (without taking her eyes off the papers): Dolon. (*Dolon is oblivious to her call.*) Will you please stop that?

(Pause.)

DOLON (opening the drawers of the chest noisily): My perfume! Just bought it the other day. Don’t see it anywhere. (*Pause.*) Finished the papers?

ARUNA: Please!

DOLON: You haven’t seen it by any chance?

ARUNA: How she ignores me, meli!

DOLON (laughing): Shotti!

ARUNA: And where do you think you are going at this hour of the night wearing that perfume?

DOLON: You give me *gaalis* and you get them back in ample measure.

ARUNA: Gaalis she can hear alright.

DOLON: It was quite expensive. French

(Act 1: 246)

Dolon is trying to put the room in order but in her effort to do so, she brings more disorder in it. Aruna is busy in assessing the papers. She makes a great effort to ignore her friend’s noisy activity, but finally cannot take it anymore, so she asks Dolon to stop her noisy activity. Dolon deliberately does not pay any attention to Aruna. All expressions by Dolon in the above extract of conversation violate the maxim of
relevance. She doesn’t respond Aruna as it should be. Aruna requests her to stop her noise, and on the contrary, Dolon is responding her by asking about her perfumes. Flouting of relation maxim on Dolon’s side signify her careless attitude towards her room as well as conversational partner. Here Dolon is intentionally uncooperative. It also reflects her light, easy go mood. Throughout the play, Dolan’s love for perfume reflects her trifling attitude. Thus, flouting of relation maxim helps us to understand the people in the fictional work and probably in the real life too.

4.5 Violation of the Manner Maxim

Grice states manner of maxim as “be clear, brief and orderly” in your conversation. The maxim of manner aims at avoiding ambiguity and obscurity of expression. Verbosity may cause failure in communication. One should be clear enough to make a sense through words; his communiqué should be economical and processible. Use of oblique language and code words makes the message difficult to be decoded for the hearer. No doubt, the hearer makes use of verbal clues and non-linguistic contexts to decoding extremely prolix and ambiguous messages. It is a fact that violation of the maxim of manner is a resource on which dramatic performance depends. This is the reason why some of the characters are remembered for their witticisms, conceits and wordplays. The characters in the plays that underpin our study do exploit the resources of euphemisms, indirect speech acts and lying, but they do not seem to violate the maxim of manner.

In an instance from *Hayavadana*, Devadatta makes use of indirect speech acts, while conversing with Padmini.

Devadatta [aside]: Does she really not see? Or is she deliberately playing this game with him? Kapila was never the sort to blush. But now, he only has to see her and he begins to wag his tail. Sits upon his hind legs as though he were afraid to let her words fall to the ground. And that pleading in his eyes-can’t she really see that? [Aloud.] Padmini, Kapila isn’t used to women. The only woman he has known in his life is his mother …
PADMINI: You mean it’s dangerous to be with him? The way you talk one would never imagine he was your best friend.

DEVADATTA [incensed]: Why do you have to paint everything I say …

PADMINI [conciliatory]: What did I say? Listen, if you really don’t want to go to Ujjain today, let’s not. When Kapila comes, tell him I’m ill. (Act 1: 22)

Through the above exclamations it is revealed that Devadatta doesn’t like his wife Padmini’s growing intimacy with his friend Kapila. His expressions, spoken in sideways, create a context for the audience/readers to know the fact. Being both, loving husband of Padmini and best friend of Kapila, Devadatta can’t directly state Padmini to be away from Kapila. So he makes use of indirect statement ‘Padmini, Kapila isn’t used to women. The only woman he has known in his life is his mother …’ Padmini comprehends the message Devadatta wants to give. Her statement ‘You mean it’s dangerous to be with him? The way you talk one would never imagine he was your best friend’, indirectly states that Kapila may sexually harass Padmini, so her husband advises her to keep distance from Kapila his best friend. Actually that is the message Devadatta hints at. But Padmini’s revelation of that meaning through words makes Devadatta enraged. He feels that Padmini has taken the meaning otherwise. Being conservative, it is uncomfortable to make use of words that directly refer to sexual act. Devadatta belongs to the rustic India, where overt meaning to the sexual act is a taboo. Hence, he uses metaphor to bring his meaning. Devadatta, who doesn’t like Kapila’s approach, makes reference to the dogs ‘he only has to see her and he begins to wag his tail’ to describe his behaviour. Reference to the dogs is a very popular expression in Indian context. Devadatta makes use of it in his aside. Though Devadatta flouts the maxim of manner, the hinted meaning of his utterance is understood by the hearers who are familiar with the Indian phrases and expressions. But these phrases are meaningless to the non-native speakers of Indian languages.

Muhammad flouts the maxim of manner when his mother comes to meet him in Tughlaq.
STEP-MOTHER: Muhammad-
MUHAMMAD: Ah, there you are! Absolutely at the right moment. If you had come a minute earlier, the world would have been so much poorer.
STEP-MOTHER: Really? That sounds very important.
MUHAMMAD: But it is. I have just solved the most famous problem in chess. Even al-Adili and as-Sarakhi said it was insoluble.
And it’s so simple-
STEP-MOTHER: Who were they?
MUHAMMAD: Mother! How can you ask? They were the greatest chess players the world’s ever seen.
STEP-MOTHER: What do I know about your chess? You’d better write about it to Ain-ul-Mulk. He’ll love it! (Scene ii: 9)

Muhammad compliments the arrival of his mother and uses the exaggerative statement ‘If you had come a minute earlier, the world would have been so much poorer’. He further makes use of references to al-Adili and as-Sarakhi. Mother doesn’t understand anything about these names and the problem which Muhammad has solved. Muhammad’s speech is somewhat obscure and lacks clarity. She seeks more information to get the clear message. Muhammad tells her that they were the greatest chess players. Muhammad does flout the maxim of manner to heighten the effect of his winning of the chess game.

In the same scene of Tughlaq, Muhammad, Step-Mother, Najib and Barani are talking about the political affairs, specially about Ain-ul-Mulk’s marching on Delhi and Sheikh-Imam-ud-din’s public speeches against Muhammad. Muhammad seeks Najib’s advice as follows.

MUHAMMAD: So, Najib what do you propose?
NAJIB: I can’t think of anything right now, Your Majesty - except that the Sheikh has a striking resemblance to you
Muhammad, startled, stares at Najib.
BARANI: What has the Sheikh got to do with this?
MUHAMMAD (slowly): You are a devil, Najib! (Pause. Then briskly).

Good. We’ll think about that. In the meantime, the army should be ready to march. We’ll start for Kanauj the day after tomorrow in the evening. (Scene ii: 16)

In the above conversation, when Muhammad seeks his political adviser, Najib’s advice over the political crises they are facing, Najib answers that he can’t think anything clearly but his statement ‘Sheikh has a striking resemblance to you’ seems to be an incomprehensible response. Barani’s statement ‘What has the Sheikh got to do with this?’ makes it clear that Najib’s response is not clear. Najib’s response is unintelligible and it violates the maxim of manner. Muhammad thinks over the statement and suddenly decodes the hidden message which Najib wants to communicate. Audience/readers, like Barani and Step-mother, do not understand the hidden message. Later on in scene four, when Ratansingh informs about what happened in the war, the audience/readers come to know the fact. Sheikh has a striking resemblance with Muhammad, so Muhammad sends Sheikh as an envoy to discuss with Ain-ul-mulk in order to prevent the war. When Sheikh was on the battlefield a trumpeter on Muhammad’s side sounded the charge. The battle started and Sheikh was killed with the arrows by the army of Ain-ul-Mulk. Muhammad’s army thought that the Sultan was dead. But it was a trap planned by Tughlaq on Najib’s advice. It has benefited Muhammad with double profit. It has killed the Sheikh, who was rebelling against the Sultan and also Muhammad could get victory in the war by defeating Ain-ul-Mulk. Najib’s flouting of maxim of manner has served the double purpose of conveying certain message to Tughlaq and hiding the same message from the audience or readers. It has extended anxiety and interest among the viewers.

This maxim demands that communicators’ message should avoid obscurity wordiness, and disorderliness. In Wedding Album, this maxim is violated in Scene two where Vidula and mother are examining saris for themselves to wear on the occasion of marriage. One sari is selected by mother for Hema. Vidula does think that it will not be suitable for her sister, Hema. And here a tension is created between Hema and mother:
Vidula (picking the kanjeevaram sari up): How about this?
Hema: For whom?
Vidula: For you. Ma has chosen this for you. But I don’t think this is your colour.
Vidula: So you see, Ma, she isn’t too keen. Didn’t I say? I’ll choose another one
for her myself.
Mother: If you don’t like it, why don’t you say so? Why all this …
Hema: ‘All this’ what? What did I say? (Scene ii: 10)

Vidula’s guess is right. Hema doesn’t like the sari selected by her mother. But she
doesn’t speak out her dislike. Her mood and lack of enthusiasm in response reveals that
she is not content with the sari. Mother understands the negative sense in her statement.
So she says, ‘If you don’t like it, why don’t you say so? Why all this …’ The words ‘all
this’ create a wordy combat between Hema and mother which lets off steam in the
marriage home.

In Old Stone Mansion, Vahini flouts the maxim of manner. To perform the post demise
rituals of Vyenkatesh, Deshapndes need some money to purchase groceries. Following
interaction takes place between Vahini and Chandu.

CHANDU (to Vahini): Vahini we’ll have to arrange for some money
somehow.
VAHINI: What’s this now.
CHANDU: Bhau sent me to ask Sudhir. He doesn’t have that much.
VAHINI: And where should I get it from?
CHANDU: Everything will have to be paid for. Bansilal won’t give credit.

We’ll need at least seven or eight hundred rupees.
VAHINI: Knock my teeth out and take them. (Act 1, sc ii: 147-48)

Being the eldest daughter-in-law, Vahini holds important position in the family. Chandu
asks Vahini to arrange some money to purchase the groceries for the post demise rituals
of Vyenkatesh. Bhaskar and Vahini expect that Sudhir should aid economically to meet the expenditure. But he doesn’t have that much amount. Vahini gets annoyed and flouts the maxim of manner by saying, ‘Knock my teeth out and take them.’ The phrase used by Vahini is commonly used by the Indians to refer when they don’t have money to spend. Though Vahini flouts the maxim of manner, the hinted meaning of her utterance is understood by the hearers who are familiar with the Indian phrases and expressions. But such phrases can confuse the non-native speakers of Indian languages.

In Reflection, the character of Girl or Broomstick uses verbosity or obscurity to introduce herself. It is also a kind of flouting of maxim of manner.

HE: Who is this, Muktabai, come to us?
GIRL: Namaskar.
HE: Who are you?
GIRL: You don’t know me.
HE: That’s why I ask you. Who are you?
GIRL: Do I have a name.
HE: What do you mean?
GIRL: Means I do not have a name. No name. But people at home, or outside, at the office, they call me Broomstick. (Act 1: 230)

Here, unnecessarily Girl delays to reveal her identity. It is a kind of violation of manner maxim. This violation heightens the effect and creates curiosity among the audience to know about her. Her name is again very unusual i.e. Broomstick.

In Old Stone Mansion, the word bhaitaad has been used by Bhaskar and Sudhir. It is one of the commonly used abusing words in Warhadi, one of the native dialects of Marathi. It simply means hopeless or nonsense fellow. In India, it is considered that after every twelve miles language gets changed. It means some locally used words are mixed in language in use. The people from the other part(s) of the province or the non-native speakers of Indian languages may not understand the exact meaning of such local terms.

In Hayavadana, Padmini uses the term saffron to refer to her husband Devadatta. In
Indian context, and specially in Hindu religion, married women wear saffron or *kumkum* on their foreheads. It is the symbol of being married. The saffron or *kumkum* on the forehead symbolically represents the husband. Women who avoid wearing saffron or *kumkum* on their foreheads means they have lost their husbands.

In *Sonata*, Aruna uses the term *Nirlajjam sada sukhi* to refer their futile life style. In Indian context the phrase *Nirlajjam sada sukhi* is used to refer the shameless or senseless people who consider themselves always happy. Postmodern way of life is practised by Aruna, Dolon and Shubhadra who take pleasure in violating the traditional norms of life. Duo Dolon and Shubhadra are anti-conventional. They are against the norms set by socio-cultural codes, morals and ethics. It doesn’t bring any concrete constructive change in their life. They go on living with their existential realism.

Use of such confusing words can be taken as the flouting of the maxim of manner by the playwright.

### 4.6 Cohesion

Cohesion and coherence establish a link in a series of sentences or expressions together. Cohesion refers to the evident grammatical markers in a series of utterances. Coherence establishes sense of meaning between or across utterances. In short, the former deals with syntactic and the latter with the semantic features of the group of expressions. Leech and Short (1981: 243-44) mention that the units of a message must be implicitly or explicitly bound together, they must not be just a random collection of sentences.

Linguistic expressions, both in real life situations and in literature, have different cohesive devices. ‘Tense Sequence’ is one of the significant strategies. Normally, a speaker or a writer will use past tense to describe an event happened in past. It is uncommon to find a mixture of the past and the present. This tense-blend or tense-switch is used to produce an effect of immediacy and temporal and spatial proximity. Further, it can be a style of a specific character in a play. One of the examples of tense-blend is analysed from *Tughlaq*. Karim was asked to bring a Turk merchant to loot. By mistake he
brings Ghiyas-Ud-Din, the descendant of a respected Khalif from Arabia and the Guest of Honour to Tughlaq. When Aziz and Aazam realize this fact, Ghiyas-Ud-Din gets very angry with them and says:

Ghiyas-Ud-Din : You’ll pay for this! I’ve come all the way from Arabia and not a soul dared touch me.
They trembled at the mention of my name. And Now this outrage! You’ll hear more about this. (Scene ix: 59)

One more example of tense-blending is in *Old Stone Mansion*. In Act two, Sudhir asks Bhaskar to get an electricity connection.

SUDHIR: Why don’t you get a connection anyway? It’s so dark around here.
BHASKAR: It’s not dark or anything. It’s all a question of habit. We don’t find it dark. And you think it’s any good having a connection? Four days of the week there’s no power. People installed pumps in place of their waterwheels. Now they are regretting it. Half their orchards have dried up. The government is happy because it has given electricity to the village, and the people are happy because they have connections. But if you ask me, there’s more loss than gain in it. (Act 2, sc i: 163)

Bhaskar makes use of three different tenses in three continuous sentences. ‘People installed pumps in place of their waterwheels. Now they are regretting it. Half their orchards have dried up.’ As discussed above tense-blending is used to create an effect of immediacy and temporal and spatial proximity. Unlike other characters, tense-blending is one of the conversational features of the character of Bhaskar.

In *Sonata*, following speech act by Subhadara exemplifies tense-blending as well as
code-switching i.e. mixture English and Hindi. It is also an example of coherence.
Subhadra is talking to her colleague, Sandeep on mobile.

**SUBHADRA:** Hello! *Han, bolo Sandeep.* *(listens for some time intently and then suddenly erupts.)* How dare he? And who the hell is he to fire me? *(Long Pause.)* I knew it. I smelt it. I’m sure that bony-ass *randi* is behind all this. *(Listens.)* Why are they so fucking paranoid? The skies aren’t going to fall down if they print my copy as it is. Let them edit one word and they have had it. I’ve slogged and researched for months man. *(Pause.)* No way, no way. That’s impossible. No compromises, please. *(Pause.)* *Arrey, main chane chabaake jeeungi.* *Ye haramjade kya muze blackmail karane nikale hain?* *(Pause.)* Moral turpitude? Hahaha! Look who is talking! That gateway of India son of a bitch wants to remove me for moral turpitude! That’s the joke of the century! Let his letter come and then see. *Sale, teri kyun phatate hai Kayar sala, buzdiil.* *(Pause.)* Nahi loongi tera naam baba. Now go sleep in your wife’s arms, baby. Thanks. *(Pause.)* For telling me yaar. *(Drops the phone in her purse.)* I was expecting this. *(Dolon and Aruna are watching her.)* And now what? Why are you looking at me like that?

*(Pause.)*

*(Act 1: 272)*

‘Ellipsis’ is another cohesive device. It refers to dropping of certain words which must be understood by the conversational partner to get complete meaning. Textual ellipsis and discoursal ellipsis are the two types of ellipses. Textual ellipsis is an exclusion of lexical and grammatical items from an expression. Here shared knowledge of conversational partners supply proper sense and meaning.

All the characters in the selected plays use textual ellipsis. Gapping, VP ellipsis and answer fragments are mostly used in the conversational acts by various characters. Some of the examples have been quoted below.
STEP-MOTHER: And what about Ain-ul-Mulk? I hope he’s dead too.
MUHAMMAD: I let him go.
STEP-MOTHER: You didn’t! You couldn’t have! Let Ain-ul-Mulk go after war.  

(Tughlaq Scene iv: 27)

KAPILA (hurt): Do you really want me to go?
DEVADATTA: Yes. I want you to go.  

(Hayavadana Act 1: 13)

ROHIT (annoyed): Are you trying to bribe me?
MOHAN: No, no, no … I am not trying to bribe you.  

(Wedding Album Scene iii: 35)

CHANDU: What’s that you are reading, girl?
RANJU: I am reading Filmfare.  

(Old Stone Mansion Act 1, sc i: 134)

HE: I was scared for a moment. That’s all.
GIRL: But why? were you scared  

(Reflection Act 1: 231)

ARUNA: You never told me that.
DOLON: How could I? tell you that  

(Sonata Act 1: 282)

All these expressions illustrate ellipses. Elided material is indicated with subscripts and small font size.

Discoursal ellipsis refers to the absence of an idea and the sentence itself may not be incomplete. Indian linguistic concepts of ‘adhyahara’ and ‘vakyasesa’ from Sanskrit are similar to ellipsis. Tughlaq contents an example of discoursal ellipsis.

MUHAMMAD: So you too believe that piece of gossip!
STEP-MOTHER: What gossip?
STEP-MOTHER: Don’t be silly. I didn’t mean anything of that kind.
MUHAMMAD: But you do believe it? And why shouldn’t you? After all my own mother believes it. My Amirs believe it. Why shouldn’t my step-mother believe it? (Scene ii: 11)

In this conversation, ‘piece of gossip’ is an example of discoursal ellipsis. Here ‘piece of gossip’ refers to the act of murdering of Tughlaq’s ancestors at the hands of Tughlaq himself. The people who are involved in this conversation comprehend it properly. In fact, audience/readers also come to know about it as they reach up to scene two.

4.7 Coherence

Coherence deals with the semantic of a spoken or written text. Syntactical features help to achieve meaning to the conversational associate. To make sense of what is said or written, listener or reader has to listen or read between and beyond the utterances. Context and the shared knowledge of speaker and listener help to arrive at certain meaning. Meaning is not present in the words or utterances. It is between and beyond the lines, somewhere in the white space in written composition and somewhere in the zone of silence between spoken utterances. Following example will illustrate the point.

HEMA: Who is this Isabel?
VIDULA: His girlfriend.
HEMA: A Christian?
VIDULA: With that name, what do you think? (Wedding Album, Scene ii: 29)

In this dialogue, Vidula’s response, ‘With that name, what do you think?’, seems to be incoherent and hotchpotch. She responds in an interrogative way instead of straightforward yes-no answer. Vidula implies that (1) the name Isabel is generally given to a lady belonging to Christian, therefore, (2) Isabel is a Christian lady. These things are not directly stated. They are simply pointed at. In pragmatics, it is called the ‘hinting strategy’. Hema is expected to arrive at meaning from what is not stated. Hema has to apply her logic and knowledge of social awareness to arrive at proper meaning.
4.8 Turn-taking

In conversational acts, turn-taking is apparent. As Sidnell (2010) opines, people interact with each other by taking turns while talking. It is one of the fundamental features of conversation and is the underlying framework of conversation. Turn-taking by conversational partners is a unique feature of both literary and real-life conversations, discussions and question-answer sessions. Turns can be verbal or non-verbal. It is possible that after the speaker’s turn, the listener’s turn may be a non-linguistic response. For instance, silence, smile, nodding head, focusing eyes, raising eye brows, hand movements etc. Both, verbal and non-verbal responses have equal potential to convey the intended meaning.

Every conversation is bound to some topic or theme. Within the framework of this broad theme, interlocutors have sub-themes and sub-topics to communicate and comprehend. The second interlocutor is bound to certain constraints implied in the turn taken by the first interlocutor. Compared with the first interlocutor, the second has limited scope for selection and opening of the conversation. Usually, the first interlocutor determines the conversational turn for the listener(s), but sometimes due to the situational requirement, turns can be taken unpredicatably. For instance, in *Old Stone Mansion*, following interlocutors take their turns with constraints implied by the previous speaker.

VAHINI (to Bhaskar): You’d better send Chandu-bhauji to Nagarmal for the groceries. Give him a note.
BHASKAR: Why? (Awkward Silence) What’s happened?
CHANDU: Bansilal is asking for arrears.
VAHINI (to Sudhir): Chandu Bhauiji went to get two boxes of matches yesterday and he sent him back.
BHASKAR: Tell that bugger the Dharangaonkar Deshpandes have never died on their debts. So what if Tatyaji is dead? We’re all here. Tell him I’ll sell the tin off the roof to repay him. When this fellow’s father came from Marwar with nothing but a lota, he made his home
in our stable. He’s forgotten those days now. Why did you take that
what that two-bit man said? (Act 1, sc ii: 145)

In this piece of conversation, Bhaskar expects Vahini to answer his question but due to conversational circumstances, Chandu meddles in and answers his question. Similarly, Vahini expects Sudhir to take conversational turn, but unexpectedly Bhaskar takes the conversational charge.

In drama, turn-taking for speech act is explicit, and in fiction, implicit. Characters in the plays under study maintain the conversation by turn-taking system. Conversational partners orient to whilst interacting with each other. To conclude, as Sacks, et al, (1974) say, turn-taking is a form of organization for conversation.

4.8 Conclusion

The analysis of the violation of the four maxims by different characters in the selected plays brings to the forefront certain behavioural patterns of Indian society in general. The examples of lying discussed under the violation of quality maxim, reveal the various intentions of the liars. The characters tell lies to please others, avoid others presence, to protect someone else etc. The analysis of the violation of other three maxims, by the characters in the plays, is probably a result of Indians’ roundabout way of talking, and this study deals with it in detail. Hence, the cultural context of the society and their mindsets are emphasized. This chapter also looks in the minds of the playwrights and how they have also violated the maxims to reveal their intentions through the characters, acting as their mouthpieces.