CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL TOOLS

1.0 Preliminaries

This chapter aims at explaining the basic concepts, principles, theories and distinctions that underpin this study. The first chapter attempts to explain the term ‘pragmatics’ and then sets forth speech act theory, the politeness principle and the cooperative principle. These principles are complied or non-complied with universally, their obeisance or disobeisance does not have homogeny in terms of linguistic strategies. Different cultures and speech communities regard and/or disregard them in their own specific ways. This culture-specificity is constantly kept in mind while analysing the six Indian dramas in English in this study. These six dramas are:

1. Tughlaq by Girish Karnad
2. Hayavadana by Girish Karnad
3. Wedding Album by Girish Karnad
4. Old Stone Mansion by Mahesh Elkunchwar
5. Reflection by Mahesh Elkunchwar
6. Sonata by Mahesh Elkunchwar

1.1 Definition and Scope of Pragmatics

Charles Morris is credited for the usage of the term ‘pragmatics. It is a subfield of both linguistics (the scientific study of a language) and semiotics (the general study of signs, both linguistic and non-linguistic). George Yule (2011:4) detects that Pragmatics is the four fold study of language. 1. Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning. It is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It has more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. 2. Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning. It means how speakers organize what they want to say in accordance with who they’re talking to, where, when, and under what circumstances. 3. Pragmatics is
the study of how more gets communicated than is said. It explores how does listeners make inferences to arrive at an interpretation of the speaker’s intended meanings. This type of study explores how a great deal of what is unsaid is recognized. It is the investigation of invisible meaning. 4. Pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance. It follows what determines the choice between the said and the unsaid. The basic answer is tied to the notion of distance. Closeness, whether it is physical, social, or conceptual, implies shared experience. On the assumption of how close or distant the listener is, speakers determine how much needs to be said. To be brief, pragmaticists take a special interest in language as it is used (Grundy 2000:214). It holds interest in the absorbed meaning of *la parole* rather than the *la langue*.

Language is a social and cultural institution. To commune is the basic function of language. When human beings in real life or figures in fictional works converse, they attempt to convey some *meaning* through the language they use. My italics. With the help of discussion about pragmatics as seen above we can deduce that *meaning*, unlike the other components of language is, literal, coded and fixed or culture specific, speaker intentional and context bound, in short, many-sided. When this many-sided *meaning* is, as it should be conceived, conceived, the conversational partners thrive on communication process. This *meaning* is the crux of the study of both ‘Semantics’ and ‘Pragmatics’, but they differ in their approach towards meaning. Alan Cruse in his *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics* (2006) mentions the difference between two. He says: 1. Semantics deals with truth conditional aspects of meaning; pragmatics deals with non-truth conditional aspects. 2. Semantics deals with context-independent aspects of meaning; pragmatics deals with aspects where context must be taken into account. Context is understood here in a broad sense that includes previous utterances (discourse context), participants in the speech event, their interrelations, knowledge, and goals, and the social and physical setting of the speech event. 3. Semantics deals with conventional aspects of meaning, that is, where there is an established connection between form and meaning. Pragmatics deals with aspects of meaning that are not ‘looked up’ but which are ‘worked out’ on particular occasions of use. 4. Semantics is concerned with the description of meanings; pragmatics deals with the uses made of those meanings. This is sometimes expressed by saying that semantics takes a formal approach and pragmatics a functional approach (2006:136).
Literary text, as mentioned by Aristotle in his *Poetics*, uses language as its medium. Hence, literary text is a linguistic entity which can offer, what it intends to be, only when the readers or audience can work out on the literariness which is hidden in culture specific, speaker/writer intentional and context bound use of language which is the area of pragmatics. Thus, pragmatics helps us to know the literariness of literature hidden in the use of language.

Pragmatics comprises of speech act theory, politeness principles, cooperative principles, talk in action and other approaches to linguistic behaviour of mankind. It takes utterance, spoken and/or written, as the basic component of its investigation. The researcher attempts to explain these underlying principles of ‘pragmatics’ on a case by case basis.

### 1.2 Speech Acts

Man has been using language as a tool of social (and many of other types of) communication and interactions. It has enabled him to interact with the environment and to regulate his social behaviour (Mohan and Banerji 2009:3). Despite number of means to commune with, language is a most widely used mechanism. Human beings do communicate through sentences or utterances. Pragmaticists believe that every utterance is an act. That is to say “the uttering of the sentence is, or is a part of, the doing of an action” (Austin 1962:5) or “speaking a language is performing speech acts, acts such as making statements, giving commands, asking questions, making promises and so on” (Searle 2011:16). “The production or issuance of a sentence token under certain conditions is a speech act and speech acts are the basic or minimal units of linguistic communication” (Ibid). Actions performed via utterances are generally called speech acts (Yule 2011:47). In English, these acts are labelled as apology, complaint, invitation, order, promise, request etc.

In a speech, a speaker expects that his/her communicative intention should be recognized by the hearer. Speech is always contextually situated and occasioned (Herman 1995:18). Conversational partners are helped in speech occasion by the circumstances surrounding the utterance. These circumstances, including other utterances, are called the speech events.
1.2.1 Austin’s Approach

J L Austin in his posthumously published book *How to do Things with Words* (1962) has proposed the speech act theory. He proposes that when we speak, we perform certain actions. And the action performed by producing an utterance will consist of three related acts - the locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary speech acts. A locutionary act is uttering a certain sentence with a certain sense and reference (Austin 1962:108). It is the basic act of utterance or the phonetic act. It is a production of meaningful linguistic expression. It is also the literal or denotative or dictionary meaning of all the words put together (Thorat 2002:27). If there is difficulty in forming a meaningful utterance in a language (if it’s a foreign or the person is tongue-tied), then the speaker may fail to produce a locutionary act (Yule 2011:48). Producing ‘Mi coffee banavalei ahe’ will not be counted as a locutionary act in English, whereas in [1] it will be. The interpretation of locutionary act is concerned with meaning (Coulthard 2007:18).

[1] I’ve made some coffee.

The illocutionary act refers to the intention or purpose in the speaker’s mind expressed through a well formed utterance. This act is under the complete control of the speaker (2007:19). It is the contextual meaning or an implicative force of an utterance. One may utter [1] to make a statement, an offer, an explanation or for some other purpose. Here, what matters is the intention of the speaker. It is also known as the illocutionary force of the utterance.

The perlocutionary act implies change in the mind of the hearer; hence it is under the control of the hearer. A well formed utterance is made with a certain intention to have an effect. Depending on the context, one may utter [1] to create an intended effect on the hearer for instance to account for an amazing smell or to get the listener to drink some coffee. This is known as the perlocutionary effect and when the listener moves or acts in accordance with the intention of the speaker the perlocutionary effect is achieved.
Of these three, the most discussed is illocutionary force. The term ‘speech act’ is generally interpreted quite narrowly to mean only the illocutionary force of an utterance (Yule 2011:49). The same illocutionary act as shown in [2a] can count as an advice [2b], a warning [2c] or a protest [2d]. These different analyses [2b-d] of the utterances in [2a] represent different illocutionary forces.

[2]  a. You can’t do that. (= A)
    b. [I advice you that] A.
    c. [I warn you that] A.
    d. [I protest] A.

In such cases, context will certify the illocutionary force. And Pragmatics is interested in deciphering such context bound sense/meaning. As Grundy says (2000:62), when sentences (grammatical objects) are used as utterances, it is not their truth value that determines what they mean so much as whether we understand what they are used to do.

Structurally or formally, utterances could be described as declaratives, interrogatives, imperatives and so on. From the functional point of view, they could be classified as questions, statements, orders, requests etc. The relationship between form and function is arbitrary. The forms and functions of utterances do not have one-to-one relationship (Thorat 2002:25). For instance, an interrogative utterance is not always a question. It may be a request, as in [3]. Similarly, a declarative utterance is not necessarily a statement. It may be a question, as in [4].

[3] Will you please pass the salt? [I request about W-S]
[4] We won the match? [I want confirmation about W-M]

It means utterances/speech acts do not carry their functions. They acquire functional quality in the specific context where they are used.
1.2.2 Searle’s Approach


The first, assertives or representatives as Yule (2011:53) calls it are the speech acts which state what a speaker believes to be the case or not. Assertions, conclusions, descriptions and statement of fact as exemplified in [5] are the examples of this type.

   b. Abraham Lincoln was the sixteenth president of America.
   c. Shakespeare didn’t write about the art of painting.

The second, expressives refer to what the speaker feels. Austin calls them behabitives (1962:151). They express psychological states or social behaviour and include the utterances of apology, joy, sorrow, likes, dislikes, pleasure, pains etc as occurred in [6].

   b. Congratulations.
   c. I am full of grief; there is no room for more.

The third, commissives, as Austin (1962:150) mentions, are typified by promising or otherwise undertaking; they commit you doing something. They express what the speaker intends. They include promises, threats, refusals, pledges etc. as shown in [7].

[7] a. We will see a film.
   b. I’ll you see you later.
   c. I do not accept it.

The fourth, directives are the speech acts where the speakers use to get the addressee or someone else to do something. They express what the speaker wants. They are
commands, orders, requests as illustrated in [8] which can be positive or negative similarly advice, invite and permit are the directives.

    b. Will you give me a glass of water, please?
    c. Don’t take it.

The fifth, declarations. These acts, as Levinson (2010:240) describes, bring immediate change in the state of human affairs. It is the exercising of powers, rights or influence (Austin 1962:150). Here a speaker performs special institutional role. Its consequence may be that others are compelled or allowed or not allowed to do certain acts (1962:154). Declaring war, excommunicating, performing marriage, firing from employment, compelling a player (not) to play further etc. are the paradigm cases as stated in [9].

    b. Boss: You are fired from this job.
    c. Umpire: You’re out!

These five general functions of speech acts, with their key features, are summarised in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Act Type</th>
<th>Direction of fit</th>
<th>S=Speaker; X=situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assertives</td>
<td>make words fit the world</td>
<td>S believes X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressives</td>
<td>make words fit the world</td>
<td>S feels X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissives</td>
<td>make the worlds fit words</td>
<td>S intends X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directives</td>
<td>make the worlds fit words</td>
<td>S wants X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declararions</td>
<td>words change the world</td>
<td>S believees X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The five general functions of speech acts (following Searle 1979) Table 1

Within the framework of these speech acts a play or a novel can be analysed. Christopher Marlowe’s Dr Faustus illustrates almost all these speech acts. At the
outset, Dr Faustus decides to give up his academic pursuits and favours magic and necromancy.

Faustus: … What will be, shall be! Divinity, adieu!

These metaphysics of magicians
And necromantic books are heavenly;
Lines, circles, letters, and characters:
Ay, these are those that Faustus most desires. (Act 1, sc. i)

This speech by Dr Faustus is an example of commissive speech act which expresses what the speaker intends. Here, Dr Faustus intends to prefer black magic and necromancy instead of divine studies. In the following dialogue, the good and evil angles convince him to turn after academic studies and to overturn it respectively.

Good Angel: O, Faustus, lay that damned book aside
And gaze not on it lest it tempt thy soul
And heap God’s heavy wrath upon thy head.
Read, read the scriptures; that is blasphemy.

Evil Angel: Go forward, Faustus, in that famous art
Wherein all nature’s treasury is contain’d:
Be thou on earth as Jove is in the sky,
Lord and commander of these elements. (Act 1, sc. i)

Their counsels are conflicting directives for Dr Faustus. This confusion is released after his meeting with Valdes and Cornelius. Dr Faustus fully agrees to practise black magic. He declares his pleasure and requests them to demonstrate the powers.

Faustus: Nothing, Cornelius. O, this cheers my soul!
Come, show me some demonstrations magical, (Act 1, sc. i)

The declaration of pleasure and request for demonstration are the exemplars of expressive and directive speech acts respectively. When Faustus decides to give his soul to Lucifer and signs the bond declaring his supreme will, it is an example of declarative speech act which brings change in Faustus’ worldly life.
Faustus: *Consummatum est*: this bill is ended,
And Faustus has bequeath’d his soul to Lucifer.  
(Act 2, sc. i)

On the basis of structure, J R Searle (1969, 1979) talks about direct and indirect speech acts. For Searle, indirect speech acts are cases in which one illocutionary act is performed indirectly by way of performing another. That is an indirect speech act can be regarded as way of performing direct speech act. Yule (2011:54) to simplify says that whenever there is direct relationship between a structure and a function, it is a direct speech act. For instance, the three structural speech acts in English declarative, interrogative and imperative as shown in [10], have an easily recognized relationship with the functional acts of statement, question and command/request.

[10]  
| a. You drive a car.    | (declarative) | b. Do you drive a car? | (interrogative) | c. Drive a car! | (imperative) |

And whenever there is an indirect relationship between a structure and a function, it is an indirect speech act. It means when an interrogative structure is used, necessarily it should not be a question. It may be a request. In [11] the illustrations of indirect speech acts are discussed. The expressions [11 a-c.] are the examples of ‘yes-no’ questioning, declarative and ‘wh’ interrogative respectively, illustrating direct speech acts intending a request.

[11]  
| a. Will you please give me something to eat? |  
| b. I want something to eat. |  
| c. Why don’t you give me something to eat? |  
| d. I feel very hungry. |  

The verbs ‘give’ and ‘want’ and the noun phrase ‘something to eat’ chip in the directness and clarity of the request. In [11d], all these elements are not present and the only clue present is the word ‘hungry’. The listener’s linguistic fitness enables him to put the word ‘hungry’ in permutation with expressions like ‘give’ and ‘want’ and ‘something to eat’. As Thorat (2002:28) puts in, Psycholinguistically speaking, it is the associative bond between these elements which enables the hearer to draw
conclusion that the speaker needs something to eat. The conventional nature of language and speech acts directs the listener to show the intended effect. The intended uptake is the intention of the speaker properly understood by the hearer and the intended effect is the hearer going to the kitchen and bringing something to eat.

The mismatch between intended uptake and unintended effect creates tension between/among the conversational partners both in real life and in dramatic production. In Shakespeare’s *Othello*, a famous scene where Othello demands the handkerchief to Desdemona and she fails to understand why Othello attaches due importance to the handkerchief, creates tension between them.

Desdemona: Why, so I can sir, but I will not now,  
This is a trick, to put me from my suit,  
I pray let Cassio be receiv’d again.

Othello: Fetch me that handkerchief, my mind misgives.

Desdemona: Come, come,  
You’ll never meet a more sufficient man.

Othello: The handkerchief!

Desdemona: I, pray talk me of Cassio.

Othello: The handkerchief!

Desdemona: A man that all his time  
Hath founded his good fortunes on your love,  
Shar’d dangers with you,--

Othello: The handkerchief

Desdemona: I’ faith, you are to blame.

Othello: Zounds! *(Exit)*  
*(Act 3, sc. iv)*

Othello’s demand for the handkerchief or the intended uptake that Desdemona should show it to him is defeated through Desdemona’s response. Instead of showing him the handkerchief, Desdemona tries to persuade Othello to talk about Cassio. Desdemona fails to contribute relevantly; this defeat of perlocutionary act from Desdemona’s side adds fuel to Othello’s suspension about the disloyalty of Desdemona.
1.3 Politeness Principle

Sociolinguistically, language has four fold functions in human interactions. They are-informative i.e. exchange of information; expressive, it is expressions of feelings, attitudes etc.; directives which means getting things done by ordering or requesting people and phatic or social function aiming at establishing and maintaining social or interpersonal relations. While performing all these functions, politeness is retained by conversational partners. Human communication is more than mere give-and-take of knowledge and information Thorat (2002:15). Some kind of commonality and fellow-feelingness among the communicators is necessary to keep the ball rolling. Communication can be successful only if communicators avoid hostile antagonistic terms and follow politeness. The concept of face is focused in the study of linguistic politeness.

1.3.1 Brown and Levinson’s Approach

Face, as Goffman (1967) says, is the public self-image that every member of society wants to claim for himself. It refers to that emotional and social sense of self that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize Yule (2011:60). Face is something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to, in an interaction Brown and Levinson (1987:61). Brown and Levinson developed in their Politeness Some Universals in Language Usage (2010), Goffman’s ideas into the concept of ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ face. Positive face is an individual’s desire to be admired, esteemed, understood, and treated well by others. Negative face is the wish to be free from any imposition by others. It is a wish to have freedom of action. A person who praises his/her co-interactant is satisfying his positive face. On the other hand, if a person criticizes or reduces choice of action of his/her communiqué collaborator, it is a threat to the negative face of the other. It is a Face Threatening Act, henceforth FTA. Brown and Levinson suggest a model for possible FTAs. It is schematized as follows.

Do the act on-record. It means to do without attempting to hide what we are doing. It has three sub-types. They are: (a) baldly, without redress; (b) with positive politeness redress; (c) with negative politeness redress.
Do the act off-record. It denotes to pretend to hide what we are doing and Don’t do the act at all.

An illustration will make the idea more comprehensible. A real-world problem, if a person parks his own car in front of his neighbour’s gate, the neighbour can perform a FTA as follows.

Don’t park your car in front of our gate anymore.
- A bald FTA

Dear friend, I know you have a beautiful car but how about you could park it across the road.
- An FTA with positive politeness

I am sorry to say, but why don’t you park your car in front of your own house.
- An FTA with negative politeness

Are you sure that your car is all right in front of our house?
- An off-record or indirect FTA

Brown and Levinson (2010: 102, 131) give a list of positive and negative strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Politeness</th>
<th>Negative Politeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notice/attend to hearer’s wants</td>
<td>Be conventionally indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exaggerate interest/approval</td>
<td>Question, hedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensify interest</td>
<td>Be pessimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use in-group identity markers</td>
<td>Minimize imposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek agreement</td>
<td>Give deference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid disagreement</td>
<td>Apologize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presuppose/assert common ground</td>
<td>Impersonalize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joke</td>
<td>State the imposition as a general rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assert knowledge of hearer’s wants</td>
<td>Nominalize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer, promise</td>
<td>Go on record as incurring a debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be optimistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include speaker and hearer in the activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Give (or ask for) reasons
Assume/assert reciprocity
Give gifts to hearer (goods sympathy etc.)

Though face maintaining or threatening is a universal phenomenon, positive and negative strategies are culture, group and language specific. Face maintaining/threatening tactics in one culture, group and language may not be applicable to others. For instance, kissing someone’s cheek might be a positive sign in one culture-group but may not be so in another.

Sociolinguist Lakoff (1973) has laid down three broad principles of politeness. They are:

1. Don’t impose.
2. Make the addressee feel comfortable; and
3. Give options.

Any imposition may be in the form of request, demand, offer, order etc., is a kind of FTA. If anybody’s freedom of action or privacy is transgressed it can cause dissension in relationships. The principle of non-imposition shows respect for the alter’s freedom to say and do whatever he or she likes to Thorat (2002:18). But some impositves are beneficial to the hearers. For instance, an announcement in an airport or railway station, which begins with ‘attention please’ may help the passengers for the smooth operation of their departure.

Politeness works like a lubricant for the smooth functioning and progression of conversation. Agreeing and disagreeing with communication partner can be studied in terms of politeness principle. Showing agreement establishes good relationship yet, one should not say ‘yes’ when he wants to say ‘no’. Misso Masani (1989: 92) in his essay ‘Saying “No”.’ mentions, “Discipline consists in saying ‘yes’ to reasonable roles and orders but saying ‘no’ to wrong or oppressive orders. Both are equally to be praised.” It is possible only when people have perfect understanding and open minds. Masani criticizes pretence of agreement. He says, “By pretending to agree, when at
the back of their minds they know it is wrong, they become cowards and lose their self-respect” Masani (1989: 93).

Refusals and displeasures in communication can cause great damage to human relations. Shakespeare’s *King Lear* illustrates how words do harmful things to king and his three daughters. The aged king Lear calls his three daughters Goneril, Regan and Cordelia and asks them to express their love for him so that he can divide his kingdom in accordance with their feeling of affection for him. Goneril and Regan overstate their love in an excessively flattering way to please the king. Cordelia, who truly loves her father, expresses her love in a very factual manner. She says that she loves him as a daughter should love her father, no more and no less. It disappoints Lear a lot and he divides his kingdom between Goneril and Regan without understanding the reality. Cordelia fails to gratify the ego of her father through words and as a consequence her relations with her father break down. The story of the play suggests that language plays a significant role in maintaining human relationships.

### 1.3.2 Geoffrey Leech’s Approach

Geoffrey N Leech in his *Principles of Pragmatics* (1983:132) discusses certain maxims of politeness as follows:

1. Tact Maxim (in impositives and commissives)
   a. Minimize cost to other.
   b. Maximize benefit to other.
2. Generosity Maxim (in impositives and commissives)
   a. Minimize benefit to self.
   b. Maximize cost to self.
3. Approbation Maxim (in expressives and assertives)
   a. Minimize dispraise of other.
   b. Maximize praise of other.
4. Modesty Maxim (in expressives and assertives)
   a. Minimize praise of self.
   b. Maximize dispraise of self.
5. Agreement Maxim (in assertives)
   a. Minimize disagreement between self and other.
   b. Maximize agreement between self and other.

6. Sympathy Maxim (in assertives)
   a. Minimize antipathy between self and other.
   b. Maximize sympathy between self and other.

In any formal or informal conversation, pursuit of these maxims by the speaker and listener make the communication process fruitful. In these maxims, the listener is being taken care for feeling easy and comfortable. The following expressions in [12] will make the point even clear.

[12]
   a. Would you like to have a glass of juice?
   b. Have a glass of juice.
   c. Do have a glass of juice.
   d. You must have a glass of juice.

These expressions, used by a hostess, differ in degree of politeness. The expression [12 a], giving options to the listener sounds least polite. It is not a tactful and unpretentious expression. The speaker doesn’t care whether the hearer wants a glass of juice or not. Thus, she is not warm or cordial. [12 b] is more polite as compared to [12 a]. Here, the speaker is offering a glass of juice with a force. He is not amiable enough and makes the listener uncomfortable. Greater degree of politeness, with a sense of affection is achieved in [12 c] as compared to the previous two. [12 d] is the most polite expression where the speaker is extremely hospitable leaving the listener no space for option. In short, these expressions [12 a-d] have a degree of politeness in an increasing order. Disagreement should be put across very tactfully in order to avoid the discomfort feeling on the part of the addressee. For instance, if someone says that cricket is a very popular game, a rational listener will first agree with the speaker and then very cautiously will express his disagreement as: ‘yes, but not as popular as football is.’ It makes the speaker comfortable as at least a part of his opinion is accepted. He is not be offended by the negative opinion of his co-communicator. In this way, following the agreement maxim, the speaker will minimize disagreement and maximize agreement between self and the other.
Politeness is not always directed towards addressee. Sometimes it is directed towards a third party belonging to the sympathy sphere of the addressee. A speaker, in order to please a listener can praise the close friend or the near relative of the latter and elevate the listener. As in case, one could say that the listener’s daughter and son-in-law are like Laxmi Narayan (perfect divine couple in Hindu religion). Leech (1983) describes that Politeness displays a kind of symmetry. A speaker can be modest by describing whoever or whatever belongs to him and appreciating persons and things associated with the co-communicator. Thus, the statement ‘Please honour us by accepting this small gift as a token of our esteem’ is a modest expression by a speaker. The expressions of offer and invitation in [13] show that speaker is generous.

[13] a. I can lend you my bike. (Offer)
   b. You must come and have dinner with us. (Invitation)

The offer [13 a] and invitation [13 b] are polite statements for two reasons: firstly, because they imply benefit to hearer and secondly and less crucially they entail cost to speaker. On the contrary, in of the dialogues from Othello quoted on page no. 10, Desdemona is impolite or less generous as her response is less beneficial to her co-communicator Othello. Approbation maxim is mostly related with compliments. Here, a speaker maximizes the praise of the communication partner. Thus, the statement ‘What a marvellous meal you cooked!’ is an expression of approbation.

Politeness and impoliteness are not absolute phenomena. In any conversation, conversational partners are aware of social and interpersonal factors such as status, power, formal or informal relationship, superior or inferior position, age group etc. These factors adjust the degree of politeness on the parts of speaker and listener in linguistic communication. For instance, in master-servant relations, the master will not bother to use polite expressions while talking to his servant because his position as a master puts him in a superior position relation. But the servant has to follow all the etiquettes and manners of formality; he cannot afford to be informal with his master. A master can call his servant by his nickname but a servant can’t do so because of social pressure. Likewise, elder people can call children by their first names but children are not allowed to do so. In the socio-cultural set-up of India, a master will call his servant tum and a servant aap to his master. English doesn’t have specific
pronouns to denote the sense of respect. Both masters and servant can use the pronoun ‘you’ to address each other.

Politeness is a sex dependent phenomenon. For instance, women try to avoid taboo words because it is considered to be impolite on their parts to use such words Thorat (2002: 20). In Indian context and in domestic situation, if women say something as a solution to an economic and probably any other type of problem, generally it is disliked by men. Women are not supposed to advice men on any problem. Their advice is considered as an act impoliteness. In mixed-sex conversations, men systematically dominate women Herman (1995:5). Lakoff (1977) mentions that women avoid using imperatives and prefer interrogatives to orders and commands. Thus, a woman would say ‘why don’t you close the window?’ instead of saying ‘close the window’. Herman (1995:246) points out that tag questions are more frequently used by women to reduce the force of assertions. Women are generally tenderer to and believe in sharing problems with their male co-communicators.

1.4 Cooperative Principle

Here the researcher studies an example from Yule (2011:36). Consider a scenario where a woman is sitting on a park bench and a fat dog lying on the ground in front of the bench. A man comes along and sits down on the bench. Following conversation takes place between them.

Man: Does your dog bite?
Woman: No.

(The man gets down to the pet dog. The dog bites the man’s hand.)
Man: Ouch! Hey! You said your dog doesn’t bite.
Woman: He doesn’t. But that’s not my dog.

One of the problems in this state of affairs deals with communication. The problem is caused because the man assumes that more was communicated than said. The problem is not with the presupposition where the assumption in ‘your dog’ (i.e. the woman has a dog) is true for both speakers. The problem is the man’s assumption that his question ‘Does your dog bite?’ and the woman’s answer ‘No’ both apply to the
dog in front of them. From the man’s perspective, the woman’s answer provides less information than expected. In other words, she might be expected to provide the information stated in the last line. She must have been cooperative in her communication. Of course, if she had mentioned this information earlier the story wouldn’t be as funny. For the event to be funny, the woman has to give less information than is needed.

Communication is essentially a cooperative conduct. In any conversation, it may be formal or informal, real life or dramatic, conversation should be cooperative for the purpose of achieving the expected goals. 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).

The Cooperative Principle: 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.

Within this principle, Grice suggested four maxims.

1. The Maxim of Quantity
   (a) Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purpose of the exchange).
   (b) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Thus,

Sachin: When did you return from Mumbai?
Rani: Yesterday morning.

Here Rani’s response is in accordance with maxim of Quantity. If she would have stated ‘I came yesterday morning by plane’ that would be the violation of the Quantity maxim because she provides information more than the requirement.
2. The Maxim of Quality
   Try to make your contribution one that is true
   (a) Do not say what you believe to be false.
   (b) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

   Thus,
   If a speaker says that ‘Chinese is a difficult language’ then he must believe it to be so and should have evidence for it.

3. The Maxim of Relation
   Be relevant.

   Thus,
   Utterances in a conversation come in adjacency pairs. There must be proper relevance in the communicative response.

   Mahesh : Do you like ice-cream?
   Vijay : Is not the rose a flower?

   In order to make Vijay’s response relevant, Mahesh has to draw proper conclusion in this setting. On the surface level, Vijay’s response doesn’t seem relevant. He doesn’t provide ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer. Mahesh understands Vijay’s answer in the form of ‘rose’ question which clearly mentions ‘yes’.

4. The Maxim of Manner
   Be perspicuous
   (a) Avoid obscurity of expression.
   (b) Avoid ambiguity.
   (c) Be Brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)
   (d) Be orderly.

   Thus,
   One of the objectives of LIC, stated below, is an illustration conveying lack of obscurity and ambiguity.

   “Maximise mobilisation of people’s savings by making insurance linked savings adequately attractive”.
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Verbosity may cause failure in communication. One should be clear enough to make a sense through words. Thus, the expression ‘Boxing day is a D-day for us’ is not conducive to intelligibility. The sentence simply means 26 December is a day for an important activity for us.

The utterance ‘They ate and went to study’ represents the order of actions such as first eating and then going for study.

One of the interesting features of our speech is, when we converse we can convey more than, less than or other than the words do literally mean. This feature is known as conversational implicature. Any conversation has a specific context. This context adds extra meaning to the conversational responses. Following illustration will make the idea more comprehensive.

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

After listening husband’s response, the wife has to assume that following quantity maxim husband is cooperating. He doesn’t mention the sugar. As he is adhering to the principle of quantity maxim, if he has brought the sugar, he should have mentioned so. He intends that wife must infer that what is not mentioned is not brought. In this case, the husband has conveyed more than he said via a conversational implicature. In the funny example seen at the beginning of cooperative principle, from the man’s perspective, the woman provides less information.

While discussing the pragmatic ideology of speech act theory, politeness principle and cooperative principle in the light of dramatic dialogues, it is necessary to discuss certain linguistic terms, especially cohesion, coherence and turn-taking.

1.5 Cohesion, Coherence and Turn-Taking

1.5.1 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 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)

‘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. Discoursal ellipsis refers to the absence of an idea and the sentence itself may not be incomplete. Kunjanni Raja observes that these two types of ellipsis are similar to the ancient Indian linguistic concepts of ‘adhyahara’ and ‘vakyasesa’. Some examples of textual ellipses are discussed below in [14].

[14] a. Subhash Can Play the tabla, and Maya can play the harmonium.
   b. Father gave me fifty rupees, and mother gave me hundred rupees.
c. Will you come to me, or should I come to you?
d. Subhash Can Play the tabla, and Maya can play the tabla too.
e. Father gave me fifty rupees, and father gave me a book also.
f. Will you eat the ice-cream, or should I eat the ice-cream?
g. Will you eat the ice-cream, or should I eat the ice-cream?
h. I will take the child to school today if you will take the child to school tomorrow.
i. They have been eating the Dosas more than they have been eating the Pizzas.
j. Q: When are you going to Delhi?
   A: Tomorrow I am going to Delhi.
   Father: Who has eaten the sweets?
   Son: Mother has eaten the sweets.
   Teacher: Why are you late for the class?
   Student: I am late Due to the rain.

k. She has cooked something, but I don’t know what she has cooked.
l. When she will call I don’t know, but Rani will definitely call.
m. She has eaten three mangoes because he has eaten two mangoes.
n. The first glass and the second glass are finished.
o. I will carry mother’s bag, and you carry father’s bag.
p. More students attended than we expected students would attend.
q. She has more friends than you have friends.
r. Q: Do you know what went wrong?
   A: No, I don’t know what went wrong.
s. I asked her to eat but she refused to eat.
t. She chose two dresses for me, but I couldn’t decide between them.

Textual ellipses are of various types. Prominent of them are: 1. Gapping, 2. Stripping, 3. VP-ellipsis, 4. Pseudogapping, 5. Answer fragments, 6. Sluicing, 7. N-ellipsis, 8. Comparative deletion and 9. Null complement anaphora. Expressions in [14] exemplify various types of ellipses mentioned above. Elided material is indicated with subscripts and small font size. In gapping finite verb is gapped which occurs in the preceding clause of coordinate structures. Expressions [14a-c] point up gapping. Stripping is illustrated with the expressions [14d-e]. Some linguists believe that Stripping a manifestation of gapping, however unlike gapping, stripping can be a subject and an object as in [14 d] and [14 e] respectively. ‘Father gave me fifty
rupees, not mother gave me fifty rupees’, is an example of ‘not-stripping’. Expressions [14f-g] are of VP-ellipsis. It omits a non-finite VP. Unlike gapping and stripping, it can occur forwards or backwards. Pseudogapping is exemplified in [14 h-i]. Usually it appears in comparative and contrastive contexts. Answer ellipsis is associated with question answer pairs. An interrogative word (e.g. when, who, why etc.) focuses an unknown portion of information. Resultant answer provides the required information eliding the redundant information already provided in the question. Utterances in [14 j] elucidate the point. Sluicing skips everything from a direct or indirect question. It can appear at both forward and backward position. Expressions in [14 k-l] explicate the idea. Nominal ellipsis occurs when a noun, accompanying modifiers (cardinal and ordinal numbers and possessive determiners) is omitted from a noun phrase. See the expressions [14m-o]. Comparative deletion, as shown in [14p-q], occurs in comparative clauses introduced by than in English. [14r-t] are the illustrations of Null complement anaphora, which omits a complete complement which can be a finite clause, infinitive phrase, or prepositional phrase.

Deixis is another device of cohesion. It is a technical term used to ‘pointing’ via language. Any linguistic form which does ‘pointing’ is a deictic expression. When we observe a strange object, we say ‘What’s that’. Here ‘that’ is a deictic expression pointing some object in the immediate context. Deictic expressions are also known as indexicals. They are used to point people via person deixis (‘he’, ‘she’, ‘me’, ‘you’ etc), location via spatial deixis (‘here’, ‘there’) and time via temporal deixis (‘now’, ‘then’). One of the interesting things about ellipses and deixis is that the former refers to the absence of linguistic feature and the latter to the presence of linguistic feature in an utterance. They complement each other.

1.5.2 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. As Thorat (2002:8) says, 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.

Husband: Has our son returned from school?
Wife: Is it five ‘o’ clock?

In this dialogue, wife’s response seems to be incoherent and hotchpotch. She responds in an interrogative way instead of straightforward yes-no answer. The wife implies that (1) still the time is not five ‘o’ clock and, therefore, (2) their son, hasn’t returned from the school. These things are not directly stated. They are simply pointed at. In pragmatics, it is called the ‘hinting strategy’. Husband is expected to arrive at meaning from what is not stated. Husband has to apply his logic through syllogism which includes first premise, second premise and conclusion.

First premise: Their son returns from school at five ‘o’ clock.
Second premise: The time is not five ‘o’ clock.
Conclusion: Therefore, Their son hasn’t returned from school.

These three stages are known as proposition, illustration and conclusion in pragmatics. Thus, the husband has to pass through these stages. It takes no time because conversational partners know how to relate an utterance to what is unsaid to get proper meaning. Thus, husband’s knowledge ability (shared knowledge, knowledge of the world, assumptions, etc.) clarifies the fact that their son hasn’t returned from the school at the time of speaking.

In dramatic dialogues, hinting strategy is, as discussed above, abundantly used by the characters to create the world of references. And the very purpose of this research is to make an attempt to explicate the dramatic world by analysing the interactions and references of various characters in a specific drama.

1.5.3 Turn-taking

Turn-taking by conversational partners is a unique feature of both literary and real-life conversations, discussions and question-answer sessions. In drama, turn-taking for speech is explicit, and in fiction, implicit. Every conversation is bound to some topic.
or theme. Within the framework of this broad theme, interlocutors have subthemes and subtopics 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. For instance, if the first talker speaks about the difficulty of pragmatics, the second talker is supposed to say something relating to this particular speech act in order to keep the ball rolling. If the speaker says that pragmatics is very difficult to learn, the listener should agree or disagree with him. He is free to say that pragmatics is not difficult or some other branches of linguistics are more difficult than pragmatics. Turn taken by the conversational partners and the exchange of relating responses make the conversation an organic whole.

In turn-taking, the addressee can become addressee and vice-versa. This turn-taking offers the speaker a chance to select, organize, alter and transit the relevant response. Turn-taking even offers a chance to stop the conversation. H P Grice’s maxim of relevance is important in turn-taking.

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. Non-verbal turns are commonly followed to give directions or instructions to the listener.

To sum up, the issue of turn-taking i.e. turns whether verbal or non-verbal, orderly or disorderly, appear in sequencing or in adjacency pair.

1.6 Pragmatics and Drama

Drama is one of the major genres of literature. The term ‘drama’ is originated from the Greek verb draein which means – to do. So the word drama would mean doing and by extension- as Kimbahune (2002:1) says, showing what men and women do i.e. how they speak, how they treat each other, interact etc. Drama is impersonal. The dramatist does tell a story but it is unlike the storyteller or a novelist. The storyteller or a novelist tells a story directly as if a poet expresses his feelings and ideas. The
dramatist creates men and women who speak to each other and from this communication we gather the story of their life. In drama, there is no narration. There is no plain or fancy description like fiction; there is first and only dialogue and Pragmatics is interested only in analysing these dialogues or ‘language-in-use’. Speech act theory, politeness principle and cooperative principles, as the researcher has explained earlier, take ‘utterance’ as the basic unit for their analysis. Among various genres of literature, only drama does allow the characters to present themselves in their role as speakers. These characters’ or figures’ speech as well as their dialogical speech creates the verbal matrix used in dramatic text. This view was neglected in Aristotle’s Poetics which emphasised plot-oriented dramatic structure. A. C. Hegel and Schlegel acknowledged its importance. In lyric and narrative texts like fiction, dialogue is one of the formal elements. In drama, it is the fundamental mode of presentation. The relationship between dialogue and plot is dialectic. Dramatic dialogue as Pirandello says, an azione parlata or spoken action. Since dramatic dialogue is spoken action, each individual utterance not only consists of propositional expressive content but also execution of an act. It may be in the form a promise, a threat or an act of persuasion etc. Therefore, the performative aspect described by speech-act theory is always present in dramatic dialogue (Pfister 1993:6). The present study attempts to discuss this performative aspect of speech act theory in the context of selected dramas. As Austin (1962:60) describes, there is something which is at the moment of uttering being done by the person uttering.

Human life is full of varied situations. Our behaviour in these various situations affects the use of language. For instance, in the situations of quarrel, passionate, political argument, grief, love and so on the use of language differs. In quarrel, the arguer may use impolite and abusing language whereas in troublesome situation he may use the most polite words. However, the usage of words in various contexts exemplifies polite and impolite behaviour. Polite words make smooth and comforting communication whereas impolite words may create knotty and discouraging communication. Context forces humans to be polite or impolite. Though we share the same language or have the same langue, every individual has his own style of using a language. In Sassurian terms, the former is known as la langue and the second la parole. When we read a drama we primarily distinguish one character from another by their use of language (Kimbahune 2002:9). Use of language by various characters
in drama is deviant which catches the readers’ or audiences’ attention. Different words have different degree of politeness. These Politeness principles fittingly analyse the dramatic dialogues.

Cooperation is the foundation of communication. Communicative partners in drama have linguistic cooperation which takes the drama forward or backward. When we read or see a drama we can understand the theme, motives of the characters, their intentions only with the help of the words they speak. Their behaviour and linguistic expression gives the audience or the readers a clue to understand them.

Politeness principles or cooperative principles are culture and community specific phenomena. These principles can be obeyed or disobeyed by the commuters in a drama. Following or flouting of these principles attributes literariness to the genre of drama in literature. This research is an attempt to analyse the language, politeness principles or cooperative principles, used by various characters in a drama. To sum up, in drama all that we have is what the characters say to each other. In the ultimate analysis, drama is nothing but the speech of the men and women created by the dramatist (Kimbahune2002:8).

1.7 Research Hypothesis

A hypothesis is a guiding thought, it is an idea or a tentative explanation designed for the research problem to study. Based on the nature of the data and the aims and objectives of the study, hypothesis designed for the present study is as follows –

Literature can be looked at as a text meditating relationships between Language-users: not only relationships of speech, but also of consciousness, ideology, role and class. The conventions of behaviour, action and speech in ordinary contexts of living are made operative in the creation, assessment and understanding of behaviour in the fictional world of the play. Literary sources can provide valuable data for identifying culture specific speech acts, politeness principle and cooperative principle. Based on this hypothesis, the following aims and objectives have been determined for the present research.
1.8 **Aims and Objective of the Study**

1. The research aims to study the speech act theory, politeness principle and cooperative principle in the light of these selected plays.

2. The research will also focus on how these principles are observed and/or flouted by the characters in the selected plays to create certain artistic/linguistic effect and moreover to establish communion.

3. To study how Indian culture has its own specific speech acts and politeness principle and cooperative principle and how they are reflected in the certain literary works.

4. The researcher will also try to explore how these Indian authors of English have been working with its protean potential to fashion it according to their needs.

5. The researcher aims at interpreting the specific plays in the light of these principles.

1.9 **Limitations of the Study**

In the present study, drama is seen more as a composition of speech rather than a mirror of action. Dramatic dialogues are analysed from pragmatic point of view. Studies of dramatic dialogue – as a speech exchange system are hardly in evidence. Even in the investigation of ‘the language of drama’, the thrust is to separate the dramatic dialogue from natural conversation in order to preserve the former’s ‘literary’ quality. The two forms have been examined contrastively as literary and non-literary. However, the present study takes into account the areas of commonality between conversation and dramatic speech. Moreover, where the relation has been confronted it has generally been confined to the uses of naturalistic speech at a certain juncture. Pragmaticists have applied the speech act theory, politeness principle and cooperative principle to the conversational speech. Drama is a literary work in conversational form hence; an attempt has been made to apply pragmatic principles to dramatic dialogues. The study is confined to the linguistic/pragmatic point of view hence social, mythological, historical, biographical, existential and ideological perspectives of the selected plays or playwrights have hardly been discussed. Dramatic dialogue has been analysed as the ‘device’ rather than the ‘reflector’ in drama similarly, Indian imagination, sense, social and cultural norms determining the scope and limitations of the conversation have been projected in the study.
1.10 About the Author Girish Karnad (1938)

Born on May 19, 1938, in Matheran, Maharashtra, Girish Raghunath Karnad is a genius dynamic renaissance playwright, poet, actor, film and television and theatre director, translator, critic and ambassador of Indian culture. He has penned twelve plays till date. His rise as a playwright with *Yayati* in 1661, marked the coming of age of Modern Indian playwriting in Kannada, just as Badal Sarkar did in Bengali, Vijay Tendulkar in Marathi and Mohan Rakesh in Hindi. *Tughlaq* (1964), *Hayavadana* (1971), *Nagamandala* (1990), *Taledanda* (1999), *The Fire and the Rain* (2005), *Wedding Album* (2008) are some of his notable plays. For five decades Karnad has been composing plays often using history and mythology to tackle contemporary issues. He has translated his plays into English and has received acclaim both nationally and internationally. His plays have been translated into some Indian languages and many well known directors like Alyque Padamsee, Vijaya Mehata, Satyadev Dubey, Shyamand Jalan and others have directed his plays. He is also active in Indian cineworld. He has contributed to Indian cinema as actor, director and screenwriter. Knowing his multifaceted brilliance in contemporary India, he was conferred Padmashri in 1974 and Padmabhusan in 1992 by the Government of India and India’s highest literary award, the Bharatiya Jnanpith, in 1999. He has also won four filmfare awards. Honorary Doctorate is also bestowed on him by the University of Southern California, Los Angeles in 2011. Following is the story outline of the selected plays of Girish Karnad.

1.10.1 An Outline of *Tughlaq* (1964)

*Tughlaq*, published in 1964, is a historical play. It is a political allegory of Nehru’s commitment to socialism and the cause of national integration. It deals with the life and ambitions of Tughlaq, the sultan or the Muslim king of the 15th century India. At the outset of the play, it is declared that the Jizia tax on the Hindus is closed down and the state capital will be shifted from Delhi to Daulatabad. Tughlaq earnestly desires to create a welfare state where every citizen will be happy. He also takes a revolutionary decision of introducing copper coins in his state. His intentions are defeated by opposition from all corners religious political, courtly and even the public. His adversary Sheikh Imam-ud-din, a saint, publicly criticizes Tughlaq’s incompetent
course of actions and opines that Tughlaq should abdicate as his conduct is against the approval of Muslim. The shrewd king invites the saint to address a public meeting but he takes enough care so that not a single inhabitant should be able to attend the public meeting. 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. Tughlaq’s decision to shift his capital to Daulatabad is accepted by the Amirs willy-nilly. Crafty Aziz and Aazam take the advantage of the situation and rob the royal treasury. They extend their forging in minting duplicate copper coins and exchanging them for silver and gold. Tughlaq’s faithful Vizier Najib is simply bewildered by the wild decisions that Tughlaq makes. Tughlaq’s step-mother dislikes Najib probably because he knows that Tughlaq’s father was assassinated by the Queen. The mute but alert observer to all these happenings is the historian Barani. He has the good fortune to be in the company of the great king and quite contrary to his sense of history watches the making of history in awe and wonder. When the capital is shifted to Daulatabad, Tughlaq spends sleepless nights praying for peace and order. He is tortured because of his apprehensions about the behaviour of his Amirs. Despite his ambition and enthusiasm, his ideals collapse and he fails miserably.

1.10.2 An Outline of *Hayavadana* (1971)

Karnad has a special enthralment for folktales and folklore. *Hayavadana* is based on one such folktale. The source of the play goes back to Somdevas *Brihadkathasaritsagar*, and ancient collection of stories in Sanskrit. It was originally written in Kannada and later on translated into English. The play is archetypal in theme. It has underlying mythical patterns. Folk theatre conventions of identifiable character-types i.e. use of mask, curtains, dolls, story within story, use of images of Ganesh, Kali, Rudra etc, allegorical significance of the play are the characteristic features of the play. This particular play resembles to Thomas Mann’s famous story *The Transposed Head*. *Hayavadana*, published in 1971, is story of two close friends and their love for a woman. Devadatta, the son of brahmin, is a poet and an eminent
scholar. Kapila is a son of blacksmith and known for his physical prowess. Devdatta is a symbol of intellectual whereas Kapila symbolises physical strength. Devdatta falls in love with Padmini and Kapila promises his friend that he would leave no stone unturned to win Padmini for him. Excited at the prospect of marrying Padmini, Devdatta promises to offer his hands to Lord Rudra and his head to Goddess Kali, if he marries Padmini. Because of Kapila’s efforts the marriage is solemnised. The married couple decides to go out for picnic along with Kapila. To Devdatta’s great surprise Kapila and Padmini go to Kali temple. Remembering his pledge Devdatta offers his head to the Goddess Kali. Kapila is shocked to see the dead body of his friend and as a true friend decided to follow him even in his death. He offers his head to the Goddess. Padmini is left alone and anguished by the death of her husband and his friend decides to end her own life but the Goddess appears and promises to grant whatever she wishes. Padmini requests the Goddess to restore the two dead men back to life. Goddess Kali instructs Padmini to attach their heads to their respective bodies. But by mistake Devdatta’s head is attached to Kapila’s body and Kapila’s head is attached to Devdatta’s body. As soon as they regain their senses they start quarrelling over the right to win Padmini. Which head or body should possess Padmini is a question that they cannot easily settle. They seek the advice of a hermit who tells them that the head is superior to the body and therefore the body with Devdatta’s head must possess Padmini. Devdatta and Padmini return home and live happily. Kapila renounces the worldly life and goes to the forest but gradually Kapila’s body with Devdatta’s head begins to weaken and cannot sustain its original vitality. Padmini is haunted by the memories of a strong body that Kapila had left behind and that had gradually deteriorated in Devdatta’s company. She abandons her husband and goes to the forest in search of Kapila. Devdatta follows her. The friends come together and resolve that the three of them cannot live together and hence must end their lives. Kapila and Devdatta kill each other and Padmini ends her life.

1.10.3 An Outline of Wedding Album (2008)

Wedding Album (2008) is the most recent play by Karnad. It’s a present-day play with “humourous insight into the country’s traditions and culture…explores the traditional Indian wedding in a globalised and technologically advanced India” (Express News service). It’s a pleasingly heart-rending tale of love and longing in a shining India.
According to Karnad: “This play has been, in a sense, 30 to 40 years in the making. When his sister got married, he watched the members of his family gathering together, and observed the resultant interpersonal dynamics and tensions…he found it a combination of “celebration and anxiety”, and tucked it away in his mind, to emerge much later. He didn’t want to write it as a “story” play, though, and the form that it has taken now is satisfying to him”. (citizenmatters.in)  

*Wedding Album* deals with an educated, liberal, modern, urban middle-class Saraswat Brahmin family of Nadkarni. The characters in the play are: a doting couple (Mother) and (Father), a daughter who lives in Australia (Hema) with her professional husband, a son (Rohit) who is a software designer, a younger daughter (Vidula) willing to marry a suitable boy (Ashwin) from America whom she has never met, and a cook (Radhabai). Each snapshot shows its members “frozen in an attitude of respectability, yet each figure has a double image with a penumbra of a hidden life… It’s a wonderful comic drama that is deeply revelatory about the India that we live in today” (Deponti “Wedding Album”). According to Lillette Dubey, director of the play, “*Wedding Album* is full of sharp, pithy, and observant comments. Just because the play is not heavy, it doesn’t mean it doesn’t have muscle and content” (Qtd. in Deepa Mohan). The *Wedding Album* which is structured into nine scenes deals primarily with women and their two different worlds i.e. traditional and modern cyber world. But both of them merge into each other. Even the traditional elder women are fused with energy, hope and modern sensibility. Younger sorts enjoy liberty in education, love, courtship via ‘distance’ technology; and marriage. The play marks the highest evolution of feminine psyche. Amrit Srinivasan has observed:

The constellation of sexual, conjugal, caste, class, and age-related behaviours and attitudes of selfishness and sacrifice, chastity and commerce, obedience and authority, all integral to modern Hindu marriage, forms *Wedding Album*’s central narrative thread…works as modern myth, whose condensed logic straddles both the real and the tech-simulated world of today, to help us confront our own mixed-up, amoral, craven, unhappy selves…*Wedding Album* encourages us to examine the growing fundamentalism of the Hindu *middle class* family, which is largely ‘missing’ from social science scholarship on India today. (“Foreword” ix).

By making ‘distance’ technology almost a character in the play, Karnad is able to demonstrate its constant co-presence in the contemporary South Indian Brahmin
home, street, and office, which underwrites the transnational embeddedness of their lives. But the masterstroke lies in linking technology to the very arranging of marriage itself. Marriage and sex without love – that aspect of Indian culture that western society finds repulsive in its strangeness and customariness- becomes, via the technologies of representation (video, email, and telephone), a ‘self arrangement’. ‘Choice within tradition’ or having the best of both possible worlds is how Ashwin panje, the suitable expat boy, sees his pending marriage to Vidula Nadkarni, whom he has met through video playbacks, sent back and forth between Indian and USA. And whom he now-sitting at their first and only face to face pre-nuptial meeting in a local Dharwad restaurant - casts in the spiritual role of ‘Woman as Mother-Wife-Daughter’, his partner in a ‘mission’, if she will have it, to demonstrate the superiority of Hinduism to the West.

Karnad is an inventive, versatile problem playwright. He imbibes several personalities of playwright, actor and director in one. He has contributed a lot to enrich Indian English drama and films through playtext, performance, acting, and direction. He has spearheaded his contemporary playwrights Vijay Tendulker, Badal Sircar, and Mahesh Dattani to reshape Indian English Drama. But unlike his contemporaries, he adapts mythical and historical material with a view to giving it a psychological interpretation. Gill (2005:8) rightly points out that as a modern playwright; Karnad is always engaged in the act of “deconstructing myths”. He adopts the mythical, legendary folktales from Indian culture and unfolds them in the light of modern sensibility. He combines the traditions in the past, with his individual talent, with the present into a unity that bespeaks of tradition and modernity in his art of playwriting. Karnad upholds the well-heeled cultural heritage and customs of India and endeavours to fight against the legacy of colonialism. He advocates indigenous Indian values, ideals and cultural ethos of India. He writes with the subjects from the native soil and his characters are deeply rooted in native culture. He has moulded English very much to suit the context and create feel of Indianness. He has rejuvenated folk and classical theatre traditions in India to set free Indian English drama from the colonial yoke. Indian imagination and sensibility can be easily seen throughout his plays.
1.11 About the Author Mahesh Elkunchwar (1939)

Born on 9th October, 1939, Mahesh Elkunchwar holds an honourable position in the evolution and development of Marathi theatre. Elkunchwar emerged onto the national theatre scene with the publication of his one-act play Sultan in 1967 in noted literary magazine Satyakatha. His plays present a grim picture of postmodern socio-cultural existence at the backdrop of post-independent urbanity in India. Elkunchwar an eminent playwright has written more than twenty plays till date and is working as a screenwriter. Today, he is one of the most prominent and progressive playwrights along with Vijay Tendulkar influencing not just modern Marathi theatre, but modern Indian theatre. Elkunchwar experimented with several forms of dramatic expressions ranging from realistic to symbolic and expressionist to absurd theatre. Some of his notable creations are- Garbo (1970), Desire in the Rocks (1974), Party (1976), Wada Chirebandi (Old Stone Mansion) (1985), Pratibimb (Reflection) (1987), Atmakatha (Autobiography) (1988), Dharmaputra (God Son) (1998), Sonata (2000), An Actor Exits (2005). His plays have been translated into multiple Indian and Western languages including English, French and German. Elkunchwar has been honoured with Maharashtra Gaurav in 1990 and Saraswati Samman, one of India’s highest literary awards, in 2003. He also the recipient of nationally and internationally acclaimed fellowships. Following is a summary of selected plays of Elkunchwar given by Sayan Dey (2014) in his Contribution of Mahesh Elkunchwar in the Evolution of post-Colonial Marathi Theatre: Tracing the Theatrical History.

1.11.1 An Outline of Old Stone Mansion (1985)

Old-stone Mansion is one of the best plays by Mahesh Elkunchwar. It deals with variety of themes and ideas. After independence an extensive development in urban areas has made the rural areas peripheral. Under the leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru, the policy of industrialization was thought to be the foremost initiative for the foundation of strong financial economy of India. However it has severely affected the social, family and individual lifestyle of Indian people. Fast growth of industrialization has fed and watered the capitalism instead of drying it up. It has led a total disintegration of Indian economy. It has widened the ridge between the bourgeois and the working class people. New approach to boost the economy has
benefited the urban trade, commerce and industry classes, but deteriorated the rural classes. Feudalistic attitude is still dominant in the rural life of modern India. Colonisers brought many healthy practices in the Indian society. “Permanent Settlement Act” by Lord Dalhousie has loosened the noose around the neck of poor underprivileged rural masses. Caste and hierarchical social structure has put an individual in the bondage of communal status. Many families, though they have lost their past prosperity and glory, are compelled to follow their conventional domestic cults and customs. The anecdotal practices of the “precious” and “prosperous” traditions lead a family or a society to further degradation. The same thing happens with the Deshpande family of Dharangaon village. The Deshpande’s have a rich feudal past associated with their name and social status. In the course of time it has all come to an end. The monetary condition of the family is in absolute adversity. They all live a disintegrated frugal life. The rats have dug holes in every nook and corner of the Wada household, the roof continuously sheds dust, all symbolic of the fallen state of human existence (Dey 2014). All family members have their own specific way of living. The familial affection and attachment is absent in every character whether they are living in Dharangaon or in Bombay.

The family have differences and separated over the issue of rural-urban disagreement. Bhaskar and his family grumble Sudhir, his younger brother, for not paying any attention to them. Sudhir shares the fact that he has been living in Bombay for many years besides, he doesn’t give up his job in Bombay to adjust in the rural settings. This disagreement instigates the domestic conflict where everybody tries to signify their sacrifice and survival for the family. Bhaskar, Sudhir, and Prabha are brothers and sister even though they are not unified with the family members or the other people in the society. When their father Venkatesh dies, Bhaskar follows the ritualistic practices and makes arrangements to feed the whole village on the thirteenth day of Venkatesh’s death. Sudhir strongly opposes the fact. Bhaskar is a man who believes in following customs and rituals as he is living in village, while Sudhir believes in “practicality”. Sudhir and Anjali feel that it is illogical and useless to spend on the post-demise rituals. But the Deshpandes don’t get rid of their old false beliefs. In order to protect their family honour they go on blowing money on baseless customs despite their meagre family income. Dadi and Aai suffer a lot due to rigorous existential crisis. The rise of capitalism has adversely affected the joint
family structure and the Wada household as the family decides to mortgage the back part of their Wada/house to Bansilal to expand his business. The holes in the walls and continuous falling of dust from the roof symbolises the deteriorating condition of Wada culture and Wada household. The Deshpandes are caught between the meagre financial condition and the wish to maintain family honour. The men in the family are egoistic. They are mad after property, money and gold which takes the Wada towards thorough degeneration. Women are marginalised and have no significant role to do or say anything in the family affairs. The jewellerys, ancestral property of the family, are the matter of honour and destiny of the Deshapande family. It symbolises the tradition and financial security of the family. Bhaskar, Sudhir, Prabha and Chandu have an equal share in it. Ranju elopes with her teacher to Bombay. Sudhir rescues her but the gold which carried family honour is lost forever. The death of Venkatesh brings two families together. It symbolises that human civilization has reached at a grave state. The union of two families in the cold and gloomy air of sorrow has captivated the Wada household. It shows the slow but steady breakdown of ancestral richness of not only Deshpande family but of whole humanity.

1.11.2 An Outline of Sonata (2000)

Sonata is a distinctive play by Mahesh Elkunchwar. It is rich in its theme and dialogues. The play has multiple layers of views and thoughts which can be analysed from various standpoints. Three female characters: Aruna, Dolon and Shubhadra dwell in the central roles with a reference of a couple of minor male characters in the background. Though the plot, major happenings and the incidents in the play move around the three female characters, it doesn’t put the play in the category of a feminist play. The opening of the play by an interaction between Aruna and Dolon reveals the fact that both of them belong to two different cultural communities. They are thoroughly dissimilar in their approach, thought, character and conduct. The non-linear, fragmented, often purposeless, repetitive version of conversation that takes place between these two characters from the beginning of the play defines the reality of human existence (Dey 2014). It represents the real life situation of the modern times where individuals’ talk is often empty and aimless. All actions in the play take place within the four walls of the house where Aruna and Dolon reside. Their expectations, aims, desires, pleasures, peace and sorrows all continue to exist with
them. They dream but cannot escape from their dull, monotonous and an unexciting state of life. They often look out of the window in the sky to get liberty from their decomposed situation of existence. Their vision and desire to be free is blocked by the huge sky scrapers outside the window. Dolon’s habits of drinking and smoking and passion for fashion give us an idea that artificial fascination of urbanization has completely entangled their life. Aruna and Dolon often debate and fight over the trivial issues of each other’s way of life, likings, and dislikings. Through it they stay connected and try to survive from a complete degeneration. Aruna is enmeshed in her conventional beliefs and profession. She keeps herself away from the void fascinating practices of metropolitan culture but doesn’t continue it for a long time. In order to stay connected with the persons around her, she finally gives up her ideal conventional beliefs to the modern fashionable lifestyles of Dolon and Shubhadra. Postmodern way of life is practised by Dolon and Shubhadra who take pleasure in violating the traditional norms of life. Shubhadra and Sangram are in violent relation even though Shubhadra accepts it as their love and affection bloom in the terms of differences and fight with each other. 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.

The characters of Shubhadra, Dolon and Aruna represent Freud’s psychological concepts of id, ego and superego correspondingly. Among the three, Shubhadra is in a better state as being the press reporter she crosses the thresholds to enter in the world outside and gets a chance to create her own voice by breaking the limits of four walls. She doesn’t surrender before anyone in her life though her emotional attachment brings her back to Sangram on his call. In its progress the play delineates the fact that the women protagonists continue to exist with their “bad faith” of existential realism. They torment, smoke, drink, collect empty perfume bottles, make fashion, and fight in search of pleasure and calm of mind. The woman whom Dolon often observes from the window is also agonised by the same “bad faith”. Aruna and Shubhadra attribute to the features of structuralism and post-structuralism respectively. Aruna remains indecisive to break her conservative outlook of life whereas Shubhadra disentangles herself from the bondage of socio-cultural establishments and creates her own voice. Her break in affair with Sangram is temporary. She goes back to him in spite of their
violent relations but never surrenders before him. While departing from Aruna and Dolon, she throws away her wrist watch to avoid the constraint and restriction of time. In the concluding scene, reality is asserted. Aruna and Dolon are shown arguing in the beginning scene but this time to be a little closer to each other. This reveals the crucial and inescapable existential realism of the civilized humanity.

1.11.3 An Outline of *Reflection* (1987)

*Reflection* is an outstanding psychological play crafted by Mahesh Elkunchwar. As Dey (2014) mentions, the playwright undertakes a deep journey into the characters’ psyche or mind and makes the audience/readers to enter deep into the characters’ mind and soul. This is one of the amazing existential plays written by Elkunchwar. The existential angst of the character HE or Blockhead is the central theme of the play. It also deals with the variety of conflicts such as physical-mental, conjugal-spiritual, conventional-modern, proletariat-bourgeois, etc. The names of the characters, incidents and dialogues in the play are all full with symbolic meanings. The character in the play are Woman, He aka Blockhead, Flags and She or Broomstick. These names connote and identify a character without any distinctiveness or differences. It shows the deteriorating state of every human in the modern/contemporary civilization. The play opens with the character HE waking up in a complete state of confusion with the telephone, alarm and the doorbell ringing all at once. HE is in utter mess and makes directionless movements and gradually feels relaxed as all the three: telephone, alarm and the doorbell stop ringing. It shows his lack of interest in and withdrawal from, the common elements which systematize the human state of existence. HE agitates towards the telephone, alarm and the doorbell and he defies social connectivity, mechanical time, and the society respectively. HE wants to keep himself away from the world outside, which he thinks, is disturbing and irritating him. His survival, his view and approach towards life reveals that he is on the edge of complete degeneration. As the play steps forward we realize that that the man happens to lose his own reflection. This loss of reflection symbolises his alienation from various aspects of human existence. Already he has been rejected by the society for violating social norms and conditions. Now his self also rejects him making him a completely isolated individual.
The woman, who is the house owner, tries to help HE to overcome his desolation. She plays the game of getting inside the mind of each other with HE. The characters’ opening the “windows” of each other’s mind, tries to explore deep, the different layers of the conscious and sub-conscious level of the human mind. First the woman enters in HE’s mind and plays the game of love with him, and through this she discovers what lies in the mind of the man. But the result is absolute cynicism and despair. When the man tries to enter the mind of the woman, he finds it difficult to function according to his own will and wish and the woman guides him in his own way. It shows that woman is psychologically more firm than the man. The woman who has lost her husband accepts the harshness of life and lives firmly as a house owner and a maid servant. She is content with what she has. She remembers her romantic days and through fantasies tries to escape from the harsh realities of life. The woman struggles to defy the pains and pangs of existentialism and thus tries to be away from the miseries of existential entanglements. The man, who has lost his reflection, gets trapped within the Satreian “bad faith” and gradually loses his vital power of “speech”. His power and ability of communication is the only weapon left for his survival with the universal social setup. Through this communication he is connected with the world and different individuals “outside”, but in the course of time he gradually loses the power to speak and finally succumbs to the existential angst and commits suicide. The other characters like the Woman, Flags and the Girl do realize the bad faith and come out of it.

They accept their fragmented, desolated existence and are trying to live in it, with it, and by it. But HE is unable to accept his situation and still lives in the modernist wistfulness. He dreams of a definite, well-structured, and specific human existence which is not possible anymore in this ever-changing ultramodern world. The communication between Flags and Blockhead criticizes the elite class people, specially their manipulative and ignorant nature. It shows Elkunchwar’s bending towards Marxism. Flags incessantly mistreatments and torments Blockhead and his class. But from the historical time, the basic problem with the proletariat is that in the process of defending the class difference they themselves get yoked by the privileged class and culture. This is what exactly happens with Flags.
We observe that in the later part of the play, HE accepts the post-modern fragmentation and he feels alleviated by the loss of his reflection. But he fails to give himself to the practised and all-pervading ethics and norms and as a consequence he is totally discarded by the society. The short triangular clash which takes place among the woman, HE, and girl towards the end of the play, shows the feeling of insecurity from the part of the woman and the girl. The anxiety of loneliness and security are the significant features of existentialism.

The play ends in a very significant way. HE becomes dumb after talking about the absurdity of life and relations. The sound of the alarm clock, telephone and the doorbell subdues him. Finally the man commits suicide by jumping from the window. The woman continues to live in her fragmented state which is a blend of fantasy and reality.

1.12 Methodology of the Research

In this study, the researcher uses a literary criticism in order to discuss the linguistic expression in the selected literary texts. The researcher has selected six Indian plays, each three authored by Girish Karnad and Mahesh Elkunchwar to test the application of speech acts, politeness principle and cooperative principle. The critical or interpretive analysis is the approach that is used in this research. Besides, the comparative approach is at times used for the sake of analysis.

At the beginning, the researcher starts categorizing the dialogues and monologues of various characters in the selected plays. The analysis of these dialogues, in the light of speech act theory, politeness principle and cooperative principle is the center of the research. An attempt is made to offer a possible critical and interpretive analysis to the various dialogues to decipher various types of speech acts used by the characters to convey certain intended message. For doing a good critical and interpretive analysis, the researcher compares “utterances” by various characters in the light of positive and negative politeness strategies as well as by applying maxims of cooperative principle. This technique is also used to reveal the nature of various characters, relations with other characters and significance of an utterance in the specific context.
The investigation of dramatic expressions based on pragmatic tools of speech act theory, politeness principle and cooperative principle is applied to each play to help prove the tentative supposition. An attempt has also been made to check how these principles are observed and violated in the selected literary works to create artistic and/or linguistic effects and to communicate certain message(s). The selected plays are from Indian Writing in English hence they reflect Indian life and culture. “How do specific utterances delineate the cultural specificity?” is also assessed by using the techniques of pragmatics.

The research work in literature doesn’t need any fieldwork. For research in literature and language, library is the main source of data collection. Regarding the data of the study, it can be categorized into two types. The first category is the primary data, which are all the data/dialogues collected from the six plays. The second category is the secondary data that involve reference books, critical books, dictionaries, encyclopedias, journals of pragmatics and applied linguistics, periodicals, magazines, internet and dissertations. The researcher follows some steps to collect the data. Reading and understanding the texts of the plays and pragmatic theories is the first step. After that, he starts analysing each play with the modus operandi of pragmatics. The guide lines recommended by Modern Language Association of America (MLA) are followed for the written presentation of research.

1.13 Conclusion

In this chapter, an account of the theoretical issues of speech acts, politeness principle and co-operative principle are discussed along with the thematic concerns of selected dramas. In the present study the researcher is going to analyse the dialogues in the selected dramas of Karnad and Elkunchwar in the light of the three models- the speech act model, politeness model, and co-operative model. This chapter provides the background and linguistic/pragmatic tools to analyse the dramatic dialogues. In the next three chapters the researcher will frequently refer to the concepts of direct and indirect speech acts, the politeness principle, the maxims of cooperative principle and the concepts of cohesion, coherence, turn-taking.
The following chapter deals with the application of speech acts to various dialogues from the selected plays. Austin’s and Searle’s model of locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary speech act and direct and indirect speech acts in the light of dramatic dialogues will prepare the background for a fuller understanding of how the theory of speech act operates in the dialogues of Indian drama.