CHAPTER II

AN ANALYSIS OF SPEECH ACTS IN THE SELECTED PLAYS OF KARNAD AND ELKUNCHWAR

2.0 Preliminaries

Pragmatics takes a special interest in language as it is used. Speech act theory is one of the basic tenets of pragmatics. It is a comprehensive theory of linguistic communication. “Speaking a language is performing speech acts, acts such as making statements, giving commands, asking questions, making promises and so on” (Searle 2011:16). In literary texts, especially in drama, characters commune with one another. Their communication, in fact any communication, has certain purpose and meaning. Speaker’s intentional meaning and hearer’s proper understanding of that meaning in a given context makes communication a successful activity. In drama, speech acts by the characters play a significant role. Most of the things happening in the drama are conveyed through speech acts. Speech Act includes locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary act. 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. The illocutionary act refers to the intention or purpose in the speaker’s mind expressed through a well formed utterance. The perlocutionary act implies change in the mind of the hearer or creates certain effect on the hearer to behave as per the intention of the speaker. In the present study a specific choice of speech act by various characters in the specific context of the drama will be studied.

Speaking is engaging in a rule-governed form of behaviour. Talking is performing acts according to rules (Searle 2011:22). It means that one can do things or get them done either in a direct way or in an indirect manner. A direct speech act is one where there is no attempt to save the face of the addressees. It is a bland plain, ordinary way of saying things. An indirect speech act is a kind of circumlocution, an attempt to save the face of the addressee. The interpersonal relationship between the addressee and the addressee as well as specific context or situation determines the particular choice of direct or indirect speech act. Jenny Thomas (1995:143) proposes that the desire to make one’s language less/more interesting, to increasing the force of one’s message, competing goals and politeness matter for the motivation of indirectness.
Use of explicit and implicit performatives is another feature of speech act. An explicit performative is one in which the utterance inscription contains an expression that makes explicit what kind of act is being performed (Lyons 1981:175). In it there is no possibility of misunderstanding the utterance. For instance –

1. a. I order you to leave
   b. Will you leave?

In the first example, (1a) speaker uses imperative proposition with the purpose making the hearer leave. The second utterance, (1b) is rather ambiguous. The hearer doesn’t understand the speaker’s intention. It may be a request as well as a verbal question. As per Lyon’s assumption, it is non-explicit or implicit expression, there is no expression in the utterance- inscription itself which makes explicit the fact that this is to be taken as a request yes no type question (Lyons 1981:176).

2.1 Speech Act Theory and Drama

The term drama is derived from the Greek verb *draein* which means *to do*. So the word drama would mean doing and by extension showing what men and women do i.e. how they speak, how they treat each other, interact etc. The dramatist creates men and women who speak to each other and make their intentions known to each other. It is here, the speech act theory is relevant. The characters in a play use speech acts to convey their messages thereby using illocutionary acts which lead to perlocutionary act. From this communication we gather the story of their life. Early history of drama tells us that it was predominantly verbal. For instance, Shakespeare’s dramas. When drama is being performed on the stage, everything a dramatist wants to convey, conveys through dialogues or speeches by the characters. Similarly, when we read drama we read speeches or dialogues which reveal the message of the dramatist. The dictionary tells us that a dialogue is conversation between two or more persons, real or imaginary. These dialogues or speeches fall in the category of speech acts hence dramatic dialogues can be analysed in the light of Speech Act Theory. As already mentioned, speech act theory, comprises of locutionary act, illocutionary act and perlocutionary act. Locutionary act is performing an act of saying something. It is the actual production of words with certain sense and reference. Illocutionary act means performing an act in saying something. It is the intention of the speaker. And
perlocutionary act refers to performing an act by saying or doing something as a response to an illocutionary act. It is an effect of the speaker’s utterance on the listener. Characters in drama do produce locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. When characters speak, they assert, conclude, describe, report, predict, inform, accuse, testify, confess, swear, criticise, complain, state the fact and mention what they believe about the external world. John Searle terms this type of linguistic acts as assertive speech act. Sometimes characters do express their psychological state or social behaviour. They apologise, bless, curse, congratulate, praise, express joy, sorrow, likes, dislikes, pleasure, pains etc. Austin calls them behabitives and Searle uses the term expressive speech act. Occasionally, characters make commitment to do something. Promising, threatening, refusing, pledging, vowing, guaranteeing etc, bind the speaker or the listener to or not to do something. They basically express what the speaker intends. These acts are called as commissive speech acts. Periodically, characters in drama speak to get the addressee or someone else to do something. They do it by advising, inviting, permitting, ordering and requesting. It can be used in positive or negative sense. These vocal acts are known as directive speech act. Episodically, characters do speak which can bring some change in the world of conversational partners. For instance betting, declaring, resigning, passing a sentence, appointing, nominating etc. These speech acts are declarative speech act. Use of illocutionary speech acts such as assertives, expressives, commissives, directives and declaratives on the part of the dramatic characters, to impart information in the direct and indirect manner create the dramatic world and context. Audience or the readers of drama make use of these expressions by the characters to fully comprehend the message of the dramatist. Speech acts do tell us about the intention, nature and psychological state of the characters defining them heroic, villainous, coward, cunning, co-operative and so on. In King Lear, King Lear asks his three daughters to express their love for him. Expressions of these three daughters reveal their nature which is contrary to their utterances:

Goneril: Sir, I love you more than words can weird the matter;
    Dearer than eye-sight, space, and liberty;
    Beyond what can be valued rich, or rare;
    No less than life, with grace, health, beauty, honour;
    As much as child e’er loved, or father found;
A love that makes breath poor, and speech unable;
   Beyond all manner of so much I love you.  (Act 1, sc. i)

...  

Regan: Sir, I am made
       of the self-same metal that my sister is,
       And prize me at her worth. In my true heart
       I find she namess my very deed of love;
       Only she comes too short: that I profess
       Myself an enemy to all other joys,
       Which the most precious square of sense possesses;
       And find I am alone felicitate
       In your dear highness’ love.  (Act 1, sc. i)

...  

Cordelia: Good my lord,
       You have begot me, bred me, loved me: I
       Return those duties back as are right fit,
       Obey you, love you, and most honour you.
       Why have my sisters husbands, if they say
       They love you all? Haply, when I shall wed,
       That lord whose hand must take my plight shall carry
       Half my love with him, half my care and duty
       Sure I shall never marry like my sisters,
       To love my father all.  (Act 1, sc. i)

These speech acts, in the course of action ahead in drama, prove that Goneril and Regan are not at all truthful. Their words are hollow. Their speeches don’t approve their deeds. They are cunning and selfish. They have an eye on Lear’s property and province. On the contrary, Cordelia loves Lear a lot but remains less verbose. Lear becomes very much pleased to listen Goneril and Regan but gets defeated in his expectation to listening Cordelia. Lear distributes his wealth and state between Goneril and Regan and banishes Cordelia from his state. It shows Lear’s mental disability to recognise true love of his daughters. Speech acts also carries the dramatic
story/action forward. For instance, in Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* three witches make prediction which is an assertive speech act as below:

Third Witch: All hail, Macbeth, thou shalt be king hereafter!

...  
Third Witch: Thou shalt get kings, though thou be none:

(Act 1, sc. iii)

The third witch, first makes prophecy about Macbeth’s kingship and secondly, about the kingship of Banquo’s children. The witches’ prophecy proceed directly all the remaining events of the story. The witches awaken in Macbeth the passion of ambition, which is the mainspring of his action leading the drama forward.

Speech acts differentiate characters from one another. They indirectly reveal the superior or inferior social positioning of the characters. Speech acts by the character create spectacular or imaginary world providing an elusive experience. It makes the audience/readers believe in the dramatic world.

Most of the happenings and incidents in drama are conveyed through speech acts. Violent scenes of murder, war, rape and death are communicated to other characters within drama and the audience rather than performing on stage. As in *Macbeth*, protagonist Macbeth conveys the message of Duncan’s murder as follows:

Macbeth: I have done the deed. Didst thou not hear a noise?  

(Act 2, sc. ii)

Thus, drama is a literary genre which makes utmost use of speech acts making the characters act on the stage. Drama makes explicit use of speech acts compared to fiction. The dialogue in a drama is an immediate ‘spoken action’ rather than reference to, or representation of an action. Changes are brought in the world of the dramatic characters with the help of illocutionary force.

Stage directions are suggestions or instructions that a dramatist gives before or after dialogue (Kimbahune 2012:10). As mentioned by Antony (2009:45), stage directions are illocutionary indicators helping us to understand the play. Actors make use of
these sub texts in the stage direction to convey the wished-for messages, intentions and purposes. Stage directions set the background of the play as well as convey the intentions of the dramatist to the readers. Hence, while analysing the conversational acts in the light of the speech act theory illocutionary indicators should also be taken into account. Only with the help of written texts all the illocutions cannot be performed. Interpretations of the reactions of the interlocutors allow speech act analysis of drama. For such purpose, systematic categorization of the speech acts is necessary. Austin has made classification of speech acts on the basis of performative verbs where as Searle has made functional analysis of these speech acts. As has already be mentioned speech acts are classified into five major types. The plays selected for this study will be analysed as per the categorisation of these speech acts.

Speech Act includes locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary act. Locutionary act can be best explained with the following instance of utterance from Tughlaq.

OLD MAN: God, what’s this country coming to! (Scene i: 1)

Linguistically speaking, what the old man has done in uttering this exclamation is: he has made use of English sounds and put them in particular sequence so as to produce words. The words he utters appear in a systematic sequence. As far as the grammar part of this utterance is concerned, he has chosen an exclamatory form. This utterance has a specific sense or meaning. The referent in this utterance is the condition of the country.

As Austin (1962) mentions, when a speaker speaks or produces a locutionary act, he utters ‘certain noises’ which is known as phonetic act. His utterance consists of clauses, phrases, words, syllables and phonemes conforming to a certain grammar. It is a phatic act. The rhetic act is the performance of an act using those vocables with a certain more-or-less definite sense or reference. Thus, A locutionary act is uttering a certain sentence with a certain sense and reference or meaning. From this point of view, every utterance by every character in a play is an illustration of locutionary act as it has certain sense and reference or meaning in the specific context of the dramatic world.
Illocutionary act means performing an act in saying something. On the functional basis, J R Searle in his *Expression and Meaning Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts* (1979) classifies five types of speech acts: assertives, expressive, directives, commissives, and declarations. These are basically the main types of illocutionary act. When a meaningful utterance is created it has always an intention. As Searle (2011:45) has stated, “In the performance of an illocutionary act in the literal utterance of a sentence, the speaker intends to produce a certain effect by means of getting the hearer to recognize his intention to produce that effect; and furthermore, if he is using words literally, he intends this recognition to be achieved in virtue of the fact that the rules for using the expressions he utters associate the expression with the production of that effect”. Perlocutionary act refers to performing an act by saying something. People, in real life or in dramatic situation, talk for a purpose. Through talk, they assert their beliefs, request, help, promise action, express congratulation, or ask information which is an illocutionary force of the speech. Listeners would be remiss if they did not register this purpose and act accordingly (Thorat 2002:33). It will not make communication a successful activity. In the plays selected for the present study, all these speech acts are used by the characters.

### 2.2 Assertive Speech Acts

Assertive or representatives are the speech acts which state what a speaker believes to be the case or not (Yule 2011: 53). According to Searle, the purpose of assertive class is to commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition. It means the speaker wants to make the listener to believe the truth of what he or she says. The assertive speech act most closely resembles Austin’s constative utterance. The speaker asserts a proposition that represents a condition or a state of affairs that in principle could be true or false like Austin’s constative utterances. As Yarahmadi and Olfati (2011) point out, Assertive speech acts are statements of facts, getting the viewer to form or attend a belief. Here, the speaker’s words reveal his beliefs and he/she is uttering about external world. Assertions, conclusions, descriptions, reporting, predicting, informing, accusing, testifying, confessing, swearing, criticizing, complaining and statement of fact are the examples of this type. Following is a list of occurrence of these speech acts in the selected plays.
Following production of assertive speech act in *Tughlaq* by Announcer, reveals Tughlaq’s just and secular attitude. Announcer says publicly that Brahmin Vishnu Prasad has filed a case against the merciful Tughlaq, as his land has been illegally seized by the officers of the state. The Kazi-i-Mumalik has also declared that Brahmin’s claim is just and recommended him to receive a grant of five hundred silver dinars from the State Treasury. Announcer further declares –

ANNOUNCER: …His merciful majesty has accepted the decision of the Kazi-i-Mumalik as just and in addition to the grant of five hundred silver dinars has offered the said Vishnu Prasad a post in the Civil Service to ensure him a regular and adequate income.  

(Scene i: 2)

The intention or illocutionary force of this assertive utterance is to create an impression among the people that Tughlaq is just and though he is a Muslim king, he is very much careful about the privilege of Hindu people. The perlocutionary act implies change in the mind of the hearer. It entails that addressee should behave as per the desire expressed by the addresser. But the citizens’ reaction/expressive speech acts, given below, shows that intended effect is not achieved.

OLD MAN: What folly is this! May Heaven guide our Sultan.  
HINDU: I don’t believe a word of it. There’s something more to this, that much is obvious-  

(Scene i: 3)

In *Tughlaq*, Muhammad Tughlaq informs his Step-Mother about the fact of marching of Ain-ul-Mulk towards Delhi as follows:

MUHAMMAD: Funny you should mention him. I was just thinking of him-but not with reference to chess. You see, my dear friend Ain-ul-Mulk, the companion of my childhood, my fellow champion in chess, is at this very moment marching on Delhi.
STEP-MOTHER: What? what do you mean?
MUHAMMAD: Exactly what I said He is marching on
Delhi with an army of thirty thousand.
STEP-MOTHER: But why, Muhammad?
MUHAMMAD: I don’t know. The last letter I wrote to him
asked him to be the Governor of the Deccan. I need
a strong man there and I thought he would like it.
STEP-MOTHER: But there must be some other reason!
(No reply.) What are you going to do now?
MUHAMMAD: Do the best I can. ... (Scene ii: 9)

Tughlaq here intends to convey his Step-Mother the fact of Ain-ul-Mulk’s march on Delhi. Her expression ‘What? what do you mean?’ is the perlocutionary effect of Tughlaq’s information. It shows that she is shocked to listen him. It is revealed through Tughlaq’s speech act that Ain-ul-Mulk is Tughlaq’s childhood companion. It creates perlocutionary effect on the readers/audience increasing curiosity among them as to why a bosom friend of Tughlaq is going to attack Delhi. Their dialogue, in the form of question and answer, reveals that Tughlaq is willing to make Ain-ul-Mulk the Governor of a province of his state but Tughlaq is defeated in his purpose as Ain-ul-Mulk doesn’t like his offer. When Step-Mother asks, “What are you going to do now?” Tughlaq’s response “Do the best I can” makes the readers/audience anxious about Tughlaq’s future action. Thus, it leads the action of the play ahead by increasing the curiosity and anxiety among the spectators about Tughlaq’s course of action.

In Hayavadana, When Kapila goes to Padmini’s house, he lets her know about Devadatta, his bosom friend and the only son of the Revered Brahmin Vidyasagara. He describes him –

KAPILA: In which case you’ll also know of Devadatta, his only
son. A poet. A pundit. Knows the Vedas backwards. Writes the
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?

[Sudden Silence.]

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

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

Kapila’s intention of visiting Padmini’s house and telling her about Devadatta is to get Padmini’s hand for Devadatta. The desired effect on Padmini is achieved as she blushes to listen Kapila showing her approval for the marriage. The marriage of Devadatta and Padmini is solemnised as a result of Kapila’s efforts.

In Wedding Album, the Nadkarni family is sending their daughter Vidula’s marriage proposal to a young boy working in America. As per the tradition in India the boy is supposed to visit girl’s family and see the girl for marriage. But the boy cannot come due to his busy schedule, so a video giving Vidula’s introduction is prepared to send on the boy’s demand. There Vidula introduces/describes herself as follows which is an instance of representative speech act.

VIDULA: I am Vidula. Vidula Nadkarni. I am twenty-two. Twenty-two and a half, actually. I have done my BA in Geography. Passed my exams last year. I am not doing anything at the moment. Worked for a travel agency for six months. (Scene i: 5)

The purpose of Vidula’s self introduction is to acquaint herself to the boy who would be her husband, if he finds her suitable for him. This representative speech act at the opening of the play creates an impression on the reader that a girl is being shown to a suitable boy for marriage. In Indian tradition son’s or daughter’s marriage is an issue of family prestige. The spectators or the readers are left with an impression about what would happen about the marriage for which the Nadkarnis are making preparations. This speech act sows the seeds of marriage related happenings which will take place in the further scenes of the play. The audience are put in an excitement to see whether the boy agrees to marry her or not? What are the would-be-husband’s expectations? How do the Nadkarnis perform the marriage ceremony? And many
such questions arise in the mind of the readers which forces them to see or read the play ahead.

Similarly, When Rohit makes it clear that Ashwin, the fiancé has postponed his arriving in India, it creates tension in the family as it will leave a very short time with Nadkarni family to manage all the nuptial arrangements. Mother out of enragement says:

MOTHER: No, I tell you. Let’s just call it off. Tell him Right now. Our Vidu will get a hundred boys better than him. We didn’t go to them begging for a bridgeroom. They asked for her. They took all the initiative. And now at the last moment…

ROHIT: Mother, please. Let’s be sensible.
MOTHER: He thinks we are so desperate for him? Just tell him the proposal is off.
VIDULA: No, we can’t. We’ll become the laughing stock of the town. We agreed to all this. Now to break off for no reason! I can’t face it.

(Scene ii: 26)

Rohit’s speech act “Mother, please. Let’s be sensible” and Vidula’s utterance “No, we can’t. We’ll become the laughing stock of the town. We agreed to all this. Now to break off for no reason! I can’t face it”, show that Mother’s intention of breaking off the marriage has achieved no effect on Rohit and especially on Vidula. Though living in the modern world and a techno savvy, Vidula is conscious enough about the social status of her family. In India, if marriage is cancelled it can bring social disgrace to the girl’s family. She feels that marriage break up may bring social dishonour to her family. The issue will be a talk of the town so she is not at all willing to call off the marriage at any cost.

In *Old Stone Mansion*, the Deshpande family is waiting for Sudhir and Anjali coming from Bombay as Vyekatesh, the father has passed away. When they come, the following dialogue takes place.
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 Amravati very 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)

In this exchange of speech act, Bhaskar and Sudhir mention the facts. The mention of telegram shows that the setting of the play is somewhat old, where people do use telegram as a means for communication with the people living distant places. In India, usually telegrams were used to convey the message of something unpleasant and shocking. Bhaskar mentions the fact of their father’s death to Sudhir. His statement ‘Tatyaji gave us no time at all’ shows that Bhaskar would have tried to save Tatyaji by taking him to the hospital if he would have survived after collapsing on the ground. Through this assertive speech act, Bhaskar wants to understand Sudhir that Tatyaji has passed away as he has fallen down on the ground after performing his evening pooja. He was not on the death bed or suffering from illness. The violent or shocking scenes like death, murder, and rape are generally not shown on the stage directly. They are communicated through speech acts, usually indirect speech acts. Here through Bhaskar’s assertive speech act, which is indirect in nature, ‘I shouted, ‘Tatyaji! Tatyaji!’ But it was all over’ the dramatist wants to convey readers / audience about the fact of the death of Vyenkatesh. The use of direct and indirect speech acts has been separately discussed later in the same chapter.

In rural and urban India, in order to maintain their high social status, many families, despite losing their past wealth and glory are forced to continue with their traditional familial cults and practices. The falsified practices of the “valuable” and “rich” traditions lead to further socio-cultural degradation (Dey 2014). The same thing happens with the Deshpandes of Dharangaon in Old Stone Mansion.
Bhaskar, after the death of Vyenkatesh, wants to do all post demise rituals. The Deshpande’s continue to flow with their false notion of status and honour and continue to blow out even their minimal financial balance behind baseless customs. Sudhir and Anjali are very practical. They feel all such things are outdated and futile. Following conversation in the form of assertive speech act, shows the impact of ancestral tradition on Bhaskar and Vahini.

BHASKAR: He used to look after Tatyaji as well. I was so busy with farm work. So he took the brunt. There’s a lot of work for you for the thirteenth and fourteenth-day rituals Chandoba. Your last service to Tatyaji.

SUDHIR: A lot of work? why?

BHASKAR: Won’t it be? With the whole village coming for a meal?

SUDHIR (tense): What?

BHASKAR: What do you think?

SUDHIR: The village?

BHASKAR: Come on. That’s a custom here. We have to feed the whole village on the thirteenth day or we lose face.

SUDHIR: So you’re going to feed all the four or five thousand?

BHASKAR: Is there a choice? The sittings will start in the morning and go on till ten or twelve at night.

SUDHIR: And no thought for the expense! Five thousand plates means at least twenty or twenty-five thousand rupees. Where will you get that?

BHASKAR: That’s what I wanted us to discuss. Tell me if you have an idea.

SUDHIR: I won’t give anything.

BHASKAR: Whether you do or no, we’ll have to manage as best we can.

VAHINI: Bhauji, this is the last expenditure for a family elder. Do we refuse it and get closer to hell?

SUDHIR: What old-fashioned ideas, Vahini?

VAHINI: Say what you like...

(Act 2, sc i: 167-68)
Bhaskar and Vahini live in a village under the impression of old customs and convention. The Deshpandes are already running short of money even though they cannot think cutting off in the expenditure for the rituals. Sudhir who is educated and working in Bombay, advises to withdraw or minimize the scale of expenditure for the rituals as the family lacks money. But Bhaskar’s assertive response, “Come on. That’s a custom here. We have to feed the whole village on the thirteenth day or we lose face” shows that it is necessary to perform the rituals to avoid social dishonour. Bhaskar expects some economical help from Sudhir but he refuses to “give anything” and expects to give up “old-fashioned ideas”. But Sudhir’s intentional force, due to heavy pressure of social customs and rituals in their rural settings, brings no perlocutionary effect in Bhaskar and Vahini. Besides, their speech acts reveal the attitude of traditional mode of life vis-a-vis modern.

Sonata, as Sayan Dey (2014) mentions, is a unique play among the creations of Elkunchwar in terms of dialogues and theme. The entire play majorly consists of three female characters, Aruna, Dolon and Subhadra with a couple of minor male characters in the background. Their dialogues reveal multiple thoughts and ideas which can be analyzed from various perspectives. Following assertive speech acts by these three women reveal what they believe and their awful lifestyle.

DOLON: What awful women we are!
ARUNA: we are all right. We are self-sufficient. We earn. We spend.
DOLON: Self-centred. Do nothing for the society.
SUBHADRA: Without any commitment. Without any ideal.
DOLON: No ideology.
SUBHADRA: We’re not even feminists.
DOLON: We blow money, smoke, drink.
SUBHADRA: And my affairs.
DOLON (giggling): Sheeeee! What kind of people are we!
SUBHADRA: Decadent. But happy. We’re happy.
DOLON: Unabashedly happy.
SUBHADRA: Abominably happy.
DOLON: Obscenely.

ARUNA (getting into it): Nirlajjam sada sukhi.  
(Act 1: 271)

The three single working women in Sonata – Aruna, a teacher of Sanskrit; Dolon, employed ‘in a big post in a multinational’ and Shubhadra, a journalist, share a life with all the signs of solidarity and freedom. They are all ‘fortyish’, were in the same class in college, can afford to flaunt their temperamental and cultural differences, and can, once in a while, break out of their stance of self-sufficiency and address the audience together in a choric avowal as mentioned above. These three women, the character of the dramatist, through their speech acts reflect their lifestyle and attitude communicating it to the audience. They are living post-modern life of cultural fragmentation. These women are educated, earn money, spend, drink and have no concern with social norms. They believe in self enjoyment and but are not content with it. ‘Sheeeee! What kind of people are we!’ shows that they hate the life they live. They feel, “Decadent. But happy. We’re happy”. Their speech acts create an impression on the audience that these women are economically independent but mentally detached from the social life. They feel ashamed of their life but cannot give it up as they feel pleasure in it.

Reflection is a play which deals with the underlying aspects of conflicts: physical-psychological, sexual-spiritual, traditional-modern, proletariat-bourgeois, etc. The Protagonist HE aka Blockhead discovers that he has lost his reflection in the mirror. When he asks his hostess WOMAN about what a reflection is she asserts that it is just a body. She says:

HE: But Bai, is a reflection just a body?
WOMAN: What else? What do you see in the mirror-your mind?
Your heart? Your Soul?
HE: I wonder. What does a mirror show? What do we see?  
(Act 1: 209)

When HE comes to know that he has lost his reflection in the mirror, he becomes very much anxious and worried. He feels that reflection doesn’t merely reflect body. It is
the very representation of our existence. He feels that his reflection doesn’t exist because he doesn’t exist. He cannot assure himself that he exists out of anxiety he asks ‘But Bai, is a reflection just a body?’ Woman’s response to him is an example of indirect assertive speech act. She doesn’t directly assert that reflection is just a body. The use of rhetorical question- ‘What else? What do you see in the mirror-your mind? Your heart? Your Soul?’ increases the force of her assertion. She believes that reflection is a mere representation of body. It doesn’t represent mind, heart or soul. Woman’s assertion doesn’t create appropriate effect on HE. His response in the form of question shows that he is still in doubt about what does a mirror show exactly?

Illocutionary act on the part of the dramatist is also very significant. He has certain message to convey. Through mouthpiece or choral character, dramatist is performing an action in saying something. Utterances on the part of the choral character function as assertive or representative speech acts. A choral character comments and exposes dramatic subject, time, and setting and describes the events happening offstage directly to the audience. A choral character in a play refers to a person within the play who stands apart from the action and by his comments provides the audience with a special perspective (Abrams 2000:36) through which the other characters and events are viewed. This channel of communication is used to enable the audience to understand the characters' world better than they do themselves. Chorus intends to help the audience for the thorough understanding of the play. In Hayavadana, Bhagavata is a choral character. He lets the audience know or informs that the “two youths who dwell in the city are our heroes”. One is Devadatta, who is the son of the Revered Brahmin Vidyasagara. He has excelled all the scholars in the world with his poetry and wit. He is the “apple of every eye” in the city. The other youth is Kapila, the son of the iron-smith Lohita. He is dark, plain, courageous and “in strengths and in physical skills, he has no equal”. He further states that-

BHAGAVATA: The world wonders at their friendship. The world sees these two young men wandering down the streets of Dharmpura, hand in hand, and remembers Lava and Kusha, Rama and Lakshmana, Krishna and Balarama.

(Act 1: 2)
BHAGAVATA \textit{sings}: Two friends there were- one mind, one heart.
They saw a girl and forgot themselves. But
they could not understand the song she sang.

FEMALE CHORUS \textit{sings}: Why should love stick to the sap of a single
body? When the stem is drunk with the thick yearning of
the many-petalled, many-flowered lantana, why should
it be tied down to the relation of a single flower.

BHAGAVATA \textit{sings}: They forgot themselves and took off their bodies.
And she took the laughing heads, and held them high
so the pouring blood bathed her, coloured her red. Then
she danced around and sang. \hfill (Act 1: 11)

Bhagavata provides the audience with the background and necessary details of the
characters Devadatta, Kapila and Padmini as above. He wants audience to grasp his
words for the thorough understanding of the play. He uses the constative utterances
in which audience do believe and as the play unfolds these utterances prove to be
performative. Whatever Bhagavata tells audience happens in the play. The world of
the play is created according to the laconic design of his observation. Here language
dictates life, and tragedy discloses the reality of the social world.

2.3 \textbf{Expressive Speech Act}

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, blessing, cursing, congratulation, praises, joy, sorrow, likes,
dislikes, pleasure, pains etc. Some of these occurred in the selected plays are enlisted
below.

The play \textit{Tughlaq} opens with some citizens discussing the state of affairs in the
country in front of the chief court of Justice in Delhi. An old man expresses his view
about the affairs. He says -
OLD MAN: God, what’s this country coming to!

YOUNG MAN: What are you worried about, grandfather?

The country’s in perfectly safe hands-safer than
any you’ve seen before.  

(Scene i: 1)

The utterance by the old man is an illustration of expressive speech act. To say something is to do something (Austin 1960:12). By saying an utterance, the Old Man has created the context or situation delineating that something wrong or unforeseen is happening in the country.

Linguistically speaking, what the old man has done in uttering this exclamation is: he has made use of English sounds and put them in particular sequence so as to produce words. The words he utters appear in a systematic sequence. As far as the grammar part of this utterance is concerned, he has chosen an exclamatory form. Thus, the production of the utterance involves syntagmatic or paradigmatic choices. The Old Man could have said the same thing in a variety of ways: ‘It is a very worst situation in this country’; ‘God, save this country from the danger’; ‘It is difficult to survive in this country’; ‘No one can live in this country’ and so on. There are several possibilities. But there must be some reason for the choice of an exclamatory form. Probably the reason is interpersonal or social. The word or phrase is selected for utterance on the basis of maximum salience (Kecskes: 2013). The Old Man has made use of the hinting strategy. He has pointed his finger at something which he believes to be unspeakable, unmentionable and unpleasant. The Old Man has produced an utterance that refers to somebody and something. This is called a prediction or a proposition act (Searle 2011:24). Utterance acts consist simply in uttering strings of words. Illocutionary and propositional acts consist characteristically in uttering words in sentences in certain contexts, under certain conditions and with certain intentions (ibid). The Old Man has produced an utterance in a specific polity-socio-cultural context. That gives a special significance to his words.

The possibilities we have mentioned above are the implications of his utterance. He has commented on the country’s state of affairs. This suggestivity is called the illocutionary aspect of an utterance. The intended message of an utterance is
appropriately understood by the people present there. The Old Man’s comment has affected the Young Man. He responds and mentions that there is nothing to worry about. The country is in perfectly safe hands. The effect of the Old Man’s comment on the Young man and others is called perlocutionary effect. In this dialogue, old man’s expression about the affairs in the country is pessimistic. Young man’s response to it is rather optimistic. This adjacency pair of expressions creates positive and negative opinions about the affairs in the country. Every utterance, as Dorothea Franck (1979) thinks, produces a state of conversation in which a set of continuation options is established by the conversational partners. Further, the characters in the context talk for and against the state of conversation and a set of continuation options SCO, is established.

In literary texts, especially in drama, characters commune with one another. What the character expresses reveals its nature. In Hayavadana, Padmini keeps a secret desire for Kapila. It is exposed as she waits Kapila to visit her house. When he comes there she hops around him twittering ‘Kapila! Kapila!’ every minute. However, Devadatta doesn’t like Kapila’s presence in their house. He expects that Kapila should keep himself away from their married life.

DEVADATTA: But shouldn’t he realize I’m married now? He just can’t go on as before ...

PADMINI: Don’t blame him. It’s my fault. He learnt a bit about poetry from you and I thought he might enjoy Bhasa. So I asked him to come... He didn’t want to-but I insisted. (Act 1: 24)

Devadatta, Padmini and Kapila decide to go to Ujjain for a trip. First, she denies trip for the satisfaction of Devadatta on account of her headache. But Padmini is very ambitious to achieve her inner desire. She likes to be in the company of Kapila. When Kapila comes with a cart Devadatta tells him to call off the trip due to Padmini’s headache. But Padmini very immediately gets ready to go for Ujjain trip. She becomes ready to go without any consent of her husband. Also, her consent for trip shows her reason of headache is false, as she says:
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 his mouth to say something but stays quiet]

KAPILA: No. really, if you have a headache….

PADMINI: I don’t have a headache now! (Act 1: 22)

As aforementioned, expressive conversational acts by Padmini reveals the fact that how Padmini changes her commitment to achieve company of her lover Kapila. Due to Padmini’s behaviour, Devadatta gets disappointed even though he agrees for the trip to comfort Padmini. In their trip to Ujjain, Devadatta, Padmini and Kapila take some rest under a tree. Padmini shows her desire for Kapila’s iron body as she observes him, from the very close side when he goes to bring “the Fortunate lady’s flower that is meant for a married woman…”

PADMINI [watching him, to herself]: How he climbs – like an ape. His dhoti up and swung up the branch. And what an ethereal shape! Such a broad back- like an ocean with muscles rippling across it- and then that small, feminine waist which looks so helpless.

...

PADMINI[aside]: He is like a Celestial Being reborn as a hunter.

... How his body sways, his limbs curve-it’s a dance almost.

...

PADMINI[aside]: No woman could resist him. (Act 1: 25-26)

The aforesaid discussed expressive speech acts by Padmini, in the form of aside, create a perlocutionary effect on the audience by letting them know her inner feelings. Audience comes to know that Padmini has a secret desire for Kapila. Aside is a special form of speech in drama. Asides are spoken away from other characters the play, and a character either speaks aside to himself, to (an)other character(s) secretly or to the audience.
Similarly, following two asides by Devadatta help the audience to know that Padmini possesses a secret desire for Kapila, and Devadatta is acquainted with this fact. He says:

DEVADATTA [aside]: No woman could resist him – and what does it matter that she is married? What a fool I’ve been... (Act 1: 26)

And when Padmini and Kapila go to visit the Rudra temple leaving Devadatta alone, he decides to go to the temple of Kali to offer his head as he has promised to do after getting Padmini. He says:

DEVADATTA: Good-bye, Kapila. Good-bye, Padmini. May the Lord Rudra bless you. You are the two pieces of my heart-live happily together. I shall find my happiness in that.

(Act 1: 28)

*Wedding Album* has an incident where Vivan, a prematurely adult thirteen year young boy, living in neighbour, gets physically attracted towards Hema, a woman of his mother’s age. She has come to attend the marriage ceremony of her sister Vidula Nadkarni. Vivan first expresses his feeling towards her through love letters. But Hema doesn’t like it. For the second time, when he comes to Nadkarni’s house to return the books taken for reading, he offers one more letter. There following utterances are exchanged between them. These utterances exemplify expressive speech act.

HEMA: What am I to do with you? If someone reads it ...
VIVAN: Let them. It’s all true. Every word.
HEMA: Such filth. Filth. I have no time now. But are you going to stop this nonsense or shall I tell your mother.
VIVAN: Go ahead. I’ll tell her I love you. The moment I saw you the other day, I fell desperately in love. I want to die kissing you. I want to die with my hand inside your blouse ...
Hema slaps him on his cheek. Not too hard. It is in fact a very helpless gesture. She then recoils scared by her own violence.)

HEMA: Such dirty stuff.

VIVAN: Hit me. The touch of your hand fills me with ecstasy. I’m crazy about you.  

(Scene iv: 45)

Vivan’s bold statements ‘I want to die kissing you’, ‘I want to die with my hand inside your blouse’ express his hunger for sex. He is in his pubic age. He takes interest in reading books like Lady Chatterley’s Lover and Madame Bovary which discusses sex and related things explicitly. However, Hema doesn’t like Vivan’s behaviour. She tries to threaten Vivan by saying ‘But are you going to stop this nonsense or shall I tell your mother’ doesn’t at all create any effect on Vivan. Like a filmy hero he says, “Go ahead. I’ll tell her I love you.”

Old Stone Mansion is full of expressive speech act where various characters express their psychological states, apology, joy, sorrow, likes, dislikes, pleasure, pains etc. Two are quoted for the sake of study. Sudhir and Bhaskar argue over the matter of ancestral property and its consumption after the death of their father Vyenkatesh. Aai’s ‘dislike’ for it is an example of expressive speech act. She says-

AAI: It’s not even ten days yet. What do you think we look like? Does it suit us to bicker like this?  

(Act 2, sc i: 173)

Aai’s intention is to stop her sons Bhaskar, Sudhir and Chandoba from quarrelling. Her intention is defeated as the three brothers go on arguing without paying any attention to Aai.

Ranju, Bhaskar’s daughter elopes with her teacher in the village. Sudhir finds her out from Bombay and brings back home. He saves the family from the social dishonour. The utterances exchanged between Bhaskar and Sudhir are expressive speech acts.

BHASKAR: Sudhir, how can I ever repay you for what you’ve done.  
SUDHIR: Let’s just forget it, Bhau. It’s over and done with
BHASKAR: The younger brother has become the elder and the elder younger today.

SUDHIR: We have found Ranju. Nothing else matters.

(Act 2, sc iii : 192)

Bhaskar feels very much obliged as Sudhir brings Ranju back from Bombay. He expresses his feelings of respect for his younger brother through the utterance “The younger brother has become the elder and the elder younger today”. He feels as if he is in debt to his younger brother and he can never repay it. Sudhir’s responses “Let’s just forget it, Bhau. It’s over and done with” and “We have found Ranju. Nothing else matters” express his sense of maturity and affection about family members.

Sonata has many instances of expressive speech acts. Aruna, a teacher by profession comments on the papers which she is assessing. She doesn’t like Dolon, her friend and flat partner, collecting empty bottles of perfume and expects her to prepare something for the dinner. Utterances exchanged between them illustrate expressive speech acts.

ARUNA: Throw that junk out. What’s this silly attachment to empty bottles?

... 

DOLON: Why do these empty bottles irritate you so much? They are so beautiful. Throw them out! And what do I keep in their place?

Vicks Vaporub? Iodex? (Pause.) Come on. Let’s cook something.

(Act 1: 247-48)

The utterances shared between Aruna and Dolon express former’s dislike for perfume bottles and later’s dislike for” Vicks Vaporub” and “Iodex” respectively. Aruna has natural antipathy for the empty bottles of perfume. As the cultural destinations are different Dolon cannot tolerate Aruna’s vehement reaction of the bottles and gives Aruna a judgemental lesson: “Why do these empty bottles irritate you so much? They are so beautiful. Throw them out! And what do I keep in their place? Vicks Vaporub? Iodex?” Her statement “Let’s cook something” shows that Aruna’s desire that Dolon should cook something for the dinner is also not fulfilled.
Reflection has an incidence where, HE worries over the loss of his reflection. What HE says is an instance of expressive speech act.

WOMAN: Forget it! It makes no difference.
HE: True. It doesn’t. But I can’t bear the idea of living without it. Even the loss of limb is okay. One manages somehow. But how can you live without your reflection, even if it is useless?
WOMAN: Don’t allow such thoughts to enter your mind. Allow only good thoughts to come in.
HE: What do you mean allow? Do you think thoughts are sheep or cattle to be brought in by their ears? (Act 1: 211)

Protagonist HE cannot bear the idea of living without reflection. His above cited expressions shows his mental condition. He feels one can live, if one loses any part of the body. It is not possible to live without one’s own reflection though it has no any significance. Due to his loss of reflection he cannot think about anything good. When Woman advises him “Allow only good thoughts to come in” his reaction shows that he is not in a state to think anything good or bad. This loss of reflection shows his alienation from every aspect of human existence. The other characters like the Girl, Flags and the Woman all have accepted their fragmented, desolated existence and are trying to live in it, with it. But Man is unable to accept his situation and still lives in the modernist nostalgia, dreaming of a definite, well-structured human existence which is not possible anymore.

2.4 Commissive Speech Act

Commissives, as Austin (1962:150) mentions, are typified by promising or otherwise undertaking; they commit you to doing something. They express what the speaker intends. They include promises, threats, refusals, pledges, vows, guaranteeing etc. Following are the instances of commissive speech acts performed by various characters from the plays under study.

Tughlaq’s Step-Mother, in Tughlaq, is worried about his decisions. She feels that Tughlaq may face some danger due to his improper decisions. She shares her feelings
with Barani, a historian. Through the following utterance Barani promises Step-Mother that he will not leave Tughlaq in any situation.

STEP-MOTHER: It’s not that. It’s just that I don’t like so
of his advisers and friends. (Suddenly.) Please
promise me not to leave him-ever-whatever he does.
BARANI (overwhelmed to the point of tears): May God help me
to retain such confidence unaltered. I won’t leave His Majesty,
Your Highness, I promise you. I love him too much to do that.

(Scene ii: 17)

Here, Barani makes a promise and a commitment to himself. His promise has put some obligation on him. In future he is bound to behave or suit his action to his words. In the course of action ahead in drama, Barani proves the fact that he is loyal to Tughlaq.

In Hayavadana, Devadatta falls for Padmini. He promises Lord Rudra and Mother Kali to offer his head and his hands respectively, if he gets Padmini. It is a model of Commissive speech act.

DEVADATTA: . . . Lord Rudra, I meant what I said.
If I get her my head will be a gift to you.
Mother Kali, I’ll sacrifice my arms to you. I swear . . .

(Act 1:16)

After marriage, Devadatta, Padmini and Kapila arrange a trip to Ujjain. On their way, Kapila and Padmini go to visit Rudra temple and Devadatta rests under a tree. There he remembers his words of offering his head to Mother Kali after getting Padmini as wife. Being a true devotee, Devadatta remains truthful to his words and by offering his head to Mother Kali fulfils his self commitment.

Wedding Album has an event in which Vidula is in a cyber cafe seeing pornography. Two hooligan youths forcefully enter in the cafe and try to threaten an attendant there
and Vidula. Expressions of threatening exchanged among them illustrate commissive speech act.

ATTENDANT: You can’t come in here! You have no right!
YOUTH 1: Try and stop us. (Scene vi: 68)

Vidula’s reaction to it is-

VIDULA (to the attendant): Please call the police. My uncle, Ramdas
   Nadkarni, he is the Police Commissioner. Will you call the police
   or shall I call him? I’ll show these swine. They think they can attack
   a woman in broad daylight and get away?
ATTENDANT: Madam, madam, not the police, please. I’ll handle this.
   Now are you two getting out or not?
VIDULA (Screaming): Get out of here, you bloody bull-shitters. If you
   don’t fuck off this minute... (Scene vi: 71)

Vidula gets angry and threatens the two boys to go away otherwise she will call the police. Her statement ‘I’ll show these swine’ is a commissive speech act through which she warns those boys to move away otherwise she will call the police. To see her temper, attendant gets frightened and requests her not to call the police. He manages the two boys and drags them away. Thus, the intended effect of making the boys go away is achieved.

In Old Stone Mansion, Sudhir’s promise to Vahini of taking Parag to Bombay is a commissive speech act.

SUDHIR: I’ll take him to Mumbai for a few days. (Act 1, sc iii: 154)

Towards the end of the play, we realize that Sudhir and Anjali decide not to take Parag to Bombay as their son, Abhay makes fun of Parag. Besides, Sudhir feels that Parag should be in the home as their family is under tension due to Ranju’s elopement with her teacher.
In *Sonata*, Dolon decides to go on diet. Her utterance is an instance of commissive speech act.

DOLON: ... I am going on a diet now.

(Pause.)

ARUNA: Not so loudly.

DOLON: What?

ARUNA: Someone might hear.

DOLON: I really am serious this time.

(Act 1:248-49)

Dolon takes drinks and is fond of eating various things, so Aruna doesn’t have faith in her words, her reaction “Someone might hear” shows that Dolon has made such promises many a times. Dolon strengthens her commissive speech act by stating “I really am serious this time”.

2.5 **Directive Speech Act**

Directives are the speech acts, where the speakers use to get the addressee or someone else to do something as a response. As Yarahmadi and Olfati (2011) mention many directive sentences are posed as questions so they are easy to identify by the presence of a question mark. However, some sentences that end in question marks are rhetorical in nature and do not represent a directive speech act. Directives express what the speaker wants. They are commands, orders, requests, warning, urging, appointing, and voting which can be positive or negative. Similarly, advice, invite and permit are the directives. Directives or exercitives are, as Austin puts (1962:150), the exercising of powers, rights or influence.

Following statements of orders to his servants by sultan Muhammad is an example of directive speech act.

Muhammad: . . .

Go at once and tell the Vizier I want everyone here - all the Khans, Amirs, Sardars – everyone – and at once!

(Scene iii: 19)
Muhammad Tughlaq is a king. Being an authority, he is in a position to direct or command his soldiers. Hence his commands are always obeyed by his fellowmen.

In *Hayavadana*, Devadatta falls for Padmini. Kapila decides to turn every throne to get Padmini’s hand for Devadatta. When Kapila goes to Padmini’s house, he happens to meet her at the door. He asks Padmini to call her father. His statement is a kind of directive speech act.

**KAPILA** [desperate]: Please, please – call your father or the master or both, or if they are the same, anyone . . . please call someone!  
(Act 1: 18)

*Wedding Album* has an instance of directive speech act where the Nadkarni family is sending their daughter Vidula’s marriage proposal to a young boy working in America. As per the tradition in India, the boy is supposed to visit girl’s family and see the girl for marriage. But the boy living in USA cannot come due to his busy schedule, so a video giving Vidula’s introduction is prepared to send on the boy’s demand. There Vidula introduces/describes herself before a camera handled by her brother Rohit. Following interaction takes place between them.

**ROHIT** *(offscreen)*: Why don’t you smile a bit? Look cheerful.
**VIDULA**: Am I looking depressed?
**ROHIT** *(offscreen)*: No. No. But cheer up. Look happy. Shall we start again?
**VIDULA** *(aghast)*: Again? Absolutely not.
(Act 1: 18)

**ROHIT** *(offscreen)*: I know. But remember, you are trying to show your best face to him.
**VIDULA**: I am not. I just want him to know what I am like.
**ROHIT** *(offscreen)*: But don’t go out of your way to make yourself unattractive
(Pause)
**VIDULA** *(visibly upset, speaks directly into the camera)*: I am not glamorous, as you can see. I am not exceptional in any way. I don’t want you to be disappointed later.
(The camera swings away from her, showing a corner of the living room at some lopsided angle)
ROHIT (offscreen): Look, we can’t possibly send this tape to him.

(Scene i: 5-6)

In the dialogue between Vidula and Rohit, Rohit insists his sister to smile a bit and to look cheerful while she is being shoted in a video for the purpose to show it to her fiancé. But intended effect or perlocutionary act is not achieved as it becomes apparent through the speech acts of Vidula that she doesn’t want to show off. Vidula’s resentment and uneasiness seems clear in the above dialogue. She wants to be a sincere woman to tell her fiancé that she is not glamorous at all. She is not exceptional in any way and don’t want him to be disappointed later. And she denies reshooting later, in spite of persistence by her dear brother.

Further, in her enragement Vidula goes on telling the truths about her family. But when she tells some facts related with family truths Rohit disagrees, asking her if she is trying to impress him or scare him off.

VIDULA: …

Apparently there was another brother between Hema and Rohit.
He was retarded. Mentally. Don’t know what she died of.
ROHIT (offscreen): Listen! Are you trying to impress him or scarce him off?
VIDULA (to Rohit): Let him know the whole truth. Perhaps he is a believer in genetics. Heredity. (To the camera) You know how it is.
There are some things no one talks about in the family. (Scene i: 7)

Vidula’s speech acts in the above dialogue clearify that she doesn’t get affected by Rohit’s idea of creating impression on her would-be-husband. She is firm to tell the truths to her fiancé. There is no perlocutionary effect of Rohit’s insistence on her. Vidula is modern, so she knows that it has been a great curse of the marriage institution that truths are never told by either sides or if at all they are told, they are not accepted by either sides and this leads to the settlement of marriage based on bare falseness which results into an unhappy conjugal life after marriage (Avachar 2012).
Pratibha and Rohit are working in a Telly-serial Production office. She invites Rohit and his wife Tapasya for dinner. It is directive speech act.

PRATIBHA: . . .

You must let me know when Tapasya is back. You two must come and have dinner with Irfan and me. Bye.

(Moves to the door and stops.)

And oh, yes, bring the baby along, please. We both love kids.

(Exits. A Long pause.)

ROHIT: Bitch!  

(Scene v: 61-62)

Rohit’s response ‘Bitch’ shows that he is not at all willing to accept Pratibha’s invitation and abuses her for her behaviour. To understand this speech act we need contextual clarification. Rohit and Isabel are working in Pratibha’s office. Isabel has recently joined Pratibha’s office. Rohit had an affair with Isabel but marries Tapasya. Tapasya has gone to her parents as she is going to have a baby. Seeking the proper time, Rohit phones Isabel twice to talk to her to “remove any bitterness she might harbour”. When Pratibha comes to know about this fact, she cross examines Rohit about what went wrong. While concluding the scene Pratibha feels that Rohit has mentally harassed Isabel and expects him not to disturb Isabel. Further, she invites Rohit for the dinner when Tapasya returns with a baby. Rohit feels insulted as Pratibha has questioned him about his treatment to Isabel. He thinks over it for a while and out of that enragement he uses the abusing word ‘Bitch’ revealing his disliking for her.

In Wedding Album, after marriage, when the Nadkarnis make preparations to send Vidula to USA, Rohit and Hema try to advice Vidula. Rohit says:

ROHIT: What she is trying to tell is if at any moment you wish to divorce Ashwin and come back, don’t hesitate to do so.

HEMA: Leave him and come back, if you feel like it. You are timid. We don’t want you to suffer in silence for fear of what people here will say. Or what we will feel. We are with you on anything you decide.
(Pause)
ROHIT: We live in a modern world. A divorce is okay. It’s no shame.

(Pause)
VIDULA (calmly): I’ll never divorce Ashwin. (Scene ix: 86)

Vidula listens Rohit and Hema but remains unaffected. Her response “I’ll never divorce Ashwin” shows that she has taken a firm decision of living with Ashwin. It shows that Ashwin’s speech has created a perlocutionary effect on Vidula. They meet in a restaurant before marriage. There Ashwin makes clear his expectations from marriage and wife. He says that he is living in a rich country like USA but the American culture is empty of values. He wants his wife to be a partner carrying the best of our spiritual tradition. He expects 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. Following speech act by Vidula shows that Ashwin’s speech has created a perlocutionary effect on Vidula. She says:

VIDULA: Ashwin may not speak much. But he was clear about what he expected from marriage. I agreed with him. I gave him my word.

(Scene ix: 86)

In Old Stone Mansion, Sudhir’s family is waiting for Sudhir and his wife Anjali who are coming from Mumbai as Sudhir’s father has passed away. Aai is very much worried and emotionally intense to meet Sudhir. Following urging remark by Aai, addressed to Prabha, is an example of directive speech act.

AAI (to Prabha): Tell Chandu to take another look at the bus stop dear...
PRABHA: The last bus must have come and gone, Aai. Why don’t you sleep? They’ll be here tomorrow. ... (Act 1, sc i: 134)

Aai’s remark shows that she is eagerly waiting for her son and his wife. She becomes restless and asks her daughter Prabha to tell Chandu to go to bus stop. Prabha is
supposed to behave as per Aai’s expectations but instead her response “The last bus must have come and gone, Aai. Why don’t you sleep? They’ll be here tomorrow” shows that the mother’s intentional effect is not achieved.

Sonata begins with a directive speech act where Aruna asks her friend Dolon to stop the noisy activity of putting the room in order as she is getting disturbed while assessing the papers.

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

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! (Act 1: 246)

In above cited dialogue, though Aruna asks Dolon to stop her noisy activity, she goes on doing bustle. Further, she asks Aruna whether she has found her newly purchased perfume. Aruna feels annoyed as Dolon is not positively responding to her and asking her about the perfume. Her response ‘How she ignores me, meli!’ shows that Dolon is not at all behaving as per Aruna’s intention.

Reflection has following instance of directive speech act. HE happens to lose his reflection in the mirror. Amazed HE, directs WOMAN to see in the bathroom mirror.

HE: ...Will you come and have a look at the mirror in the bathroom please?

WOMAN: What for?

HE: Please.

WOMAN: I must know why.

HE: I say, please.

WOMAN: I refuse to enter a man’s bathroom.

HE: Please the mirror.
WOMAN: Oh, all right. What do I do with the mirror?
HE: Tell me what you see there. (ACT 1: 204)

When the protagonist HE cannot find his reflection in the mirror, he asks the Woman to ‘have a look at the mirror in the bathroom’. He feels that something is wrong with the mirror. At first the woman refuses ‘to enter a man’s bathroom’ but when he requests her to look at the mirror she agrees to behave as per his direction.

2.6 Declarative Speech Act

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). The class includes betting, declaring, resigning, passing a sentence, appointing, nominating, giving judgement etc. These speech acts are uncommon.

Following remarks by Muhammad is an illustration of declarative speech act. Being the supreme authority, the Sultan or the king of the state, he takes the decisions of shifting his capital and introducing copper coins in his state.

MUHAMMAD: ... Later this year the capital of my empire will be moved
From Delhi to Daulatabad. (Scene i: 3)

In Scene eight, we realise that the capital has been shifted from Delhi to Daulatabad.

One more instance of declarative speech act is as follows.

MUHAMMAD: ... From next year, we shall
have copper currency in our empire along with the
silver dinars. (Scene vi: 39)
As per Tughlaq’s orders, copper coins too are introduced in his state. It is revealed through the speech acts from the following scenes.

In *Hayavadana*, The married couple decides to go out for picnic along with Kapila. To Devadatta’s great surprise Kapila and Padmini go to the Rudra temple. Remembering his pledge Devadatta offers his head to the Goddess Kali. On return Kapila is shocked to see the dead body of his friend and as a true friend decides 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 Padmini attaches Devadatta’s head to Kapila’s body and vice-versa. After regaining the life, Devadatta and Kapila quarrel over the right to own Padmini. Which head or body should possess Padmini is a question that they cannot easily settle. They seek the advice of a rishi or hermit. Hermit’s ‘words’ narrated by the choral character Bhagavata is an example of declarative speech act. This declaration brings a change in the life of Devadatta, Padmini and Kapila.

**BHAGAVATA:** ... As the heavenly Kalpa Vriksha is supreme among trees, so is the Head among human limbs. Therefore the man with Devadatta’s head is indeed Devadatta and he is the rightful husband of Padmini. (Act 2: 40)

As per the decision given by rishi or the hermit, Devadatta, Padmini and Kapila follow his decisions. Devadatta and Padmini live again as husband and wife and Kapila lives a solitary life in the forest.

Listeners do believe or disbelieve in what a speaker says because listeners interpret what a speaker says in the light of immediate situation or context. Listeners, as Thorat (2002:37) proposes, interpret utterances in specific ways.

**Step One:** On hearing an utterance, listeners identify the speech act, propositional content, and thematic content
Step Two: They next search their memory for information that matches the given information.

Step Three: Finally, depending on the speech act, they deal with the new information:

a. If the utterance is an assertion, they add new information to their memory;
b. if the utterance is a yes/no question, they compare the new information with what is in their memory and depending on the match, answer yes or no;
c. if the utterance is a ‘wh’ question, they retrieve the wanted information from their memory and compose an answer conveying that information;
d. if the utterance is a request, they carry out the action necessary to make the new information true.

Sentences can be used to let somebody know something, ask them about something, warn them about or request them to do something. Each of these must have content to convey the ideas speakers want to. So, a very important function of sentences is to specify the ideas around which a speech act is built. These ideas are conveyed by the propositional content, sometime called the ideational content, of a sentence. Of course, if listeners are ever to grasp these ideas, this content must fit people’s requirements for what is a proper idea. The propositional content of a sentence is nothing more than the combination of propositions it expresses. Propositions, as wholes, have one of three basic functions:

- they denote states or events
- they denote facts about states or events; and
- they qualify parts of other propositions.

In short, the propositional structure of a sentence is used to denote the objects, states, events, and facts that make up the core ideas behind a sentence. Because the propositions themselves are not present in surface structure, it falls on the words, phrases and clauses to make clear what propositions are being expressed. Speech itself is linear. Words follow one another in succession as they are uttered. Therefore, the expression of propositions is forced into a single line. And this is what makes sentences complex. For speakers, the problem is how to reconstruct the underlined...
propositions in strings of words. For listeners, the problem is how to reconstruct the underlined propositions (ibid).

In day-to-day conversation, this task is not much difficult. When speakers speak, listeners can understand the message as they hear and at the same time see and feel what has been communicated via speech. Verbal and non-verbal factors and context of the speech is shared by the communication partners. In drama, speech or dialogue creates verbal, non-verbal and a fictional context. It is shared by the characters speaking to one (each) another (other) and at the same time by the audience. What dramatic speech shares with ordinary speech in an everyday dialogue is the fact that it is intimately bound up with the immediate context or situation that the participant in the dialogue find themselves in (pfister 2000:103).

2.7 Direct and Indirect Speech Acts: Levels, Degrees and Comparisons

Speaking is engaging in a rule governed form of behaviour. Talking is performing acts according to rules (Searle 2011:22). 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. Yule (2011:54) says that whenever there is direct relationship between a structure and a function, it is a direct speech act. A direct speech act is one where there is no attempt to save the face of the addressees. It is a bland, plain, ordinary way of saying things. An indirect speech act is a kind of circumlocution, an attempt to save the face of the addressee. It means that one can do things or get them done either in a direct way or in an indirect manner.

The ‘how’ of one’s utterance is dependent upon who says what to whom, when, where and why. The linguistic act of realization of a speech act is determined by a number of factors such as linguistic resources available, interpersonal relationship, social taboos, nature of the topic, presence or absence of a third party, shared knowledge; and so on. The linguistic resources include lexical items, phrasal and syntactic structures. The plays under study exhibit indirectness at all the levels as mentioned above.
The interpersonal relationship between the addressee and the addressee is governed by the two major principles of solidarity and power. The conversational partners may be on good or bad terms or their relationship may be characterized by neutrality. In other words, the interactants may be friends or enemies or strangers. The intimacy or distance in terms of relationship influences their conversational moves. Moreover, the addressee and the addressee are not like islands. They live in a speech community and internalize the rules and regulations of the language that their speech community uses. As language is inseparable from the social realities which bind the interlocutors, they cannot lose the sight of what is regarded as decent and indecent, pleasant and unpleasant, appropriate and inappropriate, acceptable and unacceptable, within the bounds of speech community. There are socially acceptable ways of saying things as there are socially prohibited ways of doing so. The traditions and customs of the community at all times impinge upon the linguistic behaviour of speakers and hearers. Conversational analysis from the selected plays helps to negotiate the role relationship, power solidarity, the exchange of turns in a conversation, and the use of direct or indirect speech acts among the conversational partners. Let us take the case of terms of address and reference. The interpersonal relationship between the addressee and the addressee determines the use of direct and indirect speech acts. In Indian culture, elderly people address the younger people directly with their names. However, younger people are referred indirectly if they are at high rank or position from social, political, religious and economical point of view. In Tughlaq, Step-Mother being elderly and politically possessing an important position addresses king Tughlaq with his first name Muhammad. Similarly, Muhammad Tughlaq addresses and refers other people as Najib, Barani, Ain-ul-Mulk, Shihab-ud-din, Ratansingh and so on. This is the direct way of mentioning people. King Tughlaq is addressed and referred as Vizier Muhammad, His Majesty, Your Majesty, Sultan, Your Highness, the Slave of the Lord, the Upholder of the word of Prophet, the Merciful and the ever-Victorious, and Tughlaq’s step-mother as Her Highness, the Queen Mother. In Scene seven, Aziz disguised as Brahmin Vishnu Prasad is addressed and referred, as Sir, Your Excellency and Your Holiness these are indirect way of referring and addressing people. We find such expressions to refer people because Tughlaq is primarily a historical play. These expressions do not need contextual support to reveal the relationship of the speaker with the hearer. They explicitly tell us that the speaker is in
In some way or the other inferior to the hearer. In Hayavadana, Devadatta and Kaplia refer each other directly i.e. with their names where as Kapila refers Padmini in an indirect way as sister-in-law (23). In Wedding Album, Rohit addresses his boss in the office as Pratibhaji (8); and Vidula, as Hemakka, to Hema (11). Mother is referred as Ma (13) and father, as Appa (26), by the family members. Hema’s husband is referred as brother-in-law by Vidula and Rohit (26). These indirect ways of referring to people, show a sense of regard. The housemaid is referred indirectly as Radhabai by the family members (12). In Old Stone Mansion, the typical terms are used to refer the family members. Vyenkatesh, the father in the family, who is no more, is referred as Tatyaji; and the mother, as Aai (137). Chandu, Sudhir and Prabha refer their elder brother Bhaskar, as ‘bhau’ (153) and his wife, as Vahini (145). Bhaskar’s wife addresses Chandu, Sudhir and Prabha as Chandu-bhauji (145), Sudhir-bhauji (139) and Vansa (166) respectively. In Maharashtra or in Marathi culture, a wife has to address her husband as ‘He’; the brother of her husband as ‘bhauji’ and sister as ‘vansa’. Anjali (149) and Aai (181) refer their respective husbands as ‘He’. However, the children of the family use to call ‘kaka’ (146) and ‘kaku’ (159) to their father’s brother and his wife. Bhaskar refers Sudhir, and his wife Anjali, as brother-in-law and sister-in-law, while talking to Vahini (135). This is typically an Indian mode of referring and addressing people. Bhaskar, though the elder brother of Sudhir, doesn’t address him directly with his first name. While speaking with his wife Vahini, he uses indirect term of reference your ‘brother-in-law’ for Sudhir. These indirect terms of address and reference, demonstrate the sense of reverence towards the family members. In Reflection, ‘HE’ refers to ‘Woman’, his hostess, indirectly as ‘Bai’. In Sonata, three women who are the protagonists of the play and good friends, refer one another directly with their names as Aruna, Dolon and Subhadra. However, they refer one another in terms of endearment as Aru (263), Dolo (281) and Shubhi (258) when they are in light jolly mood. All these terms of address and reference, explain the relationship between the speakers and hearers. Indirect expression like ‘He’, is used by a wife to address and refer to her husband. In Old Stone mansion, ‘He’ is used by Anjali for her husband, Sudhir; and by Aai, for her husband, Vyenkatesh. It needs contextual support to reveal the relationship between speaker and hearer. It means it is difficult to specify the relationship between the addressee and the addressee merely on the basis of expressions in their decontextualized form. It is true that Anjali and Aai...
use the expression ‘He’ to refer and address their husbands but *He* belongs to the category of pronoun and it can be used by anyone virtually. There is no necessary inherent or logical connection between the form of address and reference and the role of the speaker.

In Indian culture, people usually try and avoid direct reference to certain activities such as death, murder, sexual act, prostitution, body functions et-cetera. Following dialogues from the plays under consideration exemplify it.

In *Tughlaq*, in Scene ii, Ain-ul-Mulk, Tughlaq’s childhood companion is reported to be marching on Delhi. Following conversation takes place between Muhammad Tughlaq and his Step-Mother.

MUHAMMAD: Mother, suppose I die fighting Ain-ul-Mulk-
STEP-MOTHER: Stop it!
MUHAMMAD: No, really. Suppose I die in the battle.

What of it? Why should I waste my last few days worrying? I am not worried about my enemies. I’m only worried about my people.

STEP-MOTHER: Pompous ass! As though other kings didn’t do that.
MUHAMMAD: No, they didn’t. Look at the past Sultans of Delhi. They couldn’t bear the weight of their crown. They couldn’t leave it aside. So they died senile in their youth or were murdered.

STEP-MOTHER *(sharply)*: Please, Muhammad-
MUHAMMAD: What?
STEP-MOTHER: Nothing—I can’t bear to see you joking about murder.
MUHAMMAD: Why not?
STEP-MOTHER: I can’t. That’s all.

*Silence. They are both tense now.*

MUHAMMAD: So you too believe that piece of gossip!
STEP-MOTHER: What gossip?
MUHAMMAD *(mocking)*: What gossip? What scandal?

You know perfectly well what I mean.
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. The whole court believes it. My Amirs believe it. Why shouldn’t my step-mother believe it?
STEP-MOTHER (flaring up): Shut up, fool! I’ve told you I won’t have you calling me that!
MUHAMMAD (suddenly calm, but with deliberate viciousness):
I know but you are my step-mother!  (Scene ii: 11)

In the above conversation, Step-Mother avoids direct reference to his own death in the battle as mentioned by Tughlaq. She sharply tells Tughlaq not to make fun of the deaths and murders of the past Sultans. Similarly, people in Delhi and courtiers in the palace believe that Muhammad Tughlaq is guilty of assassinating his father and brother in order to grab the throne of the Sultan. Tughlaq knows that Step-Mother believes it but doesn’t accept it. The implications of the words ‘piece of gossip’, ‘scandal’, ‘anything of that kind’, and ‘it’ by Step-Mother and Tughlaq refer to the act of murdering for which Muhammad Tughlaq is held responsible. However, a direct reference to the act of murdering is avoided by both, Step-Mother and Tughlaq. Tughlaq directly and deliberately refers his stepmother by calling her ‘step-mother’. This direct address as ‘step-mother’ has flared her up. It shows lack of modesty and brutality on the part of the character of Tughlaq.

In *Old Stone Mansion*, one night Sudhir and Anjali are sitting on a stone ledge in the open yard. They exchange following utterances.

ANJALI: How hot it is! It gets hot as soon as the rain stops.
SUDHIRE: Sit near me.
ANJALI: Don’t get ideas.
SUDHIRE: Ideas?
ANJALI: What else? Out here in the open...
SUDHIRE: I wasn’t even thinking that way. It’s all in your mind.
(Pause.)
ANJALI: We are in mourning. You should remember that.
SUDHIR: Have we stopped eating and drinking because we are in mourning?
        Hunh?
ANJALI: Don’t get so desperate.
        (Laughs.)
SUDHIR (fuming): What’s making you grin?
ANJALI: Ranju is also another abnormal creature.
SUDHIR: How does Ranju come into this?
ANJALI: You might think she’s stupid, but she’s interested in things she
        shouldn’t be at her age. (Pause.) She was asking me about birth control
today.
SUDHIR: You should have shut her up. The bhaitaad.          (Act 2, sc ii: 176)

In the aforesaid conversation, Sudhir’s expression “Sit near me” is taken by Anjali as
a call for romance. She avoids it by using the expression “Don’t get ideas”. The word
“ideas” is indirectly referred here for romance. Anjali reminds him that they are in
mourning as Sudhir’s father has passed away, so he should control himself and
behave properly. Further, she informs Sudhir about Ranju’s abnormal behaviour. Her
indirect expression “she’s interested in things she shouldn’t be at her age” shows that
Ranju is taking interest in the things related with sexual intercourse which is not
appropriate at her age. Ranju is already attracted to her teacher. Probably she has
established physical relations with him so she makes enquiry about birth control to
Anjali. Sudhir’s utterance, “You should have shut her up. The bhaitaad”, shows that
in Indian culture things related with sexual acts and physical relations are not
discussed directly and openly. Generally, ladies avoid referring to birth, death,
pregnancy, menstruation, sexual and excretory activities and semen. In the families
children are not supposed to discuss such issues with parents or other family members
and vice versa.

*Wedding Album* has an incident where Vivan, a prematurely adult thirteen year young
boy, living in neighbour, gets physically attracted towards Hema, a woman of his
mother’s age. She has come to attend marriage ceremony of her sister Vidula. Vivan
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first expresses his feeling towards her through love letters. But Hema doesn’t like it. For the second time when he comes to Nadkarni’s house to return the books taken for reading, he offers one more letter where following utterances are exchanged between them.

HEMA: What am I to do with you? If someone reads it ...
VIVAN: Let them. It’s all true. Every word.
HEMA: Such filth. Filth. I have no time now. But are you going to stop this nonsense or shall I tell your mother.
VIVAN: Go ahead. I’ll tell her I love you. The moment I saw you the other day, I fell desperately in love. I want to die kissing you.
I want to die with my hand inside your blouse ...

(Hema slaps him on his cheek. Not too hard. It is in fact a very helpless gesture. She then recoils scared by her own violence.)
HEMA: Such dirty stuff.
VIVAN: Hit me. The touch of your hand fills me with ecstasy. I’m crazy about you.  

(Scene iv: 45)

In this situation, Hema’s indirect expressions, “If someone reads it ...”, “Such filth”, “stop this nonsense”, refer to the conduct of sexual attraction. She tries to handle the situation by threatening Vivan by telling it to her mother. But Vivan doesn’t care for that and very boldly uses the direct expressions of sexual acts such as “I want to die kissing you”, “I want to die with my hand inside your blouse ...” It shows that Vivan is a dirty boy who wants to have sexy relation with a woman of his mother’s age. As Avachar (2012) points out this is a moral lapse of our generation. This is an effect of carelessness of parents towards their children. They have gone beyond their reach, from where they could not return! Vivan stands first in his class, a brilliant boy, again a laptop user, techno savvy and a reader of “Madam Bovary” and “Lady Chatterley’s Lover”. Technology would be fruitful if it is used in right way; otherwise the world is destined to be destroyed. This is a curse in today’s modern and globalized world. Western ideas of free and open sex spread through internet are destroying our cultural values. Women are respected in Indian culture but Vivan represents today’s young generation, going away from cultural values and seeking woman as a mere object of
sexual gratification. It also shows how in the course of time, technological advancement is changing cultural values. The things which were implicitly discussed in the previous time have become very explicit today.

Sex is considered as matter of personal physical relationship between husband and wife. But technology has made available the virtual experience of sex through pornographic sites on the internet. In Scene six of the same play, Vidula a would-be bride visits internet cafe to browse pornographic sites. She is virtually engaged with Ananga. Their utterances exchanged through internet exhibit the virtual experience of lust for sex.

VIDULA: Go ahead. I am yours. All yours.
VOICE: Good take off your shawl.
(During the following dialogue, Vidula does not remove any piece of her clothing.)
VIDULA: Okay. Done.
VOICE: Now unbutton your blouse.
VIDULA: Not blouse. It’s called the kameez.
VOICE: I don’t care. Just take it off.
VIDULA (mimes the moves to get the timing right): I have
VOICE: Now the bra.
VIDULA: Okay. Hold on.
VOICE (more urgently): The bra.
(After a pause)
Have you taken it off?
VIDULA (in a strained voice): Wait. The hook’s at the back and it’s stuck.
VOICE: Hurry up, slut. Hurry up. I am all ...
VIDULA: Done. Done.
VOICE: Is it off? Is it?
VIDULA: Yes. Yes.
VOICE: You are bare-boobed, baby?
VIDULA: Yes.
VOICE: Caress them for me.
VIDULA (without making any movement): Uhuh.
VOICE: The left one first. It is smaller than the right one. It shouldn’t develop an inferiority complex.

VIDULA (laughs): There is nothing you don’t know about me.

VOICE: You bet. Are you caressing them?

VIDULA: Yes.

(She makes a moaning sound.)

They are both so happy.

VOICE: Now take off your skirt.


VOICE: Don’t give me the details, darkie. Just take them off.

VIDULA: Done, master.

VOICE: Where are the trousers now?

VIDULA: Round my feet.

VOICE: What are you wearing inside? Your black-and-white lace mini?

VIDULA: Oh, no. Not today. Today I have brought something special for you.


VIDULA: Purple thongs. Just for you.

VOICE: Good. Now take them off.


VOICE: What is it, darling?

VIDULA: Wait I am scared.

VOICE: Scared? Of what? This isn’t your first ...

VIDULA: Just scared. Suddenly. Please. Just wait. Suddenly I have the shivers. I am trembling. Wait till I tell you. (Scene vi: 67)

This example refers to a situation which involves two persons – Vidula and Ananga, a cyber character communicating through internet represented as Voice. Vidula is alone in the cabin and browsing pornographic site. In the above conversation, direct and bold expression coming through Voice on the internet exhibit the sensuous things very explicitly. Voice on the computer “Good take off your shawl”, “Now unbutton your blouse”, “Caress them for me”, “Now take off your skirt” et cetera instruct Vidula directly to do certain sensuous activities. Here Vidula is not at all actually or practically engaged in copulation. Vidula doesn’t unpertact any of her clothes but pretends to be behaving as per his directions. Sex and related things are not at all
discussed with the known or unknown person directly. The interpersonal relationship between Vidula and Ananga is virtual. They can’t experience each other directly, so they don’t get embarrassed while using erotic language directly. At the level of imagination through direct dialogues, Vidula secretly enjoys virtual or computer created and simulated experience of sensuous love with Ananga.

Generally, the use of taboo, obscene, sex related, and dirty words is determined on the basis of whether the situation falls in the public or the private domain and whether the linguistic discourse is formal or informal. Words designated by any of the above labels are usually avoided in formal language in the public domain. The greater the aura of respectability in any social situation, the stricter the ban on using prohibited words. In the present context, however, the language is informal and the domain is private and virtual.

The speaker’s use of direct or indirect speech acts depends on his or her relationship with the hearer. Social norms tell us that elderly people, friends and close relatives can afford to be direct in their speech. People use indirect speech strategies when they want to make their speech more interesting, when they want to reach goals different from their partners’ or when they want to increase the force of the message communicated (Thomas 1995:143). While advising, speakers can use direct or indirect speech act. Following speech acts from Tughlaq illustrate indirect speech acts.

MUHAMMAD: So, Najib what do you propose?
NAJIB: I can’t think of anything right now, Your Majesty
- except ethat 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)
Here is a situation, when Najib, the politician is advising the king in all important matters of kingdom. He informs that Sheikh-imam-ud-din, a holy man, is telling publicly that Tughlaq doesn’t deserve the right to rule as he has murdered his own father and brother at prayer time. At the same time, Ain-ul-Mulk, Tughlaq’s childhood companion, is reported to be marching on Delhi. In this crisis, Tughlaq through direct speech act “So, Najib, what do you propose?” seeks advice from Najib. As a loyal Deputy, Najib proposes the only method of curbing a position and that is - to kill the enemy. Mentioning the fact, he advises Tughlaq “the Sheikh has a striking resemblance to you”. In literature, especially in drama, when characters speak, they want to convey the meaning more than, less than or other than the words actually do mean. Here, through this indirect speech act Najib advises Tughlaq to kill the Sheikh. The words “the Sheikh has a striking resemblance to you” don’t literally mean it. As suggested above, speakers use indirect speech acts when they want to reach goals different from their partners’ or when they want to increase the force of the message communicated. Barani and Step-Mother, who are present in this situation, don’t understand the hidden meaning of Najib’s advice. Only Tughlaq gets surprised and decodes the proper meaning of his advice and reacts directly “You are a devil, Najib!...Good”.

In *Hayavadana*, Devadatta advises Padmini. He says:

DEVDATTA: Padmini, I have told you ten times already ... I don’t like the idea of this trip. You should rest-not face such hazards. The cart will probably shake like an earthquake. It’s dangerous in your condition. But you won’t listen ...

PADMINI: My condition! What’s happened to me? To listen to you, one would think I was the first woman in this world to become pregnant. I only have to stumble and you act as though it’s all finished and gone... (Act 1: 24)

Interaction between Devadatta and Padmini reveals the fact that they have planned to go for a trip. However, Devadatta doesn’t like the idea of the trip as his wife Padmini, is pregnant. It is their first child. Being husband, Devadatta directly advises Padmini to take rest in the home. Journey by cart may bring some danger to her as well as
child’s health. Padmini responds Devadatta in negative and indirect manner. She could have directly stated that “No need to worry, I will manage” but she doesn’t say it and further indirectly criticizes Devadatta’s over worrying nature. Padmini’s response shows that she is not willing to behave as per Devadatta’s advice. It shows that Devadatta’s intentional effect on Padmini is not achieved. Complimenting is a rapport-establishing, distance reducing strategy. In fact, one doesn’t need to be indirect in complimenting since there is no question of saving the face of the hearer.

In *Tughlaq*, Ain-ul-Mulk, Tughlaq’s childhood companion marches on Delhi. Tughlaq very cunningly manages to win the battle by making Sheikh Imam-ud-din die on the battleground at the hands of Ain-ul-Mulk’s army. But Tughlaq doesn’t kill Ain-ul-Mulk and lets him go. Najib doesn’t like this fact and criticizes his decision indirectly; however, Barani compliments Tughlaq for his victory in the battle. Following instance does explain it.

**NAJIB**: I hate to say it on this happy occasion, Your Majesty, but that would be really tossing another torch into the chaos at Avadh.

**BARANI**: Your Highness must forgive me, but His Majesty deserves congratulations on his courage. He has shown there are things more valuable than vengeance. (Scene iv: 27)

...  

**BARANI**: You are a great man, Your Majesty, ... 

**MUHAMMAD** (*laughing*): And you are a good man, Barani, and that’s more important. Look at Najib-look at the expression on his face! He can’t even believe I can be generous. (Scene iv: 28)

As already mentioned, the speaker’s use of direct or indirect speech acts depends on his or her relationship with the hearer and the interpersonal relationship between the addressee and the addressee. The interpersonal relationship is governed by the two major principles of solidarity and power. In the aforementioned conversational acts Najib makes use of indirect speech act knowing his lower rank compared to Tughlaq. His statement “I hate to say it on
this happy occasion, Your Majesty, but that would be really tossing another torch into the chaos at Avadh” indirectly criticizes Tughlaq’s decision of not killing Ain-ul-Mulk. Najib suspects that it may bring some trouble in Avadh so he criticizes Tughlaq’s generosity. Tughlaq, who is superior to Najib in political positioning, criticizes him directly by stating “Look at Najib—look at the expression on his face! He can’t even believe I can be generous.” Here, the compliment is consolatory in nature. It is an occasion of happiness as Tughlaq has won the battle and more important than that is, Tughlaq doesn’t take revenge upon Ain-ul-Mulk and doesn’t kill Ain-ul-Mulk. And Barani appreciates this fact directly from the bottom of his heart. Najib tries to reduce the happiness in the occasion but Barani comforts Tughlaq from getting disappointed. He compliments Tughlaq by using direct speech act “You are a great man, Your Majesty”. Tughlaq properly comprehends the simple, noble and honest feelings and the respect of Barani for the king. Tughlaq directly admires Barani by saying “you are a good man, Barani, and that’s more important” and strengthens the bond of relation.

Situation of heated argument, quarrel or wordy combat force the conversational partners to use the direct speech acts. Anger on the part of the speakers and hearers is reflected through these acts. *Old Stone Mansion* has such incidence of bicker in the family. The argument begins as the Deshpandes need money to spend on the post demise rituals for Vyenkatesh. It is a tradition to feed the village on the thirteenth day. Bhaskar expects some economical aid from Sudhir, but he refuses to give anything. Bhaskar decides to pawn Vahini’s golden bangles. She refuses stating that she has kept it for Ranju’s marriage. Then Bhaskar decides to mortgage the orchard. Sudhir gets angry to listen Bhaskar and says that it is not possible to redeem mortgaged land easily. He says directly:

SUDHIR: ... Also, if I suddenly need money in the future, I must have my share of the land.

BHASKAR: So you are suddenly talking about rights!

SUDHIR: Is that wrong Bhau? We’ll have to talk about these things sooner or later.
BHASKAR: You are talking about rights, Sudhir, but you are forgetting your education-you think it came at no cost?

SUDHIR: Tatyaji spent that money.

BHASKAR: Only in name. You know that as well as I do. He passed on the whole responsibility of your education, your marriage, to me and sat back. Did that cost nothing? And here you are demanding your share!

SUDHIR: Look Bhau, I’ve had this thrown at me a little too often. My education, my marriage. Now let me tell you something.

You didn’t spend out of your pocket for my education and marriage. ... Why go on with ‘I did this, I did that’? Rubbish. Did you ever give me a single paisa from my land or even a measure of grain?

BHASKAR: You should come and take what’s yours.

SUDHIR: Are we beggars to come and take things? The question is whether you were big-hearted enough to give me anything? Earlier, I used to spend my leave here. But you kept hinting I was saving my salary staying here. So I swore not to come too often and, even when I did, not to stay for too long. I kept away for years at a time. But you couldn’t stand that either. Why are you calling me greedy then?

VAHINI: Please don’t lose your temper Sudhir-bhauji. Not in front of the children.

SUDHIR: I’ve been wanting to say this for a long time, Vahini. Let your children know the facts too; or one day they might say uncle used to come here for free meals. (Act 2, sc i: 169-70)

In the above interaction, Bhaskar and Sudhir argue on the issue of the share of the land. In this extract Bhaskar nowhere uses indirect speech acts. He states directly that he has done all the expenditure of Sudhir’s education and marriage. However, Sudhir makes use of indirect speech acts as the occasion demands. But he too gets angry in the course of interaction. And when Vahini comes in the middle to reduce force of the heating argument, She mentions “Please don’t lose your temper Sudhir-bhauji. Not in front of the children”. This speech act on Vahini’s part boosts Sudhir’s anger and he
uses a very straightforward way to state “I’ve been wanting to say this for a long time, Vahini. Let your children know the facts too”.

Speech acts used by the characters delineates their nature and it also reveals the relations of a character with (an)other character(s). The language that a particular character uses when talking to one person in the play will be altogether different from the language he uses when talking to another character (Mane 2010:66).

Speech acts by the characters help audience or the readers of a play to understand the characters’ inner feelings. In Hayavadana, we find one such example.

KAPILA: Devadatta, my friend, I confess to you I’m feeling uneasy. You are a gentle soul. You can’t bear a bitter word or an evil thought. But this one is fast as lightning—and as sharp. She is not for the likes of you. What she needs is a man of steel. But what can one do? You’ll never listen to me. And I can’t withdraw now. I’ll have to talk to her family ...

(Act 1:19)

When Kaplia goes to get Padmini’s hand for Devadatta, he gets feelings for Padmini. His expression “Devadatta, my friend, I confess to you I’m feeling uneasy” shows that he also wants Padmini. Through the aforesaid direct expressive speech act, dramatist wants to reveal Kapila’s psychological condition towards the audience. Kapila being young and stout is proud of his body and so feels that a beautiful woman like Padmini needs “a man of steel” like him. He also knows that Devadatta would not accept this fact so he decides to put up the proposal of Devadatta’s marriage. He honestly attempts for Devadatta and Padmini’s marriage though he has desires for Padmini. “And I can’t withdraw now. I’ll have to talk to her family” shows that Kapila is honestly playing the role of Devadatta’s friend. Due to his attempts the marriage is solemnised.

Drama is an expression of community, feeling the pulse of an age or of a moment in time like no other art. A play is a social event or it is nothing (Styan 2005: 11). In literary texts, especially in drama, characters commune with one another. What the
character speaks not only reveals his nature, it also gives us information about his relations with the persons spoken to (Kimbahune 2002:8). Everything that characters speak contributes to forward the action of drama. When drama is being performed, it is the dialogue that holds a mirror up to what the dramatist attempts to express (ibid).

While studying drama, we determine whether the language on the whole is “high” or “low”. By “high” we mean lofty, formal, rhetorically polished language and even language which relies strongly on fanciful expressions and by “low” we mean simple, plain, and unadorned language. It is important to identify the range of the language in order to determine the conventions within which the playwright is working. To define the world of the play, it is essential that we have some immediate grasp of the general kind of language used throughout the play. Obviously, not all of the characters within a play speak same kind of language. It is given assumption that certain kinds of characters speak in certain ways, i.e. there are many conventions of dramatic language. There is nothing more central to a play’s characters than the ways in which they speak. Fools always speak in riddles, kings of war and honour, etc. One of the considerations, when approaching the language of any play is, whether or not the language of a particular character is appropriate to his type. Does the ruffian speak in flowery language or the fair princess in the coarse language of a prostitute? As a rule playwrights tend to conform to the conventions of dramatic language.

While studying dramatic language and specially the speech acts by the characters, it is necessary to take into account paralinguistic features and kinesics used by the playwright. As Keir Elam (2007) mentions, a linguistic utterance is not simply a product of the phonological, syntactic and semantic rules of the language. Contextual constraints and the kinds of language-related behaviour accompanying the utterance are essential to its correct interpretation by the addressee. Paralinguistic factors such as pitch, loudness, tempo, timbre and non-verbal sounds supply essential information regarding the speaker’s state, intentions and attitudes, serving further to disambiguate the speech act. D Abercrombie (1968) has rightly suggested, “the conversational use of spoken language cannot be properly understood, unless paralinguistic elements are taken into account”
2.8 Conclusion

In this chapter, with the help of expressions selected from the six plays, an attempt has been made to show that how various speech acts by the characters in a play, play a significant role in the context of dramatic world to carry and convey the message of the dramatist. For the sake of convenience, the direct and indirect speech acts are discussed separately. An attempt has also been made to show the culture-specificity of these speech acts at some length. Though plot is important, speech acts on the part of the characters carry forward the actions in a play. Owing to the limitations of space, only particular expression are analysed with the help of speech act theory.