

*Understanding Politeness in the Indian way- A Study of Girish Karnad's  
Nagamandala and Vijay Tendulkar's Silence! The Court is in Session*

Ashwitha Antony

Abu Dhabi University, UAE

0420

The Asian Conference on Language Learning 2013

Official Conference Proceedings 2013

The logo for the International Academic Forum (iafor) is centered on the page. It consists of the lowercase letters 'iafor' in a light blue, sans-serif font. The text is enclosed within a large, stylized circular graphic composed of two overlapping, thick, curved lines. The upper-left portion of the circle is a light red color, while the rest of the circle is a light blue color, matching the text.

iafor  
The International Academic Forum  
[www.iafor.org](http://www.iafor.org)

## 1. Introduction

Politeness is an inevitable strategy in communication as our verbal interactions, and devoid of politeness, would result in disharmony and cause unpleasantness in human relationships, which would affect the verbal interactions between people. Hence politeness is a culture specific (Watts, 2003) and context-bound phenomenon. And also, while engaging in conversation with somebody, several factors are taken into account like sociological and interpersonal factors such as status, inferiority-superiority, formality or informality of relation, age group etc. These factors could lead to various instances of face threatening acts among speakers and hearers. One of the ways to avoid such instances is to apply negative politeness strategies as propounded by Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987). It appeals to the hearer's desire not to be impeded or put upon, to be left free to act as they choose (Brown & Levinson, 1978). It relates to how language expresses social distance between the speakers in their different role relationships. It also deals with face-work, reflecting how people in different speech communities attempt to, establish, maintain and save face during conversations.

This research paper analyses the various ways of applying different negative politeness strategies to literary texts such as plays. As drama is similar to real life conversations, it is productive to pragmatically analyze the interactive dialogues that occur in it. As Keir Elam states, "The social, interpersonal, executive powers of language, the pragmatic 'Doing things with words' is dominant in drama". (Elam, 1980). The two Indian plays that are chosen for this study are Girish Karnad's *Nagamandala* and Vijay Tendulkar's *Silence! The Court is in Session*. The aim of this paper is threefold: 1) it applies the elements of negative politeness strategies (indirectness and deferential methods) to various dialogues uttered by the characters in Girish Karnad's *Nagamandala* and Vijay Tendulkar's *Silence! The Court is in Session*. 2) By applying these strategies, the attitude of the Indian society is portrayed as it has its own perception of politeness. 3) It also focuses on how both of the dramatists deal with the notion of politeness.

## 2. Summary of the two plays

In *Nagamandala*, three flames narrate the story of Rani. She is ill treated by her husband, Appana, who has a mistress. He locks her up and an old woman Kurudava helps her. Kurudava gives Rani a magic potion to lure her husband. But Naga, the Cobra, accidentally drinks it and falls in love with Rani. He takes the shape of Appana and visits her during the nights when Appana is away. Rani becomes pregnant, and her real husband accuses her of infidelity. She is tested by villagers and passes her test which gives her the status of a Goddess and lives happily with Appana.

*Silence! The Court is in Session* revolves wholly round the idea of a game that is being enacted by the members of a theatre group, who have assembled to perform a play. Benare, Mrs & Mr. Kashikar, Ponkshe, Karnik, Rokde, are characters who are the cast members of the group. One of the members of the cast does not come and Samant, a local stagehand replaces him. They arrange a rehearsal of a mock trial to make him understand the court procedure. Benare, the protagonist becomes the accused and the other members question her about the rumours that they have heard about her. It emerges that Miss Benare killed an out-of-wedlock child by Prof. Damle,

the missing member of the cast. The pretend-play suddenly turns into an accusatory game. A mock charge of infanticide is leveled against Miss Benare. The play ends with the protagonist rendering a monologue about her misery, her fate and the cruelty of the patriarchal society.

### 3. Brown and Levinson's universal politeness theory

In their model, politeness is defined as redressive action taken to counter balance the disruptive effect of face threatening acts (FTA). In every conversation, there is a desire of the conversationalists to preserve 'face'. Face can be defined as the 'public image that every member wants to claim for himself' [Brown and Levinson, 1987:16]. It consists of two dimensions: 'positive face' and 'negative face'. The former is linked to the desire to be appreciated and win approval. Negative face is concerned with freedom of action and freedom from imposition. Some acts that threaten interlocutor's positive face as mentioned by Brown and Levinson are as follows: criticism, disagreement, irreverence, bringing of bad news, raising of divisive topics etc and those that threaten the negative face are orders, requests, advice, threats, warnings etc. Positive and negative strategies in politeness are being used by humans to convey their thoughts to others without hurting the feelings of the others. The following study is limited to negative politeness strategies. Out of the ten negative politeness strategies, only two of them are applied (indirectness and deferential methods) to some of the dialogues in the two plays.

### 4. Indirectness

Indirectness somehow creates a divided illocution, in the sense that one utterance maybe interpreted in two or more different ways by two or more addressees, because the relation between the speaker and the addressees and the amount of shared knowledge between them cannot be identified. How a hearer works out what a speaker means by words he or she utters. It occurs when there is a *mismatch* between the *expressed meaning* and the **implied meaning** (Thomas, 1995). There are three factors which lead to indirectness:

- 1) The degree to which X is rated an imposition in culture Y;
- 2) The relative power of the speaker over the hearer;
- 3) The social distance between the speaker and hearer. (Leech, 1983) (Brown & Levinson, 1978)

#### 4.1 Indirectness in the Indian society

There are many factors that lead to the use of indirectness in the Indian context. Some of the factors are mentioned in the following sections of this paper. In the two plays, the characters use indirectness to convey what they have in mind. The intentions that occur in a character's mind would have different meanings, and the addressee may or may not interpret it in the same manner. The below examples display the different

elements of indirectness being used predominantly in the Indian society due to the factors that are mentioned above.

### CONVERSATION ONE

Consider the dialogue between Kurudava and Rani:

Kurudava: (pause) “Does he... talk to you?”

Rani : Oh, that he does. But not a syllable more than required. ‘Do this’, ‘Do That’. ‘Serve food.

Kurudava: You mean-? That means- you are- still –hmm!

Rani : Apart from him, you are the first person I have seen since coming here. I’m bored to death. There is no one to talk to!

Kurudava: That’s not what I meant by ‘talk’. Has your husband touched you?

(Karnad 1990) [Nagamandala, Act One: 11].

### CONVERSATION TWO

The conversation between Sukhatme, Rokde and Mrs. Kashikar is a perfect example inundated with indirectness.

Sukhatme : ... “There’s some substance in what Mr. Samant said. Even though it came from a book. It holds water!

Mrs.Kashikar: Do you mean that Miss Benare and Professor Da-

Sukhatme : Yes. Beyond a shadow of doubt! There’s no question about it.

Mrs. Kashikar: Good Gracious!

Rokde: (Now very daring) I knew it along!”

(Tendulkar, 1978) [*Silence! The Court is in Session*, Act Two: 48].

#### 4.2 Size of Imposition (Avoidance of Taboo topics)

It is considered to be an imposition on the hearer if taboo topics are mentioned during conversations. Religious, sexual topics or bodily functions are considered to be taboo topics to Indians. “Indians don’t like to talk about sex. It is taboo, against our culture, bad for society, corrupts young minds and distracts people from the right path. In fact, it is perverted, dirty and something to be ashamed about.” (Bhagat, 2013). This is apparent in the dialogues in both the plays. In Nagamandala, Kurudava finds it difficult to phrase the intention in her mind. She wants to ask Rani whether she and Appanna have started their relationship as husband and wife in every sense of the

word- mentally and physically. She uses the term “talk” instead of “sex” in her inquiry. In *Silence! The Court is in Session*, it is clear that they are talking about Benare’s and Prof. Damle’s relationship. The ‘it’ in the sentences refers to their love affair. The other characters do not want to mention it openly. They do not talk about the relationship openly, but the characters decipher as to what each one means. Having sexual relationships outside of marriages is taboo in the Indian society.

#### **4.3 Power of the Speaker over the hearer (Women’s Language)**

Brown and Levinson’s theory is supported in the use of language by men and women. The more power the speaker has over the hearer results in the use of indirectness. In general, women use indirectness when they speak to others. In her book, *Language and Women’s Place*, Lakoff 1975, as cited in (Paltridge, 2006) proposed what she called ‘women’s language’; which is totally different from ‘men’s language’. This language, she argued, included features such as the use of overly polite forms, the use of question tags, use of euphemisms and hedges, and more indirectness. This phenomenon can be applied in the Indian scenario as well. Women generally do not talk explicitly in the Indian society. Men have the right to speak in any manner they want but women are not expected to. This fact is evident in the examples that are given above. Being a woman as well as a conservative person of the old school of thought, Kurudava indirectly puts her question to the young wife. But Rani, who takes the term ‘talk’ in the literal sense, fails to understand the older woman. Here Kurudava makes use of indirectness to enquire about Rani and saves the negative self image of the young bride. In the second play, Mrs. Kashikar is interrupted by others and is not allowed to complete her sentence.

#### **4.4 Social Distance**

Social distance (Leech, 1983) is a major component that leads to indirectness. It is seen as a composite of psychologically real factors (status, age, sex, degree of intimacy, etc) which together determine the overall degree of respectfulness’ within a given speech situation. (Thomas, 1995) In other words, when we feel close to someone, we do not feel the need to use indirectness in conversations. The characters in both the plays are mere acquaintances that lead to the use of indirectness in their verbal exchanges as we see in the given conversations. In one play, the characters are neighbours who do not know each other, whilst in the other play, the characters are cast members of a drama troupe and they are not intimate with each other.

### **5. Use of Deferential Modes**

Deference is a double sided phenomenon which finds manifestation either in **the lowering of the self** or the **raising of the other or both at a time**. It can be called as ‘formal politeness’ (Yule, 1985). For example, compliments, greetings and modes of address or honorifics. This type of politeness of raising the ‘other’ is normally used in Indian fiction. Conversations are a constant flow of verbal interactions in which,

compliments are a part of making the other person happy, and more cooperative. This strategy is used by one of the flames in the prologue of *Nagamandala*.

Flame 3: “You are lucky. My master’s eyes have to feast on his wife limb by limb if the rest of him is to react. So we lamps have to bear witness to what is better left to the dark” [Prologue: 3].

The above utterance is the reply to Flame Four’s description of how it could leave the house early and was able to assemble in the temple before the other flames arrived. The words of Flame Three are a kind of deferential strategy to make the other person feel happy. By talking about its misfortune of having a master who needs to look at his wife in the light of the flame, Flame Three is lowering himself to praise the other, by complimenting on Flame Four’s good luck. According to Ashok Thorat, there are different kinds of classification of compliments: face to face compliments and in-absentia compliments. We praise somebody in front of us because we want to satisfy his desire to be liked and approved of. When people are admired and their qualities are publicized and advertised, they feel elated and the complimenter and complimentee are glued together in a bond of social solidarity and camaraderie (Thorat, 2000). Flame Three uses the same strategy by complimenting the other flame. By this deferential strategy, it achieves its intention.

One of the other deferential strategies that can be employed in conversations, in order to avoid face threatening acts is by **using honorifics**. There are three types of honorifics as stated in Patil’s(1994) *Style in Indian Fiction in English; A Study in Politeness Strategies*.

- a) Speaker-addressee axis- the relation of speaker to hearer.
- b) The speaker-referent axis- the relation of speaker to things or persons referred to.
- c) The speaker bystander axis- the relation of speaker or hearer to bystanders or overhearers. (Huzoor, Maharaj, janab). (Patil, 1994).

Among the three types of honorifics, the one which needs special mention with regard to Indian writing is the third type, because this belongs to the address forms that people use to address others. These address forms; depend on the extent of the depth of relationship between the speaker and the hearer. A form of address can have a social meaning. The social component consists of speaker addressee relationship, speaker’s evaluation of addressee and situation, and of speaker’s background. All these things are expressed in the use of a given form of address. Address forms also include a potential of more than one social aspect- distance, status, comradeship, solidarity, equality, brotherhood, friendship, irony and so on. It is a well known fact that terms of address and reference differ from culture to culture. Keating in his book *Moments of Hierarchy: Constructing social stratification by means of language, food, space and the body in Polinpei Microneina*, stated that certain social groups outwardly display a much higher regard for people of older age groups. This feature of linguistics exists in eastern languages, however some western languages also display a similar consciousness to an age based hierarchy. (Keating, 2000 as quoted

(Anon., 2012). This phenomenon is largely prevalent in collectivistic cultures. It is a reflection of the collectivistic values of the Eastern culture (Anon., 2012). The Indian society is based on a collectivistic nature and one can see this trend among Indians.

Many of the terms of address and reference used in the Indian society are terms from Indian languages. As the two plays mentioned for study are translations of plays in Kannada and Marathi, the address terms used are more or less based on the translation of the exact address terms in both the languages. One can divide these terms into kinship terms (as stated earlier) honorific terms. 'Brother', 'sister', 'mother', 'uncle', 'aunt' are kinship terms; 'sahib', 'huzoor', 'sarkar' and 'hukum' are honorific terms. An Indian is required in his culture to behave in a respectable way and also to be respectful of others, especially persons who are of higher status either in age or their positions and educational background in the society. Hence one can see that the address terms used in the plays, are mostly honorific terms, used by the characters belonging to different backgrounds.

One common honorific that is used in the Indian society is 'Sahib'. This term can function either independently as an address form or in conjunction with nouns signifying last names, designations or educational status. One comes across an example in *Silence! The Court is in Session*. This term is used by Samant, a local villager in addressing the other characters in the play. He is impressed by the appearance of Ponshe, and instinctively addresses him as 'sahib' to show respect to the latter.

Samant: (to Ponshe, awed by his sahib-like appearance) "Do sit down, sahib.

Ponshe: (pleased at the 'sahib') No, thank you, I was sitting in the train. Er-What's your name?

Samant: Samant. I'm from this village, sir" [Act One: 13].

Apart from the term 'sahib', Samant also addresses Ponshe as 'sir', which gives an additional upliftment to the hearer. The stage directions also emphasize the effect of the honorific term that Samant uses to address Ponshe. Ponshe is obviously pleased at this strategy of politeness which is evident from the directions given by the playwright. He reciprocates politely to Samant, by asking his name, and thereby establishing a rapport between the two. It prevents any kind of face threatening acts, between the speaker and the hearer. Hence one can see that it equalizes the hierarchal difference between Samant, a local and Ponshe, the science student, and bridges the gap of awkwardness between the two, in terms of their background differences.

## 6. Politeness and Playwrights

Politeness being a universal phenomenon goes beyond the fictional characters, and it becomes important to bring out the playwrights' notion on the concept of politeness. The creator of any fictional work, behind the scenes, controls the action in the plots of any genre, be it fiction, plays etc. In spite of their invisibility, they are considered to be omnipresent. Hence their involvement in the area of politeness is unavoidable. Politeness, in the use of language by the authors/ playwrights when they communicate their thoughts to the readers, needs to be analyzed. The playwright's presence in

drama, which consists mainly of dialogues, is almost negligible. However, the dialogues of the characters bring out the extent of politeness used by the playwrights in their respective texts. And this becomes the language of the playwrights- polite or impolite, which has an effect on the readers.

There are instances in both the plays where, the characters make use of aggravating language. They make use of positive and negative kinds of aggravating language, like expressing dislike for the addressee, offending the addressee's beliefs and sensibilities, use of sarcasm, use of interruption etc, and the latter group includes threats and explicit references to the addressee's status, reference to rights and obligations of the addressee etc.

Tendulkar's plays portray the harsh realities of life, with full transparency. It is quite evident in his use of language too. To depict the raw emotions of the characters in his plays, he makes use of language which is real, hence without any shred of politeness. His characters are probably less polite, when compared to the characters portrayed by Karnad. Even the title *Silence! The Court is in Session* blatantly shows impoliteness. The admonitory word is intended to suggest the peremptoriness with which patriarchy seeks to perpetuate its hegemony by systematically silencing all the voices of protest, while silence is a curse under which the repressed and the marginalized have labored all over the world. As Urvashi Barat rightly states "The most obvious and persisting theme in the plays of Tendulkar is "power"; its effects on people and their relationships with each other, and the way it dehumanizes and brutalizes those who live in it (Barat, 2011).

The husband- wife duo of Tendulkar's play, Mr. and Mrs. Kashikar, share a relationship which is based on the attitude of the patriarchal society. Throughout the play, Mr. Kashikar addresses Mrs.Kashikar in an impolite manner. Sometimes he speaks to her sarcastically, in a commanding way, interrupts her when she talks etc, thereby showing that he uses negative aggravating language, while addressing her. Tendulkar has brought out the pathos of an Indian wife, and the manner in which she is treated by her husband who is ironically considered as equivalent to God in the Indian society. The language of Mr. Kashikar is definitely far from being polite.

Kashikar: [banging the gavel]. "Silence must be observed while the court is in session. Can't shut up at home, can't shut up here" [ActTwo: 29].

When Mrs. Kashikar, narrates the proceedings of the court trial to Samant, Mr. Kashikar gets irritated with her, for interrupting the session. Even though it is just a mock trial, and it is not necessary to keep silent in the make shift court, Mr. Kashikar admonitions his wife for talking during the trial. In another instance, he interrupts her, and does not give her a chance to talk. He cuts her off abruptly when she attempts to talk to Sukhatme.

Mr.Kashikar: "Wait, What do you mean, 'Thank you', Mrs.Kashikar.' The accused has not yet told you her age. I was listening carefully. Prisoner Benare, your age!

Mrs. Kashikar: But I –

Mr.Kashikar: It is not the custom of any court to accept someone else to answer when the accused is questioned. Don't interrupt" [Act Three: 52].



Mr. Kashikar is indifferent to Mrs. Kashikar's words. When Benare is asked about her age, she remains silent. It is Mrs. Kashikar who tells Benare's age to the court. Mr. Kashikar gets angry for it and ignores Mrs. Kashikar's statements. He dismisses her protests of being ignored and commands Sukhatme to continue with the case. Here we see that Mr. Kashikar reprimands her in public, without any misapprehensions. It is the male ego centric society that is being represented by Mr. Kashikar, in which a woman's voice is being ignored.

Paying no heed to one's suggestions or overlooking it, is one kind of impoliteness. This rises from the hierarchal system that is prevalent in the Indian society. Rokde is the adopted son, of Mr. and Mrs. Kashikar. He has been brought up on their charity. But it is clear from their dialogues that they consider him inferior, and reminds him that he is obliged to them always. The authority with which Mr. and Mrs. Kashikar address him shows their dominance over him.

Mrs. Kashikar: Balu, have you brought out all the luggage?

Rokde: Absolutely.

Kasihkar: Each time you say you've brought it all, Rokde and each time you forget something. Have you got the usher's staff? Don't just nod your head. Show it if you have it. Let me see- [Act One: 14].

In the above passage, we can see that, Mr. Kashikar is being impolite with Rokde. He shouts at Rokde, regardless of any thing and anyone. This behavior of Mr. Kashikar influences all the other characters. They lack respect for Rokde and treat him in a similar manner. The fact that Rokde is an orphan, and was given free education by Mr and Mrs. Kashikar, lowers the position of Rokde in front of others. When Rokde asks Karnik, whether he can play the role of the fourth witness, the latter opposes it and directs him to stick to the part.

Rokde: [gathering up his courage]. "Can I please do that part today? It's just a small one- anyone can do mine- I know the fourth witness lines off by- heart..."

Karnik: I oppose it! Even if you're just an usher, your character isn't an easy one to play. So what if he has no lines? It can't be managed by putting up with someone else at the last minute. Stick to your part, Rokde" [Act One: 17].

Even though Rokde asks politely to give him the fourth witness's role, Karnik impolitely refuses it. He orders Rokde to continue playing his part as an usher, thereby paying no heed to Rokde's wishes. Hence one can see this as an example of negative aggravation. The addressor does not take the addressee's welfare into consideration.

Karnad's female protagonist Rani suffers in silence at the hands of her husband and the male dominated society. Purakasyastha T.D writes about the themes of silence in the play *Nagamandala*. It is marked by a meaningful engagement with the topos of a silent woman, whose speechlessness, Karnad regards with interest for its subversive potential. It is a landmark because of the way, it challenges the role of drama, basically a verbal artifact as a medium intended to capture the silence of the speechlessness with all its nuances. (Purakasyastha, 2006)

For instance, the protagonist of *Nagamandala*, Rani is being verbally abused by her husband Appanna and she does not retort back.

Appanna: “Aren’t you ashamed to admit it, you harlot? Open the door! Open the door, you whore! All right then, I’ll show you. I’ll go to the Village elders. If they don’t throw that child into boiling oil and you along with it, my name is not Appanna”

[Act.Two:33]

Appanna abuses her, when he comes to know that she is pregnant. Appanna knows that he has not had any kind of intimate relationship with Rani, and he is thereby angered by her pregnancy. From Act One onwards, one can see that Appanna speaks to Rani in monosyllables. But in the last act, Appanna uses aggravating language to threaten her. He addresses her, as harlot, whore, which are terms that are used to refer to prostitutes. This is an example of negative aggravation. Appanna is threatening Rani, as well as abusing her. It is a face threatening act, which the speaker puts it blatantly, in order to intimidate Rani which is achieved accordingly.

The mother-son bond between Kurudava and Kappanna influences the language used among them. The familiarity quotient between them results in a not-so polite language. The two of them have lived together for so long, that they have taken each other for granted. Kurudava commands more authority over her son, as she is his mother, and this is clear from her utterances.

Kurudava: “Come here, you idiot! [Act One: 11].

Kurudava: “Shut up! ... [Act One: 15].

Kurudava: “I said come here. This fool doesn’t understand a thing. Quick!” [Act Two: 27].

Hence one can see that familiarity between individuals can bring about a change in the use of polite language. People are polite with strangers, because they have the desire to be liked and appreciated. But they can afford to use impoliteness in their interaction, and in most cases, this type of behavior is not considered as a face threatening act, by the addressee. One can see (Leech, 1983) “social distance” factor being repeated here.

Within the above examples drawn from the two plays, one can see the politeness strategies, used by both playwrights in their respective plays. The polite as well as the impolite conversations between the characters, bring out the stylistic features in which, they have made their impact among the audience. One can see that the language used in Karnad’s play is blatant and explosive which is commonly found in the rural areas of India. Tendulkar’s play subtly portrays undercurrents of the hypocritical patriarchal society and its influence on women which is predominant in the urban middle class society.

## **Conclusion**

This paper analyzes the negative politeness strategies that the characters use to converse with each other. As mentioned earlier, the manner in which the characters talk to each other determine the relationships between themselves. One can see that

the politeness strategies ( indirectness and deference) used in the plays by the characters show the extent of familiarity, sincerity and reciprocity that bond them together, and reveal a (polite/ impolite) dimension in the Indian society. The playwrights, by making the characters their mouthpieces, make a point in the society. It also focuses on the aggravating language used by the characters which reveal the playwrights' different styles of writing as well as their treatment of politeness in their plays.

### **Bibliography**

Anon., 2012. *The Cave- Experiences and Ideas worth Sharing*. [Online]  
Available at: <http://whossamt.wordpress.com/2012/10/23/honorific-speech-its-deistic-properties/>  
[Accessed 3 January 2013].

Barat, U., 2011. In: V. Sharma, ed. *On Gender and Power in Critical Perspectives: Ghasiram Kotwal*. New Delhi: Asia Book Club.

Bhagat, C., 2013. *Times of India*. [Online]  
Available at: <http://blogs.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/The-underage-optimist/entry/let-s-talk-about-se>  
[Accessed 3 February 2013].

Elam, K., 1980. In: *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd, p. 157.

Karnad, G., 1990. In: *Nagamandala*. s.l.:Oxford University Press, p. Act One: 11.

Lakoff, R., 1975. *Language and Women's Place*. New York: Harper and Row.

Leech, G., 1983. In: *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Levinson, B. a., 1978. In: *Universals in Language and Politeness Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Paltridge, B., 2006. *Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum.

Patil, Z., 1994. *Style in Indian Fiction in English: A Study in Politeness Strategies*. New Delhi: Prestige.

Purakasyastha, 2006. *Themes of Orality and Silence in Karnad's Nagamandala*. Excerpt from the paper presented at USACLALS, 4<sup>th</sup> Inter-Conference: Sutures and Fissures Programme, Oct 27-29 Santa Carla University, s.n.

Tendulkar, V., 1978. *Silence The Court is in Session*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, J., 1995. In: *Meaning In Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Malaysia: Longman Group Limited.

Thorat, A., 2000. *Five Great Indian Novels: A Discourse Analysis*. New Delhi: Prestige.

Watts, R., 2003. In: *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yule, G., 1985. *The Study of Language*. In: Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 81.



