

PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF THE SELECTED DIALOGUES FROM THE LAST THREE EPISODES OF PAKISTANI DRAMA 'EHD-E-WAFA'Hassan Alamgeer¹, Dr, Abdus Samad*², Muhammad Mazhar Mushtaq³**Original Article**

1. Visiting Lecturer, Department of English Kohsar University Murree, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Associate Professor/Chairman, Department of English, Kohsar University Murree, Punjab, Pakistan. *Corresponding Email: abdussamad@kum.edu.pk
3. Assistant Professor, Department of English, Kohsar University Murree, Punjab, Pakistan

Abstract

The drama serial 'Ehd-e-Wafa' fascinated greatly to the audience for its great characterization, ideas, dialogues, script and plot. This study applied pragmatic theories in the selected text from the last three episodes of Pakistani Drama 'Ehd-e-Wafa' aired on 'HUM TV' and analyzed the dialogues contextually. It applied Speech Act Theory, Cooperative Principle Theory, Conversation Analysis, and Politeness and Face. It intended to know the communicative purposes of the characters when they speak. This research analysis helped the researchers to know what the characters intend when they utter and how they play with the words and perform. The violation and adoption of the Gricean Maxims by the characters and the felicity conditions followed by them was the major focus of the researchers. This study also focused on the politeness strategies used by the characters and the adjacency pairs in the given conversation among them. The purpose of this study was to identify the communicative functions performed by the characters when they speak and act. This study is beneficial for the viewers who watch the drama serials but are unable to comprehend the conversation among the characters because of their lack of pragmatic knowledge, deficiency of visual representation and their inefficiency to analyze the complex discourse categories embedded in the text.

Keywords: Pragmatic Analysis, Speech Acts, Cooperative Principle, Politeness and Face, Conversation Analysis, Felicity Condition, Ehd-e-Wafa

Introduction

The drama serial 'Ehd-e-Wafa' revolves around the four characters and their friendship. There are four main characters; Saad, Shahzain, Shariq and Shehryar. Script focused heavily on Saad who is the soldier of Pakistan Army. On the other hand Shahzain is the feudal politician. "Afridi's script focused heavily on Saad (Ahad Mir), the soldier's life and Shahzain (Osman Khalid Butt), the feudal politician" (Haider, 2020).

This study helped to know that how the characters play with the words to perform different actions following the felicity conditions and the Gricean maxims. This study heavily focused on the speech acts, the felicity conditions, the maxims of quality, quantity, relevance and manner, the politeness and impoliteness strategies (face saving and threatening acts) and the necessary conversational adjacency pairs. "The Speech Act Theory can be applied to evaluate the text and context" (Mulyanto, 2019).

Statement of the Problem

The characters communicate effectively and purposively in their dialogues by using different strategies. The strategies they use need to be analyzed pragmatically in order to tell the readers about the intended and implicit meanings of the text along with the explicit and lexical meanings which are patterned in the dialogues. This study is an effort to overcome the lack of

pragmatic knowledge of the viewers that varies from text to text, context to context, speech to speech, participant to participant and content to content to address the confusions and dissatisfaction among them.

This study attempted to analyze the strategies followed by the characters. It aimed to overcome the several problems faced by the viewers while they are in the process to comprehend the visual text. The competent audience comprehends the contextual discourse structures embedded in the utterances of the characters but most of the viewers face some problems at the same time to understand the complex nature of the dialogues aurally because of their dynamic nature and interpretation within the context. They lack their understanding of the dialogues because of the gap between oral proficiency of the characters and aural comprehensibility of the audience. There is a gap in the internal communication between the characters and the audience.

Sometimes, the things characters don't know about each other are known by the visual learners. This amazing suspense strategy may confuse the viewers too. The viewers are unable to get in touch with the ongoing performance because they lack the pragmatic knowledge. This study is an attempt to fill in this gap. This study has been conducted to remove the communication gap between the viewers and the characters. It can help the readers to know the communicative purposes of the characters in their speech. "What is the significance of pragmatic studies? And how it is related to speech or text...?" (Mey, 1993).

Significance of the Study

Pragmatics deals with the words, their meanings, conversation, utterances, and the given context. As we know that the intentions of the interlocutors are the necessary part of any conversation of any form in any discourse community. When the speakers speak they keep in view the context as well. The meanings of the same utterances change in different contexts i.e. if a speaker of Urdu language says, '*Baahir nikal ky dikhaa*' could be an indication, threat, challenge or direction in general but a person from the specific context having shared knowledge would understand exactly the intended meaning of what the speaker has said.

This study is a contribution to appreciate the need of the complete analysis of literature by engaging pragmatic studies from research point of view. Moreover, the pragmatics is equally important to analyze the literary as well as non-literary daily conversation because it deals with meaning in context. The study is of prime significance because it will provide the readers to consider the possibilities of different meanings of the same utterances in different context.

Research Questions

- How the speech acts in the dialogues performed by the characters?
- How the face saving and threatening acts are performed in the dialogues?
- What are the maxims of cooperation followed and flouted by the characters?
- What are the adjacency pairs in the dialogues?

Literature Review

There are number of research studies on the application of pragmatic theories in a text worldwide but there are limited studies which have been conducted in Pakistan on visual art including film and drama. This study is an attempt to fill in this gap to contribute towards the creation of this research body in Pakistan as well to engage the viewers on pragmatic ground to speed the process of learning the realities of life and know the real and exact face of the society through the visual art.

One of the researches has been conducted on the relevant study in Pakistan is entitled: "A Pragmatic Analysis of Married Couples Conversation in a Television Series '*Nijat*'." The findings by the scholar show that the husbands and wives in the upper class share equal status, use face threatening acts on equal basis, and initiate questions equally when they have interaction with each other. On the other hand, the reason of conflict between husbands and wives in the lower

class is economical unrest condition. It states that poor economic condition of husbands and wives of the lower class result in male dominance and gender inequality (Jabeen, 2018). Julia T. Wood states, "We are born into a gendered society. We enter a social world that emphasizes the masculinity and femininity" (Wood, 1999).

A scholar points out that drama serial has more space to convey a detailed story in depth. When the characters speak to each other, they plan their conversation in a structured manner to communicate cooperatively. They follow the maxims to communicate cooperatively and if they flout the maxims in case yet the implied meanings have potential to convey exactly to the hearer what speaker said and actually meant (Szczepanski, 2015). Grice concludes that each interlocutor creates an assumption for the hearer to understand the implied meaning to co-operate to some extent in a meaningful way (Bousefield, 2008).

The comic effects are achieved by violating the maxims to make the viewers laugh. Faiza Zeb has written the article entitled: 'Flouting of Gricean Maxims in Comedy Dramas.' She has selected some dialogues from three episodes of famous comedy drama serial '*Bulbuli*' aired on Ary in the month of April and explained the ways of achieving the comic effects i.e. flouting the maxims to create comic effect. This serial has four characters; *Momo*, *Mehmood*, *Nabeel* and *Khoobsorat*. The main character is *Momo* (Mother of *Nabeel* and wife of *Mehmood*) and other three characters have been described in relation with the main character. There is an extreme violation of all four maxims of Grice in the dialogues which is deliberately done by the producers, directors and characters to create comic effect to make the viewers laugh and let them enjoy the comedy show.

Research Methodology

In order to answer the questions asked in the research, the most appropriate way is qualitative methodology. A multi-theoretical approach was applied to analyze the data. This was done to yield more superior and valid results. There are weaknesses and strengths of all theories and in this way we can overcome the weaknesses of one theory with the strengths of another to provide with pragmatically superior results. This was done to enrich the analysis of literature. The proposed study focused on the application of the pragmatic theories: 'Speech Act Theory', 'Cooperative Principle', 'Conversational Analysis', and 'Politeness and Face' as multi-theoretical and qualitative research methodology to yield more valid, strong and superior results. Thematic analysis was applied to analyze the content thematically. The researchers took the selected data from the last three episodes of 'Ehd-e-Wafa' using observational skills.

Results and Discussion

Speech Act Theory

Speech act theory was originated by John Austin and John Searle. It is grounded in a proposition that language is not just used to convey information but is used to perform some actions. They argued that words have primary meaning and clearly convey the message of a speaker. It means that a speaker says and acts simultaneously i.e. actions via utterances e.g. forgiving, apologizing, complaining and condemning.

Explicit and Implicit Performatives

Speech Act Theory develops from the observation of Austin, "the meaning of many sentences does not seem particularly tied up with their judging the world to be a certain way; rather, what crucial about them seems to be that they have a certain kind of effect on the world (on the speaker, hearer, or social environment)" (Austin, 1962). Many utterances which have more than just information are equivalent to actions e.g. 'I name this child.' According to Austin, such utterances are called performatives unlike constatives which convey information. "Austin also made a distinction between explicit and implicit performatives. He defined explicit performative as highly significant, unambiguous and having a performative verb such as '*I bet*', '*I promise*' and '*I bequeath*'" (Rustam, 2013).

In this dialogue, Saad says as a soldier that there is a danger of escalation on the border and restricts her wife to be in her house so she performs an implicit action saying '*main b sath chaloun gi*' which lacks performative verb. Similarly, Saad performs another action implicitly saying '*Main Kashmir jaraha houn.*' There are the implicit actions here in D2 and D3 which have not explicit verbs as underlined below.

- Saad: *Yh mazaq nahi order hy. LOC py tension zyada hogye hy aur escalation ka khtra hy tou hamaary unit ko hukam mila hy ky jaldi pohncho.* D1
- Dua: *Thk hy main b sath chaloun gi* (Ok then I will come along) D2
- Saad: (Army officer): *Main kashmir jarha honn.* (I am going to Kashmir) D3
- Dua: *Kab?* D4

Locutionary, Illocutionary and Perlocutionary Forces

Austin categorizes three types of speech acts. Accordingly, the three types of speech acts are: *Locutionary Act*: the basic act of saying something which is meaningful and can be understood by the receiver. *Illocutionary Act*: the speaker's purpose or the performance of the act. *Perlocutionary Act*: the result or the influence of what was stated (Hashemi & Daneshfar, 2020).

We have locutionary, Illocutionary and Perlocutionary forces here in given dialogues from '*Ehd-e-Wafa.*' When Saad says that he is going to Kashmir is a meaningful linguistic utterance therefore, '*Main Kashmir jaraha houn*' is a locutionary act in D1. The illocutionary force of this utterance is embedded in a context. Actually he isn't going to enjoy his days in Kashmir but he is an Army officer who is going to defend his homeland in Kashmir. The perlocutionary effect of D1 can be seen in D2 when she says, '*Kab?*' which is not only a question but she wants him not to go there in Kashmir.

- Saad (Army officer): *Main kashmir jarha houn.* (I am going to Kashmir) D1
- Dua: *Kab?* (When) D2
- Saad: *Kal* (Tomorrow) D3
- Dua: *Posting? Ubhi tou hamara honeymoon period b khatam ni hoa hy. Itny jaldi? Yh kya mazaq h?* (Our honeymoon period is not over yet. So soon? What kind of joke it is?) D4
- Saad: *Yh mazaq nahi order h. LOC p tension zyada hogye h aur escalation ka khtra h tou hamaary unit ko hukam mila h k jaldi pohncho.* (This is not joke, this is an order. The situation is tensed at the LOC and there is a danger of escalation, so our unit is ordered to report immediately) D5

Taxonomy of Speech Acts

Searle takes the Austinian concept of illocutionary act and further classifies it into different types: representatives, commissives, expressives, and declarations (Hashemi & Daneshfar, 2020).

Declarations

Declarations are the utterances which have a power to change the reality. "Declaration brings about some alternation in the status or condition of the referred to object or object solely by virtue of the fact that the declaration has been successfully performed" (Mey, 2001). We can see here in D1 that this utterance '*main Kashmir jaraha houn*' has a potential to change the reality because he is not going there for some days to enjoy the mother nature but he is going there to defend his homeland because there is a danger of escalation. Therefore, we can see in D2 that how Dua questions here expressively because she doesn't want him to go there. A reality is changed because Dua is expecting him to spend their honeymoon period but he has been ordered by the officials to go there in Kashmir as soon as possible.

- Saad (Army officer): *Main kashmir jarha hn.* (I am going to Kashmir) D1
- Dua: *Kab?* (When) D2
- Dua: *Kaan khol ky sun lo ky kal subho tou kya kal sham sy pehly kheen jaany nahi doungi* (Listen to me carefully. I will not let you go before tomorrow evening) D3

- Saad: *Kon si subha aur kon si sham, mujy aj 10 bajy rat ee wapis jaon gaa* (What are you talking about? I have to go by ten tonight.) D4

Representatives

Representatives speak facts, assertions, truths and descriptions about facts. Assertions are the statements which are strongly believed to be true. "These speech acts are assertions about a state of affairs in the world and thus carry the values 'true' or 'false'. This is their 'point'; as to 'fit', they should, of course, match the world in order to be true" (Mey, 2001).

Dua asks her husband to not go to Kashmir but he doesn't agree to her so, she decides to go to the border along with her husband as indicated in D1. He replies with an assertion in D2 strongly believed to be true that *LOC is not a park to enjoy but it is a field to battle against the enemies and therefore, the untrained people especially women can't survive there at LOC.*

- *Dua: Thk hy main b sath chaloun gi* (Ok then I will come along) D1
- *Saad: Hello! Yh loc h koe park ni h k ap sath chal parain. Acha rho gi khan?* (Hello! It is LOC, not a park that you can come along. OK where are you going to live?) D2

Expressives

"This speech act, as the word says, expresses an inner state of the speaker; the expression is essentially subjective and tells us nothing about the world" (Mey, 1993). We can see in D1 that Saad is going to a land even without a post office where the situation is not under control and there is a danger of escalation by the enemies too. Dua still insists Saad to go with him irrespective of the good or bad situation there. Saad expresses his pain and displeasure saying that he will come back home when the situation is under control which makes her wife speechless and she starts weeping in that painful situation.

- *Saad: Kheen nahi jaarhi ho. Tumhara whan koe kam ni h. Halaat thk hojain gy m ghar aajaonga.* (You are not going anywhere. You have got nothing to do over there. I will come back home once the situation is under control) D1
- *Dua: *silence* and *tears** D2

Commissives

"Like directives, commissives operate a change in the world by means of creating an obligation; however, this obligation is created in the speaker, not in the hearer, as in the case of directives" (Mey, 2001). Shahzain while addressing his voters in an occasion says something commissively in D1.

- Shahzain to his voters: *Main is dfa halqy ky masail py tawajo doun ga. Main aj apko zaban deta houn ky ub ager mujy laga ky main apky kaam nahi aaraha tou main usi din asteefa dy doun ga aur yh seat chor doun gaa* (This time I will focus on the problems of this area. I promise you all today that if I felt that I am not of any use for you, I will resign and will leave the seat) D1

Felicity Conditions

When a person performs an action he has to keep in mind some conditions to fulfill in order to make the utterances felicitous. Such conditions which are necessary to be fulfilled are called felicity conditions. Conditions make the performer able to perform smoothly and cooperatively and if those conditions are not fulfilled then the utterances become a source of violation i.e. violating the mutual cooperation in communication. "The emphasis is on what the speakers intend by the utterances in speech act theory. The successful fulfillment of the utterance relies on two necessary conditions called felicity conditions" (Hashemi & Daneshfar, 2020). A felicity condition is one of the real-world circumstances that are to be realized so that a specific speech act can function as planned.

Here, there is conversation between a daughter and her father. It seems that the conditions are not felicitous. Rani is a daughter of a Meher Deen. A daughter needs to keep in mind the conditions necessary for making a conversation with her father go smoothly. Meher Deen wants his daughter to take her FIR back but she says, '*Apni aulad ko kon gunahgar kehta h.*' Rani has ability to take the FIR back against his brother but she negates to do that. The way she is talking to her father seems that her father is actually dependent on her. His father is saying her that his son is innocent and expects that she will take the FIR back but she says to her father, '*ap k insaf ko tou achi trah sy jaanti houn, ap ny hee tou dimagh kharab kia hy uska.*'

- *Meher Deen: Dekho Waqar begunah hy. Us n kuch ni kia.* (Waqar is innocent, he did not do anything.)
- *Rani: Apni aulad ko kon gunahgaar kehta hy?* (Who blames his own child?) D1
- *Meher Deen: Main kehta hn. Agar us n aisa kia hota tou khud gardan sy pakarta usy main. Itna by-insaf ni hn main.* (I say. I would have caught him from his neck if he would have done so. I am not so unjust as yet.) D2
- *Rani: Ap k insaaf ko tou achi trah jaanti houn main. Ap hee ny tou dimagh kharab kia h uska.* (I know your justice really well. You have spoiled him.) D3

Saad is an Army officer who is directing his soldiers to do something and follow his orders strictly. Saad is an officer and he has a right to assign an action to them. Here, the conversation is cooperative and smooth because the participants are fulfilling the felicity conditions.

- *Saad (Army officer): Jab dushman nehat'ta ho ya hathyar phaink dy tou us par kisi qism ka jasmani ya zubani tashadud nahi hoga* (The enemy shall not be abused physically or verbally once he is unarmed or surrenders) D1
- *Soldiers: Yes sir* D2
- *Saad: Dushman ager kisi hujoom ky narghy main aajay, tou us waqt hujoom kaa nahi balky dushman ka sath dyna hy* (If the enemy is trapped in a crowd then you are supposed to support the enemy rather the crowd) D3
- *Soldiers: Yes sir* D4

Conversational Analysis

The speakers take turns and allocate them in their communication. The people don't just talk to each other but they are supposed to follow some rules in their conversation. "Conversation is what happens among people; when we use language together, our speech acting only makes sense in our common context" (Mey, 2001). The conversation (adjacency pairs and insertion sequences) is patterned and ordered. There is an interactive conversation between the interlocutors. One can't expect another to provide with the inappropriate responses to a specific utterance. If the speaker provides with the responses inappropriately he or she actually makes an error. "Conversation is having a small number of participants where the turns are short and not for the outside audience which is not supposed to perform a practical task" (Cook, 1994).

Turn Taking and Turn Allocation

"The basic unit of the conversation is the 'turn', a shift in a conversation which is essential characteristic of it as the civilized speakers don't speak at the same time rather they wait for their turn and allocate others to take their turns and this is how turn taking and allocating mechanism come into the existence" (Sacks, 1992). Conversational Analysis (CA) is an approach which studies the talk in interaction between interlocutors. It was introduced by Emmanuel Schegloff. There are some signals which can be seen at the end of every utterance which are called TRPs (Turn Relevance Place). "Turns occur normally at defined points of time during ongoing conversation between the participants; such points are called 'transition relevant places' (TRPs). These signals allocate other to commence his or her talk" (Sacks, 1992). Dua in D1 ends a statement with a question mark (TRP) which allocates Saad his turn. In this way, this conversation goes on in a sequential manner from D2 to D10.

- *Dua: Suno mujy tumhain bat btaani hy. Ubi btaon ya baad main?* (Listen, I want to tell you something. Should I tell you now or later?) D1
- *Saad: Koe kaam ki bat hy tou ubi bta do.* (Tell me if it is important) D2
- *Dua: Wo operator tou ni sunyga?* (Is the operator is going to listen?) D3
- *Saad: Matlab koe kam ki bat ni hy?* (That means there is nothing important) D4
- *Dua: Allah ki qasam bht zroori bat hy.* (I swear It is Important) D5
- *Saad: Tou bolo?* (Then say it) D6
- *Dua: Tum ee samajh jao naa. Main khn gi tou operator sun lygaa* (Figure it out yourself... the operator will listen if I will say something) D7
- *Saad: Kya mtlb?* (What do you mean?) D8
- *Dua: Wo aaty hoay junior saad k leay baby cot ly kr aana. Aagy tum khud samajhdar ho, Partner! Khuda Hafiz.* (Bring a baby cot for junior Saad on your way back. You are wise enough to understand the rest partner. Bye.) D9
- *Saad: (smilence) *laughs** D10

Adjacency Pairs

The conversational collaboration doesn't deal only who is talking when and what follows what but also what conversation is about" (Sacks, 1992). He mentions that the adjacency pairs constitute an exchange of conversation which functions by their type. "Pairs can thus be, e.g. 'greeting-greeting', 'order-compliance', 'request-providing the requested item (e.g. 'information', 'permission' etc.) and so on" (Sacks, 1992). Here, we can see the question and answer pair in D1 and D2. We can see a kind of congratulations and thanks pair embedded in a situational context in D3 and D4.

- *Dua: Suno mujy tumhain bat btaani hy. Ubi btaon ya baad main?* (Listen, I want to tell you something. Should I tell you now or later?) D1
- *Saad: Koe kaam ki bat hy tou ubi bta do.* (Tell me if it is important) D2
- *Dua: Wo aaty hoay junior saad k leay baby cot ly kr aana. Aagy tum khud samajhdar ho, Partner! Khuda Hafiz.* (Bring a baby cot for junior Saad on your way back. You are wise enough to understand the rest partner. Bye.) D3
- *Saad: (smilence) *laughs** D4

Insertion sequences

Adjacency Pairs are the units of the exchanges of the interlocutors. Turn 1 expects a direct answer in turn 2 but when there is separation between turn 1 and turn 2 because interlocutors don't provide a direct answer until they are sure about the intention of the speaker. Direct answer in turn 2 is replaced by insertion sequences. According to (Mey, 2001), the normal flow of conversation is not disturbed by the insertion sequences and the speakers behave as their turns function in different levels and thus the actual conversation takes place again. The main stream of conversation starts again once the obstacles have been removed. Thus in the middle of the conversation, none of the additional exchanges have anything to do with the flow of conversation. Here, there is an example of insertions in D3 and D4. The first turn in D2 expects a direct answer in D3 but D3 and 4 become insertion sequences which separate the D1 and expected answer in D2.

- *Dua: Allah ki qasam bht zroori bat hy.* (I swear It is Important) D1
- *Saad: Tou bolo?* (Then say it) D2
- *Dua: Tum ee samajh jao naa. Main khn gi tou operator sun lygaa* (Figure it out yourself... the operator will listen if I will say something) D3
- *Saad: Kya mtlb?* (What do you mean?) D4
- *Dua: Wo aaty hoay junior saad k leay baby cot ly kr aana. Aagy tum khud samajhdar ho, Partner! Khuda Hafiz.* (Bring a baby cot for junior Saad on your way back. You are wise enough to understand the rest partner. Bye.) D5
- *Saad: (smilence) *laughs** D6

Cooperative Principles

“The collaboration is necessary between speaker and listener to lead a cooperative and successful conversation” (Yule, 2006). Gricean’s pragmatics deals with classical cooperative principles or maxims which are taken into consideration in order to make a conversation smooth and cooperative. There are some maxims of Grice which are applied in the text to make pragmatically cooperative and smooth conversation. There are four maxims i.e. maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of manner and maxim of relation. According to Paul Grice, the baseline for a calculated utterance has some parameters; a speaker will tell the truth, estimate an utterance material according to what a listener knows, be aware of and have some knowledge about the current topic and will make the audience able to get the message and understand what is being delivered (Saeed, 2003).

Maxim of Quality

“When a speaker makes an assertion, he or she conversationally implies that he or she believes it” (Huang, 2007). One should say what he believes that is adequate and evident. Here both Dada g and Shariq are flouting the maxim of quality because they are not sure about what they are saying.

- *Shariq: Elaqy ky tamam logon jaanty hain ky Shahzain hospital main hy. Unko bhi yaqeenan pta hoga.* (All the people in the area know that Shahzain is in the hospital. They would have got to know that.) D1
- *Dada g: Phir b wo ni aaya? Uski bati ka ghar wala zindagi aur moat ki kashmaksh main mubtala h. Us ny poocha tak nahi. Aisy waqt py tou dushman b pooch lety hain.* (Still he did not come? His daughter’s husband is fighting for his life. He has not even inquired about him even the enemies inquire during such times) D2

Maxim of Quantity

Maxim of quantity means that the conversation can be cooperative if the utterance is to the extent it is required. One should not say less than the conversation is required and should not say more it. If the information is more or less than it is required the maxim of quantity is flouted. “Since the speaker has used a semantically weaker expression where a semantically stronger one of equal brevity is available, he or she would contradict the first sub maxim of Quantity if the semantically stronger expression held” (Huang, 2007). Here, the maxim of quantity is not flouted because this is an adjacency pair of information and acknowledgement. Army official is not supposed to give information more than it is required. The interaction is smooth and cooperative in D1 and D2.

- *Army Official (In Kashmir): Dushman k iraady thk ni lag rhy.* (The enemy’s plans seems to be dangerous) D1
- *Soldiers: Yes sir.* D2

We can see below that the maxim of quantity is flouted because Shariq wants more than what Shehryar replied.

- *Shariq: Tari zindagi main kabi koe ni aya?* (Did your mother choose anyone for you?) D1
- *Shehryar: Han thee naa aik.* (Yes there was one) D2
- *Shariq: Kon thee?* (Who?) D3
- *Shehryar: Tu 25 ko pohinch. Mil k btata hn tujy.* D4

Maxim of Relation

The maxim of relation is also necessary to follow to make a conversation cooperative and smooth. This maxim expects a speaker to be relevant or contribute to the extent it is relevant to ongoing conversation. Once the conversation is relevant, maxim of quality or quantity can be taken into consideration for the conversation go smoothly and cooperatively. “This implicature follows mainly from the maxims of quantity and quality. Once Bob has asked whether it’s raining, it is clearly relevant in this conversation whether it is raining or not” (Portner, 2005). Below, the conversation is

flouting the maxim of relation. When Saad asks Dua in D1 about his job and routine, he expects her to give her relevant answer. Instead, answering his questions she asks him about the situation in Kashmir and his routine.

- *Saad: Btao mujy ky job kasi jaarhi hy? Kya routine hy? (Tell me how is your job going? What is the routine?) D1*
- *Dua: Filhal tou apki routine sun'ny main zyada dilchispi hy. Ap btain naa ky kya halaat hain whan ky? Yaad kia mujy?(I am more interested in your routine at the moment. Tell me What is the situation there? Did you miss me?) D2*
- *Saad: Bht zyada (A lot) D3*

Maxim of Manner

The maxim of manner expects a speaker to avoid ambiguity and obscurity. Instead, he or she should be orderly and brief. "The speaker is expected to arrange the events in the order in which they took place, and the addressee is expected to draw inferences in such a way" (Huang, 2007). Here Dua seems ambiguous when she says in D2, 'Wo aaty hoay junior saad k leay baby cot ly kr aana...'

- *Saad: Tou bolo? (Then say it) D1*
- *Dua: Wo aaty hoay junior saad k leay baby cot ly kr aana Aagy tum khud samajhdar ho, Partner! Khuda Hafiz. (Bring a baby cot for junior Saad on your way back. You are wise enough to understand the rest partner. Bye.) D2*

Politeness and Face

There are three maxims of politeness i.e. we should not impose ourselves to others, giving others options and to acknowledge them. "Politeness cannot be assessed out of context. When we interrupt someone we should say sorry to him or her"(Thomas J. A., 1995). One should give options and acknowledge others. These are called face saving acts unlike those acts which are basically the threats to others. These acts vary from person to person. A same act can threaten any face or sometimes not as the relationship between students and teachers vary from culture to culture When a person saves the face in a situation where there is a possibility of violation of face is called face saving act. *Chacha* in D1 has created a situation where there is a chance of violation but *Shahzain*, who is a husband of *Meher Deen's* daughter, is trying to save the face of *Meher Deen*.

- *Sussar/Chacha: Mari bat maano, hamain AC saab ki dhamkian dyny ki bjaay peachy hat jao yaa phir muqabla kro. (Take my advice and step back instead of threatening us in the name of Mr. AC or otherwise, compete) D1*
- *Shahzain: Main dhamki khan dy rha houn chacha jaan, main tou sach bta rha hn. (I am not threatening you uncle. I am just telling you the truth.) D2*

Face threatening act is to impose one's thoughts on others and not acknowledge them. Here, a violation of the politeness maxim can be seen when *Shahzain* slaps on the face of his wife's brother in D2. Similarly, *Waqar* also does not act politely when he says something in D1.

- *Waqar: Oh bhai mera mashwra maan ly. Khud ee peachy hat jao. Tumhaari position bht kamzor h. Kheen yh naa ho k vote maangny jao tou joty aur thapar khany par jaain. (Take my advice and step back. Your position is very weak this time. You might get beaten up during the campaign) D1*
- *Shahzain: (Slaps on waqar's face and taps on his face and jerks hi) Mujy thapar khaany ki nahi maarny ki aadat h. Pehly apny behnoi s bat krny ki tameez seekh ly; phir election b lar lyna (I am not used to getting beaten up but I am used to beating others. First learn the manners to talk to your brother in law and then fight the elections) D2*

The impolite words always cause rudeness and anger. The participants need to deal with each other politely to communicate effectively. In order to be cooperative the participants need to

give others the options. They shouldn't be imposing their thoughts on each other. Here, there is a conversation between an army officer and his soldiers. Although, Saad has an authority over his soldiers but he doesn't misuse his authority rather he is dealing with them politely giving them options and avoid imposing his thoughts.

- Saad: *Kya ham apny jawan ko laany ky leay tyar hain?* (Are we ready to get our soldier back?) D1
- Soldiers: Yes sir D2
- Saad: *Koe dar?* (Any fear?) D3
- Soldiers: No sir D4
- Saad: *Koe shaq* (Any doubts?) D5
- Soldiers: No sir D6
- Saad: *Main sab ko lead karoun gaa aur wapsi main sab sy peechy rahoun aur mera har hukm man'na hy* (I will be leading you all and while returning I will be the last one and you have to follow all my orders) D7

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to analyze the text pragmatically. It examined the Speech Acts, Felicity Conditions, and Maxims of Grice. It also indicated the communicative functions embedded in the acts. It also dealt with adjacency pairs, turn allocation and turn taking strategies. It identified the politeness strategies, face saving and threatening acts in a text and explained them. The findings and results show that the text is enriched pragmatically. There is a need to go beyond the literal and semantic representation of the meanings to infer the intentions and actual messages interlocutors convey communicatively. This study is proposed within limited times and resources. It investigated the selected dialogues of *Ehd-e-Wafa*. This is a close study. It is recommended to have more dialogues of other drama serials in order to evaluate them from a pragmatic analysis perspective more appropriately. This study can be contributing to the readers to enhance their pragmatic knowledge and to know how they can analyze the speech or text pragmatically. It is needed to know the intended messages and intentions embedded in a literary genre in accordance with the communicative functions structured in the text to attract the attention of the viewers from a pragmatic analysis perspective. The more researches can be conducted the more strategies, acts, intended messages and communicative functions in the text can be explored.

References

- Bakir, H. (2013). Speech Act Theory: Austin, Searle Derrida's Response . *Journal of Transdisciplinary Studies*, 100-111.
- Bousefield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge.
- Cook, G. (1994). *Discourse and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grice, P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In J. L. Peter Cole, *Syntax and Semantics* (pp. 1-281). New York: Academic Press.
- Haider, S. (2020). *Ehd-e-Wafa was no Alpha Bravo Charlie but it didn't have to be*. Dawn.
- Hashemi, A., & Daneshfar, S. (2020). An Overview of Pragmatism and Pragmatism Assessment. *Academy Publication*, 584-591.
- Huang, Y. (2007). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press..

- Jabeen, D. S. (2018). A Pragmatic Analysis of Married Couples Conversation in a Television Serial 'Nijat'. *Journal of Research (Urdu), BZU-MULTAN* , 159-184.
- Malyanto, S. S., & Fabiola, P. D. (2019). Pragmatic Analysis of the Dialogues in Arther Miller's Drama "The Crucible". *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics* , 53-67.
- Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell
- Portner, P. H. (2005). *What is Meaning? Fundamentals of Formal Semantics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Rustam, R. (2013). Pragmatic Analysis of CNN Headlines Representing Pakistan. *Pastic Dspace Repository* , 1-203.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation*. Cambridge: Blackwell .
- Saeed, J. I. (2003). *Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Szczepanski, P. (2015). Flouting the maxims in scripted speech: An analysis of flouting the maxims of conversation in the television series Firefly. *Karlstads Universitet* , 1-40.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Wood, J. T. (1999). *Communication, Gender and Culture*. Canada: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zeb, F. (2019). FLOUTING OF GRICEAN MAXIMS IN COMEDY DRAMAS. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* , 87-96.