

انتهاك معايير المحادثة في مسرحيات المختارة لإدغار آلان بو

Violation of Conversational Maxims in the Selected Plays of Edgar Allan Poe

م.م. اعتماد منعم نعمه فرحان

المديرية العامة للتربية في محافظة ذي قار

Asst. Inst. I'timad Munem Neama

The General Directorate of Education in Thi Qar Governorate, Iraq

itimadmunem56@gmail.com

Abstract:

This study is devoted to the analysis of the violation of the conversational maxims in selected plays of Edgar Allan Poe. The violation of conversational maxims is proven to give the texts some conversationally implied meaning. Edger Allan Poe's plays are said to include a violation of different maxims of the cooperative principle. Such a process of violation is seen to influence the language of these plays understudy and their interpretation. The study aims at finding out how Allan Poe violates the maxims of the cooperative principle and figure out the types of implicatures that result from the process of violation. Eight extracts from two plays are selected as samples of the current study and a qualitative research analysis is followed in the investigation of the selected data. Grice's (1975) theory of cooperative principle is adopted for the analysis of these data. After analysing the selected data, the study has come up with the finding that Allan Poe violates the maxims of quantity, relevance and manner. The violation of such maxims is proved to have an influence on the meaning of the selected texts and give them different levels of meaning particularly the conversationally implied meaning.

Key words: Violation, conversational maxims, plays, Edgar Alan poe

المستخلص

خصصت هذه الدراسة لتحليل انتهاك معايير المحادثة في مسرحيات مختارة لإدغار آلان بو. أن انتهاك معايير المحادثة يعطي النصوص اللغوية بعض المعاني الضمنية. إن مسرحيات إدغار آلان بو تتضمن انتهاكاً لقواعد مختلفة لمبدأ التعاون. إن عملية الانتهاك تؤثر على لغة هذه المسرحيات محل الدراسة وتفسيرها. تهدف الدراسة إلى معرفة كيفية مخالفة آلان بو لمعايير مبدأ التعاون ومعرفة أنواع المضامين التي تنتج عن عملية الانتهاك. تم اختيار ثمانية مقتطفات من مسرحيتين كعينات للدراسة الحالية وتم اتباع تحليل بحثي نوعي في دراسة البيانات المختارة. تم اعتماد نظرية غرايس (1975) للمبدأ التعاوني لتحليل هذه البيانات. وبعد تحليل البيانات المختارة، توصلت الدراسة إلى نتيجة مفادها أن آلان بو ينتهك معايير الكمية والأهمية والطريقة. وقد ثبت أن مخالفة هذه المبادئ لها تأثير على معنى النصوص المختارة وتعطيها مستويات مختلفة من المعنى وخاصة المعنى الضمني التخاطبي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: انتهاك، مبادئ المحادثة، المسرحيات، إدغار آلان بو.

2. What are the types of implicatures that usually result from the violation of conversational maxims?

1.2. Research Objectives

The present study aims at:

1. Determining the violation of conversational maxims and the effect of such violation on the language of the selected texts.
2. Finding out the types of implicatures that result from such violations.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. Grice's (1975) Theory of Implicature

Grice (1913-1988) is the major linguist and philosopher who investigated implicature and put it in the sights of other linguists and thinkers. His research on conversational implicature and its creation was originally presented in a series of lectures at Harvard University in 1967, and it was later released as a theory in 1975. This idea established an essential paradigm for thinking about implicature (Levinson, 1995).

Mey (2001) believes that the terminology of the word implicature comes from the verb “to imply”, and its cognate is “implication”. Basically, “to imply” means to fold something into something else; hence, that which is implied is folded in and has to be unfolded to be understood” (p.45). Mey, however, in this definition states that, in our speech, we do not usually carry our message directly or explicitly, but we often leave some part of that message implied or indirectly expressed for one reason or another.

The basic concept of this approach is that the link between words and their implicature is not random, dependent on the speaker's purpose and convention, but rather reasonable, based on general norms of cooperative behaviour. Grice (1975) states that “an implicature arises when an utterance would be uncooperative if taken literally, violating one or more maxims about how a cooperative speaker should convey information” (p.20). Grice maintained that a speaker's statement must communicate an extra interpretation and that the speaker is referring to an involved meaning rather than the textual one.

According to Grice (1975), speakers may estimate implicatures using broad cooperative principles. He would not imply that audiences have to undergo this calculation process in order to understand what they hear. This concept unifies the consideration of both particularised, context-dependent implicatures and generalised, context-independent implicatures. Grice's concept is the prominent work on implicature in the philosophy of language, and it inspired several cognitive and metacognitive studies that treated implicature via the process of recovery.

1. Introduction

Wherever people go, they not only employ language as a means of communication but also use it to negotiate the circumstances around them. This is because the language has extensive influence over its recipients and also holds the potential to empower its users. Literature is also another element that is present in everyday life. There are many literary texts, plays in particular, that are descended in the shape of revelations that cannot be understood by common readers and hearers. Playwriters, for instance, often exploit language creatively by using some aesthetic devices including metaphor, irony, simile...etc. to affect their audiences' emotions and loyalties, as well as reveal their ideological views. Sometimes language users employ different strategies to twist their language for different reasons and purposes.

Grice (1975) suggests four maxims of cooperation that need to be followed by language users if they want to make their contribution to the interaction to be successful and comprehensible. There are different ways according to which speakers can act according to the maxims of the cooperative principle including; observing the maxims, violating the maxims, flouting the maxims or opting out of the maxims.

Birner (2013) said that “to violate a maxim is to fail to observe it, but to do so inconspicuously, with the assumption that the hearer will not realise that the maxim is being violated” (p.43). An obvious example of this way of behaving is when someone tells a lie. The speaker produces an utterance and he knows his utterance is false, it violates the maxim of quality and postulates that the other participant in the interaction will not realise the difference. This way of behaviour is used to mislead the listener.

1.1. Problem Statement

This study attempts to identify the violation of conversational maxims by Edgar Allan Poe in his plays. Violating these maxims usually affects the meaning of the language and its interpretation. Violating the maxims naturally creates additional meaning to the language at hand. The additionally interpreted meaning is usually known as an implicature.

To find answers to the research problem, the following questions are presented here:

1. How does Allan Poe violate conversational maxims and what is the effect of such violation on the language of the selected texts?

cooperative means that they have to make their contribution convenient to the conversation at hand. To be cooperative, as Birner (2013) believes, is that interlocutors must stick to the topic of their conversation or at least to the relevant sides of that topic, they have to present what can be accurately, plausibly and concisely interpreted, they should not present distracted and fragmented thoughts and ideas but they give a completely comprehensible contribution, and they shall never present anything irrelevant to the context of their interaction.

Birner (2013) argues that to be uncooperative means to fail to have a successful and meaningful interaction, to fail to respond to the other participant's utterance, to say something irrelevant to the current situation, or to refuse to take part in that conversation. So, it is just because the people involved in the conversation trying to be cooperative, that they can understand and interpret each other's utterances. The following are the maxims of the cooperative principle:

1. The maxim of quality

This maxim demands the communicator to be truthful in his contribution, specifically: This maxim asks the speaker to make his contribution truthful, specifically: - Do not express anything you think to be wrong. - Do not state anything for which there is insufficient proof.

2. The maxim of quantity

This maxim highlights the importance of knowledge: - Keep your participation as informative as necessary for the present aims of the interaction. - Don't make your input any more informative than necessary.

3. The maxim of relation

This maxim requires the communicator to make a declaration about the subject of his talk.

4. The maxim of manner

The communicator follows this rule to make a clear and concise point. He or she must avoid vagueness and vagueness in language, as well as being succinct and tidy.

Even when people may not explicitly plainly articulate their goals, they typically comprehend what each other is saying when they engage. Grice (1975) developed the cooperative principles theory, which explains how one may precisely comprehend what

New-Grecian ideas are works that were influenced by Grice's 1975 concept. These theories confirmed this because when listeners analyse speech, they automatically use some heuristics. The implemented heuristics aid in the conversion and enhancement of the apparent or literal interpretation of words in many ways, resulting in a new type of meaning that exploits and improves the interaction process. According to the neo-Grecians, generic conversational implicatures belong to this type of meaning, but particularised ones do not. According to Levinson (1995), "Grice's theory of implicature is essentially a theory about how people use language" (p.225). Grice (1975) proposes a rule that governs the flow of interaction. He creates his approach primarily to interpret and anticipate conversational implicature. Grice's perspective is to explain how different sorts of implicature may be utilised to comprehend the correct message in a discussion. With this goal in mind, he established a general cooperative principle comprised of four maxims to determine how a speaker might be cooperative in the current dialogue. As was widely known, he felt that interlocutors in a discussion should adhere to these maxims in order to have an effective and successful engagement.

2.2. Grice's Cooperative Principle

Grice (1975) defines the cooperative principle as "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (p.45, as cited in Birner, 2013, p.33). He states that the conversation is not merely a series of fragmented remarks, but is a characteristically rational and cooperative event. He remarks that the participants have to identify the purpose that they intend to evolve within the course of the conversation.

Birner (2013) comments on Grice's definition saying that for you as a speaker, you have to make your utterances compatible with their conversational context. He said that for a conversation to work successfully and efficiently, the participants involved must be cooperative or at least they have to try to do so. Being

Martha: I have to be with my father. Martha's answer, whether yes or no, would have represented a meaningful reply to Steve's query; therefore, Martha's response cannot be considered unimportant. Because she has to be with her father, she does not have time to attend the party. In this case, both Steve and Martha must have common prior knowledge for Martha's response to be considered relevant and meaningful to the topic at hand.

Interpreting particularized conversational implicature requires some reference to a special background knowledge between the participants involved in the conversation. Yule (1996) thinks that "most of the inferences are assumed in a very specific context in which conversation takes place. The analysis of the conveyed meaning requires such inferences that give rise to particularized conversational implicatures" (p.42). Paltridge (2006), in the same way, argues that this implicature is derived from the words used in a conversation, the context in which these words are used, they require shared knowledge and cultural understanding between the participants, and they require observing the maxim of relation for the implied meaning to be interpreted correctly.

2.3.1.2. Generalised Conversational Implicature

Birner (2013) defines conversational implicature as "the one that can be generally attached to the form, and therefore does not need to be computed anew with each relevance utterance" (p.63).

(3) Some of my friends came to my graduation party.

The phrase (some of my friends) in this sentence includes the meaning that (not all of my friends). There is nothing in this example concerning friends, their coming, or any other matter that contributes to the understanding of this statement. The use of the expression "some" leads to the interpretation. In most circumstances, when the term "some" is employed in a document, it does not imply all. As a result, we may say that the kind of implicature from some to not all is a generalised one, and it is the one that has come to be found when the term some is employed. With this sort of implicature, no special type of common knowledge between the participants is necessary for the perception of the extra and intentional interpretation. That is, this sort of conversational implicature is situational, and

other people mean by general standards in human communication based on cooperative principles. The model of analysis is adopted from Grice (1975).

2.3. Types of Implicatures
Mey (2001) and Grice (1975) state that implicature can be classified into two main types these are conventional implicature and conversational implicature.

2.3.1. Conversational Implicature
Conversational implicature, according to Grice (1975), is a variety of implicature that may be grasped and comprehended if and only if the speakers in a given conversation comprehend the situation of the speaker's statement.

Black (2006) says that conversational implicature is considered as "the combination of language and the context of the situation in which that language is used. One utterance, when found in different occasions might not give rise to an implicature, or it might suggest different implicatures" (p.25). Conversational implicature is based on the situation where it is discovered, and its understanding must be dependent on that context in order to be genuinely comprehended. Mey (2001) describes conversational implicature as the part of the meaning that is left implicit in any interaction; it relates to a particular aspect of meaning that is left for the perception of the persons participating in real language usage. It refers to how we interpret a speaker's speech in a given discussion based on what we anticipate to hear.

2.3.1.1. Types of Conversational Implicature
Grice (1975) identifies two kinds of conversational implicatures: particularised implicatures and generalised implicatures. Scalar quantity implicature and clausal implicature are two forms of implicature in turn.

2.3.1.1. Particularized Conversational Implicatures

According to Birner (2013), particularised implicature is "unique to the particular context in which they occur" (p.64). The implicature cannot be extended to certain other situations, and its interpretation is limited to the context in which it is found; if it appears in another context, it will be interpreted differently.

(1) - Steve: Martha, are you going to the marriage party tomorrow?

should realize that the speaker is sarcastically speaking. In this type of implicature, the speaker fails to obey the maxim of quality.

Opt-out a maxim: Birner (2013) states that to opt out of a maxim is “to refuse to play the game at all” (p.43). If you want to argue with your brother but he says nothing he just responds by opening his book and starts reading, he has opted out. In the same way, when in court, according to the fifth amendment which gives the defendant a way of opting out, that is the defendant says nothing and does not take part in the court discussion.

3. Methodology

3.1. Methods of Analysis

In this study, a qualitative research analysis is employed. A qualitative design is a research method that is used descriptive data. In the qualitative technique, "the descriptive data are human beings' written or spoken words and their observable behaviours" (Verstraete, 2005, p.4). This study examines the notion of the violation of conversational maxims in selected plays by Edgar Allan Poe. According to Vanderstoep and Johnston (2009), qualitative research is a type of study that produces a descriptive text about a specific phenomenon. In addition to qualitative methodology, Grice's (1975) theory of cooperative principle is adopted for the analysis of the selected data. By following this theory, the process of violation is identified and the types of implicatures that result from this violation are investigated.

Throughout this study, two plays by Edger Allan Poe are selected, which are then read several times and the violation of the conversational maxims in these selected plays is determined and eight extracts are selected as samples of the present study. The texts are selected according to the violation of the maxims and the influence of these maxims on the meaning of the selected texts, which is regarded as an important component because of its relevance to the major topic of the study and also meets research aims. eight extracts are selected from two plays entitled “The Black Cat” and “The Conversation of Eiros and Charmion” by Edger Allan Poe.

4. Data analysis

This section is devoted to the analysis of the selected data. Two plays by Edger Allan Poe have been selected.

we may generalise our understanding of the intentional interpretation of the selected words to the majority, if not all, of the other circumstances in which they exist (Yule, 1996).

2.4. Acting According to the Conversational Maxims

Grice (1975) mentions four ways according to which participants can behave concerning the maxims of the cooperative principle. These ways include observing the maxims, violating them, flouting them, or opting them out. Birner (2013) gives a brief explanation of these ways of behaving as follows:

Observe a maxim: Birner (2013) remarks that “to observe a maxim is to straightforwardly obey it” (p.43). That means for the interlocutors to observe a maxim is to say the thing for which they have adequate evidence, to say the required amount, to say only what is relevant to the conversation at hand, and to say it briefly, clearly, and unambiguously.

Violate a maxim: Birner (2013) says that “to violate a maxim is to fail to observe it, but to do so inconspicuously, with the assumption that the hearer won't realize that the maxim is being violated” (p.43). An obvious example of this way of behaving is when someone tells a lie.

The speaker produces an utterance and he knows his utterance is false, it violates the maxim of quality and postulates that the other participant in the interaction will not realize the difference. This way of behaviour is used to mislead the listener.

Flout a maxim: Birner (2013) argues that “to flout a maxim is also to violate it but in this case, the violation is so intentionally obvious that the hearer is expected to be aware of the violation” (p.43). A simple example of this kind of behaviour is when a student, after taking an exam, tells his colleague that (the exam was easy), and they both know that the exam was not easy, here the speaker does not expect his friends to believe that the exam was easy. In this example, the utterance (the exam was easy) should not be interpreted literally, but it has some kind of implied meaning and the hearer

other utterance that includes some violation of other maxims of the cooperative principle is *“My original soul seemed, at once, to take its flight from my body and a more than fiendish malevolence, gin-nurtured, thrilled every fibre of my frame”*. In such an utterance the speaker violated the maxims of quantity, relevance and manner. The maxim of quantity is violated when the speaker says less than is required to express the man’s state of mind. The relevance maxim is violated when the speaker speaks an utterance that has no relation to the linguistic structure of the text, but pragmatically it is related. It is related in that the speaker conversationally implies that the man reached a level of anger that made him lose his mind and act in such a criminal way. The maxim of manner is, additionally, violated. The speaker does so by mentioning some ambiguous utterances that conversationally imply the man’s rage and anger.

Extract 2

“When reason returned with the morning --- when I had slept off the fumes of the night’s debauch --- I experienced a sentiment half of horror, half of remorse, for the crime of which I had been guilty; but it was, at best, a feeble and equivocal feeling, and the soul remained untouched. I again plunged into excess, and soon drowned in wine all memory of the deed”.

In this extract, some maxims of the cooperative principle are violated. The violation is found in the maxims of quantity, relevance and manner. The maxim of quantity is violated in the utterance *“When reason returned with the morning”*. This utterance conversationally implies that the man got calm down and retained his consciousness in the morning and regretted what he did. The maxim of relation is also violated in this extract. The violation of relevance can be seen in *“it was, at best, a feeble and equivocal feeling”*. This utterance can be seen as linguistically irrelevant to the text but it has a pragmatic meaning. It conversationally implies that the man considers his feelings as weak and unintentional.

4.1. Analysis of the First Play

The first play that has been selected by the researcher is entitled *“The Black Cat”*.

Extract 1

“One night, returning home, much intoxicated, from one of my haunts about town, I fancied that the cat avoided my presence. I seized him; when, in his fright at my violence, he inflicted a slight wound upon my hand with his teeth. The fury of a demon instantly possessed me. I knew myself no longer. My original soul seemed, at once, to take its flight from my body and a more than fiendish malevolence, gin-nurtured, thrilled every fibre of my frame. I took from my waistcoat-pocket a pen-knife, opened it, grasped the poor beast by the throat, and deliberately cut one of its eyes from the socket! I blush, I burn, I shudder, while I pen the damnable atrocity”.

In the above extract, the speaker violates some of the maxims of the cooperative principle. In the first line, the speaker violates the maxim of quantity. The violation of such a maxim leads to the creation of a conversational form of implicature. When he says *“much intoxicated, from one of my haunts about town”* the speaker means that he got back home feeling very tired after a long. When the man got home, he imagined that his cat avoided him. His imagination made him feel very angry and act violently towards the poor cat. Another example that included some sort of violation is found in the text *“he inflicted a slight wound upon my hand with his teeth”* in which the maxim of quantity is violated. In saying this utterance, the speaker conversationally means that the cat reacted to the man’s violence by scratching his hand and this increased the man’s anger. the extract above conversationally means that the man’s bad temper and the cat’s reaction made the man act violently and harm the poor animal.

In the above extract, the speaker is found to violate the maxims of the cooperative principle in others examples. He violates the maxim of relation when he says *“The fury of a demon instantly possessed me”*. In saying this utterance, the speaker conversationally implicated that the man became so angry to the extent that he could not control himself. The extent of his rage made him lose his mind and became mad. This is what made him act violently against the poor cat. The

includes some violation of other maxims of the cooperative principle is “*forgetting, in my wrath, the childish dread which had hitherto stayed my hand*”. In such an utterance, the speaker violated the maxims of quantity, relevance and manner. The maxim of quantity is violated when the speaker says less than is required to express the man’s state of mind. The relevance maxim is violated when the speaker says an utterance that is not related to the linguistic structure of the text, but pragmatically it is related. It is related in that the speaker conversationally implies that the man reached a level of anger that made him lose his mind and act in such a criminal way. The maxim of manner is, additionally, violated. The speaker does so by mentioning some ambiguous utterances that conversationally imply the man’s rage and anger.

4.2. Analysis of the Second Play
The second play which is selected is entitled “The Conversation of Eiros and Charmion”

Extract 1

“*Dreams are with us no more; --- but of these mysteries anon. I rejoice to see you Looking life-like and rational. The film of the shadow has already passed from off your eyes. Be of heart, and fear nothing. Your allotted days of stupor have expired; and, tomorrow, I will myself induct you into the full joys and wonders of your novel existence*”.

In this extract, there can be seen a violation of some conversational maxims. Quantity, relevance and manner maxims are violated in this example. The utterance “*Dreams are with us no more*” includes a violation of the maxim of quantity. The violation causes some form of conversational implicature. It, however, conversationally implies that the people, addressed in the speech, lost hope and could not gain their dreams and wishes. The utterance also includes a violation of the maxim of manner. The utterance is produced ambiguously. This ambiguity can have different interpretations.

In the above extract, the utterance “*Be of heart, and fear nothing*” are found to include a violation of some of the maxims of the cooperative principle. The quantity maxim is violated when the speaker says less than is required. It also included a violation of the relevance maxim in which the speaker says “*be of heart*” which is, somehow, irrelevant. The manner maxim, furthermore, is violated when the speaker says the

Extract 3

“*In the meantime the cat slowly recovered. The socket of the lost eye presented, it is true, a frightful appearance, but he no longer appeared to suffer any pain. He went about the house as usual, but, as might be expected, fled in extreme terror at my approach. I had so much of my old heart left, as to be at first grieved by this evident dislike on the part of a creature which had once so loved me*”.

This example is found to include a violation in some maxims of the cooperative principle. Such violation exists in the maxim of quantity, relevance and manner. Quantity maxim is violated in the utterance “*The socket of the lost eye presented, it is true, a frightful appearance, but he no longer appeared to suffer any pain*”. In this utterance, the speaker conversationally implies that the cat recovered from the wound and no longer feels pain. The maxim of relation is also violated. By saying “*I had so much of my old heart left*”, the speaker mentions something irrelevant to the linguistic text. This utterance could be interpreted to have some form of conversational implicature that result from the violation of the relevance maxim. This utterance can be understood as the man feeling sorry for what happened to the poor cat and feeling pity for the creature that used to love him. when the man saw that the cat avoided him, he realised that this innocent animal no longer loved him.

Extract 4

“*The cat followed me down the steep stairs, and, nearly throwing me headlong, exasperated me to madness. Uplifting an axe, and forgetting, in my wrath, the childish dread which had hitherto stayed my hand, I aimed a blow at the animal which, of course, would have proved instantly fatal had it descended as I wished. But this blow was arrested by the hand of my wife. Goaded, by the interference, into a rage more than demoniacal, I withdrew my arm from her grasp and buried the axe in her brain. She fell dead on the spot, without a groan*”.

In the above extract, the speaker is found to violate some of the maxims of the cooperative principle. He violates the maxim of relation when he says “*exasperated me to madness*”. In saying this utterance, the speaker conversationally implied that he became so angry to the extent that he became mad and out of consciousness. The extent of his rage made him lose his mind and behave with craziness. This is what made him act violently against the poor cat. The other utterance that

Extract 4

“Yet a day, and men breathed with greater freedom. It was clear that we were already within the influence of the comet; yet we lived. We even felt an unusual elasticity of frame and vivacity of mind. The exceeding tenuity of the object of our dread was apparent; for all heavenly objects were plainly visible through it. Meantime, our vegetation had perceptibly altered; and we gained faith, from this predicted circumstance, in the foresight of the wise. A wild luxuriance of foliage, utterly unknown before, burst out upon every vegetable thing”.

The extract above is assured to include a violation of some conversational maxims. The violation is seen in the quantity, relevance and manner maxims. The utterance *“Yet a day, and men breathed with greater freedom”* includes a violation of the maxim of quantity. The violation causes some form of conversational implicature. It, however, conversationally implies that the people, addressed in the speech, finally got their freedom after a long time of suffering and harshness. The utterance also includes a violation of the maxim of manner. The utterance is produced ambiguously. This ambiguity can have different interpretations and meanings.

In the above extract, the utterance *“We even felt an unusual elasticity of frame and vivacity of mind”* is found to include a violation of some of the maxims of the cooperative principle. The quantity maxim is violated when the speaker says less than is required. It also included a violation of the relevance maxim where the speaker means that they feel a sort of mind clearness and simplicity of thinking and imagination. The maxim of manner, furthermore, is violated when the speaker says the utterance ambiguously. Violating these maxims leads to the creation of some conversational implicature. In this utterance, the speaker means that they passed the time of restriction and started the time of freedom, mental clearness and extension of thinking and imagination.

5. Discussion of the Results

The selected extracts are found to include different forms of the violation process. The speakers in the extracts have the choice to act in different ways according to the maxims of the cooperative principle. Those participants have the choice to observe, flout, violate or opt them out. Since the analysis is mainly concerned with the violating these maxims, the focus was on this process other than other ways of acting.

utterance ambiguously. Violating these maxims leads to the creation of some conversational implicature. In this utterance, the speaker means that the addressed person should be fearless. That person should fear nothing and be courageous.

Extract 2

“The wild sickness and the terrible darkness have left me, and I hear no longer that mad, rushing, horrible sound, like the “voice of many waters.” Yet my senses are bewildered, Charmion, with the keenness of their perception of the new”.

This extract is proven to include a violation of the maxims of the cooperative principle. The maxim of quantity is violated in this extract. When the speaker says *“The wild sickness and the terrible darkness have left me”*, his utterance is found to include a conversational form of implicature. This type of implicature also results from the violation of relevance and manner maxims. The speaker says some utterances that are proved to be irrelevant to the text. Saying the expressions *“wild”* and *“darkness”* are found to include a type of conversational implicature. This conversationally implies that the speaker suffered from a real and tiring sickness.

Extract 3

“I fully understand you, and feel for you. It is now ten earthly years since I underwent what you undergo --- yet the remembrance of it hangs by me still. You have now suffered all of pain, however, which you will suffer in Aidenn”.

This extract is proved to include a form of violation of the maxims of the cooperative principle. The utterance *“I fully understand you, and feel for you”* includes a violation of the maxim of quantity. The speaker violates this maxim to convey more than what he said. The speaker conversationally implies that he is aware of the feelings and emotions of the addressed person. This shows the close relationship between the speaker and the addressed person. The speaker could be understood to have seen and experienced all that the addressed person experiences and feels now. In this extract, the speaker is found to talk about his experience and feeling towards what he saw and passed through along the journey of his life. He is noticed to tell and advise the addressed person, in particular, and people in general how to behave in their lives and to act according to the circumstances they pass through.

References

- Birner, J. (2013). *Introduction to pragmatics*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Black, E. (2006). *Pragmatics stylistics: Edinburgh textbooks in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Grice, p. (1975). *Logic and conversation. Syntax and semantics*. Academic Press.
- Levinson, C. (1995). *Interactional biases in human thinking*. In E. Goody (ed.), *Social intelligence and interaction* (pp.221-60). Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, J. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse analysis. An introduction*. Great Britain: London, Cornwell.
- Verstraete, J. (2005). Scalar quantity implicature and the interpretation of modality. Problems in the deontic domain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37 (11), 1401-1418. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(01\)00039-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(01)00039-X).
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. London: Oxford University Press.

In the selected extracts, the speakers violate some of the maxims of the cooperative principle including the maxim quantity relevance and manner. The speakers violated these maxims to convey more meaning than the explicit interpretation of their utterances. In the extracts of the first play, the violation is represented in the description of the man's state of mind in reacting against the poor cat. The violation is used as a technique by the writer to express his intention indirectly and to convey more meaning and information regarding the events between the man and his cat.

The same thing is found in the second play. The writer is realised to violate some of the maxims of the cooperative principle. The violation also exists in many instances where more meaning and information are indirectly expressed. The violation of these maxims in the selected data proves the belief that, in literary texts, the maxims are violated by the writer. This is a procedure followed by those writers to present some messages and implied meanings that require a common knowledge between them and their audience in order to be understood.

5. Conclusions

In all of the previously analysed extracts, the maxims of the cooperative principle are proved to be violated in many instances and for different purposes. The maxims of quantity, relevance and manner are violated by the speakers. The participants, in these extracts, are found to present some of their speech ambiguously, present some irrelevant expressions and say less than is required for the interaction in which they are engaged. As a result of the violation of these maxims, the extracts are found to include a conversational form of implicature. These extracts are proved to have different interpretations which are related to the conversational form of implicature. According to the results of the analysis, Allan Poe is proved to violate the maxims of the cooperative principle. The violation of these maxims makes the language of the selected plays include several form of conversational implicatures. Therefore, the selected plays include different levels of meanings and interpretations.