Modern Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities
ISSN: 2795-4846 Volume 22 (Dec-2023)
Available online: https://mjssh.academicjournal.io

Gricean Maxims, Violations, and Cooperation: An Analytical Study of Discourse

Ashish Kumar Sonkar
Research Scholar, IIT Roorkee

Prof. Rashmi Gaur
Professor, IIT Roorkee

Abstract: This research explores the notion of the Gricean maxims, conditions of violations or infringements, and applicability in discourse. Grice (1975) developed his views on language concerned with the relationship between direct and indirect speech acts and the concept that you could 'do' things with words. Grice discussed the distinction between saying and meaning and how the mechanism behind this process works. This article examines the relevance, applicability, and interruption of the Gricean cooperative principle in discourse. The Gricean notion of maxims is an abstract rule and pattern that the member of the society follows consciously or unconsciously during the conversation. The article finds that maxims are applicable in discourse with certain constraints that are context-specific and inferential meaning of discourse or conversation.

Keywords: Gricean Maxims, Discourse, Cooperative Principle, Violations.

1. Introduction

H. P. Grice presupposes in his cooperative principle, "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Grice, 1989, p. 26). From classical to contemporary time, pragmatic theories are theoretical frameworks that explain the message-driven use of linguistic and extralinguistic communication elements according to contextual nuances. His theory is founded on the premise that a differentiation exists between saying and meaning. This implies that individuals can convey implicit significance, and those engaged in the conversation can discern the intended meaning. Furthermore, he contends that participants subconsciously adhere to specific rules and patterns in their verbal exchanges.

Grice formulated his language theories by exploring the interplay between direct and indirect speech acts and the idea that words have the power to accomplish actions. He delved into the distinction between utterance and intended meaning, investigating the underlying mechanisms of this process, where implicit and intended meanings come into play. In his seminal work, 'Logic Conversation' (1975), Grice argued that human communication is inherently rational and logical, evident in how we structure our discourse. Grice's influential 1975 theory serves as the cornerstone for ostensibly universal politeness theories. This study assesses the applicability of Grice's theory in elucidating discourse. Foundational pragmatic theories, such as Conversational implicature (e.g., Grice 1975) and Speech Act Theory (e.g., Austin 1962; Searle 1969), have played crucial roles. Leech (1983a), for instance, posits that, in conversations, prioritizing the avoidance of offense outweighs the pursuit of absolute clarity, as reflected in his assertion, "It is more important in a conversation to avoid offense than achieve clarity" (1973: 297). Grice's Cooperative Principle is grounded on the assumption that language users implicitly agree to cooperate by making their contributions to the ongoing conversation based on its current stage and direction. Grice's understanding of what is said is relatively constrained,

and pragmatics has a much more significant role in determining what is said than Grice initially acknowledged.

According to Austin (1962), words can be considered actions because when certain words are uttered in specific contexts and meet felicity conditions, they lead to the performance of actions. Austin classifies speech acts into three categories: locutionary act (performing an act of saying something), illocutionary act (the act performed while saying something), and perlocutionary act (the act achieved by saying something). The pragmatic theory of Bach and Harnish (1979) focuses on intentions and inferences. They argue that the Speaker (S) should use language in a manner that allows the Hearer (H) to understand the speaker's intentions, whether they are literal or non-literal. This inferential process is facilitated by Mutual Contextual Beliefs between the Speaker and Hearer, as well as their shared world knowledge. However, Gumperz (1982) argues that the speakers must consider all the contextual clues in various discourse types. These include turn-taking strategies, speech accommodation, and voice alterations. On the other hand, Ladegaard (2008) also adds that to understand the speaker's intention accurately in interaction and interpret the underlying meaning of an utterance, the use of these cues is essential. Furthermore, Ladegaard's (2008) analysis conflicts with Grice's position. He claims "human interaction may be irrational and illogical, and that resistance and noncooperation may be adopted as the preferred discursive strategy interactants seem to try their best to be 'bad' communicators.

Despite the diverse critiques, Grice's Cooperative Principle and its associated maxims remain the predominant model for understanding the implicit agreement among participants in everyday conversational contexts. In contrast, Sperber and Wilson's relevance theory and Horn's Neo-Gricean principles are deemed too abstract to enable the direct prediction of potential inferences made by participants or interlocuters, making them challenging to test directly. Consequently, many survey researchers have concentrated on investigating Grice's maxims (Schwarz, 1994).

Grice delves into the concepts of speaker meaning or intention, but intriguingly, these aspects are conspicuously absent in his exploration of implicature. Grice briefly encapsulates this idea (1989: 86) by stating, "What is implicated is what it is necessary to presume a speaker thinks in order to uphold the belief that they are adhering to the Cooperative Principle, if not in the exact what is said, at least at what level what is implied." According to Grice's own perspective, speakers cannot merely imply whatever they intend by expressing something different. Grice asserts that conversational implicatures can be deduced by considering various factors, including world knowledge, the linguistic and non-linguistic context of the utterance, general background information, and adherence to the cooperative principles of conversation. The cooperative principles suggest that during a conversation, participants should contribute necessary and relevant information to the ongoing discourse, aligning with the accepted purpose or direction of the exchange in which they are engaged (Grice, 1989, p. 26). According to Grice, the cooperative principle operates in the plans of speakers and understanding of hearers by obeying maxims –

1. **Quality –** People are expected to say something they believe to be correct. People are not supposed to say anything that lacks evidence.

A. Make your contribution as informative as required (for the current purposes of the exchange);
B. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

2. **Quantity –** People shall not give more information than what is needed. People should not provide too little information as well.

A. Try to make your contribution one that is true.
B. Do not say what you believe to be false;
C. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

3. **Manner –** People shall make their utterances as clear or straightforward as possible. People shall not be ambiguous and obscure.

A. Be relevant

4. **Relation –** People shall give information relevant to the issue being asked.

A. Be perspicuous.
B. Avoid obscurity of expression;
C. Avoid ambiguity;
D. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity);
E. Be orderly (Grice, 1975, p. 47)

2. The notion of Gricean Implicature

Grice (1989) makes a distinction between two types of conversational implicatures, which have been further explored and discussed by Levinson (1983, 2000) and Horn (2004): generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. Generalized conversational implicature is not reliant on the specific context-independent and is based on the conventional default meaning of linguistic structures. For example, in the sentence "she varnished her nails," it is typically understood that she varnished her own fingernails without any additional context support. On the other hand, particularized conversational implicature is context-dependent and arises from the speaker deliberately flouting a maxim (Grice, 1989). The speaker intends for the hearer to draw conclusions from various sources, such as the literal meaning of words, the speech situation, encyclopedic background knowledge, shared cultural models, and more. The cooperative principle and maxims are often considered a set of guiding principles that facilitate the hearer's comprehension and interpretation of the intended meaning of the speaker in natural conversations.

In examining the concept of indirectness, Grice postulated a dual facet to an utterance, delineating it into the explicit content, known as what is said, and the implied content, for which he coined the term "implicature." Within this framework, he made a crucial distinction between conventional implicature, where the established meaning of words or structures in an utterance dictates the implications, and conversational implicature, which delves into the implied or suggested aspects beyond the conventional meaning within the contextual dynamics of a specific conversation. Grice proceeds to categorize conversational implicatures into two distinct types: generalized implicatures, exhibiting a certain degree of autonomy from context, and particularized implicatures, intricately reliant on both the specific content and contextual intricacies of the uttered expression.

Davis delves into his comprehensive exploration of Grice's theory; he introduces certain significant propositions that extend beyond Grice's original framework. These additional claims pertain to Davis' definitions of two distinct types of conversational implicatures: speaker implicatures and sentence implicatures. In Davis' view, speaker implicatures encompass the ideas or implications that a speaker conveys by expressing something else. On the other hand, 'sentence implicature' is intricately connected to speaker implicature. It is defined in reference to speaker implicature as follows: "sentence implicates, roughly, what speakers using the sentence with its regular meaning would commonly use it to implicate." Speaker implicature revolves around individual intentions, while sentence implicature relies on community-wide conventions. Consequently, In Davis' framework, speaker implicature corresponds to Grice's particularized implicature, while sentence implicature corresponds to Grice's generalized implicature.

3. Violations and Infringements of Maxims

Grice also outlines four ways in which a participant may fail to adhere to a maxim. Firstly, a speaker can "Violate" a maxim by intentionally misleading the listener without the listener being aware of the speaker's lack of adherence, such as when telling a lie. Secondly, a speaker may "Opt Out" to follow a maxim, explicitly indicating a lack of cooperation, as in the expression 'my lips are sealed.' Thirdly, situations may arise where two or more maxims "Conflict," leading to the fulfillment of one violating another. Lastly, a speaker might openly disregard a specific maxim, anticipating that the listener recognizes this non-compliance; this open non-observance is termed "Flouting," a maxim. Since the listener is cognizant of the maxim violation, the Cooperative Principle remains in effect. The implicature resulting from flouting can significantly differ in meaning from the semantic content of the

statement. Any meaning conveyed through conversational implicature represents a form of indirect communication, with flouting a maxim being a specific instance of such indirectness.

Interlocuters deviate, flout, or manipulate the maxims in cooperative principles for various reasons, resulting in less effective and efficient communication. Politeness may lead people to violate the quality maxim, as exemplified in the case of a woman asking if she looks fat, and we respond with an inaccurate account of her weight. Similarly, the maxim of manner may be breached when a friend asks for our opinion on their newly constructed house, which has evident flaws and is relatively small. To be courteous, we might intentionally respond with an ambiguous and unclear answer like, "Your house is unique." In Grice's theory, a form of indirect communication arises through the deliberate violation or "flouting" of a maxim. In this scenario, the speaker anticipates that the recipient will perceive the violation and, consequently, deduce implications diverging from the literal meaning of the communicated message. When conversational participants adhere to the maxims, the speaker aims to convey not only the explicit content of their statement but also "inferences beyond the semantic content of the sentences uttered" (Levinson, 1983, p. 103).

In Grice's framework, when a maxim is flouted, it leads to the creation of an implicature. This assumption is essential because, without it, a co-interactant would not find it worthwhile to invest the effort required to decipher an indirect speech act. This represents the fundamental and widely accepted explanation of the cooperative principle, maxims, and implicatures. However, the operation of the cooperative principle can be observed in language usage through instances of flouting, violations, infringements, and opting out. It is important to note that the Cooperative Principle does not aim to simplify the hearer's task; in fact, it can have the opposite effect. It grants the speaker the ability to make their statement more challenging, rather than easier, to interpret. Speakers can choose to withhold information or use non-literal propositions, expecting the listeners to undertake the additional effort necessary for comprehension. Grice's focus lies in distinguishing between what is said and what is meant, specifically in how listeners discern the speaker's intention when implicit language is employed. From a different perspective, Leech (1983) proposed that "politeness plays a crucial role as the "missing force" within Grice's cooperative principle. Politeness could be the driving force behind a speaker's choice to violate or manipulate the four maxims: Quality, Quantity, Relevance, and Manner in a conversation. Another aspect where Gricean's Conversational Logic falls short in explaining the conversational patterns relates to the Maxim of Quality. Grice posits that in conversations, participants typically refrain from uttering statements they know to be untrue, thereby establishing an expectation among interlocutors that the information shared by speakers is accurate.

4. Literature Review

Bousfield (2008) seeks to draw a distinction between two types of cooperation: formal or linguistic cooperation and extralinguistic or social cooperation. Confining Gricean's concept of co-operativeness to the former can explain why, even in confrontational or impolite interactions, people can still effectively exchange information to engage in confrontation. However, there are concerns regarding how distinct formal cooperation is from social, extralinguistic cooperation (see Sarangi and Slembrouck 1992). Nonetheless, Lumsden (2008: 1903) highlights that Grice was aware of challenging cases like quarreling. This is why Grice's description of the cooperative principle not only speaks of a "common purpose or set of purposes" but also includes the phrase "or at least a mutually accepted direction" (Grice, 1989, p. 26). Moreover, according to Moeschler (2004: 50), since speakers have the capacity to communicate beyond their literal words, the listener is required to deduce the speaker's intended meaning not solely from the utterance itself but also from other available information within the context.

The Gricean maxims have not been universally accepted as an unquestionable theory, facing several criticisms. Hadi (2013) highlighted critical challenges to Grice's theory, referencing the works of Thomas (1998), Davies (2007), Taillard (2004), and others. Thomas (1998, as cited by Hadi 2013) contended that proponents of Grice's theory overlooked exploring the ambiguous term "cooperation" and failed to interpret and apply this concept consistently. Ladegaard (2009) emphasized that the

ambiguity and inconsistency in Grice's own definition of cooperation led adopters of the theory to define the term to align with their specific objectives.

Davies (2007) argued that conflicting interpretations of the "cooperation" concept stemmed from the disparity between Grice's usage and the general meaning of the word. Additionally, some researchers asserted that Grice's cooperative principle and its maxims were considered universal. Thomas (1988) criticized Grice's work for three misinterpretations: an overly optimistic view of human nature, the proposition of a set of rules for effective conversation, and the assumption that his suggested maxims would always be taken into account.

An intriguing investigation was carried out by Tupan (2008), where she delved into the dialogues of the American television series titled "Desperate Housewives." This captivating show amalgamates elements of drama, comedy, mystery, thriller, farce, soap opera, and satire. The housewives portrayed in the series find themselves in desperate situations due to love, betrayals, scandals, and conflicts among them, leading to a web of lies and deceit. Consequently, they frequently breach conversational maxims, committing multiple violations to navigate their lies, each with its own underlying purpose. The data revealed that the characters lied for various reasons, such as concealing the truth, preserving the speaker's or the hearer's reputation, providing the hearer with an appropriate utterance or response to uplift them, or avoiding causing harm to the hearer.

Sarangi and Slembrouck (1992) also contested the Gricean assertion of the normality of cooperation, proposing that Grice's framework should encompass societal factors, such as the social position of communicators. Hadi (2013) concluded that Grice's theory is flawed for several reasons. Firstly, it exhibits a notable bias towards cooperation, neglecting instances where speakers intentionally aim to miscommunicate. Secondly, the theory is inherently asocial, lacking an explanation for how people communicate within complex social contexts. Furthermore, Hadi (2013) argued that Grice's theory is rigid, failing to acknowledge the intricate, diverse, and rich nature of human communication. It overlooks situations where the speaker's intention is deliberate miscommunication. As Jin (1999) contended, the Cooperative Principle is not a rule governing everyday conversation but rather an observed pattern in research on social discourse. Despite the limitations of Grice's work, Hadi (2013) acknowledged its central position in the field of pragmatics and recognized its undeniable importance in shaping the discipline.

Mukaro (2013) investigated instances of conversational maxim infringement in public discussions in Shona, encompassing daily conversations, talks, and discussions. Equipped with an understanding of the maxims and substantial background information on implicature, the researchers examined how these maxims were transgressed in their collected data. They referred to Yang (2008), who observed instances of conversational implicature failure due to various reasons, including linguistic nature, failure to grasp the speaker's true intentions, or misunderstanding language idioms. Consequently, Mukaro and colleagues highlighted in their paper that the most prevalent form of implicature failure in Shona is the inability of the listener to interpret language idioms. The violations of maxims in Shona were categorized into three groups: maxim clash, opting out, and flouting. Similarly, Jin (1999) also explored the potential for violating maxims to enhance cooperation in doctor-patient interactions.

Jakaza, E. (2013) utilized a pragmatic methodology in investigating newspaper discourse, specifically predicting the outcomes of the harmonized elections in Zimbabwe in 2008. The researcher aimed to scrutinize how journalists adhered to or deviated from the Cooperative Principle and its maxims in their coverage leading up to the 2008 harmonized election. The underlying hypothesis was that news reporters anticipate complying with the maxims and cooperative principle in their communication with the audience.

Francesca Poggi (2016), in his article, "Grice, the Law, and the Linguistic Special Case Thesis," examines the applicability of Grice's theory of conversational implicatures to legal statutes and other general heteronomous legal acts, and he argues that in the exceptional cases, cooperative principle and conversational implicature is inapplicability. In support of his arguments, he proposed the valid argument viz. the first feature is the conflicting nature of the legal practice, as typically emerges in

legal trials; the second peculiarity of legal practice is the absence of something like a legislative communicative intention, and the third feature of legal practice is represented by the somehow "a-contextual" nature of the legislation. Therefore, most philosophers of language cannot accept that cooperative principle and conversational maxims do not apply to legislative interpretation because they see the legislation as a particular case of ordinary conversation. Therefore, they use the same conventions, maxims, notions, etc. They have tested in their studies on everyday linguistic interactions.

Ngenget, S. (2017) also sought to reexamine Gricean maxims within the context of the Manado Malay language, spoken by the residents of Manado and its surrounding areas. The objective of the study was to explore how the Cooperative Principle is transgressed in the Manado Malay language and to discern the purpose behind the resulting implicature. The findings demonstrated that violations of Gricean maxims are evident in the Manado Malay language. This implies that the cooperative principle is breached through the violation of Grice's four maxims, suggesting that users of the Manado Malay language tend to employ implicature in their everyday communication. Grice's (1975) contributions, specifically his conversational principle and maxims, aim to address the concept of indirect speech within speech act theory, as discussed by Searle in 1975. Although the politeness aspect in the social context has been suggested as a primary factor for indirectness in speech (Brown and Levinson 1987, 1978), an alternative explanation for indirectness based on cognitive factors has also been presented (Sperber & Wilson, 1986).

In the article "The Speaker Knows Best Principle," Forman (1974: 170) endeavors to explain both direct and indirect speech acts through the following principle: A speaker is permitted to interrogate a proposition known by the hearer and assert a proposition about which the speaker possesses more knowledge than the addressee. Forman defines a speaker-proposition as one in which the speaker has greater knowledge than the addressee, while a hearer-proposition pertains to a topic about which the addressee is more knowledgeable than the speaker.

5. Methods and Frameworks

The researcher has followed descriptive and qualitative methodology for this research. For this article, the researcher has selected Munro's short story collection, *Runaway*. This collection has eight stories, but the researcher has taken only three stories for the examination and analysis of the study that are suitable from the point of Gricean conversational maxims. The researcher has not selected other stories due to the limitations of the study and the compatibility of the research. The list of the chosen three stories is viz—C*hange, Soon, and Passion.* The analysis of the discourse is presented by unfolding and elucidating the context of the situation when the conversation occurred, followed by interpreting the discourse with applicability and infringement of Gricean conversational maxims. There are four Gricean conversational maxims below.

1. Maxim of Quantity
2. Maxim of Quality
3. Maxim of Relation or Relevance
4. Maxim of Manner

According to Grice, there are five types of violations of Maxims, which are listed below.

1. Violation of Maxim
2. Flouting of Maxim
3. Infringement of Maxim
4. Opt-out of Maxim
5. Suspending of Maxim (Grice, 1975, p. 47)

6. Source of Data and Analysis

For this study, the researcher has selected three short stories from Alice Munro's collection, Runway, namely, *Chance, Soon, and Passion.* To analyze the discourse of interlocutors, I have taken Munro's short stories as a data source for the research. The researcher has selected 29 discourses, seven discourses from the first two stories viz—*chance and Soon.* The last story is *Passion*, and I have chosen the five discourses from this story. This study has followed descriptive and qualitative methodology for this research and employs conversational and discourse analysis methods for the analysis of the data. Discourse and conversational methods are essential and valuable approaches for examining discourse and textual conversation (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). The analysis of the discourse is presented by unfolding and elucidating the context of the situation when the conversation occurred, followed by interpreting the discourse with applicability and infringement of Gricean conversational maxims.

A. Analysis of the Discourses of the Second Story, Chance

Context of Discourse – In the early summer of 1965, Juliet's temporary assignment at Torrance House School came to an end. Instead of heading straight home, she decided to visit a friend in Whale Bay, a small town north of Vancouver. However, doubts started to creep in during her journey to see him. At the age of twenty-one, Juliet first encountered Eric Porteous on her train journey to begin her stint at Torrance House School. Initially, another man had occupied the seat across from her, attempting to strike up a conversation. Uninterested, Juliet moved to the observation car. During a brief stop, the train abruptly came to a halt, revealing that the man who had tried talking to Juliet had tragically thrown himself in front of the train. Juliet felt a deep sense of guilt as if she bore responsibility for his suicide. Later, she engaged in a conversation with Eric Porteous, who reassured her that the man's death was not her fault. Despite feeling an attraction to Eric, Juliet recognized the impossibility of a romantic involvement since he was married to a woman named Ann. When she reached Whale Bay to visit Eric, she discovered that Ann, his wife, had recently passed away. Juliet located Eric's residence and encountered Ailo, Ann's former caregiver, who explained that Ann was paralyzed and required assistance at home. Ailo informed Juliet that Eric had gone to spend the night with a woman named Christa. When Ailo left to catch the bus home, Juliet insisted on waiting alone in Eric's house for his return. When he arrived the next morning, Eric was delighted to see her. Over the ensuing years, Eric and Juliet remained together.

a. He (Old Man) said, "Not much to see out there." "No." She (Juliet) lowered her eyes to her book. "Ah," he said, as if things were opening up in a comfortable way. "And how far are you going?" "Vancouver." "Me too. All the way across the country. May as well see it all while you're at it, isn't that right?" "Mm." But he persisted. "Did you get on at Toronto too?" "Yes." "That's my home, Toronto. I lived there all my life. Your home there, too?" "No," said Juliet. (p. 55)

In (i. a), Juliet decides to visit a friend in Whale Bay, a small place north of Vancouver. She is traveling by train, and an Old Man meets her and tries to talk to her. The old man asks Juliet if nothing is interesting to see or watch outside. Juliet responds no without looking at him. The old man further inquires by asking, *"And how far are you going? Did you get on at Toronto too?"* Juliet does not show an interest in talking or discussing anything with him, even though she follows the **"quantity maxim"** by uttering that she is heading to Vancouver once she has visited Toronto. In the end, the old man tells her that his home is in Toronto and asks her by uttering, *"Your home there, too?"* Juliet articulates that she is not going there to meet one of her friends. Juliet is informative with the old man's queries, gives the information as required, and cooperates in conversation. She does not say anything that is too much or too little or creates any misunderstanding.

a. You travelling on your own? Like me?" He (the old man) kept flapping his hands one over the other. "Yes." No more, she thinks. No more. "This is the first time I went on a major trip anywhere. Quite a trip, all on your own." Juliet said nothing. (p. 55-56)

In (i. b), the old man asks Juliet by saying, *"You travelling on your own? Like me?"* Juliet gets irritated with the old man's question and answers the question by articulating, *"Yes." No more, she thinks. No more."* Though she follows the **"maxim of quantity"** by contributing as much information as required. But she says to herself no more and no more questions because she was unwillingly talking to him. And finally, when he says that it was his first major trip, all by his own arrangement, Juliet does not cooperate and answers nothing. It can be observed that in the conversation, Juliet ***violates and infringes Gricean maxims*** and does not follow any maxim, being silent and non-cooperative.

b. "Cold up here," he (Eric) said when they were settled. "Do you want me to go get your jacket?" "Don't bother." "It's no bother." "I'll be all right." (p. 58)

In (i. c), Juliet is in the observation car, and she is getting cold. Another passenger named Eric also comes in the observation car, and he finds Juliet is getting cold. Eric offers support to her by asking, *"Do you want me to go get your jacket?"* But Juliet denies it by articulating, *"Don't bother. I'll be all right."* She fully cooperates with conversation by utilizing the Gricean **"maxim of manner."** She avoids obscurity of expression or ambiguity. Juliet tells Eric clearly and perspicuously that she does not need Jaiket now and she is fine.

c. Did you enjoy your breakfast? "The eggs were runny." "I know." The woman commiserated. "I was thinking, I should just have barged into the kitchen and done them myself." "Galley. They call it a galley." "I thought that was on a boat." (p. 58)

In (i. d), Juliet shows an interest in talking to Eric, and she asks him about the breakfast by articulating, *"Did you enjoy your breakfast?"* Eric replies that the eggs were runny, which shows that he does not enjoy the breakfast. Juliet agrees with Eric and utters that they call it galley. Eric and Juliet communicate clearly and unambiguously. Eric follows the **"maxim of relation or relevance."** He contributes during the conversation with a relevant topic and expresses what Juleit wants or asks. Eric's reply is relevant to the subject, and he is fully cooperative.

d. "How old was he?" The man looked at her with steady patience and some displeasure. "Hard to say. Not young." "Was he wearing a blue shirt? Did he have blondish-brown-colored hair?" He shook his head, not to answer her question but to refuse it. (p. 63)

In (i. e), Juliet wants to know about an incident that happened on the way to the train that stopped it. Regarding this, she chases Eric and asks him by uttering, *"How old was he? Was he wearing a blue shirt? Did he have blondish-brown-colored hair?"* Eric replies that it is hard to say how old he was, but surely he was not so young. But Eric does not reply further to her queries about the old man. Eric **flouted or violated the "quantity maxim"** because he did not cooperate in conversation by providing as much information as required. He prefers to give less information about the train incident and the old man. Thus, he does **not follow the quantity maxim.**

e. Juliet feels obliged to say, "When I finish this, I can help you." "No. I don't think so," Ailo says. "I know everything." She is moving around not swiftly but purposefully and effectively. (p. 76)

In (i. f), Ailo is the caretaker of Eric's wife, Ann. Juliet comes to visit Whale Bay, and there she meets Ailo. Ailo offers her coffee and food. Juliet feels obligated to Ailo. Juliet says that she will help her as soon as she gets free by uttering, *"When I finish this, I can help you."* Ailo employs the **"manner maxim"** by articulating, *"No. I don't think so."* She denies her help washing the kitchen due to Curtsey. She says that she manages everything. She avoids obscurity of expression and prolixity. She expresses her thoughts briefly and concisely.

f. "I think I'll stay here," she says. "Here?" "I don't have anything much to carry. I'll walk to the bus." "How will you know your way? It is a mile." "That's not far." Juliet wonders about knowing the way but thinks that, after all, you just have to head downhill. (p. 78)

In (i. g), Juliet tells Ailo that she will stay tonight in Eric's house because he is not coming back. Ailo asks her, *"Here? How will you know your way?"* She answered that she did not have much stuff to carry, so she could stay there and reach the bus easily because the distance was not too far. She

employs the **"quantity maxim"** by articulating, *"It is a mile. That's not far."* She delivers information as required during the conversation. She does not give much information. Thus, she practices the Gricean conversational maxim of quantity.

B. Analysis of the Discourses of the Second Story, *Soon*

Context of Discourse – Juliet initiated her connection with Eric in Western Canada, and in the events unfolding in "Soon," they have become parents to a child named Penelope. Despite maintaining their relationship, Juliet finds herself unmarried, a relatively unconventional situation for the 1960s. The narrative then shifts its focus to Juliet and her young daughter's visit to her parents, Sam and Sara, in Ontario. "Soon" primarily explores Juliet's challenging journey back to her parents and her childhood home. Upon arrival, she makes the unexpected discovery that the Chagall painting "I and the Village," which she had bought for her parents, is stashed away. The narrative unfolds to reveal Juliet's inevitable growth and separation from her parents. Juliet's father, possibly facing consequences in his teaching position due to a conflict over Juliet's unmarried status, appears irritated with both Juliet and the situation. He makes a cutting comment about the caretaker, Irene, expressing that she "has restored [his] faith in women," as Irene had rescued him from the chaos of Sara's sickness. Juliet's mother presents an even more intricate challenge. Already fragile in health, Sara's condition has worsened. She seems to be involved in a mental affair with a local fundamentalist minister, a development that disturbs Juliet. Sara's enduring clinginess, rooted in a historically close relationship with Juliet, remains unchanged. Despite these intricate dynamics, Juliet's primary desire is to return to Whale Bay swiftly. She cannot fathom returning to what was likely an isolated and demanding, if not suffocating, family of origin.

a. "Hello," said Juliet. Irene said, "Pleased to meet you," in a sufficiently audible voice but without expression. "Irene is our good fairy," Sara said, and then Irene's face did change. She scowled a little with sensible embarrassment. (p. 91)

In (ii. a), Juliet comes to her parent's home with her child, Penelope. Her mother, Sara, introduces Irene, a caretaker, to Juliet by saying, *"Irene is our good fairy."* Juliet says hello to Irene. Irene follows the **"quantity maxim"** to contribute and cooperate by replying, *"Pleased to meet you."* She does not say too little or too much to Juliet.

b. "You're serious about all this?" said Juliet quietly. "Darn right, I am." "You're (Sam) not going to miss teaching?" "Not on your Nelly-O. I was fed up. I was fed up to the eyeballs." (p. 92)

In (ii. b), Juliet asks his father about the termination of his teaching job by articulating, *"You're serious about all this? You're not going to miss teaching?"* Sam does not want to tell her why he left his teaching job and gets irritated with her. Sam answers Juliet's queries impolitely by uttering, *"Darn right, I am. Not on your Nelly-O. I was fed up. I was fed up to the eyeballs."* Sam does not cooperate in the conversation, nor does he follow the conversational maxims. He ***violates and infringes the quantity maxim*** because he repeats certain words and does not utter them to the point. He does not contribute information as required. Thus, Sam ***violates the maxim of quantity.***

c. "Why would he take it down?" "Oh. It would be some notion he had, you know." "What sort of a notion?" "Oh. I think—you know, I think it probably had to do with Irene. That it would disturb Irene." (p. 99)

In (ii. c), Juielt had brought a painting, Chagall, for her parents. When she came back to her parent's home, she did not find it in the place where it used to be. She asks about the painting to her mother by uttering, *"Why would he take it down? What sort of a notion?"* Sara replies that her father, Sam, might be removed because of some notion, and maybe Irene does not like it, so he replaced it. Sara employs the **"quality of maxim"** to contribute information that is true to her best knowledge by pronouncing, *"Oh. It would be some notion he had, you know. I think it probably had to do with Irene. That it would disturb Irene."* She says to Juleit that she believes it is true. She does not say that it is false or lacks adequate evidence. Thus, Sara follows the **"maxim of quality"** during the conversation.

d. Juliet said to Sam, "He (Charlie) told me he thought it was a shame what happened with you." "He did, did he? What did you say to that?" "I didn't know what to say. I didn't know what he meant. But I didn't want him to know that." (p. 104)

In (ii. d), Juliet tells her father that Charlie told her that what she did after looking at Penlope's face was a matter of sham. Sam asks Juliet to know what Charlie said to her by uttering, *"What did you say to that?"* Juliet answers that she got upset and felt distressed and did not know what to say. She practices the **"maxim of manner,"** being orderly and brief. Juliet avoids ambiguity and obscurity of expression in the conversation. She expresses herself and replies perspicuously.

e. "So you drink now, too?" "Wine. We make our own Wine. Everybody in the Bay does." He told her a joke then, […] "So it's like what I always tell the girls at Sunday school—you don't have to drink and smoke to have a good time." (p. 104)

In (ii. e), Sam asks Juliet if she takes a drink by uttering, *"So you drink now, too?"* Juliet answers that it is very common in Whale Bay to take a drink. She uses the **"maxim of relation or relevance"** by articulating, *"Wine. We make our own Wine. Everybody in the Bay does."* She is relevant in the conversation by contributing to the point of the topic. She utters according to the relevance of the topic.

f. "It had nothing to do with me?" "All right," Sam said. "I got into an argument. There were things said." "What things?" "You don't need to know. "And don't worry," he said after a moment. "They didn't fire me. They couldn't have fired me. There are rules. It's like I told you—I was ready to go anyway." (p. 104-5)

In (ii. f), Juliet inquires Sam why he is not interested in his job and doing the farming at home. She thinks that Sam was fired from his job because of her, so she asks by stating, *"It had nothing to do with me? What things?"* Sam employs the **"maxim of quantity"** to contribute information as required and responds to her by articulating, *"I got into an argument. There were things said. And don't worry. They didn't fire me. They couldn't have fired me. There are rules."* He does not articulate too much or too little during the conversation with Juliet and does not provide false information. He tells her that he wants to leave his teaching job willingly; therefore, he quit the job. Sam applies the **"quantity of maxim"** by giving her the appropriate information.

g. "Does she want to get married? Irene?" This question startled Sam, coming as it did in that tone and after a considerable silence. "I don't know," he said. And after a moment, "I don't see how she could." "Ask her," Juliet said. "You must want to, the way you feel about her." "I don't know what you're talking about," he said. (p. 114)

In (ii. g), Juliet inquires about her father, Sam, about what he thinks about Irene. He wants to marry Irene or not. She asks Sam by uttering, *"Does she want to get married? Irene? Ask her. You must want to, the way you feel about her."* He responds to her by articulating, *"I don't know. I don't see how she could. I don't know what you're talking about."* Sam was shocked and stunned by this question that Juliet asked. He ***violates and opts-outs the manner maxim,*** not expressing his views clearly and creating ambiguity and prolixity in his response. Sam does not give obvious answers and makes his statement vague, that he does not know or is sure about it. Thus, he ***violates the manner maxim*** by being obscure of expression, not brief, and making an ambiguous statement.

C. Analysis of the Discourses of the Second Story, Passion

Context of Discourse – Grace, now an elderly woman, returns to the charming town where, at the age of 20, she worked as a waitress in an inn over four decades ago. During that summer, she formed a bond with the Travers family, consisting of Mr. Travers, Mrs. Travers, Neil (Mrs. Travers' son from her first marriage), Gretchen (their daughter), and Maury (their 21-year-old son and college senior). One pivotal day, while the family was dining at the inn's restaurant, Maury asked Grace out. They commenced a relationship, and Grace, who always had a passion for learning but couldn't afford college, cherished the family's intellectual word games. Mrs. Travers, in particular, earned Grace's

admiration as she generously granted her access to their extensive library. As the summer unfolded, Maury began discussing marriage with Grace, assuming her agreement. However, Grace had not yet disclosed the relationship to her aunt and uncle. One day, Mrs. Travers revealed that her eldest son, Neil, a doctor married to a challenging woman, possessed great intellect and depth. Shortly after, Mrs. Travers was unexpectedly hospitalized. Maury informed Grace that she was in a psychiatric hospital due to nerve issues and shared the tragic suicide of Neil's father, Mrs. Travers' first husband. During a playful moment with Gretchen's daughters, Grace accidentally injured her foot, leading Neil, who had a noticeable scent of alcohol, to treat the cut with his medical kit. It was then that Grace discovered Neil's struggles with alcoholism. As they left town, Grace confided in Neil that she couldn't marry Maury. Neil took her to a bar and a bootlegger's house, where, in a conversation about his alcoholism, Grace realized the depth of Neil's depression. She contemplated the nature of intimacy, understanding that it wasn't solely physical contact but a deeper connection. Eventually, Neil, exhausted, pulled over to rest, and when Grace couldn't wake him, she drove them back to the inn. They shared a tight hug as a farewell. The following day, news arrived that Neil's car had collided with a bridge abutment, resulting in his instant, seemingly deliberate, and tragic death by suicide.

a. Mrs. Travers was disappointed but she rallied, calling out in cheerful dismay, "But the children aren't in Ottawa, surely?" "Unfortunately not," said Mavis. "But they're not being particularly charming. I'm sure they'd shriek all through dinner. The baby's got prickly heat and God knows what's the matter with Mikey." (p. 169)

In (iii. a), Mrs. Travers asks Mavis (daughter-in-law) about her children by uttering, *"The children aren't in Ottawa, surely?"* Mavis tells her that children are not charming and healthy. They have prickly heat and make noise at dinner. She responds to Mrs. Travers (mother-in-law) by articulating, *"Unfortunately not. But they're not being particularly charming. I'm sure they'd shriek all through dinner."* She ***violates and infringes the "quantity maxim"*** by providing too much information that is not required in the conversation. During the response, Mavis says unnecessary things and provides the information equivocation and not to the point.

b. "What brings it on?" "I don't think they know," Maury said. But after a moment, he said, "Well. It could be her husband. I mean, her first husband. Neil's father. What happened with him, et cetera." What had happened was that Neil's father had killed himself. "He was unstable, I guess. (p. 175)

In (iii. b), Mr. Travers has a psychiatric issue, and suddenly, she gets hospitalized, and Maury (her son) takes care of her. Maury calls Grace to the hospital. Grace is curious to know what happened to Mr. Travers, and she asks him by uttering, *"What brings it on?"* Maury responds to her by uttering, *"It could be her husband. I mean, her first husband. Neil's father. What had happened was that Neil's father had killed himself. He was unstable."* He employs the **"manner maxim,"** being orderly and avoiding ambiguity. He tells her clearly and apparently expresses information perspicuously as required in the discourse. He avoids any obscurity of expression or prolixity, and thus, Maury applies the **"maxim of manner."**

c. "Where do you keep the cranberry sauce?" said Gretchen. "In the cupboard," said Mrs. Travers, still squeezing Grace's arms and ignoring the destroyed puzzle. "*Where* in the cupboard?" "Oh, Cranberry sauce," Mrs. Travers said. "Well, I make it. First, I put the cranberries in a little water. Then I keep it on low heat no, I think I soak them first." (p. 176-177)

In (iii. c), Gretchen asks her mother, Mrs. Travers, by articulating, *"Where do you keep the cranberry sauce?"* Mrs. Travers replies that she put it in the cupboard. But Gretchen could not find it there and again asked her mother, Mrs. Travers, by uttering, *"Where in the cupboard?"* Mrs. Travers comes to know that the cranberry sauce is finished. She responds with how she made the cranberry sauce; this is not a relevant answer, and she violates and flouts the ***"relation or relevance of maxim."*** She does not contribute to the relevance of the topic and the point of the discussion in communication. She hides the facts and abruptly changes the point of the conversation. In this discourse, Mrs. Travers **violates and flouts** the ***"relation or relevance of maxim."***

d. "You the patient?" Neil said to Dana. "What's the matter? Swallow a toad?" "It's her," said Dana with dignity. "It's Grace." "I see. She swallowed the toad." "She cut her foot. (p. 179)

In (iii. d), Grace gets a cut on her foot, and it is bleeding. Neil asks, *"You the patient? What's the matter?* Grace answers by articulating, *"It's Grace. She swallowed the toad. She cut her foot."* She employs the **"quantity maxim"** by contributing information as required. She does not say too much or too little but says what is required and relevant during the conversation.

e. He said, "You know—I'm sleepy. Soon as we find a good spot, I'm going to pull over and go to sleep. Just for a little while. You don't mind that?" "No. I think you should." "You'll watch over me?" "Yes." "Good." (p. 192)

In (iii. e), Neil gets tired after a long drive, so he asks Grace to take a rest as he finds a proper spot by uttering, *"You know—I'm sleepy. Just for a little while. You don't mind that?"* She follows the **"manner maxim"** by cooperating and showing her consent by articulating, *"No. I think you should."* She avoids any obscurity of expression and prolixity. She responds that he should rest and not worry. She cooperates with him without any ambiguous response.

7. Conclusion

The conclusion of this research article recognizes that a significant portion of the discourse follows the Gricean cooperative principle and maxims. The analysis of the selected discourse in the study shows that a significant number of experts employ maxims. Grice's work encounters significant limitations that cause the violation and infringements of Gricean maxims in discourses (i. b), (i. e), (ii. b), (ii. g), (iii. a) and (iii. c). A couple of discourses interpret that Grice's theory lacks flexibility as it fails to acknowledge that human communication, akin to human nature, is a complex, diverse, and rich phenomenon. Furthermore, it overlooks situations in which the participants' objective is intentional miscommunication. It remains central to the field of pragmatics, and its pivotal role cannot be disregarded. It is advisable to examine to gain a comprehensive understanding of Grice's cooperative principle within the larger context of Grice's collective works rather than in isolation. However, due to Grice's theory not factoring in social contexts and exclusively focusing on the speaker-listener interaction in an idealized setting that applies universally, disregarding social elements such as sex, power dynamics, social class, and age, it possesses limited explanatory efficacy.

References

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). Speech Acts.
2. Bach, K., & Harnish, R. M. (1979). Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts.
3. Bousfield, D., & Locher, M. A. (Eds.). (2008). *Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice* (Vol. 21). Walter de Gruyter.
4. Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
5. Davies, B. L. (2007). Grice's cooperative principle: meaning and rationality. *Journal of pragmatics*, *39*(12), 2308-2331.
6. Forman, D. (1974). The speaker knows best principle. *CLS*, *10*, 162-177.
7. Geoffrey, L. (1983). Principles of pragmatics. 13.
8. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In *Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). Brill.
9. Grice, H. P. (1989). Studies in the way of words. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
10. Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies* (No. 1). Cambridge University Press.
11. Hadi, A. (2013). A critical appraisal of Grice's Cooperative Principle. *Open journal of modern linguistics*, *3*(1), 69-72.

12. Horn, L. (2009). WJ-40: Implicature, truth, and meaning. *International Review of Pragmatics*, *1*(1), 3-34.
13. Jakaza, E. (2013). *Appraisal and evaluation in Zimbabwean parliamentary discourse and its representation in newspaper articles* (Doctoral dissertation, Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University).
14. Jin, J. (1999). The use of maxims for cooperation in Chinese medical interviews. *Health Communication*, *11*(3), 215-222. Jin, J. (1999). The use of maxims for cooperation in Chinese medical interviews. *Health Communication*, *11*(3), 215-222.
15. Ladegaard, H. J. (2009). Pragmatic cooperation revisited: Resistance and noncooperation as a discursive strategy in asymmetrical discourses. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *41*(4), 649-666.
16. Ladegaard, H. J. (2012). Discourses of identity: Outgroup stereotypes and strategies of discursive boundary-making in Chinese students' online discussions about "the other." *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *7*(1), 59-79.
17. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
18. Lumsden, D. (2008). Kinds of conversational cooperation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *40*(11), 1896-1908.
19. Moeschler, J. (2004). Intercultural pragmatics: a cognitive approach.
20. Mukaro, L., Mugari, V., & Dhumukwa, A. (2013). Violation of conversational maxims in Shona. *Journal of Comparative Literature and Culture (JCLC)*, *2*(4), 161-168.
21. Munro, A. (2013). Runaway. In Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling (Vol. 53, Issue 9).
22. Ngenget, S. (2017). A revisit of the Gricean maxims in Manado Malay language. *Script Journal: Journal of Linguistic and English Teaching*, *2*(2), 204-211.
23. Poggi, F. (2016). Grice, the law and the linguistic special case thesis. *Pragmatics and law: Philosophical perspectives*, 231-248.
24. Sarangi, S. K., & Slembrouck, S. (1992). Noncooperation in communication: A reassessment of Gricean pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *17*(2), 117-154.
25. Schwarz, N. (1994). Judgment in a social context: Biases, shortcomings, and the logic of conversation. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 26, pp. 123-162). Academic Press.
26. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language* (Vol. 626). Cambridge University Press.
27. Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In *Speech acts* (pp. 59-82). Brill.
28. Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (Vol. 142). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
29. Tupan, A. H., & Natalia, H. (2008). The multiple violations of conversational maxims in lying done by the characters in some episodes of Desperate Housewives. *k@ ta*, *10*(1), 63-78.
30. Yang, X., Minai, U. and Fiorentino, R. (2018) 'Context-sensitivity and individual differences in the derivation of scalar implicature,' *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01720.