



## American Journal of History and Culture (ISSN:2637-4919)



# Analysis of the Conversational Implicature of Violating Cooperative Principles in Daily Discourse

**Mengyuan Bi**

Shanxi Normal University.

### ABSTRACT

Conversational implicature and conversational principle are proposed by the American language philosopher Grice. The principle of conversation is an important part of the study in the field of pragmatics, represented by Grice's Cooperative principle and Leech's Politeness principle, which constitutes the main reference principle and basis for understanding the meaning of conversation. To a certain extent, they regulate people's verbal communication behavior. Grice believes that in the process of people's communication, the two sides of the dialogue seem to follow a certain principle intentionally or unintentionally in order to complete the communicative task effectively. But sometimes, to make the communication activities go smoothly, the communicative parties usually break the cooperative principles in order to achieve some kind of communicative purpose. Based on the daily communicative dialogue as corpus, this paper analyzes the communicative implicature that violates the principle of conversation. Through the analysis of communicative implicature and pragmatic effect to explore the main forms of conversational implicature in verbal communication in the context of real communication.

**Keywords:** The principle of cooperation; Conversational implicature; Daily discourse

### \*Correspondence to Author:

Mengyuan Bi  
Shanxi Normal University.

### How to cite this article:

Mengyuan Bi. Analysis of the Conversational Implicature of Violating Cooperative Principles in Daily Discourse. American Journal of History and Culture, 2019, 2:13



eSciPub LLC, Houston, TX USA.

Website: <https://escipub.com/>

## 1. Theoretical Background

Conversational implicature was put forward by the American language philosopher Grice, which was first seen by Grice's speech *Logical and conversation* at Harvard University in 1967. In that article, Grice argued that "conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange." (Grice, 1975). Grice creatively put forward this very new linguistic concept at that time, "conversational implicature", which is based on his research on the purpose and direction of speech conversation. According to Grice, "In the ordinary case, people's conversations will not be made up of a series of non-coherent and non-coherent words, and people talk more or less to work together for cooperation. Because the conversation has one or a group of common purposes to a certain extent, or a direction of conversation that is acceptable to one another." Therefore, even in a very casual conversation, there is a message of cooperative conversational implicature. Through the content and expression of the conversation, the talker will convey the meaning beyond the literal meaning, such as whether he is willing to talk, how willing to talk, etc. Grice materialized this abstract concept, and concretely summed up a criterion system to intuitively quantify people's discourse conversation. His definition of the principle of cooperation is "We can put forward a general principle that both sides of communication should follow, that is, in the process of communication, according to the requirements of communicative goals and directions, we consciously make efforts to achieve the goal of successful communication. We call such an unwritten rule the principle of cooperation." This paper analyses the meaning of the session in violation of the principle of

cooperation, on the basis of the four principles of Grice's principle of cooperation, carries on the semantic analysis of the session in violation of each principle, and tries to analyze the pragmatic effect of the meaning of the session. American language philosophers believe that in order to achieve a specific goal in all language communication activities, there is a tacit understanding between the speaker and the hearer, a principle that both sides should abide by. He calls this Cooperative Principle. For short. The cooperative principle includes four criteria: Quantity maxim, Quality maxim, Relation maxim, Manner Maxim. In the opinion of Grice, the two sides of the communication must strictly abide by these standards before the communication can be carried out smoothly. Since the premise is to abide by the principle of cooperation, the emergence of conversational implicature will not be transmitted through all violations of the principle of cooperation, most of which are contrary to one of the principles or principles to achieve the purpose of informing the hearer of the implicature of the conversation. If it is intended to violate these principles in order to achieve a particular effect, it is genuine humor (Liu Fuzhang, 1987). Grice's cooperative principle plays an important role in the field of pragmatics and is the foundation theory of conversational implicature analysis. At the same time, Grice's reasoning mechanism of cooperative principle is also limited. "Grice believes that the key to understanding conversational implicature lies in the analysis of the speaker's intention, but there is no further explanation for how the hearer analyzes the speaker's intention from the literal meaning of the discourse. The speaker's intention is related to his conversational implicature. The hearer can obtain the conversational implicature by virtue of the

context and other related factors, but how does the hearer establish a relationship between what the speaker says and the speaker's intention to deduce the conversational implicature? Grice did not elaborate on this. The third situation mentioned above is that the speaker is deliberately violating a certain criterion in the principle of cooperation, and the listener knows that the other party is doing so on the premise that the communication is intended to be carried out. So the obedient man can deduce the meaning behind the various words in the light of the specific context and the common sense and the cognitive ability.

## **2. The Violation of Cooperative Principles and Conversational Implicature**

### **2.1 Conversational Implicature Caused by Violating the Principle of Quality**

According to the contents of Grice's principle of cooperation, the specific contents of maxim of quality include:

Firstly, if you know it is false, don't say it;

Secondly, don't say what you're not sure if it's true or false.

Quality maxim is actually a requirement for the fidelity of the conversation process. As we all know, the premise of communication is sincerity. Without this cornerstone, then our communication will not be necessary, because if we do not always live in illusory novels or storylines, our first requirement for communication is truth.

The maxim of quality is a rule on the authenticity of the conversation, which requires both parties to tell the truth in the course of the conversation. Among the two criteria contained in the quality principle, the conversational implicature caused by the violation of different criteria is also different. This paper mainly studies the positive deviation phenomenon that violates the principle of cooperation, that is, the com-

municative dialogue which can produce positive pragmatic effect and does not abide by the principle of cooperation.

Example 1:

A: want some more bread.

B: Oh, man, are you a horse?

In the above example, B does not directly accuse A of eating too much, but borrows the English proverb "eat like a horse" to question the other. It shows B's attitude to the listener who wants some bread. B said the other side was a horse that ate a lot. This is obviously out of line with reality because A is a person but not a horse. B's way of speaking violates the principle of quality. Use metaphorical figures of speech to express their implicature to each other.

Example 2:

Background: A and B are good friends. They got the test results

A: If only I could get 90 points. How many points did you get?

B: ninety five

A: I can't say a word to you today.

What A said "I can't talk to you today." using an exaggerated technique to violate the principle of quality. By understanding the context, we know that A and B are good friends. It is clear that A will speak to B in a few minutes. Even if A is serious when he says this sentence, he is not sure if he can do it before the day is over. Therefore, what A says is "not sure if it is true or not." Pragmatic effect is to express jealousy and envy. But such jealousy and envy do not make the other person feel the burden. Because in such a situation, the true meaning of A to B's envious expression is that "B's very great. His grade is over 90 points" Therefore, the real conversational implicature is not only an attack on B, but also a recognition and praise of his ability. The pragmatic effect is naturally positive

and friendly, and it is a reasonable application of the deviation of the principle of conversation.

## **2.2 Conversational Implicature Caused by Violating the Principle of Quantity**

According to the specific requirements of Grice's principle of cooperation, the principle of quantity is to specify the amount of information provided by both parties. The principle of quantity also contains two specific guidelines:

Firstly, what you say should include the information you need to meet the purpose of the conversation.

Secondly, what you say should not contain information that goes beyond the purpose of the conversation.

Quantity maxim is a kind of control of the length of speech and the amount of information in the process of communication, and it is necessary for you not to be too much or less, and as long as it contains the information you want to receive, it should not contain the content that the other party has not asked about. The amount of information provided should also be less than the amount of information that the listener wants to obtain, which can enable the conversation to proceed smoothly and efficiently on the premise of cooperative communication. As with the violation of the principle of quality, the violation of the principle of quantity will also express different implicature. The rhetorical devices usually used are not as complicated as the principle of quality, and the rhetorical figures of speech will usually be used to convey the meaning of conversation in the form of different figures of speech.

Example 3:

Background: men and women meet for the first time

Woman: will you give me a birthday present?

Man: uh...

The man is in violation of the principle of quantity. The man did not answer the question of the woman, and he chose not to speak. He is failure to give the information that he needed to meet the purpose of the conversation which was a violation of the Grice's principle of quantity. He cleared that it was not appropriate for a girl to ask such a question if he believes that when the two people first met and were in a strange state. However, the man did not refuse directly, although it violated the principle of quantity, but the pragmatic effect was the maintenance of the "face" of the woman. From the psychological point of view, it is a positive deviation from the principle of quantity.

## **2.3 Conversational Implicature Caused by Violating the Principle of Relationship**

The specific requirement of the maxim of relation is that words should be related to the purpose of the session. The principle of relationship is a guarantee for the efficiency of communication. It requires that the two parties cannot answer the questions of the other party. Keep in mind what the other party asks, what the other party is interested in, not answer some inconsistent content. Otherwise, in addition to delaying the delay, it cannot achieve the purpose of effective communication and cannot reflect the attitude of cooperative communication. Therefore, the violation of the maxim of relation is mainly intended to express the meaning of conversation is the intentional avoidance of the problem of conversation. The violation of the maxim of relation can also be divided into positive deviation and negative deviation. Positive deviation means that while the speaker evades the topic in violation of the principle of relevance, it may be out of the protection of the hearer, but also may be euphemistic to protect his self-esteem. In such a case, it will not cause

the aversion of the hearer, or even cause the reflection of the hearer, and make the communication more smooth in the future.

Example 4:

Background: friends travel by plane, B makes breakfast for everyone, but friends get up late and can't have breakfast.

A: will there be food on the plane?

B: Why the hell are you sleeping so late every day? I don't understand. I make breakfast and you don't eat either.

B is in violation of the relationship criteria. B didn't answer A's question, but talked about their late and they don't eat the breakfast. The meaning is "I get up in the morning for everyone to prepare for breakfast, you don't eat, but now you want to have an airplane meal. B is a little bit angry."

#### **2.4 Conversational Implicature Caused by Violating the Principle of Manner**

Grice's specific requirements for the principle of mode include four prescribed guidelines for the way of speaking, namely:

Firstly, to be popular and clear, to avoid obscurity;

Secondly, it is clear that the ambiguity is avoided.

Thirdly, to be concise and avoid long;

Fourth, we should be in good order to avoid chaos.

The starting point for Grice to put forward this principle is to hope that communicators can express their ideas or views clearly and directly in the process of communication, and do not use ambiguous or messy and long words. In daily communication, it is inevitable that words that violate the principle of mode will be spoken, in some cases, it may not necessarily imply the implicature of conversation, but will also be affected by the communicative environment or

psychological state and have to violate the principle of mode; in most cases, it is a deliberate violation of the principle of mode, so that the hearer can know the implicit meaning of the speaker by deducing the implicit meaning of the speaker.

Example 4:

Background: walking at the airport, A's clothes are long.

B: (to A), isn't this dress a little Indian?

A: what is it?

B: Look how clean this place is.

B did not follow the principle of manner in answering A's question. The intention of B was to say that A's clothes were long, he didn't choose an simple and clear utterance but said that her clothes dragged the floor clean. This utterance which in turn allows the other party to know the reason why her dress is a little Indian is that the clothes are long. B's way of speaking is not clear enough, not only to express the meaning of the words, but also to have the function of humor. As long as the hearer thinks a little bit, she can get the true meaning of B, and then laugh and make the atmosphere very active. This is the pragmatic effect of the positive violation of the principle of manner.

#### **3. Conclusion**

Conversational implicature and conversational principle are proposed by the American language philosopher Grice. The principle of conversation is an important part of the study in the field of pragmatics, represented by Grice's Cooperative principle and Leech's Politeness principle, which constitutes the main reference principle and basis for understanding the meaning of conversation. To a certain extent, they regulate people's verbal communication behavior. Grice believes that in the process of people's communication, the two sides of the dia-

logue seem to follow a certain principle intentionally or unintentionally in order to complete the communicative task effectively. But sometimes, to make the communication activities go smoothly, the communicative parties usually break the cooperative principles in order to achieve some kind of communicative purpose.

Through the above analysis of the conversational implicature of the corpus in the real communicative context, we can see the accurate communication of the "implicative meaning", provided that both sides are in the same context and that the speaker should express the "implicative meaning" in a way that the hearer can detect. The transfer of the meaning of the session contains a number of situations, either by violating the maxim of quality or by violating the maxim of quantity, or by violating many principles at the same time, but the core is that the speaker tries to make the speaker aware that he is deliberately violating the principle of cooperation, This is the condition for deriving the meaning of a word. When the hearer finds that the speaker has no reason to violate the principle of cooperation, he will first make a basic hypothesis, and then he can deduce the speaker's true semantics step by step according to the context.

## REFERENCES

1. Bethan L. Davies. Grice's Cooperative Principle: Meaning and rationality[J]. Journal of Pragmatics, 2007, 39 (12).
2. Halliday, M.A.K. An Introduction to Functional Grammar [M]. London: Edward Arnold, 1994.
3. Paul, Grice (1975). "Logic and Conversation". In Syntax and Semantics, 3: Speech Acts, ed. P. Cole & J. Morgan. New York: Academic Press.
4. Liu fuchang. The generation of English humor from the perspective of "cooperative principle" [J]. Modern foreign language, 1987.

5. Liu fuchang, "object language" and "meta-language" in linguistics [J]. modern foreign language, 1989.

