CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE

5.0 PRELIMINARIES

The present chapter devotes itself to the application of pragmatic framework of conversational implicature devised in Chapter III in order to analyze conversational pieces in the selected plays. The plays selected for implicature analysis in this chapter are Harold Pinter’s well known works, that is, *The Birthday Party, The Caretaker* and *The Homecoming*.

5.1 ANALYTICAL MODEL

The following analytical model has been devised for the analysis of conversational implicature in the selected plays:

5.1.1 Selection of Conversational Passages

In order to apply the analytical model based on the concept of conversational implicature, interactional passages are extracted from the selected plays. As it is not feasible as well as practicable to analyze each and every utterance in a play, the conversational passages are selected on the basis of various facts. The selection depends on the fulfillment of the following five criteria:

**Treatment of the Maxims of CP**

The conversational passages are selected for analysis after giving due significance to the treatment of the maxims of CP in the interaction among characters. As it has been pointed out earlier in Chapter III, conversational implicatures arise out of the observance or the non-observance of the four basic maxims of the CP. Moreover, it depends on the flouting, hedging as well as non-fulfillment of the maxims and sub-maxims. Therefore, while selecting passages it has been purposefully seen that the passages having varied treatment of the maxims should be extracted. The selection of passages based on this criterion renders the analysis more fruitful and comprehensive. In addition, the process of selection of conversational passages also pays due attention to the disparity between what is said and what is meant by the characters in the selected plays.

**Character Coverage**

The process of selection of the conversational passages gives due significance to cover the dialogues of major as well as minor characters, so as to make the analysis of a play all
inclusive. Though the minor characters are not given more space by the dramatist, it has been noticed that they play significant roles in varieties of speech events in a play. For instance, Joey in *The Homecoming* and Lulu in *The Birthday Party* are minor characters, however, their roles facilitate the flow of action towards climax. Therefore, while selecting passage for analysis, these characters have not been neglected.

**Turns**

As turns are fundamental organizations of conversation, the analysis of conversation in drama gives due significance to turns taken by the characters. The selection of conversational passages in the present research activity also depends on the nature of turns. The care has been taken to select passage containing long, medium and short turns.

**Variety of Themes**

The drama is a sequence of incidents and events. It constitutes of a major plot and more than one sub-plots. The plays selected for the present study also contain a variety of sub-themes. For instance, the major theme in *The Birthday Party* is Stanley’s fate; however, there is a sub-theme which depicts the seduction of Lulu by Goldberg. Though such events seem to be less significant, they help to arrive at the nature and intention of the characters involved. Therefore, the present research activity attempts to cover various sub-plots, while selecting passages for analysis.

**Location Coverage**

The plays selected for analysis follow the unity of place, as the place of action doesn’t change in all the three plays. In other words, the action in *The Birthday Party*, for instance, begins in Meg’s boarding house and the play ends in the same house. Therefore, the present research activity attempts to locate the beginning, the middle and the end of the action in selected plays. Proper care has been taken to select passages depicting the beginning, the climax and the end of the action in the play in order to give a sense of completeness and authenticity to the analysis.

5.1.2 Analytical Structure

The following analytical structure is based on the theoretical framework developed in Chapter III, in order to give orderliness to the analysis of conversation.

**Introduction**

The analysis begins with an introductory comment on the passage selected for the purpose. It introduces the passage in two or three sentences.
Contextual Environment

In pragmatic analysis of conversation, context plays a significant role. Semantic theory analyses conversation without taking into consideration the context in which the conversation takes place, however, pragmatics gives due importance to the context of an utterance. Pragmatic analysis believes that an utterance gets its meaning out of the context in which it is uttered. Therefore, the present research activity focuses on the contextual environment of the passage, that is, it gives importance to the circumstances and the events which give rise to the particular speech event selected for the analysis.

Passage

The actual passages selected for analysis have been extracted from the selected plays as they appear in the original source. The page numbers of the selected conversational passages refer to the editions of the plays cited in bibliography. In order to avoid unnecessary recurrence of the titles of the plays, they are abbreviated as BP for The Birthday Party, CT for The Caretaker and HC for The Homecoming.

Implicature Analysis

The selected passage follows actual analysis of implicature based on the analytical model derived out of the theoretical framework developed previously in Chapter III. The process of analysis takes into consideration the conversational strategies adopted by the characters with reference to the maxims of CP. It also gives due significance to investigate the vast disparity of meaning with reference to what is said by the characters, that is, the literal import of the words and what is conveyed by them in uttering those words, that is, implicated meaning. While analyzing the utterances from the point of view of the suggested meaning, it has been focused how the meanings of the utterances as well as intentions of the characters are affected by the context of utterances. It is after this process that a listener receives the message meant by a speaker in interaction. For instance, an exchange between Aston and Davies conveys more than its literal denotation:

ASTON: What was he, a Greek?
DAVIES: Not him, he was a Scotch. He was a Scotchman.

(CT, 10)

Aston here wishes to know whether that person was Greek which Davies gives a cooperative reply that he was not and adds that he was a Scotchman. This exchange carries only this much amount of information literally. However, if the same reference is
analyzed with reference to its context, it seems to convey more than its literal meaning. Aston wants to know whether that person was superior in status than Davies who is British. He suggests that Greeks are superior to British. In reply, Davies gives more information than expected by saying that the person was a Scotchman. It can be taken to implicate Davies’ opinion that Scotchmen are not superior to British people. In this way, analysis of implicature attempts to draw out the meaning which the characters wish to suggest without stating it explicitly. Analysis of conversational implicature shares a significant feature with the analysis of presupposition, that is, both these concepts do not have the delusion regarding literary language and ordinary language. Such an analysis facilitates discovering implicit meaning in literature in the most familiar way through the analysis of implicature.

**Concluding Remarks**

The outcome of implicature analysis of utterances in the selected passages has been pointed out as concluding remarks. It highlights the remarkable features of conversational implicature analyzed in the passages, with its significant contribution to render the seeming absurd communicative activities more meaningful. Moreover, it comments on the treatment of CP in the conversation and the implied meaning resulted from the analysis.

**5.1.3 Analysis Procedure**

Conversational implicature is one of the noteworthy phenomena in communicative activity. It is essential on the part of interlocutors to come across the intended meaning in communication. Understanding the exact message is crucial to understanding the rationale and the general course of overall interaction. However, understanding an utterance does not simply involve knowing the meaning of words uttered, but it is a matter of drawing inferences on the basis of contextual knowledge and assumptions. It further takes into consideration the relation between ‘what is said’ and the maxims of the CP. Therefore, the analysis follows the following steps: understanding ‘what is said’ by the character in an utterance, choices and decision which sense and reference could possibly have been deliberated by the character and understanding and interpretation of an utterance to come across the implied or unstated message. Moreover, the nonverbal devices of communication such as pauses, silences, intonation as well as incomplete utterances, repetitions will be analysed in order to bring out their communicational
import, if any. The analysis will focus on types and properties of implicatures and the maxims of the CP.

The conversational passages with implicature potential are selected keeping in mind that they should cover the dialogues of all the major as well as minor characters in the selected play. The focus remains on conversations among major characters, however, the minor characters also are paid due attention. Moreover, it focuses on what is said and what is meant by the characters as well as the treatment of the four maxims and sub maxims of the CP by the characters. The selection also depends on the nature of turns, that is, the selected passages include long, medium and short turns. Moreover, the proper care is taken to cover the variety of related concepts in pragmatics, so that authentic analysis of the plays is possible. The selection depends on the process of implicature analysis which begins with the identification of what a character says and what he/she implicates in doing so.

As the analysis in the present chapter is limited to the study of conversational implicatures, the passages selected for analysis are pieces of conversation among characters. The activity gives more importance to the conversational implicature and related concepts in pragmatics; rather than comprehensive thematic analysis. The basic objective here is to apply the theoretical framework to the utterances in the selected plays.

5.2 THE BIRTHDAY PARTY

5.2.1 Conversation One

This passage is a casual interaction between Meg and Petey. Meg asks Petey about Stanley and then she wants to know whether Petey went out early in the morning.

Contextual Environment

Petey enters with a newspaper and sits reading it. Meg is in the kitchen and notices that someone has entered the house. Therefore, she confirms that it is Petey who has arrived. She serves him breakfast and asks whether it is nice. Meg wants to know whether he worked hard this morning but Petey denies doing so. After talking about the weather outside, they turn to Stanley.

Conversation

MEG: Haven’t you seen him down?
PETEY: I’ve only just come in.
MEG: He must be still asleep.

She looks round the room, stands, goes to the sideboard and takes a pair of socks from a drawer, collects wool and a needle and goes back to the table.

What time did you go out this morning, Petey?

PETEY: Same time as usual.

MEG: Was it dark?

PETEY: No, it was light.

MEG (beginning to darn): But sometimes you go out in the morning and it’s dark.

PETEY: That’s in the winter.

MEG: Oh, in winter.

(BP, 10)

Implicature Analysis

Meg thinks that Petey might know whether Stanley is upstairs, but Petey is unaware of his presence. Meg asks ‘Haven’t you seen him down?’ and Petey replies ‘I’ve only just come in?’ Here, Petey’s reply to Meg’s question seems irrelevant as a relevant reply could have been either yes or no. Thus, he seems to be uncooperative by violating the maxim of relation. However, if his reply is taken to be cooperative, it seems to implicate that Petey hasn’t seen Stanley as he has entered the house only before a while. Had he been there for a long time, he could have seen Stanley. In other words, Petey wants to suggest that he does not know where Stanley is because he was not present there since morning. Therefore, Meg concludes that he must be still asleep, suggesting that he might be upstairs. She takes wool and a needle and sits at the table in order to weave socks. Then she asks ‘What time did you go out this morning, Petey?’ and he replies ‘Same time as usual’. Here, Meg seems to ask this question only for the sake of conversation. She seems to violate the maxim of quality as it is not a sincere question. Being a wife, she is supposed to know the time when Petey leaves every day. However, this question can be taken to implicate that they don’t share a healthy relation as they have nothing to talk regarding their familial concerns. Therefore, in order to keep talking, she asks Petey about his time of departure. She doesn’t seem curious to know about his routine and there isn’t a substantial reason behind her question. Petey also seems to violate the maxim of quantity as his reply provides insufficient information. However, if his reply is interpreted as cooperative, it seems to implicate that Petey is not interested in talking to Meg. Therefore, instead of stating the exact time of his departure, he suggests Meg that he neither left early nor became late than usual. In other words, he suggests that he left on the time he leaves every day. Petey also realizes that Meg is asking it for the sake of
nothing; therefore, he doesn’t reply it seriously. Meg again asks ‘Was it dark?’ in order to infer that if it was dark, Petey must have left early. However, Petey makes it clear that it was light when he left. Meg’s utterance ‘But sometimes you go out in the morning and it’s dark’ can be taken to suggest that Petey doesn’t have any fixed time of leaving, though he says ‘Same time as usual’. Here, the word ‘sometimes’ in the utterance carries a scalar implicature that it is not always that Petey goes out in the dark. However, he clarifies Meg’s doubt saying ‘That’s in the winter’. With this utterance, Petey wants to suggest that he leaves at the same time usually, but it is due to changing seasons that sometimes it is light and sometimes it is dark when he leaves the house. It doesn’t mean that he leaves early in winter, but the sun rises late due to extended night, therefore, it seems to be early.

**Concluding Remarks**

In this passage, both of them seem to realize that their conversation is devoid any genuine purpose. While answering Meg’s question, Petey seems least interested in providing detailed information. His replies indicate his apparent indifference to what Meg is asking for. Thus, the piece of conversation depicts the couple as least involved in their relation, though Meg tries to show her interest in Petey’s routine.

5.2.2 **Conversation Two**

In this piece of conversation, Meg serves breakfast to Stanley and asks him whether he slept well. However Stanley is eager to know the weather condition outside and asks about it to Petey.

**Contextual Environment**

Meg is sorry to know that someone has had a girl. She feels that she would rather have a little boy instead of a little girl. As Petey finishes the cornflakes, she gives him fried bread. Petey informs her about the two men whom he met at the beach last night. They want to stay in Meg’s boarding house for a couple of nights. Meg is happy to realize that her boarding house is famous as people wish to stay there. She informs Petey that she can accommodate them easily as she has a room ready for the expected visitors. When Petey tells her about a new show on the pier, she informs him that she likes listening to the piano when Stanley plays on it. Then she goes upstairs and calls Stanley for breakfast.
Conversation

MEG: So he’s come down at last, has he? He’s come down at last for his breakfast. But he doesn’t deserve any, does he, Petey? (STANLEY stares at the cornflakes.) Did you sleep well?

STANLEY: I didn’t sleep at all.

MEG: You didn’t sleep at all? Did you hear that, Petey? Too tired to eat your breakfast, I suppose? Now you eat up those cornflakes like a good boy. Go on.

_He begins to eat._

STANLEY: What’s it like out today?

PETEY: Very nice.

STANLEY: Warm?

PETEY: Well, there’s a good breeze blowing.

STANLEY: Cold?

PETEY: No, no, I wouldn’t say it was cold.

MEG: What are the cornflakes like, Stan?

STANLEY: Horrible.

(BP, 14)

Implicature Analysis

Meg goes upstairs to wake up Stanley and her wild laughter and shouts are heard. She comes down panting and tells Petey that Stanley is coming. As Stanley arrives, Meg thinks that he has come down only for his breakfast. However, her utterance ‘But he doesn’t deserve any, does he, Petey?’ implicates that he will not get breakfast as he has come late. She wants to suggest Stanley that if he wants breakfast, he should get up early; otherwise, he will not be served anything. Though Meg says so, she doesn’t seem to mean it. She is teasing Stanley in a friendly way because she has already served breakfast to him. Then she asks ‘Did you sleep well?’ and Stanley replies ‘I didn’t sleep at all’. Here, Stanley seems to violate the maxim of quality as he doesn’t have sufficient evidence to prove that he didn’t sleep throughout the night, rather it is false information. Therefore, he seems to be uncooperative by not being genuine. However, if he is taken to be cooperative, his utterance can be interpreted as implicating that he doesn’t feel comfortable to stay there in Meg’s house. He wants to suggest that he was unable to sleep there in the house. Moreover, his reply can be taken to implicate that he doesn’t like such sympathetic questions by Meg; therefore, to discourage and disappoint her, he deliberately provides false information. Meg realizes that Stanley is telling a lie, therefore, she says ‘Too tired to eat your breakfast, I suppose?’ This utterance can be taken to implicate that she doesn’t believe that Stanley did not sleep at all. Therefore, she
says mockingly that he must be so tired that he could not eat his breakfast. When she says ‘Now you eat up those cornflakes like a good boy’ she seems to suggest that she will not listen to his false complaints anymore. She compares him with ‘a good boy’ suggesting that good boys never complain and obey the orders of the elders, in the same way; Stanley should eat breakfast without making more complaints. While eating cornflakes, Stanley asks ‘What’s it out like today?’ and Petey informs ‘Very nice’. Here, Stanley’s question seems to violate the maxim of relation as it doesn’t seem relevant to the ongoing conversation. However, it can be taken to be cooperative if it is interpreted as implicating more than what it literally asks for. If there is nothing worth talking about, people usually talk about weather for the sake of conversation. In the same way, Stanley asks Petey about weather so that there should not be silence. Petey’s reply ‘Very nice’ seems to be casual which violates the maxim of quantity by providing insufficient information about weather. As a result, Stanley could not understand what Petey means by saying ‘Very nice’. However, this violation can be taken to implicate casual attitude of Petey, who doesn’t express negative opinion about anything since the opening of the play. He has made the same comment on cornflakes and fried bread. Therefore, it seems that he is not very serious while talking about weather also. Stanley tries to know the exact weather condition by asking ‘Warm?’ and Petey replies ‘Well, there’s a good breeze blowing’. Here, Petey seems to violate the maxim of relation by giving irrelevant reply. Petey would have been cooperative by saying ‘yes or no’. However, his reply can be taken to implicate that the weather is not very warm. If the breeze is blowing, weather could not be warm. Therefore, Stanley asks him is it ‘Cold? Again, Petey’s reply ‘No, no, I wouldn’t say it was cold?’ seems to be uncooperative as he violates the maxim of manner by being vague about the weather condition. He doesn’t make it clear weather it is warm or cold. However, this violation can be taken to implicate that he is not sure about the weather condition. Moreover, the word ‘cold’ in Petey’s reply ‘I wouldn’t say it was cold’ raises a scalar implicature that the weather is warm. Meg is curious to know whether Stanley liked the cornflakes, therefore, asks him ‘What are the cornflakes like, Stan?’ She asked the same question to Petey also, who replied that the cornflakes are nice. Therefore, she asks Stanley thinking that he also will praise her; however, his reply ‘Horrible’ seems to be irrelevant as cornflakes cannot be horrible. It can be either tasty or tasteless. Thus, Stanley seems to violate the maxim of relation. However, if it is interpreted as cooperative, it can be taken to implicate that Stanley didn’t like the cornflakes. He wants to suggest that the cornflakes are not worth eating as they are not tasty.
Concluding Remarks

Though Meg shows affection towards Stanley and cares for his comfort, he doesn’t exhibit the same feeling for her. By calling him ‘a good boy’ she projects herself as a motherly figure. Stanley is curious to know the weather condition though it doesn’t make any difference for him as he never leaves the house. But his curiosity for outside throws light on his suppressed wish to go out. Stanley is afraid of the open life; however it seems that he longs for it. His curiosity about weather reveals both the feelings - his interest for outside as he asks ‘Warm?’ and fear as he again asks ‘Cold?’

5.2.3 Conversation Three

In this interaction, Meg and Stanley share contrary opinions regarding the tea she served him. Though he doesn’t like the tea, Meg is firm on her opinion that the tea is good.

Contextual Environment

Stanley complains that the milk in the cornflakes is sour; however, Meg informs him that Petey ate his breakfast without any complaints. She denies giving fried bread to Stanley on account of his complaints. When Stanley decides to go to some good hotel to have breakfast, Meg gives him fried bread, so that he should not go outside. Petey leaves the house without having tea; therefore Stanley blames Meg for being a bad wife. However, Meg denies it and assures herself that Petey doesn’t think so. She claims to be the best wife. She further claims that her boarding house is very famous but Stanley denies it saying that he is the only visitor since a long time. She warns him that he should not use words such as ‘succulent’ to a married woman. He asks for a cup of tea but she tells him that if he wants tea, he will have to apologize for calling her succulent.

Conversation

STANLEY: How long has that tea been in the pot?
MEG: It’s good tea. Good strong tea.
STANLEY: This isn’t tea. It’s gravy!
MEG: It’s not.
STANLEY: Get out of it. You succulent old washing bag.
MEG: I am not! And it isn’t your place to tell if I am!
STANLEY: And it isn’t your place to come into a man’s bedroom and - wake him up.
MEG: Stanley! Don’t you like your cup of tea of a morning - the one I bring you?
STANLEY: I can’t drink this muck. Didn’t anyone ever tell you to warm the pot, at least?
MEG: That’s a good strong tea, that’s all.

(BP, 18)
**Implicature Analysis**

Meg brings out the tea pot in order to serve tea to Stanley. He takes the tea and asks her ‘How long has that tea been in the pot?’ In this utterance, on account of ‘what is said’, Stanley seems to ask the time since the tea has been in the pot. On the other hand, on the account of ‘what is meant’ Stanley seems to suggest Meg that the tea has become cold as it has been there in the pot for a long time. In other words, he wants to suggest her that she needs to make it hot before she gives it to him. Thus, he is not interested simply in knowing the time since it has been in the pot, but he wants to suggest that the tea is not worth drinking. However, as Meg claims ‘It’s good tea. Good strong tea’ she seems to violate the maxim of quality as she calls the tea strong, though it is not. She has made the tea before Petey left and since then she has put it in the pot. As a result, the tea has become cold, though she doesn’t admit it. This violation of the maxim of quality by Meg can be taken to implicate her haughty nature as well as her tendency to prove herself right. She doesn’t like this hard criticism by Stanley but she likes flattery when Petey praises cornflakes and fried bread prepared by her. Therefore, she believes firmly, but falsely, that the tea is strong. Stanley denies believing it and says ‘This isn’t tea. It’s gravy!’ Here, he seems to flout the maxim of quality as he compares tea with gravy. However, if it is interpreted as an example of metaphor, Stanley seems to suggest something beyond the words. It can be interpreted by comparison of the qualities of the two substances in question. It implicates that the tea has turned thick and cold like gravy as it has been in the pot for a long time, therefore, it is not worth drinking. But as Meg is hard to believe, Stanley gets irritated and calls her ‘You succulent old washing bag’. Once again, in this utterance, Stanley flouts the maxim of quality by calling her names which are categorically false. If this utterance is interpreted as a metaphor in which he compares Meg with succulent old washing bag, it can be taken as cooperative. Stanley here applies the qualities of succulent old washing bag to Meg to suggest that she is thick and fleshy and as useless as an old washing bag. Moreover, the word ‘succulent’ carries certain obscene connotations also. In other words, Stanley is abusing her for her bad service. Meg denies being ‘succulent old washing bag’ and warns Stanley ‘And it isn’t your place to tell me if I am!’ With this utterance, Meg seems to suggest Stanley that he should not cross his limits. She warns him not to abuse her as he is simply a lodger there. As they don’t share such a relation in which one gets the superior status than another in family, Stanley doesn’t have any right to use such words for her. However, Stanley retorts ‘And it
isn’t your place to come into a man’s bedroom and – wake him up.’ In this utterance, Stanley seems to flout the maxim of quality in order to suggest the absurdity of Meg’s utterance. He retorts in the same way in order to suggest the ridiculousness of her warning. However, if his utterance is taken to be cooperative, it can be taken to implicate that as Stanley is not in a position to abuse Meg, in the same way, Meg doesn’t have the right to enter his bed room. He wants to suggest her that if she enters his bedroom, why shouldn’t he use such words for her? Moreover, if she crosses her limits by entering into a man’s bedroom, then why shouldn’t he cross his limits? He wants to suggest that if she takes this liberty, why shouldn’t he? Meg asks him ‘Don’t you like your cup of tea of a morning - the one I bring you?’ In this utterance, Meg seems to suggest him that she comes to his bedroom only to give him the morning tea, as she believes that he likes it very much. She suggests that she doesn’t have any other intention than giving him tea when she comes to his bedroom. However, Stanley bursts out saying ‘I can’t drink this muck’. Here also, he flouts the maxim of quality by being categorically false as he calls the tea as muck. However, if the utterance is taken as an instance of metaphor, it can be interpreted as cooperative. By calling it muck, he wants to suggest that the tea is so dirty and cold that it is not worth drinking. He further asks her ‘Didn’t anyone ever tell you to warm the pot, at least?’ Being a rhetorical question, the utterance flouts the maxim of quality which seems to implicate that she didn’t even warm the tea pot. He suggests that, as a minimum requirement, she should have made it warm so that he could drink it. However, as Meg says ‘That’s a good strong tea, that’s all’ it seems to implicate her aggressiveness as well as her domination.

Concluding Remarks

There is vast disparity between what Stanley asks and what he means to know from Meg while talking about tea. Meg gets hurt due to Stanley’s harsh criticism and pretends to believe that the tea is good and strong. In fact, she expects that Stanley should praise her as Petey did, but she is disappointed due to his bitter comments. With the help of metaphor resulting out of flouting the maxim of quality, Stanley suggests her that the tea has become so thick and cold as if it is gravy. Moreover, he exhibits a sheer lack of respect by calling her with obscene names. Their interaction leaves certain hints of illegal obscene relations between them as Stanley refers to her presence in his bedroom. As Stanley dislikes the tea prepared by her, in a way, he challenges her skill as a good cook.
She feels as if her self-importance is being questioned, therefore, she makes such dominating statements in order to feel triumphant.

5.2.4 Conversation Four

In this passage, Stanley claims to have cleaned the house and further informs Lulu that he had been out for a morning walk. However, she doesn’t seem to believe him.

Contextual Environment

Meg informs Stanley that she is expecting two gentlemen, who want to stay there for a few days. He seems curious to know their details and wishes that they won’t come. He gets irritated to see that Meg took away his cup of tea. Meg notices that he has become upset, therefore, she tries to calm him down by reminding him of the piano. She reminds him that he can play piano very well; though, he is doubtful about it. He informs Meg that he has got an offer of a job as pianist. Then he speaks about a concert once he gave at Lower Edmonton. The concert was going to be successful; however, some persons spoiled it. They wanted to see him defeated. Then he frightens Meg informing that someone will come with a wheelbarrow to take her away. Lulu enters with a shopping bag and whispers something in Meg’s ears, which Stanley could not listen.

Conversation

LULU: You’re not to touch it.
STANLEY: Why would I want to touch it?
LULU: Well, you’re not to, anyway.
      LULU walks upstage.
LULU: Why don’t you open the door? It’s all stuffy in here.
      She opens the back door.
STANLEY (rising): Stuffy? I disinfected the place this morning.
LULU (at the door): Oh, that’s better.
STANLEY: I think it’s going to rain to-day. What do you think?
LULU: I hope so. You could do with it.
STANLEY: Me! I was in the sea at half past six.
LULU: Were You?
STANLEY: I went right out to the headland and back before breakfast. Don’t you believe me!
      She sits, takes out a compact and powders her nose.
LULU (offering him the compact): Do you want to have a look at your face?
      (BP, 25)
Implicature Analysis

Lulu puts a solid round parcel on the sideboard and warns Stanley to keep himself away from that. Therefore, he says ‘Why would I want to touch it?’ This rhetorical question flouts the maxim of quality to implicate that Stanley doesn’t intend to touch the parcel. He wants to suggest Lulu that he knows that it is none of his business to see the parcel and he is not interested in it. However, Meg emphasizes it saying ‘Well, you’re not to, anyway.’ In this utterance, Meg hedges the maxim of relation by using expressions ‘well’ and ‘anyway’. Such hedging of the maxim of relation is taken to implicate that whatever Lulu says is not very much relevant at the stage at which it occurs in the conversation. Lulu uses these expressions because she realizes that it is irrelevant to warn Stanley about touching the parcel as he didn’t try to. Lulu goes upstairs and says ‘Why don’t you open the door? It’s all stuffy in here’. In these utterances, she tries to suggest that she needs to have fresh air. She further wants to suggest that the house needs cleaning as she finds it stuffy in there. Therefore, she opens the back door to let the fresh air come inside. At this, Stanley says ‘I disinfected the place this morning’. Here, he seems to violate the maxim of quality by telling a white lie. In fact, neither he nor anyone else has disinfected the house. He was simply complaining Meg in the morning that his room needs sweeping and cleaning. Thus, he seems to be uncooperative; however, if his utterance is taken to implicate something else, it can be interpreted as cooperative. Stanley here wants to suggest Lulu that he also likes cleanliness. He wants to save himself from humiliation by suggesting that he is not a dirty fellow. Then he suddenly talks about weather saying ‘I think, it’s going to rain to-day’. In this utterance, the verb ‘think’ gives rise to clausal implicature that Stanley is not sure whether it will definitely rain. Here, Stanley seems to violate the maxim of relation by talking about weather, which is not related to their ongoing conversation. However, his utterance can be interpreted as implicating Stanley’s suggestion that Lulu feels stuffy in the house because of the weather and not because the house is dirty. It further can be taken to implicate that Stanley wants to deviate Lulu’s attention so that she should not find out whether he has really disinfected the house. Then he asks her opinion about the possibility of rain and she replies ‘I hope so’. In this utterance, Lulu uses weaker construction which can be interpreted as implicating that she is not firm about her opinion. She wants to suggest that she is not in a state to believe that it will definitely rain. With her utterance ‘You could do with it’ she wants to suggest Stanley that it doesn’t matter for him whether it rains or not. In other words, she wants
him to realize that he never goes out of the house; therefore, he shouldn’t bother about the possible rain. However, Stanley claims ‘I was in the sea at half past six’. With this utterance, he once again violates the maxim of quality by being a liar. He didn’t go to the sea in the morning but he was in the bed. It was Meg who woke him up late in the morning. Therefore, it is obvious that he did not go out of the house. However, if his utterance is taken to be cooperative, it can be interpreted as implicating that he wants to create his positive image in Lulu’s mind. He wants to establish himself as a person who is up to date. For the same reason, he goes on telling lies so as to strike out Lulu’s prejudices about him. Moreover, he also seems to violate the maxim of relation as his utterance is not relevant to the topic. However, with this violation, he wants to suggest that he also goes out for exercise in the morning; therefore, it matters for him if it rains. He further says ‘I went right out to the headland and back before breakfast’. In this utterance, he seems to violate the maxim of quantity by providing unwanted details. However, this utterance can be taken to be cooperative if it is interpreted as implicating Stanley’s futile efforts to prove that he was at the sea early in the morning. He thinks that she will believe him if he gives the details of his visit to the sea. However, when she offers him a compact and asks ‘Do you want to have a look at your face?’ she seems to mean more than what she says. By asking him to see his face in the mirror, she wants to suggest him that she doesn’t believe that he was at sea early in the morning. She observes that his face doesn’t look fresh, therefore, she conduces that he didn’t go out of the bed. Had he been out early in the morning, his face should have been fresh. In other words, she suggests him to stop telling all these lies. However, he tells white lies so as to avoid going out with Lulu.

Concluding Remarks

Stanley doesn’t show any such action which might reflect his interest in touching the parcel, but Lulu warns him against it. Thus, Lulu’s warning can be taken to implicate that there is something in that parcel which is either meant for Stanley or something of his interest. It can be concluded from Stanley’s utterances that he realizes the meaninglessness and boredom in the way he lives; therefore, he tries to project himself as a happy man who gets out in the morning regularly and is clean and up to date. However, by offering him a compact, Lulu means to suggest him that he is a liar.
5.2.5 Conversation Five

Here, Lulu tries to get Stanley out in order to have a bit of fresh air. But Stanley asks her whether she would join him as he wishes to go nowhere. Lulu is confused at this strange proposal.

**Contextual Environment**

Lulu asks Stanley whether he never goes out of the house. She wonders what he might be doing all the day sitting in the house. She is surprised to realize that even Meg doesn’t have any objection regarding his stay in the house throughout the day. However, he declares that he never causes any trouble to her. When Lulu suggests him to take wash, he denies it saying that it wouldn’t make any difference.

**Conversation**

LULU: It’s lovely out. And I’ve got a few sandwiches.
STANLEY: What sort of sandwiches?
LULU: Cheese.
STANLEY: I’m a big eater, you know.
LULU: That’s all right. I’m not hungry.
STANLEY (abruptly): How would you like to go away with me?
LULU: Where?
STANLEY: Nowhere. Still, we could go.
LULU: But where could we go?
STANLEY: Nowhere. There’s nowhere to go. So we could just go. It wouldn’t matter.
LULU: We might as well stay here.
STANLEY: No. It’s no good here.
LULU: Well, where else is there?
STANLEY: Nowhere.
LULU: Well, that’s a charming proposal.

(BP, 26)

**Implicature Analysis**

Lulu complains that Stanley makes her feel depressed with such a clumsy appearance. When she says ‘It’s lovely out’ she means that they should go out so that they will get some fresh air. She further wants to suggest that it is not very lively to stay inside the house; therefore, she tries to persuade him to go out for a walk. While she adds ‘And I’ve got a few sandwiches’ the phrase ‘a few’ raises a scalar implicature that Lulu hasn’t got more sandwiches. Moreover, she seems to violate the maxim of relation by talking about sandwiches which is not relevant to the ongoing conversation. However, if it is assumed
to be cooperative, it can be taken to implicate that they can eat those sandwiches sitting somewhere if they go outside. She might have thought that, at least for sandwiches, he will leave the house for some time. When she tells him that she has got cheese sandwiches, he says ‘I’m a big eater, you know’. Here Stanley seems to mean that he likes cheese sandwiches very much, therefore, he will eat all of them. However, when Lulu tells him ‘I’m not hungry’ she seems to violate the maxim of relation as she gives irrelevant information. Stanley never asked her whether she is hungry or not. However, her utterance can be taken to implicate that he can have all the sandwiches. She wants to suggest that it doesn’t matter if he eats all the sandwiches as she doesn’t need any. Suddenly, Stanley invites her to go out, but when she wants to know where he wishes to go, he replies ‘Nowhere. Still we could go’. She gets confused and asks him once again about the place where he proposes to go, however, he again replies ‘Nowhere. There’s nowhere to go. So we could just go’. Here, Stanley seems to violate the maxim of manner as he doesn’t make it clear where he plans to go. He gives information that is vague, obscure as well as ambiguous; therefore, he seems to be uncooperative. However, it can be taken to implicate Stanley’s aimless life. He can’t decide exactly where he should go. It reflects his state of mind in which he doesn’t realize any particular aim of his life. As he says ‘Still we could go’, it can be interpreted that he is leading such a life which is without any purpose, though he has to live. He seems to be oblivious about his future. It seems as if he is forced by some unknown power to stay there in the house, therefore, he could not decide whether he should go out or not, though it seems that he wishes to. These utterances express his suppression at the thought that his life is without any concrete goal. He doesn’t feel any place worth visiting. He is forced to lead his life as it comes, that is, he could not live as per his own ideas, but he has to adjust himself according to the situation as he says ‘So we could just go’. When Lulu suggests him that they will stay in the house instead of going out, he says ‘It’s no good here’. In this utterance, he wants to suggest that he doesn’t want either to stay there or to go out. He has been caught in such a fix that he can neither escape from it nor find any purpose of his life there. In other words, life has become a meaningless journey for him. As he says that there is neither such place where he could go, nor he likes to stay in the house, Lulu says ‘Well, that’s a charming proposal’. Here, Lulu seems to flout the maxim of quality. It isn’t a charming proposal that Stanley wants to take her ‘Nowhere’. Though the idea of going nowhere is absurd, Lulu calls it a charming proposal. Thus, she seems to be uncooperative. However, if her utterance is taken as an example of irony, it can be
interpreted as cooperative. Her utterance seems to implicate the meaning that is exactly opposite of its literal import. She wants to suggest Stanley that his proposal is ridiculous.

**Concluding Remarks**

In this passage, Lulu makes all possible efforts to get Stanley out of the house but Stanley disappoints her by spoiling her plan. She tries to tempt him with sandwiches and he, on the other hand, tries to discourage her by saying that he is a big eater. The overall passage seems to convey that he feels life vibrating within him but is afraid of its destructive potential. He fears his possible engulfment by Meg’s possessive maternity on one hand, and Lulu’s sexuality on the other. However, he has a lurking desire for both as he could not leave the house and, at the same time, wishes to go out.

**5.2.6 Conversation Six**

This piece of conversation between Meg and Goldberg takes place when he encourages her to arrange a party. Meg becomes happy to know that Goldberg is willing to help her to arrange a surprise party for Stanley.

**Contextual Environment**

As Stanley comes to know that Goldberg and McCann have entered the house, he goes out unnoticed through the back door. They greet Meg and ask her whether she could accommodate them. She informs them that there is one person already as a lodger. Goldberg is curious to know the details of the lodger. Meg informs him that Stanley, the lodger, is a pianist and once he gave a concert. She wishes that he could have played piano today as it is his birthday. Goldberg suggests her to arrange a party on his birthday.

**Conversation**

GOLDBERG: You like the idea?
MEG: Oh, I’m so glad you came today.
GOLDBERG: If we hadn’t come today we’d have come tomorrow. Still, I’m glad we came today. Just in time for his birthday.
MEG: I wanted to have a party. But you must have people for a party.
GOLDBERG: And now you’ve got McCann and Me. McCann’s the life and soul of any party.

(BP, 33)

**Implicature Analysis**

Meg is in high spirits to know that Goldberg shares her opinion that they should give a party to Stanley on his birthday. He assures her that he will arrange it for her. Therefore,
he asks her ‘You like the idea?’ and she replies ‘Oh, I’m so glad you came today’. Here, Goldberg wants to know whether Meg liked the idea of having birthday party. Meg’s reply seems totally irrelevant as she should have answered in yes or no as a relevant reply. Thus, she seems to violate the maxim of relation by providing information which is not relevant to the topic of their conversation. However, her reply can be interpreted as cooperative if Goldberg assumes certain background and tries to draw relevant inferences. Meg’s utterance can be taken to implicate that she liked the idea of having a party. Though she doesn’t mention it directly, it can be inferred from her suggestion that she is happy that Goldberg came on that day. She further wants to suggest that if Goldberg would not have come, it would have been impossible for her to have a party on Stanley’s birthday. Therefore, she expresses her happiness on Goldberg’s arrival on this occasion. Goldberg assures her ‘If we hadn’t come today we’d have come tomorrow’. In this utterance, he wants to suggest Meg that their visit to the boarding house was confirmed. It implicates that they have got a purpose behind their visit, as they had planned it previously. Though Meg seems happy at the thought of having a party, she regrets ‘But you must have people for a party’. In this utterance, she seems to implicate that she thinks it impossible to have a party as there is no one whom she can invite. She wants to suggest that a party cannot be arranged and enjoyed without people. However, Goldberg has a solution for this. He offers their willingness to help Meg to have a nice party. He says ‘McCann’s the life and soul of any party’. Here, Goldberg seems to flout the maxim of quality by calling McCann as the life and soul of any party. It is categorically false to compare a human being with abstract ideas. However, the utterance can be taken to be cooperative if it is analyzed as an example of metaphor, that is, by comparison of the qualities of life and soul with McCann. Life and soul play a crucial role in the proper functioning of a human body. In the same way, Goldberg seems to suggest that McCann is an expert in arranging parties successfully. He will definitely arrange a lively party. He wants to suggest Meg that she should not worry about anything as McCann will take care of everything. Moreover, Goldberg seems to violate the maxim of quality as he doesn’t have any evidence to prove that McCann is the life and soul of any party. McCann himself is surprised to hear that he is life and soul of any party. However, through this violation, it seems that Goldberg wants to have a party at any cost. Therefore, to make sure that Meg should not cancel it on any grounds; he wants to assure her of the success of proposed birthday party. He wants to assure her that McCann is responsible to make the party a grand success.
Concluding Remarks
Meg realizes that now it is possible to have a party with Goldberg and McCann to help her. Therefore, she expresses her pleasure at their arrival at the right time. Goldberg indirectly suggests her that their visit to the house was planned previously with a definite purpose. He makes all possible efforts to ensure that the party should be arranged. He might have planned something for the party, therefore, he tries to assure Meg that they will help her to make the party successful. He is trying his best so that the party shouldn’t be cancelled.

5.2.7 Conversation Seven
In this piece of conversation between Stanley and McCann, Stanley claims that it is not his birthday and abuses Meg for deceiving them. But McCann seems not to believe him.

Contextual Environment
Meg assures Stanley that the two gentlemen won’t cause him any trouble and she will continue giving him early morning tea. Stanley denies that it is his birthday; however, Meg gives him ‘a boy’s drum’ as a birthday gift. Stanley beats the drum in an erratic and uncontrolled manner. In the evening, when McCann informs him that they have arranged a party, he expresses apology as he could not attend it. He wants to go out alone to celebrate his birthday quietly. He thinks that he had met McCann somewhere before also. He tries to persuade McCann for leaving the house telling him that it is not good to stay there.

Conversation
STANLEY (to the table): Listen. Don’t call me sir.
MCCANN: I won’t, if you don’t like it.
STANLEY (moving away): No. Anyway, this isn’t my birthday.
MCCANN: No?
STANLEY: No. It’s not till next month.
MCCANN: Not according to the lady.
STANLEY: Her? She’s crazy. Round the bend.
MCCANN: That’s a terrible thing to say.
STANLEY (to the table): Haven’t you found that out yet? There’s a lot you don’t know. I think someone’s leading you up the garden path.
MCCANN: Who would do that?
STANLEY (leaning across the table): That woman is mad!
MCCANN: That’s slander.
STANLEY: And you don’t know what you’re doing.
MCCANN: Your cigarette is near that paper.

(BP, 41)

Implicature Analysis

In the course of their conversation, McCann addresses Stanley as ‘Sir’. Stanley doesn’t like to be addressed as sir; therefore, he tells him so. McCann assures him that he will not call him sir if he doesn’t like it. Then Stanley informs him ‘Anyway, this isn’t my birthday’. With this utterance, Stanley seems to hedge the maxim of relation as he uses expression ‘anyway’. Such hedging implicates that what is said by the speaker is not very much relevant to the topic of their conversation. Stanley also realizes that it is not relevant to talk about his birthday at the moment, but he wants to make it clear in order to avoid further complications. Moreover, as Stanley adds ‘It’s not till next month’ he seems to violate the maxim of quantity by giving more information that is not expected or asked by McCann. Thus, he seems to be uncooperative by providing additional information. However, the utterance can be taken to implicate that Stanley wants to make McCann believe, by providing additional information about his birthday, that he has got wrong information. Moreover, Stanley even violates the maxim of quality by providing information about his birthday that lacks adequate evidence. He seems to give false information as he admitted before a while that he wants to celebrate his birthday quietly. But then, he denies it saying that there are months to go for his birthday. However, he seems to implicate that he wants to avoid the proposed party. When McCann refers to Meg, Stanley says ‘She’s crazy. Round the bend’. Here also, he violates the maxim of quantity by sharing unwanted information. However, through this violation, Stanley wants to suggest McCann that he should not believe Meg. He suggests that as a crazy or mad person goes on talking meaningless things, in the same way, Meg is talking about his birthday. By calling her crazy and insane, Stanley tries to suggest McCann that they should not take her seriously. McCann could not believe it as he says ‘That’s a terrible thing to say’. He seems to tell Stanley that Meg is not crazy and he should not talk such things about her. Stanley further tells him that there are so many things which McCann doesn’t know. When he says ‘There’s a lot you don’t know’, he seems to warn McCann about Meg. He wants to disrepute Meg so that they should not stay in the house. He also expresses a doubt that McCann and Goldberg have been misguided by someone. When he says ‘I think someone’s leading you up the garden path’ he seems to suggest McCann that he has reached a wrong destination. Therefore, McCann asks him ‘Who would do that?’
and he replies ‘That woman is mad!’ Here, Stanley seems to violate the maxim of relation, as a relevant reply would have been the name of a person who is misleading McCann. However, if the utterance is interpreted as cooperative, it can be taken to implicate Stanley’s suggestion that Meg is misleading McCann. However, McCann doesn’t believe him as he says ‘That’s slander’ suggesting that Stanley is deliberately spreading false and damaging information about Meg. Stanley cautions him saying ‘And you don’t know what you’re doing’ and McCann says ‘Your cigarette is near that paper’. Stanley here tries to make McCann aware that he will have to face difficulties as he is ignorant of what he is doing. In other words, he warns McCann to be careful while he is in the house. Moreover, McCann’s utterance seems to flout the maxim of relation. This flouting can be taken to implicate McCann’s suggestion that it is Stanley who needs to be more careful. He tries to focus on the fact that Stanley’s cigarette is near that paper, which is dangerous as that paper may catch fire.

**Concluding Remarks**

This interaction reveals Stanley’s suppressed anger for Meg as he abuses her by calling her crazy. As he realizes that it is because of Meg that McCann believes it to be his birthday, he tries to create distorted image of Meg in his mind so that he shouldn’t take her seriously. He suggests McCann that he hasn’t found out the real nature of Meg, otherwise he won’t have believed her. However, McCann blames him for spreading rumors about Meg. By making him aware of the possible danger, McCann suggests him that instead of advising him to be careful, Stanley should bother about his own safety.

**5.2.8 Conversation Eight**

In this extract, Stanley tries to persuade McCann to believe that he is away from any complications. He tries to appeal McCann’s honesty and makes him aware that someone is making him fool. Then he talks about Ireland and Irish people.

**Contextual Environment**

Stanley gets disturbed to listen to the voices coming from backside. He is curious to know why these people at the back don’t come in the house. He also wonders what they might be doing there. However, McCann advises him not to bother about it. At this moment, Stanley seizes McCann’s arm in order to tell him something seriously. McCann warns him about it and orders him to leave his hand.
Conversation

STANLEY: It’s a mistake! Do you understand?
MCCANN: You’re in a bad state, man.
STANLEY (whispering, advancing): Has he told you anything? Do you know what you’re here for? Tell me. You needn’t be frightened of me. Or hasn’t he told you?
MCCANN: Told me what?
STANLEY (hissing): I’ve explained to you, damn you, that all those years I lived in Basingstoke I never stepped outside the door.
MCCANN: You know, I’m flabbergasted with you.
STANLEY (reasonably): Look. You look on honest man. You’re being made a fool of, that’s all. You understand? Where do you come from?
MCCANN: Where do you think?
STANLEY: I know Ireland very well. I’ve many friends there. I love that country and I admire and trust its people. I trust them. They respect the truth and they have sense of humour.

(BP, 42)

Implicature Analysis

Stanley takes McCann across the stage holding his hand and tries to convince him saying ‘It’s a mistake! Do you understand?’ and McCann replies ‘You’re in a bad state man’. Here, Stanley seems to suggest that McCann has got wrong information; therefore, he wants McCann to understand the facts. McCann seems to flout the maxim of relation by giving irrelevant reply. However, his utterance can be taken to implicate that he is sure about what he is doing. He suggests that Stanley is very much disturbed; therefore, he thinks it as a mistake. It is not McCann but Stanley who is unable to understand the situation. By flouting the maxim of relation, McCann seems to suggest that it is not a mistake. Stanley tries to know if Goldberg has told something to him about their visit to this boarding house. He urges him to reveal everything, saying ‘You needn’t be frightened of me’. While saying this, Stanley seems to mean that McCann should feel free to inform him whatever he has been told by Goldberg. He further seems to suggest McCann that he doesn’t intend to harm him. However, McCann couldn’t understand what Stanley is trying to explain him. As a result, Stanley repeats ‘I’ve explained to you, dam you, that all those years I lived in Basingstoke I never stepped outside the door.’ In this utterance, Stanley seems to assume that Goldberg might have told everything about Stanley’s past to McCann. Therefore, he wants to make it clear that he never stepped outside the door while he lived in Basingstoke. However, in this utterance, he seems to mean something else which is beyond the literal meaning expressed by the words. He
wants to suggest McCann that he is not responsible for anything that might have happened in Basingstoke. He seems to violate the maxim of quality by providing false information as he could not prove that he never stepped out. However, this violation can be taken to suggest that Stanley wants to convince McCann that he never got himself involved in any controversies there in Basingstoke. However, McCann seems to suggest that he doesn’t believe whatever Stanley says when he utters ‘You know, I’m flabbergasted with you’. He is surprised to see Stanley trying to keep himself aloof. Stanley takes a reasonable stance when he says ‘You look an honest man’. Here, Stanley seems to suggest McCann that he should keep himself away from Goldberg, who is not honest. He tries to appeal McCann that an honest man like him should not get himself involved in such matters. He further says ‘You’re being made a fool of’ suggesting that he is not supposed to do any significant task there, but it is Goldberg who is misleading him. Then suddenly he asks McCann ‘Where do you come from?’ and in reply, he asks a counter question to Stanley saying ‘Where do you think?’ Here, McCann seems to be uncooperative by violating the maxim of relation by giving an unexpected reply. However, it can be taken to implicate that McCann is not willing to tell the exact name of the place from where he has come. He seems to avoid telling it to Stanley to check whether he knows it previously. But Stanley seems to violate the maxims of relation as he says ‘I know Ireland very well. I’ve many friends there. I love … a sense of humour.’ He seems irrelevant as he doesn’t give a relevant reply of McCann’s question. However, it can be interpreted as cooperative if it is taken to implicate Stanley’s guess that McCann has come from Ireland. Moreover, he goes on talking about his friends there, how he loves that country and expresses his trust and admiration towards people in Ireland. As he guesses that McCann belongs to Ireland, he wants to suggest him that they can be friends. He tries to flatter McCann as he admires Irish people by calling them truthful and humorous. He thinks that McCann might change his plan to know that both of them are associated with the same country and Stanley has a great respect for the country as well as Irish people.

**Concluding Remarks**

Stanley wishes that McCann shouldn’t have any prejudices for him. Therefore, he tries to assure him that whatever Goldberg might have told him about Stanley’s past is not a reality. He lived his life peacefully without bothering about anything else. Thus, he wants to prove himself innocent and away from all complications. Stanley deliberately talks about McCann’s honesty in order to suggest him that he is different from Goldberg who
is not honest. To notice that McCann seems not to believe him, he takes one more chance to create soft corner for him in McCann’s mind. He guesses that McCann is an Irishman; therefore he praises Ireland and Irish people. It can be taken to suggest that Stanley wants to establish friendly relation with McCann by informing that he has many friends in Ireland.

5.2.9 Conversation Nine

This is a piece of conversation which takes place in the party. Meg, Goldberg and McCann are about to drink wine and Meg wants Goldberg to have some comments on her dress.

**Contextual Environment**

Stanley tries to expel Goldberg and McCann telling them that all the rooms are booked out. However, Goldberg neglects him and offers best wishes on his birthday. McCann enters with bottles in his hands and Stanley orders him not to bring drinks in the house as it is not licensed for drinking. He further warns them against any possible trouble they might cause to the people in the house. Goldberg asks him to calm down and be comfortable in a chair; however, he forces them to sit down first. They go on asking him various questions which he could not answer properly. Due to this interrogation, Stanley gets irritated and hits Goldberg in his stomach. McCann seizes a chair in order to hit Stanley, who covers his head with another chair. McCann makes a threatening move towards Stanley to hit him with a chair but Goldberg asks him to take it easy.

**Conversation**

MEG: Oh, Mr. Goldberg, what should I drink?
GOLDBERG: Glasses, glasses first. Open the Scotch, McCann
MEG (*at the sideboard*): Here’s my very best glasses in here.
MCCANN: I don’t drink Scotch.
GOLDBERG: You’ve got the Irish
MEG (*bringing the glasses*): Here they are.
GOLDBERG: Good. Mrs. Boles, I think Stanley should pour the toast, don’t you?
MEG: Oh yes. Come on, Stanley. (*STANLEY walks slowly to the table.*) Do you like my dress, Mr. Goldberg?
GOLDBERG: It’s out on its own. Turn yourself round a minute. I used to be in the business.

(BP, 53)
Implicature Analysis

At this moment, Meg enters with a drum and they pretend as if nothing has happened. Goldberg informs her that they have got bottles of Scotch and Irish, therefore, Meg asks him ‘What should I drink?’ and he replies ‘Glasses, glasses first. Open the Scotch, McCann’. Goldberg here seems to be uncooperative as he doesn’t give a relevant reply to Meg’s question. Thus, he violates the maxim of relation. He would have told Meg either of the brands, which she should drink. But he asks her to bring the glasses and tells McCann to open the bottle of Scotch. However, this utterance can be taken to be cooperative if it is interpreted as implicating Goldberg’s suggestion that Meg should drink Scotch. Therefore, he asks her to bring glasses and asks McCann to serve her Scotch. Meg goes to the sideboard in order to bring some glasses. When McCann informs ‘I don’t drink Scotch’ Goldberg advises him ‘You’ve got the Irish’. Here, Goldberg seems to suggest that McCann need not bother about it as he has got an option. If he doesn’t want to drink Scotch, he can have Irish. Then Goldberg wishes that Stanley should pour the toast as it is his birthday and Meg also thinks the same. Stanley walks to the table in order to serve drinks. Meg is in evening dress and wants to know whether the dress suits her, therefore, she asks ‘Do you like my dress, Mr. Goldberg?’ and he replies ‘It’s out on its own. Turn yourself round a minute. I used to be in the business’. Here, Goldberg seems to violate the maxim of quantity as he provides more information than expected. He would have been cooperative with a reply in yes or no. Moreover, it also seems to violate the maxim of manner as the reply given by Goldberg is ambiguous. Instead of giving a direct reply, he uses a roundabout way by saying ‘It’s out on its own’. However, this violation can be taken to generate implicature that Goldberg tries to flatter Meg, as he knows that she loves flattery. Therefore, instead of simply saying that I liked your dress, he uses circumlocution to say that the dress has achieved recognition as the best in itself. He exaggerates his comments in order to suggest her that she is looking gorgeous. Then he asks her to turn round so that he could observe her dress properly. When he says ‘I used to be in the business’ he violates the maxim of relation as it is irrelevant to talk about his business when Meg asks his opinion about her dress. However, through this violation, he seems to suggest her that he is giving an authentic opinion about her dress. As he was in that business, he wants to suggest that, he is able to give expert comments on the dress. He wants to emphasize the fact that he is serious about his opinion, therefore she should believe him.
Concluding Remarks

All of them, except Stanley, are excited at the thought that finally they have arranged a party. They are eager to drink the wine and they have got various brands. As it is Stanley’s birthday, they wish that they should pour a toast. When Meg asks Goldberg about her dress, he exaggerates her praise so that she should be happy. Moreover, to give an authenticity to his comments, he tries to suggest her that he knows much about fashion, being in the same business.

5.2.10 Conversation Ten

In this passage, Meg is relieved to know that the car belongs to no one else, but Goldberg. She is worried to realize that Stanley doesn’t have anything to eat. Then arrives Goldberg, who praises her for a nice cup of coffee.

Contextual Background

The game as well as the party gets disturbed due to unexpected blackout and there is utter chaos. In the darkness, Lulu screams and becomes unconscious. McCann finds a torch and sees in the torchlight that Lulu is laying spread eagled on the table and Stanley bent over her. Stanley could only produce meaningless giggles as McCann and Goldberg move towards him. The next morning, Meg informs Petey that she doesn’t have any cornflakes as the two men have had their breakfast. Meg complains that she has got headache and regrets to see the broken drum. She is surprised to see that McCann was in Stanley’s room early in the morning; therefore, she doubts that they must be friends. She thinks that Stanley must have gone to sleep again as he didn’t come for breakfast. She is worried about the car parked outside, which might contain a wheelbarrow.

Conversation

MEG (relieved): His car? Oh, I didn’t know it was his car.
PETEY: Of course it’s his car
MEG: Oh, I feel better.
PETEY: What are you on about?
MEG: Oh, I do feel better.
PETEY: You go and get a bit of air.
MEG: Yes, I will. I will. I’ll go and get the shopping. (She goes towards the back door. A door slams upstairs. She turns.) It’s Stanley! He’s coming down - what am I going to do about his breakfast? (She rushes into the kitchen.) Petey, what shall I give him? (She looks through the hatch.) There’s no cornflakes. (They both gaze at the
door. Enter GOLDBERG. He halts at the door, as he meets their gaze, then smiles.)

GOLDBERG: A reception committee!
MEG: Oh, I thought it was Stanley.
GOLDBERG: You find a resemblance?
MEG: Oh no. You look quite different.
GOLDBERG: (coming into the room). Different build, of course.
MEG (entering from the kitchen): I thought he was coming down for his breakfast. He hasn’t had his breakfast yet.
GOLDBERG: Your wife makes a very nice cup of tea, Mr. Boles, you know that?

(BP, 69-70)

Implicature Analysis

Meg wants to know whether Petey saw a wheelbarrow in the car. However, he informs her that there is nothing like that in the car and the car belongs to Goldberg. Meg is surprised to know the fact and says ‘Oh, I didn’t know it was his car’. Here, Meg seems to implicate that she bothered about the car since morning for no reason at all. She is relieved of the unknown menace caused by Stanley’s threat that someone will come with a wheelbarrow to take her away. Her headache also seems to be resulted out of her anxiety to notice the car outside her house. As she comes to know the truth, she gets relaxed. She realizes that she needs not to worry about the car. Petey assures her that the car belongs to no one else but Goldberg. As a result, Meg says ‘Oh, I feel better’. Her headache is vanished and she feels better to realize that no one is going to take her away in a wheelbarrow. Petey gets confused at Meg’s behavior, therefore, asks her ‘What are you on about?’ and Meg repeats the same expression, that is, ‘Oh, I do feel better’. With this reply, Meg seems to be uncooperative by violating the maxim of relation as she doesn’t give information relevant to Petey’s question. However, this violation can be taken to implicate that Meg doesn’t want to tell Petey that she was afraid of a wheelbarrow. Therefore, she avoids telling Petey about her baseless anxiety. Petey suggests her ‘You go and get a bit of air’. With this utterance, Petey implicates that Meg is disturbed mentally and if she goes out in fresh air, she might feel relax. He wants to suggest that she is talking about certain meaningless and illogical things, which show her confused state of mind. He thinks that it might be the result of the late-night party; therefore, she may feel better in the fresh air. Meg accepts his suggestion as she says ‘Yes, I will. I’ll go and get the shopping’. Here, Meg seems to violate the maxim of quantity as she provides more information than expected. She would have been
cooperative by only saying ‘Yes, I will’. But she adds that she will go out for shopping.
This violation can be taken to implicate that now she has got things clear in front of her.
Before some time, she was confused due to unknown fear caused by the car, however,
now she is relieved of that burden. As she is about to go, a door slams upstairs and she
thinks that Stanley might be coming down for breakfast. She is worried as she doesn’t
have any breakfast for Stanley. She seems restless at the thought that she could not give
him any breakfast. She didn’t show the same restlessness while telling Petey that he
won’t get any breakfast as she is running out of cornflakes. She didn’t express any regret
for being unable to serve breakfast to her husband. However, for Stanley, she is eager to
serve him something though she doesn’t have any. It can be taken to implicate that she
cares more for Stanley than Petey, her husband. She didn’t feel guilty for not giving
breakfast to Petey, but for Stanley, she feels. To think what possible reaction of Stanley
will be, they stand still, looking upstairs. However, it is not Stanley but Goldberg, who
comes downstairs. He notices their gazes and comments ‘A reception committee!’ As it
was unexpected for Goldberg that Meg and Petey will be there as if to receive him, he
wonders whether they are standing there to welcome him formally. Therefore, he calls
them as reception committee. He makes this comment as he is unaware of their guess that
it might be Stanley. Therefore Meg says ‘Oh, I thought it was Stanley’. Here, Meg seems
to flout the maxim of relation, thus, seems to be uncooperative. However, this flouting
generates an implicature that they were not expecting Goldberg at that moment. They
were waiting for Stanley to come down and ask for breakfast. As she didn’t have anything
for breakfast, they were worried about Stanley’s reaction. Further, Goldberg asks ‘You
find a resemblance?’ and Meg replies ‘Oh no. You look quite different’. Here, Meg seems
to violate the maxim of quantity by adding ‘You look quite different’. Through this
violation, Meg can be taken to suggest Goldberg that there can’t be any comparison
between the two. She seems to suggest that there is no one who can take Stanley’s place.
Therefore, she denies any resemblance between Goldberg and Stanley. While coming into
the room, Goldberg comments ‘Different build, of course’. With this comparison, he
wants to suggest that he is more powerful than Stanley as the obvious difference between
them is their physique. Meg tries to clarify the confusion that they were expecting Stanley
and says ‘He hasn’t had his breakfast yet’. In return, Goldberg praises Meg saying ‘Your
wife makes a very nice up of tea, Mr. Boles’. He violates the maxim of relation with this
utterance as it is irrelevant to the topic of the present conversation. However, it can be
taken to implicate that Goldberg wants to avoid talking about Stanley. He changes the
topic in order to divert Meg’s attention from Stanley, and he knows that the best way to do this is to praise her. He is sure that Meg will forget Stanley if she is praised for something. Therefore, he flatters her by telling Petey that Meg is a good cook who prepares nice tea.

**Concluding Remarks**

As Petey informs Meg about the car, she gets relieved of all the feelings worry, anxiety and fear of unknown. But she avoids telling it to Petey because she realizes that these things are not very important as they were her illusions. She regains her vitality at the realization that she is out of danger now and decides go for shopping. She becomes so restless to think that Stanley won’t have any breakfast. As she doesn’t show the same relations for Petey at breakfast, it can be concluded that she cares Stanley more than Petey, her husband. She also refutes any resemblance between Stanley and Goldberg, suggesting that Stanley is unique, who cannot be replaced with anyone else. To divert her attention from Stanley, Goldberg flatters her by calling her a good cook.

**5.2.11 Conversation Eleven**

In this conversational exchange, Petey and Goldberg talk about Stanley. Petey seems worried about Stanley’s condition however; Goldberg is not sure about Stanley’s illness and reasons behind it.

**Contextual Environment**

Goldberg informs Meg that Stanley will come down at any moment in order to have his breakfast. She tells Goldberg that she was surprised to see his car and asks him whether he is going out for a ride. However, Goldberg neglects Meg’s question and goes on praising his own car. Then he pours some tea for himself and declares that the car has never let him down. Meg asks him once again whether he is going out for a ride but Goldberg doesn’t answer. Meg seems to understand his negligence and goes out herself. Goldberg notices Meg’s affection towards Stanley and calls her a good woman.

**Conversation**

PETEY: Stanley. Is he any better?

GOLDBERG (a little uncertainly): Oh … a little better, I think a little better. Of course, I’m not really qualified to say, Mr. Boles. I mean, I haven’t got the … the qualifications. The best thing would be if someone with the proper … mnn … qualifications … was to have a look at him. Someone with a few letters after his name. It makes all the difference.
PETEY: Yes.
GOLDBERG: Anyway, Dermot’s with him at the moment. He’s … keeping him company.
PETEY: Dermot?
GOLDBERG: Yes.
PETEY: It’s a terrible thing.
GOLDBERG (sighs): Yes. The birthday celebration was too much for him.
PETEY: What came over him?
PETEY: But what brought it on so suddenly?
GOLDBERG (rising, and moving upstage): Well, Mr. Boles, it can happen in all sorts of ways. A friend of mine was telling me about it only the other day.

(BP, 71-72)

Implicature Analysis

As Meg goes out for shopping, Petey asks Goldberg about Stanley’s present condition. He asks ‘Is he any better?’ and in reply, Goldberg violates the maxim of manner as he doesn’t make clear statements about Stanley’s condition. His reply ‘Oh … a little better, I think, a little better’ doesn’t convey any concrete information about Stanley’s health. However, this violation can be taken to implicate that Goldberg is not sure about Stanley’s present condition. Stanley’s condition might be worse than before, but Goldberg doesn’t want to reveal it to Petey. Therefore, he avoids giving a straightforward reply. He becomes more obscure and ambiguous when he says ‘Of course, I’m not really … … all the difference’. Here, Goldberg avoids being brief and goes on talking the roundabout way. He uses circumlocution instead of a straightforward answer. He would have been cooperative if he says ‘Stanley needs a doctor’, but he tells Petey that Stanley needs ‘Someone with a few letters after his name’. Goldberg wants to suggest that Stanley needs special treatment which only a qualified person, that is a psychiatrist, can provide. He cannot say anything about Stanley as he is not a qualified person. Therefore, it is necessary for Stanley that he should be taken to a psychiatrist. Petey seems to be in favor of Goldberg’s opinion. When Goldberg informs ‘Anyway, Dermot’s with him at the moment’ he seems to hedge the maxim of relation. However, it can be taken to implicate that Goldberg realizes that it is irrelevant at the moment to tell Petey that Dermot is with Stanley. This hedging can be interpreted as implicating Goldberg’s suggestion that though Dermot is with Stanley, he is not a person with proper qualifications. He further seems to suggest that Petey should not worry about Stanley. Moreover, Goldberg’s utterance ‘He’s
… keeping him company’ seems to mean more than what it actually conveys. He seems to violate the maxim of manner as it is not clear. If Dermot is not a psychiatrist, why is he there with Stanley? Goldberg here seems to hide something from Petey as he avoids talking more about Dermot. Petey’s utterance ‘It’s a terrible thing’ also violates the maxim of manner by being ambiguous. Petey doesn’t make it clear what he is talking about. The utterance can be interpreted in two ways. Petey might think Stanley’s present condition as terrible or it might be terrifying for him to know that Dermot is with Stanley. However, this violation can be interpreted as implicating that Petey is shocked to know about Stanley’s condition. When Goldberg says ‘The birthday celebration was too much for him’ he seems to violate the maxim of quantity by providing unexpected information. He tries to suggest Petey that it is the celebration that is responsible for Stanley’s present condition. He wants to prove that he or McCann is not responsible for it. Petey could not understand what is wrong with Stanley, therefore asks ‘What came over him,’ and Goldberg replies ‘What came over him? Breakdown, Mr. Boles. Pure and simple. Nervous breakdown’. Here, Goldberg seems to violate the maxim of quantity as he provides more information than necessary. He would have been cooperative simply by saying ‘Nervous breakdown’ but he repeats Petey’s question and adds ‘Pure and simple’. However, this violation can be taken to implicate Goldberg’s suggestion that there is nothing to worry about Stanley. Petey could not understand the reason behind this nervous breakdown, therefore, asks ‘But what brought it on so suddenly?’ Petey here seems to implicate that Stanley was all right even up to the party, so what might have happened with him suddenly that he got a nervous breakdown? Goldberg replies ‘Well, Mr. Boles, it can happen in all sorts of ways. A friend of mine was telling me about it only the other day.’ Here, Goldberg seems to violate the maxim of relation as his reply is not relevant to Petey’s question. A cooperative reply would have been the reasons behind Stanley’s sudden nervous breakdown. But Goldberg goes on giving irrelevant information. However, this utterance can be interpreted an implicating that Goldberg doesn’t want to reveal the fact that Stanley’s nervous breakdown is a result of the mental torture due to their interrogation. He also seems to know nothing more about nervous breakdown; therefore, he goes on talking for time being. He refers to his friend’s opinion in order to give authenticity to his claim. Thus, he pretends to know enough about it.
Concluding Remarks

Though Petey wants to know about Stanley, Goldberg avoids revealing the fact and deliberately talks using obscure language so as to confuse Petey. He wants to suggest Petey that Stanley’s condition cannot be improved unless he is taken to an expert. He uses circumlocution so as to convey that Stanley is serious; therefore Petey should not prevent them from taking him away. When he declares that it has happened due to birthday celebration, he wants to prove that they are not responsible for Stanley’s nervous breakdown.

5.2.12 Conversation Twelve

In this piece of conversation, McCann and Goldberg argue on the issue of the happenings in Stanley’s room. McCann is so shocked and disappointed that he doesn’t want to go upstairs in Stanley’s room again.

Contextual Environment

Petey informs Goldberg that when he came last night, all the lights were off. Therefore, he put a coin in the slot and all the lights came on. However, he could not find anyone there as the party was over. Then he met Dermot who informed him about Stanley. He asks Goldberg whether Stanley will recover from his nervous breakdown but Goldberg doesn’t seem sure about it. Petey thinks that he should take Stanley to a doctor but Goldberg asks him not to worry as they have taken care of it.

Conversation

GOLDBERG: Well? (MCCANN does not answer.) McCann. I asked you well.
MCCANN (without turning): Well what?
GOLDBERG: What’s what? (MCCANN does not answer.)
MCCANN (turning to look at GOLDBERG, grimly): I’m not going up there again.
GOLDBERG: Why not?
MCCANN: I’m not going up there again.
GOLDBERG: What’s going on now?
MCCANN (moving down): He’s quiet now. He stopped all that … talking a while ago. PETEY appears at the kitchen hatch, unnoticed.
GOLDBERG: When will he be ready?
MCCANN (sullenly): You can go up yourself next time.
GOLDBERG: What’s the matter with you?
MCCANN (quietly): I gave him …
GOLDBERG: What?
MCCANN: I gave him his glasses.
GOLDBERG: Wasn’t he glad to get them back?
MCCANN: The frames are bust.

(BP, 73-74)

Implicature Analysis

McCann comes downstairs with suitcases and Petey goes to the kitchen. McCann goes to the window and stands there looking out. Goldberg asks him ‘Well?’ but he doesn’t answer. When Goldberg repeats the question, McCann makes a counter question ‘Well what?’ Here, Goldberg seems curious to know about Stanley. Therefore, as McCann has just come from him, he wishes that McCann should speak something about Stanley. However, McCann’s counter question seems to implicate that he could not understand what Goldberg is asking about. It also suggests that McCann is not in a state of mind to speak anything, therefore, he asks for clarification. But Goldberg gets irritated and asks ‘What’s what?’ which can be taken to implicate that Goldberg realizes McCann’s indifference, therefore, he wants to suggest McCann that he should know what Goldberg is asking him about. He should tell the latest happenings to Goldberg as he had been upstairs. But McCann seems to violate the maxim of quantity by not providing sufficient amount of information, thus, seems to be uncooperative. However, this violation can be taken to implicate that either there is nothing to talk about or McCann doesn’t want to tell anything to Goldberg. Moreover, he violates the maxim of relation when he says ‘I’m not going up there again’. This utterance is irrelevant to the question asked by Goldberg. However, the utterance can be interpreted as cooperative if it is taken to implicate that something might have happened there which McCann doesn’t wish to narrate. He seems to be frustrated due to certain unpleasant incident, therefore, doesn’t want to go up again. Though, Goldberg asks ‘Why not?’ he repeats the same sentence, which implicates his firm decision as well as the situation upstairs which he could not put into proper words. It seems that he is shocked to see Stanley’s condition and feels pity for him. Goldberg tries to know more as he asks ‘What’s going on now?’ and McCann replies ‘He’s quiet now. He stopped all that … talking a while ago’. Here, McCann seems to violate the maxim of manner as his answer is vague and ambiguous. From the utterance ‘He’s quiet now’ it cannot be interpreted whether Stanley’s condition is better or worse. It doesn’t become clear from the utterance whether the word ‘quiet’ has negative or positive connotations. He seems to avoid being clear while saying ‘He stopped all that … talking a while ago’. Here also, it is not clear whether ‘He stopped talking’ is an improvement in Stanley’s
condition or it has become more critical. However, these utterances can be taken to implicate that McCann gives this vague information to Goldberg for the sake of answer. In fact, McCann himself doesn’t seem sure about Stanley’s condition, whether it is good or bad. Goldberg asks him ‘When will he be ready?’ and McCann answers ‘You can go up yourself next time’. Here, McCann seems to violate the maxim of relation as he gives irrelevant answer to Goldberg’s question. A cooperative reply would have been an approximate time which Stanley will take to be ready. However, the utterance can be taken to implicate that McCann is not sure whether Stanley will be ready to go or not. He looks sad at the pitiable condition of Stanley, therefore, asks Goldberg to go there himself. He wishes that Goldberg will realize the facts only after he goes upstairs. Therefore, he avoids direct answer to his question. He is so shocked to see Stanley’s condition that he doesn’t want even to speak about him. Goldberg gets disturbed due to McCann unusual behavior, therefore, asks him ‘What’s the matter with you?’ McCann’s reply ‘I gave him his glasses’ is irrelevant as it doesn’t satisfy the question, thus, violates the maxim of relation. However, it can be interpreted as implicating McCann’s state of mind. He gives Stanley’s glasses back to him which indicates that McCann could not see his helplessness. It arouses pity for Stanley in his mind, which diverted him from his job. Therefore, he gets disturbed and feels out of energy. He wants to suggest Goldberg that he will no more torture Stanley. Goldberg again questions him ‘Wasn’t he glad to get them back?’ McCann’s reply ‘The frames are bust’ seems to violate the maxim of relation as he doesn’t provide relevant answer. A cooperative reply to this question would have been either yes or no. However, the reply can be taken to implicate that Stanley was not happy to get his glasses back because the frames of his glasses are broken. He could not use broken frames, therefore, could not be glad.

**Concluding Remarks**

Here, McCann seems dejected due to Stanley’s pitiable condition. He could not even thought to go upstairs again, therefore he asks Goldberg to go if he wants to know more about Stanley’s condition. On the other hand, Goldberg also shares the same feelings as he seems to avoid going upstairs. He seems eager to know about Stanley’s happiness when McCann informs him that he gave Stanley’s glasses back to him. Thus, this piece of interaction between these two reveals the fact that they have lost the energy and enthusiasm which they exhibited at the beginning.
5.2.13 Conversation Thirteen

This is a piece of conversation between Goldberg and Lulu which reveals his intention to seduce her once again. But Lulu is smart enough to be aware of his plan.

**Contextual Environment**

McCann looks restless and wants to finish the job as early as possible. Goldberg also feels knocked down and tells McCann that such feeling is unusual for him. McCann observes that Goldberg is quite disturbed; therefore, to calm him down, he calls him ‘Simey’. However, Goldberg becomes violent and warns McCann not to call him with that name again. McCann asks him whether he should go upstairs. Goldberg reminds him that he didn’t want to go upstairs before a while but McCann denies saying anything like that. At this, Goldberg speaks about his philosophy of life and his father’s last words. He reveals the secret of his success and urges McCann to follow the same line.

**Conversation**

LULU: What’s going to happen?
GOLDBERG: Come over here.
LULU: No, thank you.
GOLDBERG: What’s the matter? You got the needle to Uncle Natey?
LULU: I’m going.
GOLDBERG: Have a game of pontoon first, for old time’s sake.
LULU: I’ve had enough games.
GOLDBERG: A girl like you, at your age, at your time of health, and you don’t take to games?
LULU: You’re very smart.
GOLDBERG: Anyway, who says you don’t take to them?
LULU: Do you think I’m like all the other girls?
GOLDBERG: Are all the other girls like that, too?

(BP, 79)

**Implicature Analysis**

Lulu enters the house and McCann goes out giving five minutes to them. Lulu asks ‘What’s going to happen?’ and Goldberg replies ‘Come over here’. This reply seems to be irrelevant to Lulu’s question, thus, violates the maxim of relation. However, his reply can be interpreted as cooperative, if it is taken to implicate that Goldberg is asking her to be comfortable first and then he will tell her something. He asks her to come near so that he could explain things to her. In other words, Goldberg wants to suggest Lulu that she
should not bother about whatever is going to happen there. Therefore, he avoids a
relevant reply and asks her to come near. But Lulu doesn’t want to go near him as she
says ‘No, thank you’. Here, she can be taken to suggest that she is all right where she is
standing. Goldberg is disappointed to know that Lulu doesn’t wish to come near him;
therefore, he asks ‘You got the needle to Uncle Natey?’ Here, the question seems to be
categorically false as it is semantically invalid. Therefore, it seems to flout the maxim of
quality. However, if it is interpreted as a metaphorical expression, it can be treated as
cooperative. By the means of metaphor, Goldberg wants to ask Lulu whether she doesn’t
like him now. He wants to know whether she is annoyed with him as she denies coming
near. Lulu’s reply ‘I’m going’ seems to violate the maxim of relation as it doesn’t satisfy
Goldberg’s question. However, it can be interpreted as implicating that Lulu doesn’t want
to argue with Goldberg. As she prefers not to argue, it can be taken to suggest that she is
not happy with him. Therefore, to avoid further arguments and possible complications,
she chooses to leave the place. Goldberg tries to stop her by asking her to play a card
game of pontoon. He thinks that if she agrees to play the game, she will stay there at least
for some time. He is simply spreading a net in order to catch Lulu in it, but she is clever
enough to say ‘I’ve had enough games.’ Through this utterance, Lulu seems to mean
more than what she says literally. The overt meaning of this utterance is that Lulu doesn’t
want to play a game of pontoon as she has played a lot of games. However, she wants to
mean that she understands Goldberg’s intention behind inviting him to play a game. She
wants to suggest him that she is not a fool to accept his invitation and fall prey to his
crafts. Therefore, she rejects the proposal. Goldberg argues ‘A girl like you, at your age,
at your time of health, and you don’t take to games?’ Here, though Goldberg seems to
talk about a game of pontoon, he means more than that. He mentions her age and health,
which has sexual connotations also. He wants to suggest her that as she is young and
healthy, she should play youthful games. In other words, he is teasing Lulu in order to
provoke her. Lulu’s reply ‘You’re very smart’ once again violates the maxim of relation
as it is not a relevant reply. However, it can be taken to implicate that Lulu has realized
that Goldberg is flirting her by praising her as young and healthy. But she understands his
purpose behind the flattery and calls him smart. Moreover, the utterance ‘You’re very
smart’ can be taken as an instance of irony, thus flouting the maxim of quality. The
utterance implicates the meaning contrary to its literal import. Thus, it can be said to
implicate that Lulu wants to convey Goldberg that he is a fool if he is thinking to deceive
her once again. Goldberg hedges the maxim of relation when he says ‘Anyway, who says
you don’t take to them?’ He hedges the maxim using the expression ‘Anyway’ as he realizes that he is going to contribute irrelevant information. Moreover, the question flouts the maxim of quality as it is not asked sincerely. But, if it is interpreted as an example of rhetorical question, it asks for a fact which Goldberg knows very well. He wants to suggest that though Goldberg is a fool, she like such persons. In other words, he claims that Lulu likes him. She asks ‘Do you think I’m like all the other girls?’ and Goldberg asks a counter question ‘Are all the other girls like that, too?’ Lulu’s question can be taken to mean that she is different from all the other girls. Here, ‘All the other girls’ can be taken to mean the girls of loose character. Lulu wants to prove herself as a spotless and well-cultured girl who is of good character. Goldberg seems to flout the maxim of quality as it is an example of patent falsehood. Such utterances are used to suggest the absurdity of the prior utterance. Here, Goldberg wants to suggest that the question asked by Lulu is extremely absurd, therefore, he replies with same kind of question. However, if his reply is taken to be cooperative, it can be interpreted as implicating Goldberg’s suggestion that Lulu is a licentious girl. In other words, he suggests that though Lulu compares herself with ‘all the other girls’, she is not different from them.

**Concluding Remarks**

This interaction can be analyzed as a debate between Goldberg and Lulu as both of them try to outwit each other. Goldberg seems to think that he can seduce once again by appealing her sexually, therefore, he refers to her youth and health. But Lulu has made up her mind to avoid him as she has come to know his shrewdness. She tries to prove that she is different from any other girl as she cares more for moral values in her life. But he takes her lightly. In fact, Lulu tries to project herself as a different type of girl, though she is not.

**5.2.14 Conversation Fourteen**

In this passage, Petey tries to prevent Goldberg from taking Stanley away with him but Goldberg informs him how it is necessary to give special treatment to Stanley, which he might not get in the house.

**Contextual Environment**

Lulu accuses Goldberg for he used her to satisfy his appetite. McCann asks her to confess everything, but she exits hastily as he threatens her. Stanley enters the room. He is well
dressed and clean shaven. Goldberg and McCann allow him to be comfortable in a chair and express their regret for the broken glasses. They try to coax him and make a lot of promises regarding his better future. However, Stanley doesn’t show any reaction and remains silent without a single movement. As they try to ask his opinion, he could produce certain meaningless sounds and becomes still again.

**Conversation**

PETEY: Where are you taking him?

_They turn. Silence._

GOLDBERG: We’re taking him to Monty.

PETEY: He can stay here.

GOLDBERG: Don’t be silly.

PETEY: We can look after him here.

GOLDBERG: Why do you want to look after him?

PETEY: He’s my guest.

GOLDBERG: He needs special treatment.

PETEY: We’ll find someone.

GOLDBERG: No. Monty’s the best there is. Bring him, McCann.

_They help STANLEY out of the chair. They all three move towards the door, left._

PETEY: Leave him alone!

_They stop. GOLDBERG studies him._

GOLDBERG (insidiously): Why don’t you come with us, Mr. Boles?

(BP, 85)

**Implicature Analysis**

Petey enters the house to see that Goldberg and McCann are asking Stanley to join them. Therefore, Petey asks ‘Where are you taking him?’ There is a ‘Silence’ after Petey’s question. This ‘Silence’ can be taken to implicate that Petey’s entry at this crucial moment was as unexpected for them as his question. They were not ready to face such a question at that time, therefore, they couldn’t give sudden reply. It further shows their disappointment at the thought that it might create complications for them if Petey tries to prevent them from taking Stanley away. After a while, Goldberg replies that they are taking Stanley to a person called Monty. Petey tries to prevent them as he says ‘He can stay here’ but Goldberg retorts saying ‘Don’t be silly.’ Goldberg’s utterance seems to flout the maxim of relation while he calls Petey as silly. However, the utterance can be taken to implicate Goldberg’s suggestion that Stanley should not stay there. He further wants to suggest Petey that it is better for Stanley to go with them, instead of staying there
only. Thus, he expresses his disagreement with Petey by calling him silly. Petey tries to convince him that he is able to take proper care of Stanley; therefore, he says ‘We can look after him here’. However, Goldberg is not convinced and asks him ‘Why do you want to look after him?’ Petey’s answer ‘He’s my guest’ seems to violate the maxim of relation as it seems to be an irrelevant reply to Goldberg’s question. A cooperative reply would have been some reasons for Petey to look after Stanley. However, if the utterance is taken to be cooperative, it can be interpreted as implicating Petey’s belief that it is his duty to look after his guests. As Stanley is a guest in his boarding house, he wants to suggest Goldberg that it is his responsibility as well as moral duty to take care of him. Therefore, they should not take Stanley away. Goldberg’s utterance ‘He needs special treatment’ can be taken to suggest that it is essential for Stanley to leave the house as he might not get the necessary treatment here. Petey’s utterance ‘We’ll find someone’ is an example of clash. Here, clash results from Petey’s lack of exact information about a person who could give special treatment that Stanley needs. It implicates that Petey’s knowledge about it is imperfect, but he says so in order to prevent them from taking Stanley away. However, Goldberg says ‘Monty’s the best there is’ suggesting that there is no one better than Monty to treat Stanley. They help Stanley out of the chair and move towards the door. Petey becomes impatient and shouts ‘Leave him alone’. They stop at the door; Goldberg looks at Petey, then makes a threatening move towards him and says ‘Why don’t you come with us, Mr. Boles?’ This utterance means more than an invitation for Petey to join them. Goldberg here seems to suggest Petey that if he tries to prevent them from taking Stanley away, they will kidnap Petey also. In other words, Goldberg warns Petey to keep himself away from this matter; otherwise, they will take him away and torture him as they did to Stanley. Thus, Goldberg threatens Petey in order to remove the obstacle in their way.

Concluding Remarks
It can be observed that Petey is worried about Stanley and he is ready to take care of him in the house itself. However, Goldberg and McCann are firm on their decision to take Stanley with them. Therefore, they try to convince Petey that they are taking Stanley for special treatment. But as Petey says that Stanley is his guest, he wants to suggest them that Stanley’s illness is their personal problem and they shouldn’t bother about it. Goldberg realizes that Petey is creating problems for him; he becomes impatient and threatens him that they will give same treatment to Petey also. Thus, Petey couldn’t
gather courage to fight Goldberg remains a helpless observer while they took Stanley away.

5.3 THE CARETAKER

5.3.1 Conversation One

In this conversational exchange, Davies complaints about the treatment he received at a café. He seems annoyed because he was asked to do inferior jobs. In fact, his job is equally inferior.

**Contextual Environment:**

As the play opens, Aston enters with Davies, whom he met at a cafe. Davies complains about the Greeks, Poles and Blacks because they treated him badly. Aston asks him to be calm and feel comfortable. Davies claims that he never smokes a cigarette and asks for some tobacco for his pipe. He further reveals that he had a tobacco tin also, however, he lost it somewhere at the Great West Road. Davies thinks that those people in the cafe are vulgar and dirty. However, he likes to be up to date and clean. He left his wife only after a week because she used to keep her underclothing in a vegetable pan. He further claims to have eaten off the best plates and he regrets that now he is not young. He also had some heart-attacks, due to which he feels weak. Otherwise, no one could have taken liberties with him.

**Conversation**

DAVIES: … Did you see what happened with that one?
ASTON: I only got the end of it.
DAVIES: Comes up to me, parks a bucket of rubbish at me tells me to take it out the back. It’s not my job to take out the bucket! They got a boy there for taking out the bucket. I wasn’t engaged to take out buckets. My job’s cleaning the floor, clearing up the tables, doing a bit of washing up, nothing to do with taking out buckets!
ASTON: Uh.

He crosses down right, to get the electric toaster.

DAVIES (following): Yes, well say I had! Even if I had! Even if I was supposed to take out the bucket, who was this git to come up and give me orders? We got the same standing. He’s not my boss. He’s nothing superior to me.
ASTON: What was he, a Greek?
DAVIES: Not him, he was a Scotch. He was a Scotchman.

(CT, 9-10)
Implicature Analysis

Davies comes closer to Aston asking him ‘Did you see what happened with that one?’ and Aston replies ‘I only got the end of it.’ Here, Davies wants to know whether Aston could see whatever happened and expects the answer either in Yes or No. However, Aston’s reply doesn’t seem to fulfill Davies’ expectations, therefore, seems irrelevant. But if it is supposed that Aston is being cooperative in giving such a reply, it may be taken to implicate that Aston wants to suggest Davies that he could not see whatever happened with him from the beginning. As he arrived somewhat late, he could not witness the whole incident but could see only the final part of the happenings. He tells Aston that someone came to him, handed a bucket of rubbish and asked him to take that out. In the utterance ‘Comes up to me, parks a bucket of rubbish at me tells me to take it out the back’ Davies seems to give unnecessary details which shows his resentment, as he thinks that nobody should ask him to do such inferior jobs. When he says ‘It’s not my job to take out the buckets!’ he implicates that they should not tell him to take out that bucket. He tries to suggest that taking out a bucket of rubbish is not included in the nature of his job. He further suggests that they should have told to the boy who is engaged for taking out the buckets, with the utterance ‘They got a boy there for taking out the buckets.’ He is of the opinion that he was engaged to do the jobs other than taking out a bucket of rubbish. When he speaks of his job, he tries to suggest that if they had told him to clean the floor, tables or to wash up something; he would definitely have obeyed. But he claims to have nothing to do with taking out buckets. If Aston’s reply ‘Uh’ is interpreted at the level of ‘What is said,’ it means that he is paying attention to what Davies is speaking. However, ‘what is meant’ by him in saying ‘Uh’ can be different. If uttered in rising tone, the utterance may be taken to mean that Aston is disagreeing with Davies. As Davies himself says that his job is related to cleaning, taking out a bucket of rubbish has a lot to do with cleaning. Therefore, Aston’s reply seems to implicate that taking out a bucket of rubbish is Davies’ job and he should not deny it. Davies interprets his reply in a right way and accepts that he was supposed to take out the bucket. However, his utterance ‘Who was this git to come up and give me orders?’ seems to suggest that the person was not supposed to give orders to him. It further implicates that if that person had requested Davies, he would have taken out the bucket. It seems that he doesn’t like to receive orders from the person who is equal in status with him. His utterance ‘He’s not my boss’ implicates that if that person were his boss, he would have followed his instructions.
Davies here wants to suggest that he would obey the orders given by the boss only and not by the colleagues. The person wasn’t superior to him, he rejected the order. Aston’s question ‘What was he, a Greek?’ and the reply ‘Not him, he was a Scotch’ coincides with Grice’s (1975:44-45) example ‘He is an Englishman; he is, therefore, brave.’ Here, Aston wants to suggest that if that person was a Greek, then he was definitely superior to Davies. It implicates that Greeks are superior people than British as Davies is a British. However, Davies’ reply ‘Not him, he was a Scotch’ implicates that Scotchmen are not superior to British people. Davies thinks that a Scotchman, being inferior in status, should not order him. Moreover, if such a person gives orders, as Davies implicates, those orders should not be followed.

**Concluding Remarks**

Davies has been haunted by inferiority complex due to the job he is supposed to do in the café. It can be interpreted from his utterances that he is a kind of person who doesn’t like to work. He seems to avoid his job by giving trivial and unjustifiable reasons. He thinks it as his insult that a person of equal status gives him orders to take out the rubbish. In fact, he is supposed to keep the place clean but he denies doing such things. He even suggests Aston that the person was lower in status as he was a Scotchman. Had he been a Greek, Davies should have obeyed his orders.

**5.3.2 Conversation Two**

In this piece of conversation, Davies inquirers about the neighbours and then goes on talking about his visit to a monastery for getting shoes and the treatment he received by the hands of a monk.

**Contextual Environment**

Davies thanks Aston for he saved him from that Scotch git. He realizes that he would have been in hospital if he wasn’t rescued by Aston. However, he left his bag there at the café. Aston promises him to pick up his bag from that cafe. Davies begins to inquire about the house and the neighbors. He asks whether Aston owns the house and as he noticed the curtains pulled down the next door, he guesses rightly that someone must be living there. When Aston tells him that an Indian family lives there, he wants to know whether they are Blacks. Then he asks Aston for a pair of shoes as his are worn out. He states that shoes are life and death for him as he could not go anywhere without it. Then, he narrates an incident about his visit to a monastery and his experiences there.
Conversation

DAVIES: You got anymore Blacks around here?
ASTON (holding out the shoes): See if these are any good.
DAVIES: You know what that bastard monk said to me? (He looks over to the shoes.) I think those’d be a bit small.
ASTON: Would they?
DAVIES: No, don’t look the right size.
ASTON: Not bad trim.
DAVIES: Can’t wear shoes that don’t fit. Nothing worse. I said to this monk, here, I said, look here, mister, he opened the door, big door, he opened it, look here, mister, I said, I come all the way down here, look, I said, I showed him these, I said, you haven’t got a pair of shoes, have you, a pair of shoes, I said, enough to keep me on my way. Look at these, they’re nearly out, I said, they’re no good to me. I heard you got a stock of shoes here. Piss off, he said to me. Now look here, I said, I’m an old man, you can’t talk to me like that, I don’t care who you are.

(CT, 14)

Implicature Analysis

Aston informs Davies that a family of Indians lives the next door. Davies becomes curious to know whether there are more Blacks in the neighborhood, therefore, asks ‘You got any more Blacks around here?’ However, in reply Aston seems to violate the maxim of relation by not answering his question giving related information. Instead of giving a straightforward relevant reply, Aston speaks about a pair of shoes which he offers to Davies. If it is taken for granted that Aston is being cooperative, and if his reply is taken as relevant at some deeper level, it seems that it implicates Aston’s belief that the question asked by Davies is not important as well as relevant, therefore it is not necessary to answer. Davies’ question also implicates his sense of superiority over Blacks.

Moreover, instead of looking at the shoes, he goes on contributing irrelevant information by saying ‘You know what that bastard monk said to me?’ This question implicates that the monk might have insulted him due to which he is expressing his anger towards the monk. Then he turns to the shoes and notices that they don’t fit him well as they are too small to wear. As he says ‘No, they don’t look the right size’ he suggests that the size of his feet does not match with the shoes. He expresses his disappointment as he could not wear them. Again he turns to the monk story and instead of stating it in brief, and thus violating maxim of manner, goes on uttering the same words again and again. The vagueness implicates his confused nature as well as his inability to speak to the point. The use of imperative such as ‘look here’ more than once implicates his feigned dominance,
which he wants to convey to Aston. Then he said to the monk ‘I come all the way down here.’ In this utterance, at the level of ‘what is said’ Davies seems to make that monk aware of his presence there at the monastery. However, at the level of ‘what is meant’ it is a matter of investigation. Davies here implicates that the monk should pay proper attention to him as he has come from a long away. He also wants to suggest the hardships which he might have faced due to the shoes throughout his journey. Therefore, he expects a warm welcome as well as proper respect from the monk. His question ‘You haven’t got a pair of shoes, have you?’ asked to the monk implicates a request, that is, ‘Can you give me a pair of shoes?’ Davies is not simply interested in knowing whether the monk has got a pair of shoes but he implicates that he needs one for himself and therefore his question can be interpreted as a request for shoes. He shows his shoes to the monk saying ‘they’re nearly out, they’re no good to me’ implicating that he needs a new pair of shoes which will be good for him. He tries to suggest that the shoes which he was wearing were not good. The utterance ‘I heard you got a stock of shoes here’ implicates that Davies wants to ask the monk whether he can give him a pair of shoes if he had. However, instead of giving relevant information, the monk gets angry and orders him to ‘piss off’. Davies gets shocked due to the monk’s reply and warns him saying ‘I’m an old man, you can’t talk to me like that, I don’t care who you are.’ By saying that he is an old man, he wants to suggest that one should not use such harsh words while talking to an elderly person. He thinks that the monk should treat him with proper respect. The utterance further implicates that even monks also are supposed to give respect to elderly people, irrespective of their social or religious status.

**Concluding Remarks**

Here also, Davies is trying to establish his superiority over others as he refers to Blacks. While talking about the monk, he seems to implicate that the monk should have treated him properly, however, he is disappointed due to the monk’s behavior. He tries to suggest that even the monk is superior in status than him being a religious person; he should have respect for elderly people like him. Moreover, his frequent use of the expression ‘I said’ depicts him as an egoist.

**5.3.3 Conversation Three**

This is a piece of conversational exchange between Aston and Davies in which Davies goes on asking questions and he gives patient replies. Davies here tries to know more about various things from Aston.
Contextual Environment

Davies gives the shoes back to Aston saying that they are not comfortable and they would cripple him in a week. Aston promises him to find another pair. Davies needs good shoes because he has to go from place to place in order to get settled somewhere. However, he doesn’t have any concrete plan about his future as he avoids direct answer when Aston asks him where he wishes to go. Then Aston offers him to stay in the house till he gets fixed somewhere and Davies accepts the offer happily. Then he comments on the bulk of furniture that Aston has got and asks him whether he is going to build something. He notices a thick lawn as well as a pond near the house and asks him about the place where Aston will build a shed.

Conversation

DAVIES: Where you going to put your shed?
ASTON (turning): I’ll have to clear the garden first.
DAVIES: You need a tractor, man.
ASTON: I’ll get it done.
DAVIES: Carpentry, eh?
ASTON (standing still): I like ... working with my hands.

DAVIES picks up the statue of Buddha.
DAVIES: What is this?
ASTON (taking and studying it): That’s a Buddha.
DAVIES: Get on.
ASTON: Yes. I quite like it. Picked it up in a ... in a shop. Looked quite nice to me. Don’t know why. What do you think of these Buddhas?
DAVIES: Oh, they’re all right, en’t they?

Implicature Analysis

Davies notices some planks in the house and thinks that Aston might have brought these planks for building something. When Aston informs him that he wishes to build a shed, Davies asks him ‘Where you going to put your shed?’ and Aston replies ‘I’ll have to clear the garden first.’ Aston’s reply seems to be irrelevant as he is expected to tell a particular place where he is going to build a shed. However, if it is supposed that Aston is being cooperative, the above exchange can be interpreted as relevant at deeper level. Aston here seems to violate the maxim of relation in order to implicate that he is going to put his shed in the garden itself, therefore, he wants to clean it. It is only after he cleans the garden, that he could possibly build a shed there. Davies says ‘You need a tractor, man’
thinking that Aston will need a tractor for cleaning the garden, which implicates that it must be a difficult task which could not be done by Aston alone. However, Aston declares that he will manage it suggesting that he doesn’t need a tractor as well as any help. Davies thinks that it is not possible unless one has certain skill, therefore asks Aston ‘Carpentry, eh?’ Aston denies it saying that he likes working with his hand ‘I like … working with my hands’ implicating that he doesn’t need or doesn’t like any other assistance. Davies picks up a statue and Aston informs him that it is the statue of Buddha. Then he goes on giving irrelevant details about the statue, which were not asked by Davies. He picked that statue only because he liked it and his utterance ‘Don’t know why’ implicates that he didn’t have any intention. Therefore, he asks Davies ‘What do you think of these Buddhas?’ In reply, Davies says ‘Oh, they’re … they’re all right, en’t they?’ Here, Davies violates the maxim of quantity by giving less information than required which implicates his lack of knowledge about Buddha. Though he doesn’t know anything about Buddha, he says that they are all right, violating the maxim of manner by giving information about which he lacks adequate evidences.

**Concluding Remarks**

Aston implicates his intentions that that he proposes to build a shed in the garden, though he doesn’t mention it directly. He suggests Davies that he doesn’t need his help in doing anything as he likes to work himself. He has bought a statue of Buddha but he doesn’t know its importance. He thinks that Davies might know something about Buddha. However, Davies’ reply implicates his lack of knowledge about Buddha as he gives a vague reply.

**5.3.4 Conversation Four**

In this conversational passage, Aston accuses Davies for making noises while sleeping. On the other hand Davies tries to convince him that he wasn’t dreaming but it must be the neighbors who were making noises.

**Contextual Environment**

Davies feels comfortable after he gets a bed to sleep in. However he is not ready to share the toilet with the neighbors who, as he thinks, are Blacks. He is grateful as Aston gives him some money. Davies informs him that he wants to go to Sidcup in order to bring his papers but cannot go because of bad weather. After Aston asks him about the papers at Sidcup, he informs that the papers are crucial to prove his real identity as he is going
under an assumed name. His real name is Mac Davies, but these days he has changed his name as Bernard Jenkins. The next morning, Davies gets startled to see that Aston is staring at him. Aston accuses him of making noises; however, he denies it firmly saying that nobody ever told him before that he makes noises.

**Conversation**

ASTON (*crossing to the bed with the toaster*): No. You woke me up. I thought you might have been dreaming.

DAVIES: I wasn’t dreaming. I never had a dream in my life.

*Pause.*

ASTON: Maybe it was the bed.

DAVIES: Nothing wrong with this bed.

ASTON: Might be a bit unfamiliar.

DAVIES: There is nothing unfamiliar about me with beds. I slept in beds. I don’t make noises just because I sleep in a bed. I slept in plenty of beds.

*Pause.*

I tell you what, may be it were them Blacks.

ASTON: What?

DAVIES: Them noises.

ASTON: What Blacks?

DAVIES: Them you got. Next door. Maybe it were them Blacks making noises, coming up through the walls.

ASTON: Hmmnn.

DAVIES: That’s my opinion.

(CT, 23)

**Implicature Analysis**

Davies strongly opposes the charge against him that he makes noises while sleeping. However, Aston claims ‘You woke me up’ implicating that he was disturbed due to noises made by Davies. Therefore, Aston thinks that Davies might have been dreaming. When he says ‘I never had a dream in my life’ he blatantly violates the maxim of quality by not being authentic as no one can claim never to have dreamt in life. It implicates Davies haughty nature, who does not accept the fact which may cause his devaluation. He speaks firmly though he doesn’t have any evidence to prove that he did not make noises. Therefore, Aston says ‘May be it was bed.’ Here Aston tries to suggest that if Davies wasn’t making noises, it may be unused and old bed, in which Davies was sleeping, was making noises. But Davies denies it saying ‘Nothing wrong with this bed’ implicating that there might be something else making noises. He thinks that the bed is in good
condition, therefore could not make noises. Aston’s utterance ‘Might be a bit unfamiliar’ opens up a new possibility. He wants to suggest that Davies might be making noises because he was sleeping in an unfamiliar bed. He further suggests that, as Davies is not accustomed to sleep in bed, he might not have slept well which gave him bed dreams resulting in sleeplessness. However, Davies claims to have slept in bed. When he says ‘I don’t make noises just because I sleep in a bed’ he tries to suggest that he usually sleeps in bed without making noises as he has slept in plenty of beds. Therefore, he says ‘I tell you what, may be it were them Blacks’ suggesting that those Blacks in the next house might be making the noises. Through this, he means that it is neither he nor the bed but the Blacks who are making noises. However, he once again violates the maxim of quality as he cannot prove that the noises were made by the Blacks. It implicates that Davies wants to keep himself on the safer side by turning the limelight towards the Blacks. Aston’s curt reply ‘Hmmmnn’ here means a lot. If it is taken with reference to the literal meaning, that is, ‘what is said,’ it is simply a cooperative reply that ensures attentiveness on the part of the hearer. However, the same expression uttered with proper intonation may convey some deeper level meaning. Here, Aston’s reply ‘Hmmmnn’ implicates that he has not taken it seriously that the noises were made by the Blacks. He does not believe it and knows that Davies is being shrewd while accusing the Blacks. But Aston wants to avoid further arguments by being too brief in his reply, thus violating the maxim of quantity. Davies also realizes that Aston does not believe his doubt about the Blacks, therefore rectifies himself saying ‘That’s my opinion.’ This utterance falls short to fulfill the maxim of quality implicating that the fact might be something else. It hedges the maxim of quantity which implicates that it is Davies personal opinion, which may be wrong.

**Concluding Remarks**

This interaction reveals Davies as an obstinate kind of person who doesn’t accept his drawbacks pointed out by Aston. Davies tells lies and outwits Aston by talking forcefully. He even boasts of sleeping in better beds than this and falsely accuses the Blacks for making noises. It depicts his shrewdness and hatred for Blacks as well as his own sense of superiority. On the other hand, Aston here seems meek and humble as he could not strike out Davies’ false claims. The ‘pauses’ between their turns implicate Davies’ want of words in order to prove that he wasn’t making noises as well as Aston’s lack of confidence to prove that it was Davies who was making noises.
5.3.5 Conversation Five

In this passage, Davies asks Aston for some money and Aston reminds him that he has given him already. He plans to go to Wembley in order to get some job. He wants to make it sure that Aston wishes him to stay in the house in his absence.

Contextual Environment

Davies is of the opinion that he should leave the house with Aston, as he is a stranger there. However, to his surprise, Aston not only asks him to stay there while he will be out of the house but gives him the extra keys of the house. Aston want to bring a jig saw which he had seen the other day. Then he narrates an irrelevant incident happened with him when he was sitting in a cafe. A woman sat beside him and started to talk about her holidays. Then suddenly she put her hands on Aston’s and asked him to have a look at her body. Davies claims to have the same experience regarding women. Aston again asks Davies about his real name and birth place. However, he avoids giving precise information about it. Aston tells him to switch on the fire if he needs and assures him not to worry about the stove, as it is not connected.

Conversation

DAVIES (coming round): Eh, mister, just one thing ... eh ... you couldn’t slip me a couple of bob, for a cup of tea, just, you know?
ASTON: I gave you a few bob last night.
DAVIES: Eh, so you did. So you did. I forgot. Went clean out of my mind. That’s right. Thank you, mister. Listen. You’re sure now, you’re sure you don’t mind me staying here? I mean, I’m not the sort of man who wants to take any liberties.
ASTON: No, that’s all right.
DAVIES: I might get down to Wembley later on in the day.
ASTON: Uh-uh.
DAVIES: There’s a caff down there, you see, might be able to get fixed up there, I was there, see? I know they were a bit short handed. They might be in the need of a bit of staff.
ASTON: When was this?
DAVIES: Eh? Oh, well, that was ... near on ... that’ll be ... that’ll be a little while ago now.

(CT, 26-27)

Implicature Analysis

While Aston is about to leave, Davies asks him in hesitation ‘You couldn’t slip me a couple of bob, for a cup of tea, just, you know?’ In fact, Davies here wants to suggest that
he needs some money as he might wish to have a cup of tea. However, Aston’s reply ‘I gave you a few bob last night’ implicates that he will not give him more as he has given him some money already. He wants to suggest Davies that he should not ask him for money again only after last night. Though Davies claims to have forgotten that Aston gave him some money last night, it seems that he pretends in order to get more money from Aston. He simply wants to have some amount with him which reflects his shrewd and greedy nature. However, Aston denies him more money by reminding him that he had given a few bob to him the day before only. As Davies hasn’t been out of the house since last night to spend money, Aston knows that he is not short of it. Davies thanks him for giving him money and wants to know whether Aston is sure about Davies’s stay there in the house in his absence. With his utterance ‘I’m not the sort of man who wants to take any liberties’ Davies suggests that he will stay there only if Aston is sure about him. He further suggests that he is a sort of man who does not like to take undue advantage of anything like others. He claims to be a different kind of man who doesn’t like to trouble others. Aston doesn’t have any objection as his utterance ‘No, that’s all right’ implicates that he is sure about it and he is firm on his decision. Therefore, Davies informs him ‘I might get down to Wembley later on in the day’ implicating that now he will stay in the house but will leave after some time. Aston’s expression ‘Uh-uh’ may be taken to implicate various propositions. If uttered casually, it may implicate Aston’s lack of interest in the details provided by Davies and if the same expression is uttered with rising intonation, it may be taken to implicate Aston’s curiosity to know the reasons behind Davies’ proposed visit to Wembley. Moreover, it may be taken as a sign of attentiveness implicating ‘go on, I am listening.’ Therefore, Davies explains his intention behind proposed Wembley visit. He suggests that if he goes there, he might get a job there in a cafe and he will be settled down there. He further informs that he has worked there before also. His utterance ‘I was there, see?’ seems to violate the maxim of quantity as he goes on adding more information that sufficient. However, it implicates that he will get a job there easily as he has an experience as a worker there. He further violates the maxim of quantity by saying ‘They were a bit short-handed.’ This violation can be taken to implicate his suggestion that he will get a job definitely as there are vacancies. As Aston asks him ‘When was this?’ instead of giving a precise and clear answer, he violates the maxim of manner by being vague. When he says ‘Oh, well, that was ... near on ... that’ll be ... that’ll be a little while ago now’ it implicates that Davies doesn’t know the exact time of his past visit to Wembley or he never visited Wembley. Moreover, his reply
‘That’ll be a little while ago now’ is an example of ‘clash’ as Davies is unable to give precise answer forcing Aston to draw inference that Davies either does not know the exact time of his visit to Wembley or he is giving false information about his experiences there at Wembley, thus, violating the maxim of quality.

**Concluding Remarks**

This interaction projects Davies as a greedy and shrewd person who tries to take undue advantage of Aston’s humanity. He wants to suggest Aston that he won’t cause him any trouble. Though he wishes to go to Wembley in search of a job, he could not tell any details of the job there and gives vague reply. Thus, it seems that he simply wants to suggest Aston that he won’t stay in the house for a long time. Moreover, it seems that he had never been there at Wembley as he could not talk about it confidently but he seems to talk only for time being.

**5.3.6 Conversation Six**

In this piece of conversation, Davies is surprised to know that Mick is the owner of this house. He wants to know whether Mick stays in this house but Aston goes on talking about his plan to decorate the upper part of the house.

**Contextual Environment**

Mick enters and seizes Davies thinking that he must be a robber. However, Davies tries to convince him that he was brought there by Aston. Mick is hard to believe and accuses him of being fraudulent. Mick threatens him that he can send him to prison within five minutes under various changes such as trespassing and daylight robbery. He then proposes Davies to purchase the house or take in on rent and explains the details of the proposed deal. After some time, Aston returns with a bag which he gives to Davies. Mick grabs the bag saying that the bag seems to be a familiar one. Finally he gives the bag to Davies. Aston informs Davies that Mick is his brother. Davies calls him joker and Aston agrees that Mick has got a good sense of humor.

**Conversation**

ASTON: I’m supposed to be doing up the upper part of the house for him.
DAVIES: What ... you mean ... you mean it’s his house?
ASTON: Yes. I’m supposed to be decorating this landing for him. Make a flat out of it.
DAVIES: What does he do, then?
ASTON: He’s in the building trade. He’s got his own van.
DAVIES: He don’t live here, do he?
ASTON: Once I get that shed up outside ... I’ll be able to give a bit more thought to the flat, you see. Perhaps, I can knock up one or two things for it. (*He walks to the window.*) I can work with my hands, you see. That’s one thing I can do. I never know I could. But I can do all sorts of things now, with my hands.

(CT, 40)

**Implicature Analysis**

Davies thinks that Mick has his own specific way of life. He also finds him humorous as he frightened him. Aston informs that he is going to reshape the upper storey of the house for Mick. Davies takes it to implicate that the house belongs to Mick. His question ‘You mean it’s his house?’ implicates Davies’ assumption that the house may be Mick’s property and not Aston’s. He wants to make sure who the owner of the house is. Aston replies that Mick is the owner of the house but then goes on speaking, and thus, violates the maxim of quantity. Thus, Aston wants to suggest Davies that he stays in the house simply as a decorator who is ‘supposed to be decorating this landing for him’. Then Davies becomes curious about Mick’s profession. Therefore he asks Aston ‘What does he do, then?’ In reply, Aston contributes more information than asked by Davies, saying ‘He is in the building trade. He’s got his own van.’ Thus, Aston here seems to violate the maxim of quantity. However, if it is taken for granted that Aston violates the maxim for the sake of providing certain important suggestion about Mick, the violation may be taken to raise an implicature that Mick is well off. As it is generally acclaimed fact that only a rich person can afford to have a van of his own, Aston here wants to suggest Davies that Mick is a rich person. By giving this extra information, Aston intends to create an image of Mick in Davies mind. As a result, Davies becomes more curious about him and wants to know whether he stays in the house or not. He asks Aston ‘He don’t lives here, do he?’ and Aston replies ‘Once I get that shed up outside ... I’ll be able to give a bit more thought to the flat, you see.’ Davies’ question demands for an answer in either yes or no. However, Aston seems to be uncooperative by not giving relevant information and violates the maxim of relation. But if it is supposed that Aston is being cooperative with this reply, it may convey some relevant information. The reply can be taken to implicate that Mick doesn’t stay there in the house because Aston is still decorating the flat in which Mick is supposed to stay. He further wants to suggest that he will stay in the shed which he will put up outside and then Mick will come to stay in the house. Therefore he wants to decorate the house and the upper storey for Mick. When he says ‘I can work with my hands’ he wants to suggest that he is able to work on his own and he is willing.
Further his utterance ‘That’s one thing I can do’ can be taken to implicate that apart from other things, he can work with his hands also. It also implicates his psychological as well as physical weakness which he tries to conceal. Contrast in the utterance ‘But I can do all sorts of things now, with my hands’ conventionally implicates that he was unable to do anything with hands before.

**Concluding Remarks**

Davies here seems to be curious about the things which are none of his interest. It doesn’t make any difference for him whether Mick or Aston owns the house. However, he seems surprised to know the fact and becomes more curious about Mick’s profession and his place of living. Aston suggests him indirectly that Mick is a successful builder. He is preparing the house for Mick and, as he suggests, he will stay in a shed which he proposes to build.

**5.3.7 Conversation Seven**

This is a piece of interaction that takes place when Aston offers Davies a job of caretaker. Both of them could not communicate properly though they wish to talk a lot.

**Contextual Environment**

Aston proposes to build a workshop where he could do simple wood work. He plans to put partition in one of the rooms along the landing. At the same times, Davies comes to a conclusion that the bag brought by Aston does not belong to him. He expresses a doubt that the people at cafe might have replaced his bag with another one. However, Aston informs him that he could not get Davies’ bag, therefore, he brought this bag from somewhere else. The bag contains two check shirts; however, Davies is not happy with them as he likes shirts with strips on them. There is a smoking-jacket also in the bag which Davies likes. After a slight pause, Aston abruptly asks him whether he would like to work as a caretaker of the house.

**Conversation**

ASTON: How do you feel about being one, then?
DAVIES: Well, I reckon … Well, I’d have to know … you know….
ASTON: What sort of ….
DAVIES: Yes, what sort of … you know ….
Pause.
ASTON: Well, I mean ….
DAVIES: I mean, I’d have to … I’d have to ….
ASTON: Well, I could tell you …
DAVIES: That’s … that’s it … you see … you get my meaning?
ASTON: When the time comes …
DAVIES: I mean, that’s what I’m getting at, you see …
ASTON: More or less exactly what you …
DAVIES: You see, what I mean to say … What I’m getting at is … I mean, what sort of jobs …

Pause.

ASTON: Well, there’s things like the stairs … and the … the bells…
DAVIES: But it’d be a matter … wouldn’t it … it would be a matter of a broom … isn’t it?
ASTON: Yes, and of course, you’d need a few brushes.

(CT, 42-43)

Implicature Analysis

Davies is shocked due to the unexpected offer of the job as a caretaker. He gets excited and could not understand how to react. Therefore, he falls short of words when Aston asks ‘How do you feel about being one, then?’ Incomplete, vague and incoherent utterance in Davies’ reply violates the maxim of manner. However, the violation can be taken to implicate the excited state of Davies’s mind because of an unexpected offer of a job at such a crucial time, when he is in search of a proper job in order to settle down. Aston’s inability to communicate properly is implicated in incomplete and meaningless utterances violating the manner as well as maxim of relation. In addition to violation, Davies hedges the maxims of manner and relation. His utterance ‘You get my meaning?’ is an instance of hedging the maxim of manner. It implicates that Davies is unable to convey properly what he wants to mean. He asks Aston whether he could understand it without saying anything concrete and clear. As a result, both of them get confused and go on uttering vague expressions. Davies says ‘I mean, that’s what I’m, getting at’ and thus, hedges the maxim of relation which implicates that he was not talking to the point. Aston’s vague utterance ‘More or less exactly what you …’ violates the maxim of manner by being vague and implicates his inability to understand what Davies wishes to say. Davies is caught in the puzzle of words and could not ask in precise words, whatever he wants to know. Therefore, when he says ‘I mean, what sort of jobs …’ he violates the maxim of manner using incomplete and vague expressions. Davies wants to suggest that he should know the nature of the job of caretaker before he accepts the offer, in order to avoid further complications. In reply, Aston says ‘There’s things like the stairs … and the … the bells …’ suggesting that Davies, as a caretaker, will have to look after the things
such as the stairs and the bells. He will have to keep these things clean. Therefore, Davies asks him ‘It’d be a matter of broom…isn’t it?’ Here Davies wants to know whether he will have to sweep the place with broom to keep it clean. Aston’s reply ‘Yes, and of course, you’d need a few brushes’ violates the maxim of quantity by providing more information. Astons tells him that he would need some brushes though Davies asked only about broom. However, by violating the maxim of quantity, Aston seems to implicate that Davies will have to keep the things clean using brushes in addition to broom. The dots all over the selected passage implicate excited state of mind as well as Davies and Aston’s want of words in order to communicate successfully.

**Concluding Remarks**

This exchange between Aston and Davies contains incomplete and vague utterances. Both of them fail to communicate their thoughts properly as they lack appropriate expressions. The incomplete utterances suggest that they are trying to explain various things to each other but they fail to do so. Davies is unable to convey his feeling due to excited state of mind at an unexpected offer. They have a lot to say but they are short of proper expressions.

**5.3.8 Conversation Eight**

This is a conversational passage in which Davies tries to threaten Mick by projecting himself as an experienced person. Mick pretends to believe whatever Davies is talking.

**Contextual Environment**

Aston gives an overcoat to Davies and asks him to try it. Davies likes the overcoat and thanks Aston for that. Aston then begins to explain his plan to Davies. He says that he will fit a bell outside with the word ‘Caretaker’ written on it, so that, if any visitor rings the bell, Davies could answer the queries. However, Davies does not approve the idea of a bell, as he thinks that there will be anyone, even that Scotch git, coming up the front door and Davies will be caught easily. It might create difficulties for him. After blackout, Davies enters the house and notices that the light has gone out. Mick is already present there in the house and frightens Davies in the darkness. Davies tries to defend himself with a knife, however, Mick apologizes him saying that he did not do it deliberately. He explains that he was cleaning the house with a vacuum cleaner.
**Conversation**

MICK: … Eh, you’re not thinking of doing any violence on me, are you? You’re not the violent sort, are you?

DAVIES (vehemently): I keep myself to myself, mate. But if anyone starts with me though, they know what they got coming.

MICK: I can believe that.

DAVIES: You do. I been all over, see? You understand my meaning? I don’t mind a bit of a joke now and then, but anyone’ll tell you … that no one starts anything with me.

MICK: I get what you mean, yes.

DAVIES: I can be pushed so far … but ….

MICK: No further.

DAVIES: That’s it.

MICK sits on junk down right.

What you doing?

MICK: No. I just want to say that … I’m very impressed by that.

(CT, 46-47)

**Implicature Analysis**

Mick reveals that he was doing some spring cleaning but Davies is still holding the knife in defensive stance. Therefore, Mick asks him whether he is thinking to attack him with the knife. He asks Davies ‘You’re not the violent sort, are you?’ implicating that the violent sort of persons tend to attack others in order to save themselves. As Davies is holding the knife, Mick thinks that he may attack him to defend himself. In reply, Davies avoids exact answer and says ‘I keep myself to myself, mate.’ Here, as the reply doesn’t provide expected information, it seems irrelevant, thus violates the maxim of relation. Moreover, it violates the maxim of manner by being obscure. However, if Davies is supposed to be cooperative in his reply and if the utterance is taken to be relevant to the question, it can be interpreted as implicating that Davies is not a violent sort of person. However, he wants to suggest that he doesn’t like to get involved in any controversies. He is a kind of person who avoids interfering in others matter and lives his life as he likes. Instead of stating it clearly, he prefers to convey it in a roundabout way using circumlocution. In his reply, he further says ‘But if anyone starts with me though, they know what they got coming.’ Here also Davies violates the maxim of manner by using obscure and ambiguous language. It implicates that Davies knows how to defend him if someone tries to trouble him intentionally. He wants to suggest that he is a straightforward person but he will not run away from the difficult situations if the time
comes. If someone tries to attack him, he will have to face the consequences. In other words, Davies wants to warn Mick about his behavior. As a result, Mick comes to the back foot and accepts that he believes whatever Davies says. With his utterance ‘I been all over, see?’ Davies implicates that he is a man of the world and has got various kinds of experiences throughout his roaming all over the world. In other words, Davies wants to suggest that Mick should not try to trouble him as he is more experienced than Mick. In fact, Davies is trying to create his glorified and superior image in Mick’s mind. He further asks him ‘You understand my meaning?’ Here, Davies hedges the maxim of manner implicating that he is using such an obscure language which Mick might not have understood. He, therefore, tries to explain using equally vague language when he says ‘I don’t mind a bit of a joke now and then, but anyone’ll tell you … that no one starts anything with me.’ By violating the maxim of manner again, Davies here implicates that he appreciates some playful jokes played with him once or twice. He suggests that he is a kind of a person who has that much patience to bear mild jokes and he does not get irritated easily. However, if someone tries to annoy him deliberately, he never pardons him. He wants to suggest that there are a lot of persons whom Davies has taught lessons, therefore nobody dares to cross his way.

Concluding Remarks
Here, Davies implicates a lot of information about his nature so as to beware Mick against causing him any trouble. He projects himself as a person who prefers to keep himself away from any controversy. He wants to suggest Mick that he is not an escapist but he can tackle any difficult situation. He never causes any nuisance to others as well as he never lets others to trouble him. Therefore, no one dares to take liberty with him.

5.3.9 Conversation Nine
This conversation takes place after Mick offers Davies the same job of caretaker. Mick asks Davies for his references and he informs that he has left all his papers at Sidcup, where he plans to go.

Contextual Environment
When Mick asks Davies whether he is Aston’s friend, he seems to deny it saying that he is not a particular friend of Aston. Mick feels sorry to know that Aston is not very friendly. But then Davies denies saying that Aston is not friendly. Mick is worried about Aston because he doesn’t like to work; therefore, he asks Davies’ advice about it. Davies
says that he has met such type of persons who are work shy. Instead of giving advice, Davies declares Aston to be a ‘funny bloke.’ Therefore, Mick warns him not to be hypercritical about Aston. Then suddenly, he offers him the job as a caretaker. Mick is of the opinion that Davies is capable for doing such a job. Davies accepts the offer readily after he comes to know that Mick is the landlord there, and not Aston. He even boasts to be ex-serviceman having worked in the colonies.

**Conversation**

MICK: Can you give me any references?
DAVIES: Eh?
MICK: Just to satisfy my solicitor.
DAVIES: I got plenty of references. All I got to do is to go down to Sidcup tomorrow. I got all the references I want down there.
MICK: Where’s that?
DAVIES: Sidcup. He ain’t only got my references down there; he got all my papers down there. I know that place like the back of my hand. I’m going down there anyway, see what I mean, I got to get down there, or I’m done.
MICK: So we can always get hold of these references if we want them.
DAVIES: I’ll be down there any day, I tell you. I was going down today, but I’m … I’m waiting for the weather to break.

(CT, 51)

**Implicature Analysis**

Davies accepts the proposal to work as a caretaker and Mick decides to prepare a legal agreement which will be beneficial for both of them. Therefore, Mick wants Davies’ references in order to fulfill the legal requirements so that they can finalize the agreement. As Mick asks him ‘Can you give me any references?’ Davies seems to be shocked at this unexpected demand from Mick and utters an expression ‘Eh?’ which implicates that he did not expect the question about references. Mick tries to convince him and explains the reason behind his asking for references as he says ‘Just to satisfy my solicitor.’ Here, Mick wants to suggest that references are necessary legal documents in order to satisfy the solicitor; otherwise, their agreement would not be finalized. Instead of replying whether he could give references or not, Davies says ‘I got plenty of references.’ He seems to violate the maxim of quantity as he gives more information than expected. However, it can be interpreted that Davies can give references as he has got plenty of them. But he has got all his references at Sidcup and it is possible to give them to Mick only after he visits Sidcup in order to bring those references. Mick wants to know exact
location where Davies has left the references, therefore he asks him ‘Where’s that?’ In reply, Davies violates the maxim of quantity by providing more information than asked. Mick would have been cooperative only by saying ‘Sidcup’; however, he goes on talking about other things. As he says ‘He ain’t only got my references down there; he got all my papers down there’ he wants to suggest that in addition to references, he has got other documents also at Sidcup. He says ‘I know the place like the back of my hand’ and thus, violates the maxim of manner by being obscure. The information also seems irrelevant as there cannot be any relation between a place called Sidcup and the back of his hand. However, if it is supposed that Davies is being cooperative by trying to suggest the association of these two concepts, it can be interpreted that, as a person knows the back of his hand very well, Davies is familiar with Sidcup in the same way. He tries to implicate that it is not a difficult task to go down to Sidcup and bring the references as he is very much familiar with Sidcup. He says ‘I got to get down there, or I’m done’ implicating that it is very necessary for him to bring the papers, otherwise he will have to face difficulties. Mick also agrees that it will be good to have the references with them. Davies had decided to go to Sidcup on the same day but he could not go because of bad weather. As he says ‘I’m waiting for the weather to break’ he implicates that he will go there only after the weather improves. He tries to suggest that he is willing to go there, but could not go due to unavoidable natural conditions.

Concluding Remarks

Davies’ utterances carry a great amount of information while he talks about his references. He doesn’t mention anything clearly about the documents suggesting that he must be trying to conceal something from Mick. Though he mentions Sidcup, he doesn’t really seem eager to go there in order to collect the documents. As he finds excuses of bad weather to postpone his proposed visit, it can be taken to implicate that he is misleading Mick.

5.3.10 Conversation Ten

In this extract, Davies registers his complaints about Aston. As he makes complaints about trivial matters, Mick seems to understand his real motifs behind these complaints.

Contextual Environment

Davies complains that he could not go out even to have a cup of tea without a good pair of shoes. Therefore, Aston suggests him to visit a nearby café where he would get tea
without going far away. The café reminds Aston that he used to go there very often. But then he stopped altogether to visit the café as he used to have hallucinations. Then he recollects the treatment he got in a hospital which made him unable to work with hands. But these days, he has been getting recovered and wants to build a shed in the garden, without anyone helping him. Two weeks later, Davies notices that Aston has repaired the leaks in the roof as it had not been dripping in the bucket since last week.

**Conversation**

DAVIES: … How can I cut a loaf of bread without no knife?

*Pause.*

It’s an impossibility.

*Pause.*

MICK: You’ve got a knife

DAVIES: What?

MICK: You’ve got a knife.

DAVIES: I got a knife, sure I got a knife, but how do you expect me to cut a good loaf of bread with that? That’s not a bread knife. It’s nothing to do with cutting bread. I picked it up somewhere. I don’t know where it’s been, do I? No. What I want –

MICK: I know what you want.

*Pause.*

DAVIES rises and goes to the gas stove.

DAVIES: What about this gas stove? He tells me it’s not connected. How do I know it’s not connected? Here I am, I’m sleeping right with it. I wake up in the middle of the night, I’m looking right into the oven, man! Its right next to my face, how do I know, I could be lying there in bed, it might blow up, it might do me harm!

(CT, 58-59)

**Implicature Analysis**

Davies, while talking to Mick, complains that Aston doesn’t speak to him. He doesn’t even give him a knife in order to cut a loaf of bread. His rhetorical question ‘How can I cut a loaf of bread without no knife?’ implicates that one cannot cut bread without a knife. In other words, a knife is a must thing to cut anything, for that matter, a loaf of bread here. Therefore, he concludes that it is not possible without a knife; however, Aston doesn’t give it to him. Here, Davies seems to suggest Mick that Aston is not a cooperative person. But Mick knows that Davies has got a knife, which he had used to threaten Mick in the darkness. Therefore, Mick says ‘You’ve got a knife.’ Here, Mick seems to ask him ‘Why don’t you cut the bread with your own knife?’ He further seems to implicate that Davies should not ask Aston for a knife as he has got one with him. He
should use his own knife to fulfill his need. Davies agrees that he has got a knife but raises an issue saying ‘How do you expect me to cut a good loaf of bread with that?’ Through this rhetorical question, Davies wants to suggest that he cannot use his knife to cut bread. When he says, ‘That’s not a bread-knife. It’s nothing to do with cutting bread’, he implicates that the knife he has got, is meant for something else. Therefore, it should not be used for cutting bread. Here, Davies wants to suggest that his knife is meant for his safety. He violates the manner of quantity by providing unnecessary information about the knife. He is simply trying to prove that his knife is not meant for such things. Therefore, Mick says ‘I know what you want.’ Here, Mick’s utterance implicates that Mick has understood Davies attitude as well as his shrewdness. He wants to suggest that he can understand why Davies is giving much importance to the knife-issue. However, Davies goes on registering his complaints about various things related to Aston’s behavior. He tells Mick how the gas stove might prove dangerous for him as it is near his head throughout the night. Aston has told him that it is not connected; therefore, Davies should not be afraid of it. However, Davies says ‘How do I know it’s not connected?’ which implicates that the gas stove might blow up causing him injuries. It also implicates that Davies doesn’t believe whatever Aston has told him. Therefore, he comes to a conclusion that it is dangerous for him to have such things like gas stove and oven near him while sleeping.

Concluding Remarks
This passage reveals Davies’ intention to remind Mick of Aston’s previous psychological condition. The issues which he complains about are not worth giving that much importance but it is Aston’s behavior which Davies wants to focus. Davies simply intends to complain about Aston and the knife is only a mean to express his disapproval about Aston. Thus, he tries to prove that Aston is a careless person who is not fit to look after the house. In other words, he is trying to blur Aston’s image in Mick’s mind.

5.3.11 Conversation Eleven
In this conversational exchange, Mick requests Davies to talk to Aston about his being work shy. But Davies declares that they are not friends, therefore he cannot talk to him.

Contextual Environment
Davies doesn’t like to share the lavatory with the Blacks living downstairs and complaints that it is all dirty. He blames Aston calling him responsible for everything and suggests
that Aston is not a proper person to be in charge of the house. He also tells Mick about Aston’s long speech and a habit of speaking to himself. He doesn’t talk a word to Davies; therefore, Davies finds it difficult to stay with him. He tries to suggest Mick that both of them could keep the place in good condition without Aston. Then Mick speaks about his plan about the decoration and the renovation of the house. As Aston doesn’t seem to be interested in Mick’s plan, Mick requests Davies to speak to Aston.

**Conversation**

MICK: … Why don’t you have a chat with him, see if he’s interested?
DAVIES: Me?
MICK: Yes. You’re a friend of his.
DAVIES: He’s no friend of mine.
MICK: You’re living in the same room with him, en’t you?
DAVIES: He’s no friend of mine. You don’t know where you are with him. I mean, with a bloke like you, you know where you are.

*(CT, 61)*

**Implicature Analysis**

Mick neglects Davies’ question about his stay there in the house. He gets irritated to see all the junk collected by Aston as it hasn’t got any value. However, he is helpless as Aston is not interested to know his plan about the house. Therefore, he asks Davies ‘Why don’t you have a chat with him, see if he’s interested?’ This question implicates Mick’s request to Davies pleading him to speak to Aston. He wants Aston to understand Mick’s plan about the renovation of the house. Davies’ reply ‘Me?’ can be taken to implicate that he is surprised to see that Mick wishes him to speak to Aston. He could not understand why he should talk to him. Therefore, Mick says ‘You’re a friend of his’ implicating that he could give him an advice as a friend. In other words, if Davies speaks to Aston as a friend, there will be change in his behavior and he might take interest in Mick’s plan. However, Davies declares ‘He’s no friend of mine.’ Davies here seems to implicate that he could not speak to Aston because they are not friends. Therefore, Mick asks him ‘You’re living in the same room with him, en’t you?’ Here, Mick implicates that Davies and Aston must be friends as they are staying together sharing the room. If they are not friends, they would not have stayed together. One cannot stay with any person for long time unless they are friendly with each other and Aston and Davies are having company for more than two weeks, therefore, Mick thinks that they must be friends. However, Davies denies it saying ‘You don’t know where you are with him. I mean, a bloke like you, you know where you are.’ Davies here seems to violate the maxim of manner by
beings ambiguous as well as vague about what he wants to mean. However, he might be taken to implicate that it is difficult to live with Aston. He wants to suggest that Aston is not suitable person to live with. Then he tries to flatter Mick by suggesting him that he is not like Aston. He suggests that it is more convenient to live with Mick than Aston, who is absentminded. He keeps on praising Mick implicating that Mick has got his own ideas about his life which Aston is lacking. Thus, it can be interpreted that Davies wants to suggest Mick that Aston is not normal and therefore, he shouldn’t live with him. In other words, he wants to remind Mick that Aston is an abnormal human being who had undergone treatment for that. Thus, he wishes to make his stay permanent there in the house by declaring Aston as lunatic and unsuitable person to live with.

**Concluding Remarks**

Mick thinks that Davies’ friendly advice might bring change in Aston’s behavior. Davies is surprised to know that Mick is asking a stranger to talk to his brother. He denies having friendly relations with Aston and ads that he is not a person worth making friendship. He talks about Aston in such a way that implicates his intention to spotlight Aston’s mental weakness and uselessness. On the other hand, he praises Mick as a person having concrete goals in comparison to Aston. In fact, Davies tries to focus Aston’s abnormalities so as to secure his stay in the house as a caretaker.

### 5.3.12 Conversation Twelve

In this passage, Davies is asking Mick to inform Aston that he no more needs his help in decorating the house. Moreover, he declares that he is ready to work only for Mick.

**Contextual Background**

Davies tries to convince Mick that Aston is not like any normal human being, by exaggerating his behavior. He complains that Aston does not let him sleep throughout the night. He goes out without informing him where he is going and comes late at night. He doesn’t talk to Davies and keeps smiling at nothing. Therefore, Davies doesn’t remain enthusiastic throughout the day due to sleeplessness. He calls Aston responsible for all the problems he faces. Mick also believes that sleep is essential. As a result, Davies narrates him how Aston disturbs him while sleeping.

**Conversation**

DAVIES: … *(bending, close to MICK.)* No, what you want to do, you want to speak to him, see? I got ... I got that worked out. You want to tell him ... that we got ideas
for this place, we could build it up, we could get it started. You see, I could decorate it out for you, I could give you a hand in doing it ... between us.

Pause.

Where do you live now, then?

MICK: Me? Oh, I’ve got a little place. Not bad. Everything laid on. You must come up and have a drink some time. Listen to some Tchaikovsky.

DAVIES: No. You see, you’re the bloke who wants to talk to him. I mean, you’re his brother.

Pause.

MICK: Yes … may be I will.

(CT, 63-64)

Implicature Analysis

Aston doesn’t know that Davies looks at him through the blanket while he smiles at nothing. He feels it abnormal and thinks that Aston should be warned about it. Therefore, he suggests Mick ‘What you want to do, you want to speak to him, see?’ Here, Davies implicates that it is necessary that Mick should talk to Aston about his behavior so that he should mind it and try to behave wisely. Davies further wants to suggest that Aston needs an advice or warning about his eccentric behavior. Moreover, Davies has some other things also in his mind. Therefore, he suggests Mick ‘We got ideas for this place, we could build it up, we could get it started.’ Here Davies seems to say that they can decorate the house as per their ideas. However, by giving emphasis on personal pronoun ‘we’ he implicates that now Mick doesn’t need Aston as he is there to help him. He will decorate the house better than Aston. Therefore, he seems to suggest that Mick doesn’t need to have Aston to look after the place as he will assist him in the renovation of the house. The only thing Davies has in his mind is that if Aston is expelled by Mick, his place in the house will be secured forever. Therefore, he tries to convince Mick of Aston’s uselessness and his own availability as well as ability to help him. He is curious to know where Mick lives as he doesn’t live there in the house with Aston. He asks ‘Where do you live now, then?’ to which Mick replies ‘Oh, I’ve got a little place. Not bad. Everything laid on.’ Here, Mick’s reply seems to be vague as he is expected to tell exactly where he lives. However, it might be taken to implicate that Mick doesn’t want to reveal his whereabouts to Davies; therefore he gives such a vague reply avoiding precise and clear answer. He might want to suggest by saying ‘Everything laid on’ that the house in which he lives is well decorated and well arranged than this one. Mick further violates the maxims of quantity as well as relation by saying ‘You must come up and have a drink
some time.’ Here, though he seems to invite Davies to his house, he means more than this. He implicates that he wants to close the topic by inviting him for tea. He simply wants to avoid speaking about the place where he stays. He might have thought it improper to tell the details to Davies. It further implicates that Mick thinks Davies not to be trustworthy. But Davies neither accepts nor rejects the invitation and thus seems to be uncooperative. However, Davies here seems to implicate that an invitation is not important but what is important is that Mick should look into the matter and speak to Aston about their ideas about the house. When he says ‘I mean you’re his brother,’ he seems to implicate that Mick has an authority to talk to him being his brother. He wants to suggest that it is Mick who could speak to Aston and if he doesn’t talk to him, who else is there to speak to his brother. He denies being Aston’s friend, therefore he could not talk to him or maybe Aston will not listen to him. Mick agrees to speak, however, as he says ‘Yes … maybe I will,’ he implicates that it is not sure whether he will speak to him or not. It further implicates that Mick might have something else in mind.

**Concluding Remarks**

Davies here emphasizes the fact that he is ready to help Mick in renovation of the house. Though he wishes to help Mick, his offer means more than his plain meaning. He wishes that Mick will expel Aston if he gets someone ready to help him. Therefore, he becomes ready to work only for Mick. Though he shows curiosity in Mick’s house, he is more interested in Aston’s exile. He even appeals Mick by reminding him that he must talk to Aston as they are brothers. As a brother, he can talk to him very frankly because their relation is more close than friendship. But Davies is not sure whether he will be able to talk to Aston about their plan.

**5.3.13 Conversation Thirteen**

In this exchange, Davies complains about the treatment he received from Aston and wishes that Mick should take some action against him. He tries to prove himself as innocent and Aston as guilty.

**Contextual Environment**

Aston wakes Davies up for he was making noises. However, Davies thinks that Aston is responsible for that as he gives him bad dreams. Davies reminds him that he had been in a nuthouse. At this, Aston makes an aggressive move towards him and Davies points a knife at him. Consequently, Aston asks him to leave the house but Davies informs him
that he is a caretaker of the house and it is Aston who should leave the house. Davies tells him that he is going to complain about it to Mick and thinks that Mick will teach him a lesson. He gets angry and points the knife at Aston’s stomach as Aston calls him a stinker. Aston gets his bag and expels him out of the house but he comes back with Mick complaining about Aston’s rude behavior.

**Conversation**

DAVIES: I told him, I told him he … I said to him, you ain’t heard the last of this man! I said don’t you forget your brother. I told him you’d be coming along to sort him out. He don’t know what he’s started, doing that. Doing that to me. I said to him, I said to him, he’ll be along, your brother’ll be along, he’s got sense, not like you –

MICK: What do you mean?

DAVIES: Eh?

MICK: You saying my brother hasn’t got any sense?

DAVIES: What? What I’m saying is, you got ideas for this place, all this … all this decorating, see? I mean, he’s got no right to order me about. I take orders from you, I do my caretaking for you, I mean, you look upon me … you don’t treat me like a lump of dirt … we can both … we can both see him for what he is.

*Pause.*

MICK: What did he say then, when you told him I’d offered you the job as caretaker?

DAVIES: He … he said … he said … something about … he lived here.

*(CT, 70)*

**Implicature Analysis**

In the evening, Davies comes back with Mick narrating how Aston behaved with him. By saying ‘I said, don’t you forget your brother’, Davies wants to suggest that Aston not only insulted him but also insulted Mick. In other words, he is trying to prove that Aston doesn’t care even for Mick, so that; Mick should take some action against him. He wants to provoke Mick in order to punish Aston and to make his stay secure. Davies says ‘He don’t know what he's started, doing that’ which implicates that he wants to create an atmosphere of seriousness by suggesting that Aston has done a grave mistake by expelling him out of the house. He further says ‘I said to him, he’ll be along, you’re brother’ll be along, he’s got sense, not like you.’ Here, Davies seems to suggest Mick about Aston’s past when he was admitted in a hospital for treatment of hallucinations. Therefore, he tries to flatter Mick by calling him sensible and different from Aston, who is psychologically weak. Mick could not get what Davies is saying and asks him ‘What do you mean?’ Davies, instead of answering Mick’s question, simply could utter ‘Eh?’
which can be taken to implicate that Davies is calling Aston as senseless and he thinks that it may affect his job if Mick is angry with him. Mick asks once again whether Davies thinks that Aston hasn’t got any sense. In reply, Davies violates the maxim of relation as he goes on talking about irrelevant things and thus avoids a precise answer. He tries to suggest Mick that he is an authority there and Aston should not give him orders because he is working for Mick and not for him. Therefore, he won’t obey his orders. He implicates that Mick gives him a fair treatment saying that ‘You don’t treat me like a lump of dirt.’ In fact, Davies wants to convey that Aston treated him very badly. He further says ‘We can both see him for what he is’ implicating that he is a lunatic and he should be sent back to an asylum. Mick wants to know Aston’s reaction about Davies being caretaker, therefore he asks Davies ‘What did he say then, when you told him I’d offered you the job as caretaker?’ Davies’ reply ‘He… he said … he said… something about … he lived here’ violates the maxim of quality as Aston’s reply to this was ‘I don’t think you’re really suitable.’ However, if it is investigated thoroughly why Davies becomes uncooperative by contributing false information, it can be interpreted as implicating Davies’ fear that if Mick will come to know that Aston doesn’t think him to be suitable for the job, Mick might think seriously about Aston’s opinion. As a result, his job might come at stake. Therefore, he avoids telling the truth by providing irrelevant information.

**Concluding Remarks**

Davies tries to incite Mick against Aston by providing him false information. By telling Mick that Aston insulted him, he wishes that Mick should take revenge of his insult. However, Mick seems to be aware of Davies’ nature as well as intention, therefore, scolds him for calling Aston as senseless. Davies tries to convince Mick that he will be more helpful to Mick than Aston as he has got ideas about the decoration of the house. However, he gives false information when Mick asks him about Aston’s reaction about Davies as a caretaker. He thinks that Aston’s reaction that Davies is not suitable might affect Mick’s offer. Therefore, he conceals the fact.

**5.3.14 Conversation Fourteen**

In this piece of interaction, Mick has come to know the real nature of Davies he scolds Davies for pretending to be an interior decorator and warns him for insulting Aston.
Contextual Environment

Davies tries to suggest Mick that he should ask Aston to leave the house as he is the landlord. He further suggests Mick to send Aston back from where he has come, that is, to the nuthouse. Mick expresses his disapproval at Davies’ advice and asks him to begin with interior decoration of the house. However, to Mick’s surprise, Davies denies being an interior decorator. He thinks that Mick has got the wrong man and tries to remind him that he was supposed to help him as a caretaker on a small wage. Mick gets irritated due to Davies’ falsehood and calls him a bloody imposter.

Conversation

MICK: You got two names. What about the rest? Eh? Now come on, why did you tell me all this dirt about you being an interior decorator?

DAVIES: I didn’t tell you nothing! Won’t you listen to what I’m saying?

Pause.

It was him who told you. It was your brother who must have told you. He’s nutty! He’d tell you anything, out of spite, he’s nutty, he’s half way gone, it was him who told you.

MICK walks slowly to him.

MICK: What did you call my brother?

DAVIES: When?

MICK: He’s what?

DAVIES: I … now get this straight ….

(CT, 73)

Implicature Analysis

Davies informs Mick that ‘Jenkins’ is the name he has assumed. Therefore, Mick says that Davies has got two names and asks him ‘What about the rest?’ Mick here implicates that apart from these two names, Davies might have got other names also. He thinks that Davies is a person who is not worth believing as he might be going under various assumed names. Therefore, he is of the opinion that Davies intentionally pretended to be an interior decorator. However, Davies denies being one. His utterance ‘Won’t you listen to what I’m saying?’ can be interpreted as a request, ‘Please, listen to what I’m saying.’ Then, Davies violates the maxim of quality by providing information which is false as well as lacks adequate evidence. He says ‘It was your brother who must have told you.’ Here, he tries to suggest that it is Aston who must have told Mick that Davies is an interior decorator. However, it is obvious that Aston has never given such information to Mick. Thus, Davies seems to be uncooperative by giving false information. If his
utterance is taken to be cooperative and if it is interpreted at deeper level, it may be taken to implicate that Davies wants to divert Mick’s attention to Aston by accusing him of falsity. When Davies further says ‘He’s nutty,’ he wants to suggest Mick that Aston has lost his mental balance; therefore, he might have spoken such things to Mick. He further adds that Aston might have provided false information about him ‘out of spite’ implicating that Aston is jealous of him because he might be thinking that Davies will take his place in the house. Davies here seems to turn the focus of attention towards Aston, in order to convince Mick that he is innocent and Aston is behind all this confusion. However, Mick is upset to know that Davies is calling his brother as nutty. Therefore, he becomes aggressive and asks ‘What did you call my brother?’ Here Mick’s aggressiveness seems to suggest that he did not like Davies calling Aston as a lunatic. Davies also notices this fact and instead of giving a cooperative reply, he avoids a precise and relevant answer. Davies thinks that if he once again calls Aston as nutty, Mick will definitely take some action against him as it is obvious from his stance.

**Concluding Remarks**

Mick comes to a conclusion that Davies must be a professional fraud who assumes various names in order to deceive people. When he scolds him for being a liar, Davies points the finger to Aston and tries to convince Mick that Aston must have given this information to him. He even thinks that Aston is jealous of him. To prove that Aston must be guilty, he reminds Mick that he is not a normal human being, therefore he might have told anything to him. Mick gets annoyed to see that Davies is insulting Aston, but Davies goes to the back foot to save himself from further complications.

**5.3.15 Conversation Fifteen**

This conversation takes place after Davies was fired by Mick. Davies here seems to be ready to adjust himself in the house as per Aston’s opinions. However, Aston doesn’t need any assistance now.

**Contextual Environment**

Mick declares Davies as the cause for all the troubles as well as unpredictable violent and erratic. Mick also brings it to his notice that he never went to Sidcup to bring the references. Therefore, he pays him off half-a-dollar and leaves the house and at the same time, Aston enters. Davies feels ashamed for he came back even after Aston had expelled him. Therefore, he pretends that he has come back to get his pipe which he had left there.
However, Aston is wise enough to understand his pretence and doesn’t entertain him. Davies tries to convince him that he will not make any noise if they change their beds. Then he speaks sympathetically about Aston’s being in the hospital and says that he can understand the suffering that he might have undergone. Then he becomes ready to work only for Aston and not for any other person.

**Conversation**

DAVIES: … What do you think of this I’m saying?

*Pause.*

ASTON: No, I like sleeping in this bed.

DAVIES: But you don’t understand my meaning!

ASTON: Anyway, that one’s my brother’s bed.

DAVIES: Your brother?

ASTON: Any time he stays here. This is my bed. It’s the only bed I can sleep in.

DAVIES: But your brother’s gone! He’s gone!

*Pause.*

ASTON: No. I couldn’t change beds.

DAVIES: But you don’t understand my meaning!

ASTON: Anyway, I’m going to be busy. I’ve got that shed to get up. If I don’t get it up now it’ll never go up. Until it’s up I can’t get started.

DAVIES: I’ll give you a hand to put up your shed, that’s what I’ll do!

*Pause.*

I’ll give you a hand! We’ll both put up that shed together! See? Get it done in next to no time! Do you see what I’m saying?

*Pause.*

ASTON: No. I can get it up myself.

(CT, 76-77)

**Implicature Analysis**

Davies tries to convince Aston that he doesn’t have any complaint about him or about his stay there. However, Aston doesn’t pay any attention to him as he seems uninterested in Davies’ chatter. Therefore, he becomes restless and asks him ‘What do you think of this I’m saying?’ The question implicates Davies’ eagerness to know Aston’s opinion about his suggestions because he will have to leave the house if Aston denies his proposal. But to his disappointment, Aston denies his suggestions by saying ‘No’. Aston’s utterance ‘I like sleeping in this bed’ can be taken to implicate that it is not possible for him to change beds, therefore, Davies should not argue about it. Davies becomes more restless as he tries to convey something else which Aston doesn’t understand. When he says ‘But you don’t understand my meaning!’ Aston takes it to implicate that Davies is asking him to
sleep in the other bed, therefore, he says ‘Anyway, that one’s my brother’s bed.’ Aston, here seems to implicate that Mick will sleep in the other bed. Therefore, Davies now cannot sleep in that bed also. Davies’ question ‘Your brother?’ can be taken to implicate that he doesn’t stay here. Davies wants to suggest that if Mick doesn’t stay there, there will be no question about his sleeping in that bed. Aston understands what he is trying to convey and makes it clear that Mick will sleep in the bed whenever he will stay there. Therefore, Davies now cannot sleep on either of the beds as he doesn’t have any choice. However, Davies is unconvinced and tries to tell him ‘But your brother’s gone!’ He tries to suggest that as Mick has left now, his bed will be empty and Aston could sleep in that bed. But Aston wants to avoid further arguments saying that he could not change beds. He seems to be firm about it. He hedges the maxim of relation by saying ‘Anyway, I’m going to be busy’ which implicates that though it seems irrelevant on that occasion, Aston has some other things to do. He wants to suggest Davies that he wants to close the topic of changing the beds. He thinks that it won’t be possible for him to build the shed if he could not do it now. Thus, he wants to suggest that it is very urgent for him to build a shed. Davies offers his assistance for building the shed saying that if both of them started to build it up, they will get it done very fast. However, Aston says ‘No. I can get it up myself’ which implicates that he doesn’t need Davies’ help for it. Aston here suggests Davies that now it is not possible for Davies to stay there for any reason. He will have to leave the house as there is nothing which he can do. Aston no more needs Davies either as a caretaker or as a helping hand to build up the shed.

**Concluding Remarks**

Davies is disappointed to realize that his intention to take Aston’s place could not be fulfilled. As a result, he comes back to Aston and tries to suggest him that he will stay in the house without causing him any trouble. However, Aston is firm on his decision. Davies tries to take an opportunity by offering his help to Aston, thinking that Aston will let him stay there if he becomes ready to help him. But Aston rejects his offer and there is no alternative left in front of Davies to leave the house.
5.4 THE HOMECOMING

5.4.1 Conversation One

In this conversational passage, Max is asking Lenny about the scissors but Lenny neglects him and reads newspaper. As Max goes on asking, Lenny abuses him and asks him to keep quiet.

Contextual Background

The play begins in an old house where Lenny is busy reading newspaper and Max is searching for something. He comes in from the kitchen and rummages a drawer of the sideboard; however, he could not get the expected thing. Therefore, he comes downstage and looks about the room. Then he asks Lenny about the scissors as he wants to cut something out of the paper. Lenny does not pay attention and avoids replying Max. Instead, he abuses Max by calling him a fool.

Conversation

MAX: What have you done with the scissors?

Pause.

I said I’m looking for the scissors. What have you done with them?

Pause.

Did you hear me? I want to cut something out of the paper.

LENNY: I’m reading the paper.

MAX: Not that paper. I haven’t even read that paper. I’m talking about last Sunday’s paper. I was just having a look at it in the kitchen.

Pause.

Do you hear what I’m saying? I’m talking to you! Where’s the scissors?

LENNY: (looking up, quietly). Why don’t you shut up, you daft part?

(HC, 7)

Implicature Analysis

Max is searching for scissors and as he could not get it anywhere in the house, he asks Lenny ‘What have you done with the scissors?’ Max doesn’t know where the scissors are and believes that Lenny might have done something with them; therefore, he might know the whereabouts. He needs them as he wants to cut something out of the paper. Lenny thinks that Max wants to cut today’s paper. Therefore, he says ‘I’m reading that paper’ implicating that Max should not cut the paper as Lenny is reading it right now. He wants to suggest Max that it is not possible for him to cut the paper. Therefore, Max clarifies saying ‘Not that paper’ which implicates that he is no talking about the paper which
Lenny is reading. He wants to cut some other paper than this one. His utterance ‘I haven’t even read that paper’ can be taken to suggest that how can he cut the paper before reading it. In other words, if he wants to cut today’s paper, he will read it first and if he comes across something worth cutting, he will think about it. He will not cut it without reading. Therefore, he wants to suggest Lenny that he wants to cut something from last Sunday’s paper, which probably he might have read. Therefore, Max thinks that Lenny must not have any objection for cutting last Sunday’s paper. He violates the maxim of quantity as he provides more information than expected by informing Lenny ‘I was just having a look at it in the kitchen’. Lenny neither asked him whether he was reading the paper nor the place where he was reading it. However, it can be taken to suggest that Max wants to focus on the fact that he has not seen today’s paper but the last Sunday’s one, which he was reading in the kitchen. The ‘Pauses’ here implicate Lenny’s negligence as well as lack of respect towards his father, Max. It also throws light on the lack of proper communication between them. As Lenny doesn’t give any reply, Max gets irrigated and says ‘I’m talking to you’. It can be taken to implicate that Max wants to ask him, ‘Why don’t you answer my question?’ In other words, Max feels restless to notice that Lenny is neglecting him deliberately, therefore he doesn’t entertain him. Though Max repeats the question, Lenny is not moved. He quietly looks towards Max and says ‘Why don’t you shut up, you daft part?’ Here, Lenny violates the maxim of relation by abusing Max, instead of informing him the whereabouts of the scissors. But this violation can be assumed to implicate that Lenny is getting disturbed by Max as he is busy reading the paper. Therefore, he abuses Max thinking he might not ask him anything after getting abused. It also can be taken to implicate that Lenny doesn’t know where the scissors are; therefore, he thinks that Max should stop asking him.

**Concluding Remarks**

This is a piece of conversation which focuses on a kind of relation between father and son, in which the son doesn’t have any respect for the father. Lenny seems to be uncooperative while talking to Max, which can be taken to implicate that he doesn’t care much about the needs of his father. He seems to be rude and adamant while talking to his own father. If he doesn’t know the whereabouts of the scissors, he should have informed so to Max. But he evades giving a relevant reply which can be taken to implicate that he deliberately avoids talking to Max. He asks Max to shut up because he not know anything about the scissors.
5.4.2 Conversation Two

This interaction takes place after Max narrates his experiences about horses. Lenny changes the topic and goes on talking about Max as a bad cook. As a result, he gets irritated and asks Lenny to get out of the house.

**Contextual Background**

Lenny asks Max’s opinion about a possible winning horse and challenges him saying that a horse called Second Wind is the winner, whereas Max doesn’t think so. Therefore, Max tries to tell Lenny that he knows more about horses than anyone else as he has spent a lot of time on the racecourse. He narrates how he used to calm down highly strung horses. He had an instinctive understanding of horses. He had even been offered the job of a trainer; however, he did not accept it due to his responsibility towards his family. He used to identify a good horse only with his smell. He even used to examine their qualities by looking straight into their eyes. He thinks that it was a gift of God to him that he could identify qualities of a good horse.

**Conversation**

MAX: … And he talks to me about horses.
LENNY: Dad, do you mind if I change the subject?
   
   Pause.
   
   I want to ask you something. The dinner we had before, what was the name of it?
   What do you call it?
   
   Pause.
   
   Why don’t you buy a dog? You’re a dog cook. Honest. You think you’re cooking for a lot of dogs.
MAX: If you don’t like it get out.
LENNY: I am going out. I’m going out to buy myself a proper dinner.
MAX: Well, get out! What are you waiting for?

LENNY looks at him.
LENNY: What did you say?
MAX: I said shove off out of it, that’s what I said.

   (HC, 10-11)

**Implicature Analysis**

Max’s ego gets hurt as Lenny challenges his opinion about a possible winning horse. Therefore, he elaborately narrates his experience regarding horses and says ‘And he talks to me about horses’. The utterance implicates that Max knows more about horses than Lenny, therefore, Lenny should not argue with him. Max seems to suggest that he is
acquainted with horses more than anyone else, particularly Lenny. He suggests that he has an authority to talk on the topic of horses as he has got firsthand experience with them, having spent a lot of time on the racecourse. After this elaborate narration, Lenny asks him ‘Dad, do you mind if I change the subject’. Lenny here violates the maxim of relation as his contribution is irrelevant to the ongoing conversation, thus, seems to be uncooperative. However, his utterance can be taken to implicate that Lenny wants to close the topic of horses. He wants to suggest Max that it’s enough about horses now and they should talk about some other topic. Lenny is not interested in the elaborate details about Max’s experiences regarding horses. Therefore, he wants to talk about something else. His utterance can be taken to implicate ‘Will you stop talking about horses?’ Therefore, for the sake of digression, Lenny talks about the dinner prepared by Max. From the way of his speaking, it can be interpreted that Lenny wants to express his dislike about the food which they had at the dinner. Therefore, he says ‘The dinner we had before, what was the name of it?’ Here Lenny seems to violate the maxim of quality as it is not a sincere question. However, it can be interpreted to be cooperative if it is taken to implicate that Lenny wants to express his dislike towards the food prepared by Max. He further wants to suggest that he has never eaten such a tasteless food before. Lenny asks him ‘Why don’t you buy a dog?’ This utterance seems to implicate that Max is a very bad cook, who prepares tasteless food. Therefore, Lenny wants to suggest that the food is not worth eating by human beings, but by dogs. He calls Max as a dog cook, who prepares food for dogs. Lenny further says ‘You think you are cooking for a lot of dogs’ suggesting that he is a human being, therefore, could not eat such a tasteless food. Max feels insulted and asks Lenny to get out if he doesn’t like the food. Therefore, Lenny says ‘I’m going out to buy myself a proper dinner’. This utterance implicates that Lenny could not get proper dinner in the house. He further seems to suggest that the dinner prepared by Max in the house is not good. Therefore, he prefers to go out to get good food. It doesn’t make any difference to Max as it is obvious from his utterance ‘Well get out! What are you waiting for?’ which implicates that Lenny should leave the house immediately. The rhetorical question flouts the maxim of quality to implicate that Lenny should not wait but leave. Max will not stop him from going out to have good food. Lenny gives a threatening look at Max and asks him about what he just has said. He asks Max ‘What did you say?’ and Max replies ‘I said shove off out of it, that’s what I said’. Here, Max observes the maxim of relation by providing relevant reply and thus implicates
that he is firm on what he has said, that is, he wants Lenny to get out. He wants to suggest Lenny that he is not afraid of anyone.

**Concluding Remarks**

Max suggests Lenny that he should not defy his knowledge of horses. However, Lenny is least interested in his chatter and in order to avoid the horse issue, he talks about the food. Though he resents the food prepared by Max, it seems that he criticizes Max only to feel triumphant and to annoy him. He wants to suggest Max that though he knows more about horses, he lacks qualities of a good cook. However, Max doesn’t care about Lenny’s condemnation and asks him to get out if he doesn’t like the food.

**5.4.3 Conversation Three**

In this extract, Max warns Sam that he will kick him out if he stops paying him for his stay and food. But Sam argues that the house belongs to their parents.

**Contextual Background**

Max guides Joey that he should learn how to defend as well as how to attack while boxing. He is of the opinion that Joey will be a successful boxer only after he masters these skills. However, it seems that Joey didn’t like Max’s advice and goes upstairs. Max asks Sam to go upstairs as he wants to be alone. But Sam wants to talk to him about Jessie. He tells Max that he used to take care of Jessie in Max’s absence. He even used to take her out in his cab to the West End. Sam reminds him that he did not trust any of his other brothers with Jessie. Max wouldn’t have trusted even Mac.

**Conversation**

MAX: Why do I keep you here? You’re just an old grub.
SAM: Am I?
MAX: You’re a maggot.
SAM: Oh yes?
MAX: As soon as you stop paying your way here, I mean when you’re too old to pay your way, you know what I’m going to do? I’m going to give you the boot.
SAM: You are, en?
MAX: Sure. I mean, bring in the money and I’ll put up with you. But when the firm gets rid of you - you can flake off.
SAM: This is my house as well, you know. This was our mother’s house.
MAX: One lot after the other. One mess after the other.
SAM: Our father’s house.
MAX: Look what I’m lumbered with. One cast-iron bunch of crap after another. One flow of stinking pus after another.

(HC, 18-19)

Implicature Analysis

As Sam abuses Mac, who was Max’s good friend, Max becomes furious and begins to abuse Sam in return. Max’s utterance ‘Why do I keep you here?’ is a rhetorical question that flouts the maxim of quality. However, it can be taken to implicate that there is not a single reason for Sam, being there in the house. Max further wants to suggest that it is most intolerable thing for him to have Sam with him in the house. He thinks that Sam is simply useless. He further says ‘You’re just an old grub’. Here, Max flouts the maxim of quality by being categorically false. This utterance is an instance of metaphor in which Max compares Sam with an old grub. Though the utterance seems to be semantically invalid, Max wants to suggest something which is not expressed literally. Max’s next utterance ‘You’re a maggot’ also shares the same feature, being another example of metaphor. Here, Sam is compared with a maggot, which is synonymous to grub. A maggot or a grub is an insect in stage between egg and pupa. If these two utterances by Max are taken to be cooperative; they can be interpreted as meaningful. These utterances flout the maxim of quality as there cannot be any comparison between a person and an insect. However, by means of flouting, Max here may be taken to implicate that Sam is as immature and useless as insect between egg and pupa. It can be taken to suggest that as a pupa is dependent on its parents for everything, Sam is dependent on his family, particularly, on Max. Therefore, Max wants to get rid of him. His utterance ‘As soon as you stop paying your way here, I mean when you’re too old to pay your way, you know what I’m going to do?’ contains the expression ‘I mean’ which hedges the maxim of manner. When speaker uses such an expression, he is aware that he is being obscure and that the listener might get confused. It seems to implicate that either Max is unable to talk clearly or he might he hesitating to make such a bold statement about Sam. He wants to suggest Sam that if he stops paying money to Max for his stay as well as food there, Max will take some action against it. He will even kick Sam out of the house. Max is sure and makes it clear that Sam’s place in the house is secure till he earns money. However, Sam argues that ‘This is my house as well, you know. This was our mother’s house.’ These utterances seem to implicate that Sam shares equal rights on the house. The utterance, ‘This was our mother’s house’ implicates that as the parents’ property belongs to their
children, Sam also is the rightful owner of this house, therefore, Max cannot expel him. Max’s utterances ‘One lot after the other’ and ‘One mess after the other’ violate the maxims of relation as well as manner as they seem irrelevant to the present conversation. The utterances are obscure and vague. However, if it is supposed that Max is being cooperative by violating these maxims, it may be taken to implicate that he did not like Sam’s claim to be the rightful heir of the house. Max wants to suggest that Sam is simply creating confusion by putting such a claim. It also implicates Max’s dominating nature. Though Sam tells him that the house also belonged to their father, Max is not in a state of mind to listen to his arguments. In his utterances ‘One cast-iron bunch of crap after another’ and ‘One flow of stinking pus after another’ he compares Sam’s speech with cast-iron and pus by way of metaphor. These utterances flout the maxim of quality by being false as there may not be any similarity between words and cast-iron or pus. However, if Max is taken to be cooperative, the utterance can be interpreted as implicating Max’s dislike of what even Sam speaks. A cast-iron is heavy and pus is dirty and intolerable, in the same way, Sam’s words seem heavy and intolerable to Max.

**Concluding Remarks**

This interaction reveals Max’s hatred towards Sam, though they are brothers. Max wants to suggest Sam that he bears his presence in the house only because he is earning money. Otherwise, he would not have permitted him to stay in the house. On the other hand, Sam suggests him that he could not easily expel him out of the house as the house is their inherited property. He wants to suggest Max that he has a legal right on the house; therefore, he cannot take such action against him. Max gets furious to see that Sam is making arguments; he tries to suppress his voice by abusing him. Max thinks that if he treats Sam badly, he won’t argue further about the house. Thus, he wants to rub out Sam’s claim on the house.

**5.4.4 Conversation Four**

This interaction takes place when Teddy and Ruth arrive in the house at night. Ruth wants to go out for a walk but Teddy doesn’t like the idea as it is too late.

**Contextual Environment**

Teddy has an old key of the house that works and he and Ruth enters the house unnoticed at the time of mid-night. Teddy thinks that they should not disturb the family members at this time of night, therefore, decides to meet them in the morning. He goes upstairs and is
surprised to see his room and bed still there. Teddy asks her to go to bed as she might be
tired and he thinks of going out for a walk. However, he suddenly changes his plan and
decides to go to bed with Ruth. But then Ruth wishes to go for a walk in order to have
some fresh air.

**Conversation**

RUTH: I think I’ll have a breath of air.
TEDDY: Air?

*Pause.*

What do you mean?
RUTH (*standing*): Just a stroll.
TEDDY: At this time of night? But we’ve … only just got here. We’ve got to go to bed.
RUTH: I just feel like some air.
TEDDY: But I’m going to bed.
RUTH: That’s all right.
TEDDY: But what am I going to do?

*Pause.*

The last thing I want is a breath of air. Why do you want a breath of air?
RUTH: I just do.
TEDDY: But it’s late.
RUTH: I won’t go far. I’ll come back.

*Pause.*

TEDDY: I’ll wait up for you.
RUTH: Why?
TEDDY: I’m not going to bed without you.

(HC, 23-24)

**Implicature Analysis**

As per his changed plan, Teddy thinks that both of them should go to bed as they have to
meet Max early in the morning. At this, Ruth says ‘I think I’ll have a breath of air’
implicating that she needs to go out to get fresh air. Teddy could not understand what
Ruth wants to mean, therefore, asks for clarification. She makes it clear that she just want
to stroll for a couple of minutes. When Teddy says ‘At this time of night? But we’ve …
only just got here. We’ve got to go to bed’ it can be interpreted as implicating that he
does not approve her idea of going out for a stroll. He wants to suggest her that it is not a
proper time to go out for a walk as it is midnight. He thinks it odd to go out for a walk as
they have just arrived there from outside. She might have got fresh air while coming to
the house only before a few minutes. Therefore, he thinks it unnecessary to go out again.
His utterance ‘We’ve got to go to bed’ can be interpreted as implicating that if they are
late to go to bed, they might not meet the family members early in the morning. If they go to bed early, it is possible that they will get up early. However, Ruth is firm on her decision of going out to have some air. Teddy’s utterance ‘But I’m going to bed’ implicates his sense of masculine domination that, as he wants to go to bed, his wife should respect his decision. He further informs Ruth that he is not thinking of going out so that she should cancel her plan. Ruth’s reply ‘That’s all right’ implicates that she doesn’t have any objection about Teddy’s decision. It doesn’t matter for her whether Teddy goes to bed or goes outside. However, Teddy says ‘But what am I going to do?’ Here, Teddy’s utterance implicates that he wants to go to bed with Ruth. Therefore, he is not happy with Ruth’s decision. Teddy’s utterance can be further interpreted as implicating his wish to have sex with Ruth. Therefore, he is not happy to see that his wish is spoiled by Ruth’s going out for a walk. Otherwise, he would have gone to bed without Ruth. Thus, his utterance has sexual connotations also. He further says ‘The last thing I want is a breath of air’ implicating that there is something more important for him than a breath of air. Therefore, he asks her ‘Why do you want a breath of air?’ and she replies ‘I just do.’ Here, Ruth violates the maxim of quantity by giving inadequate reply when she is supposed to give precise reason for her wish to have a breath of air. However, if her reply is interpreted to be cooperative, it can be taken to implicate that she doesn’t want to prolong the arguments or she might not have proper reasons behind her wish to go out for a walk. She avoids precise answer in order to close the topic. Teddy’s utterance ‘But it’s late’ implicates that she should not go outside as it is very late and it is not a time to have some air. She assures him saying ‘I won’t go far.’ Ruth seems to understand Teddy’s state of mind as she says ‘I’ll come back’. It can be interpreted that Teddy is afraid if she goes out, she might not come back. He is restless at the thought that she might leave him forever. Ruth realizes it and assures him that she will definitely come back.

**Concluding Remarks**

Though Ruth wishes to go out after Teddy cancels his plan, he doesn’t seem to be happy with her decision. He has something else in mind, therefore tries to convince her it is not proper tome to go out. He tries to persuade her to cancel her plan by giving her various reasons. However, she seems so obstinate that she denies changing her plan. She realizes that Teddy has got a sense of insecurity to think that she might leave him; she assures him that she will come back. Thus, the interaction reveals a kind of tension in their relation as they don’t respect each other’s opinions.
5.4.5 Conversation Five

This is a piece of conversation between Lenny and Ruth that takes place after she comes back from outside. They talk about their visit to Europe and about the family.

Contextual Environment

Ruth goes outside for a walk and Teddy meets Lenny while going upstairs. They greet each other in a formal way without exhibiting little excitement, though they are meeting after six years. After Teddy goes upstairs, Ruth comes back and Lenny greets her in the same way. Lenny asks her name and her relation to Teddy. When Ruth tells him that she is Teddy’s wife, Lenny changes the topic of conversation. He speaks about a tick which keeps him up throughout the night. He doubts that it is the sound of clock; however he is not sure about it. He feels it funny to meet Teddy after a long gap. He is sure that Max will be very happy to meet Teddy.

Conversation

LENNY: … I thought he was in America.
RUTH: We’re on a visit to Europe.
LENNY: What, both of you?
RUTH: Yes.
LENNY: What, you sort of live with him over there, do you?
RUTH: We’re married.
LENNY: On a visit to Europe, eh? Seen much of it?
RUTH: We’ve just come from Italy.
LENNY: Oh, you went to Italy first, did you? And then he brought you over here to meet the family, did he? Well, the old man’ll be pleased to see you, I can tell you.

RUTH: Good
LENNY: What did you say?
RUTH: Good.

(HC, 29)

Implicature Analysis

Lenny tells Ruth that he was surprised to meet Teddy. He Says ‘I thought he was in America’ and Ruth utters ‘We’re on a visit to Europe’. In fact, these two utterances mean more than they actually express literally. Lenny’s utterance can be taken to implicate his belief that Teddy was in Europe itself and not in America. In response, Ruth’s utterance seems irrelevant as Lenny did not ask her anything about their visit, thus, violates the maxim of relation. However, if the utterance is interpreted as cooperative, it can be taken to implicate that Teddy and Ruth live together in America. She wants to suggest Lenny
that they are on a visit to Europe for a few days, they don’t stay there. Lenny’s question ‘What, both of you?’ seems to implicate his curiosity to know whether Teddy and Ruth are together, which Ruth replies affirmatively. Therefore, Lenny asks her ‘What, you sort of live with him over there, do you?’ to which Ruth replies ‘We’re married’. Here, Ruth’s reply to Lenny’s question seems irrelevant as he doesn’t ask her whether they are married or not. Thus it violates the maxim of relation by being irrelevant to the ongoing topic of conversation. A relevant reply to the question would have been either yes or no. But Ruth talks about their relation. However, if the reply is taken to be cooperative, it can be interpreted as implicating that Ruth lives with Teddy as a man and a woman married to each other generally stay together. The next piece of conversation also shares the similar features. Lenny asks Ruth ‘On a visit to Europe, eh? Seen much of it?’ and she answers ‘We’ve just come from Italy’. Here also, Ruth’s reply seems irrelevant as she is expected to tell Lenny whether they travelled a lot or they didn’t. However, this violation of the maxim of relation can be taken to implicate that they have not seen much of Europe. Ruth here wants to suggest that they visited only Italy and they have not visited other countries in Europe yet. They came to home directly from Italy. Lenny’s utterance ‘Oh, you went to Italy first, did you? And then he brought you over here to meet the family, did he?’ conveys more meaning than expressed by the words. Lenny’s choice of pronouns as subjects in these two questions seems meaningful as well as deliberate. When he says ‘You went to Italy first’ he seems to suggest that it might be Ruth’s own decision to visit Italy. However, when he says ‘And then he brought you over here’ he wants to suggest that Ruth might not be willing to visit the family. In other words, Lenny wants to focus that Ruth’s visit to Italy was a willful activity, whereas she might have been forced by Teddy to visit the family. Lenny tries to emphasize the fact that Ruth doesn’t seem so pleased to visit Teddy’s family. Whatever the case may be, Lenny thinks that Max will be very happy to see Ruth. Her response ‘Good’ seems to violate the maxim of quantity by being curt and very short in comparison to Lenny’s utterances. However, this violation may be taken to implicate that Ruth is not very much interested in whatever Lenny is talking. She avoids speaking elaborately in order to close the conversation. However, Lenny does not understand it and goes on asking questions. She gives the same reply again, however it doesn’t seem to be correctly interpreted by Lenny.
Concluding Remarks

Lenny assumes that Teddy stays there in Europe but Ruth makes it clear that they stay in America. She suggests Lenny that both of them stay together as they are married and now they are on a visit to Europe. As Lenny is curious to know whether they have seen much of Europe, she suggests him that they haven’t visited any other country than Italy. At this, Lenny thinks that Ruth must not be willing to visit the family but she must be forced by Teddy. However, Ruth seems least interested in talking to him and wishes to stop the conversation.

5.4.6 Conversation Six

In this piece of conversation, Max advises Ruth not to bother about past. Teddy praises Ruth as a good woman and Max is surprised to know that Teddy also has three sons.

Contextual Environment

Ruth praises Max for a very good lunch and in return, Max calls Ruth a first-rate cook as she prepared a lovely cup of coffee. Max is happy that the whole family is together after a long time. However, he regrets his wife’s death. Sam claims to be the best driver in the firm but Max thinks that the best driver was MacGregor. Max tells Teddy that he would have arranged a big function on his marriage, had he told him about it. He is happy at Teddy’s marriage and whishes that Lenny and Joey should also find some nice girls. As per his opinion, marriage makes life worth living.

Conversation

RUTH: I was … different … when I met Teddy … first.
TEDDY: No, you weren’t. You were the same.
RUTH: I wasn’t.
MAX: Who cares? Listen, live in the present, what are you worrying about? I mean, don’t forget the earth’s about five thousand million years old, at least. Who can afford to live in the past?
Pause.
TEDDY: She’s a great help to me over there. She’s a wonderful wife and mother. She’s a very popular woman. She’s got lots of friends. It’s a great life at the university … you know … it’s a very good life. We’ve got a lovely house … we’ve got all … we’ve got everything we want. It’s a very stimulating environment.
Pause.
My department is highly successful.
Pause.
We’ve got three boys, you know.
MAX: All boys? Isn’t that funny, eh? You’ve got three, I’ve got three.

(HC, 50)

**Implicature Analysis**

Ruth assures Max that Teddy is very happy to see that Max liked her. When Max calls her a charming woman, she says ‘I was … different … when I met Teddy … first’. In this utterance, Ruth violates the maxim of manner by being vague. But if the utterance is interpreted as cooperative, it implicates that she wants to tell something about her past which is different from her present. Therefore, Teddy says ‘No you weren’t. You were the same’. Here, Teddy seems to violate the maxim of quality as he does not have any evidence to prove that Ruth was the same in the past. Moreover, Ruth herself denies being the same in the past. Therefore, he tries to conceal it by striking out the facts. Max also is of the same opinion, when he says ‘Who cares? Listen, live in the present, what are you worrying about?’ The rhetorical questions in the above utterance flout the maxim of quality which gives rise to implicature. The first rhetorical question ‘Who cares?’ implicates Max’s belief that no one should care about the past. Instead, he advises Ruth and Teddy that one should live in the present, without bothering about the past. The next rhetorical question ‘What are you worrying about?’ carries an implicature that one should not worry about the past. Max’s utterance ‘I mean, don’t forget the earth’s about five thousand million years old, at least’ seems irrelevant to the present topic of conversation, thus, violates the maxim of relation. However, if the utterance it taken to be cooperative, it can be interpreted as implicating that it is not possible to think about past as it is beyond one’s imaginations. In other words, if one tries to find out the past of the earth, it might not be possible as the earth is at least five thousand million years old. The next rhetorical question ‘Who can afford to live is the past?’ implicates the fact that it is not possible as well as affordable to live in the past. Therefore, Max gives more importance to the present. He seems least interested in knowing the past status of Ruth. After a pause, Teddy begins to speak about Ruth as a good wife and mother. Then he speaks about the life at the university and suddenly talks about his house. He says ‘She’s a great help to me … … stimulating environment’ In fact, Teddy here violates the maxim of relation as well as quantity by referring to irrelevant details which were not asked by Max. He goes on giving more information than necessary, therefore, seems to be uncooperative. However, the violation of the maxims can be taken to implicate that Teddy wants to avoid the topic of Ruth’s past; therefore, he begins to talk about other irrelevant things. In other words,
he wants to divert Max’s attention from the discussion about the past. He does it deliberately as he is afraid that Ruth will reveal her past to Max, which he never wants. Therefore, he changes the topics abruptly. His utterance ‘We’ve got everything we want’ implicates that Teddy is happy with Ruth there in America. As Teddy is leading a satisfied life, he does not want to go to the past, which might hamper his life in present. When Teddy says ‘We’ve got three boys, you know’ it implicates that Teddy wants to suggest that now they are well settled in their family life, therefore, past doesn’t matter for them. Max finds it interesting to know that Teddy has got three boys. He says ‘You’ve got three, I’ve got three’. This utterance can be taken to suggest that Max wants to create a sense of sameness as well as closeness in Teddy’s mind by focusing on the fact that both of them are fathers of three sons. In other words, Max here tries to establish a kind of similarity with Teddy as a father. He thinks that it might help Teddy to find himself close to Max.

**Concluding Remarks**

Ruth’s hesitation as well as discontinuity of speech suggests that there might be something about her past status which may not be worth telling publically. The violation of the maxim of quality by Teddy implicates that he does not want to reveal the past of Ruth to his family members. Max is of the opinion that they shouldn’t think about the past and enjoy the present. Teddy tries to divert their attention by talking about irrelevant things such as University and their family life in America. He doesn’t want Ruth to talk about her past as it might raise problems. Max tries to create an atmosphere of affinity between himself and Teddy by pointing out the fact that both of them have got three sons.

**5.4.7 Conversation Seven**

In this passage, Ruth talks about her birth and migration. She seems to be nostalgic but talks contemptuously about America.

**Contextual Environment**

Max wants to know whether the children are missing Ruth, and Teddy informs him that they will leave soon as children might be waiting for them. Lenny asks a philosophical question to Teddy, who denies to answer it sayings that the question doesn’t fall within his specialization. However, Lenny goes on asking such abstract questions which Teddy is unable to reply. Joey tries to answer them but doesn’t succeed. At this, Ruth enters in
the conversation and boldly enough, answers the question with certain obscene references.

Conversation

RUTH: … I was born quite near here.
  
  *Pause.*
  Then … six years ago, I went to America.
  
  *Pause.*
  It’s all rock. And sand. It stretches … so far … everywhere you look. And there’s lots of insects there.
  
  *Pause.*
  And there’s lots of insects there.
  
  *Silence.*
  *She is still.*
  
  MAX stands.

MAX: Well, it’s time to go to the gym. Time for your workout, Joey.

(HC, 53)

Implicature Analysis

Teddy, Lenny and Joey are taken aback by Ruth’s answer. They could not utter a single world, therefore, remain silent. Teddy becomes so restless that he stands to his feet without saying anything. Ruth says ‘I was born quite near here’. This utterance seems to violate the maxim of relation for she is providing information which doesn’t seem to suit the topic of their conversation. She was not asked by anyone about her birthplace but she speaks about it. They are discussing some philosophical problem, therefore, it is irrelevant for Ruth to speak about her birthplace, which has nothing to do with the ongoing topic of conversation. However, it is necessary to investigate the reasons behind this violation to treat the utterance as cooperative. The utterance can be interpreted as implicating that Ruth wants to give certain hints about her background. As all of them are shocked due to her way of speaking, she seems to intend that they should be made aware of the surrounding and the background where she was born. The ‘Pause’ between the two utterances indicates that there are certain things about Ruth’s birth and childhood up to six years ago, which are not to be revealed at this moment. When she says ‘Then … six years ago, I went to America’ she skips out a vast period of time that ranges from her childhood to her youth and up to six years ago. She wants to suggest that she has spent a lot of time in that area before she went to America. Then speaking about her life in America, she comments ‘It’s all rock. And sand’. Here, she flouts the maxim of quality
by using metaphorical expression. She compares life in America with rock and sand which implicates that she is not happy there. The rock and sand symbolizes hardships as well as tedious life, therefore, Ruth wants to suggest that she doesn’t like to stay in America. She says ‘And there’s lots of insects there’ and she repeats the same utterance after a pause. In this utterance, if the word ‘insects’ is taken to represent people in America, Ruth flouts the maxim of quality by comparing people with insects, as there cannot be any comparison between the two. However, if it is interpreted as a metaphor, it seems to implicate her hatred towards people in America. She might have found contemptuous and mean people in America. In other words, she wants to express her dislike of American life. After she finishes her dialogue, there is a ‘Silence’ which implicates their want of proper expressions to continue the conversation. They seem to be shocked to witness various shades of Ruth’s personality and her outspoken behavior. The silence further can be taken to implicate Ruth’s dominance at the moment. She seems to be victorious as others don’t have anything either to approve or disapprove about her thoughts. They choose to be silent as they are defeated and she remains ‘still’ as if she is a victorious queen. After a while, Max says ‘Well, it’s time to go to gym. Time for your workout, Joey.’ This utterance seems to be irrelevant as it is not connected to the ongoing situation, therefore, violates the maxim of relation. However, it can be interpreted to implicate Max’s attempt to reduce the tension created by Ruth’s comments. Therefore, in order to break the silence, Max speaks about Joey’s routine and reminds him of his workout at gym. Moreover, it can be taken to implicate that Max doesn’t want Joey to be there at that moment, therefore, he indirectly asks him to leave by reminding him of his schedule.

**Concluding Remarks**

Ruth talks about her birth in order to suggest them that she used to stay in the same area in her childhood. Then she talks about her shifting to America before six years, however, she avoids talking about what she was doing before she left. As she skips to talk about the period from her birth up to her migration, there must be something which she doesn’t want to disclose. The way she talks about life in America, it becomes clear that she is not happy there. The ‘silence’ after her speech conveys that all of them are dumbfounded at her revelation so that they could not utter a word. Therefore, Max breaks the silence by reminding Joey of his schedule.
5.4.8 Conversation Eight

This is a piece of conversation in which Lenny is irritated to notice that someone has stolen his cheese-roll. As he comes to know that it is Teddy who has eaten the roll, he rebukes him.

**Contextual Environment**

As Teddy and Ruth are about to leave, Lenny requests her for a dance. Lenny kisses and Joey embraces her while Teddy and Max stand watching them. Looking at the cases, Max thinks that Teddy is leaving and asks him to inform beforehand whether he is married or not next time. He praises Ruth as a beautiful woman and a mother. Ruth asks something to eat and drink, therefore Lenny serves her drinks. Ruth wonders whether the family has read any of Teddy’s critical works. When Max denies reading a single of his works, Teddy says that they would not understand his works. In the evening, Sam reveals that Teddy was his favorite of all the boys and informs him about his feelings when he received a letter from Teddy. Sam further informs Teddy that he was his mother’s favorite son and requests him to stay there for a couple of weeks more.

**Conversation**

LENNY: Still here, Ted? You’ll be late for your first seminar.

*He goes to the sideboard, opens it, and peers in it, to the right and the left, stands.*

Where’s my cheese-roll?

*Pause.*

Someone’s taken my cheese-roll. I left it there. *(To SAM)* You been thieving?

TEDDY: I took your cheese-roll, Lenny.

*Silence.*

SAM looks at them, picks up his hat and goes out of the front door.

*Silence.*

LENNY: You took my cheese-roll?

TEDDY: Yes.

LENNY: I made that roll myself. I cut it and put the butter on. I sliced a piece of cheese and put it in between. I put it on a plate and I put it in the sideboard. I did all that before I went out. Now I come back and you’ve eaten it.

TEDDY: Well, what are you going to do about it?

LENNY: I’m waiting for you to apologize.

TEDDY: But I took it deliberately, Lenny.

*(HC, 63)*
Implicature Analysis

At the time when Sam requests Teddy to extend his stay there, Lenny arrives into the room. He is surprised to see that Teddy has not yet left for America yet. Therefore, he says ‘You’ll be late for your first seminar’. With this utterance, Lenny seems to implicate that if Teddy would not leave for America on that day, he will be late for his first seminar in the university. He wants to suggest that if Teddy makes late to leave for America, it will not be possible for him to reach there to meet his academic duties. However, it should not be taken simply as a reminder for Teddy but it can be interpreted implicating Lenny’s wish that Teddy should leave now. He seems to be interested more in Teddy’s departure only. Then he searches something in the sideboard and asks about his cheese-roll, which he had left there. He thinks that Sam might have taken it, therefore, accuses him of thieving. However, Teddy interferes and says ‘I took your cheese-roll, Lenny’. Here, by observing the maxim of quality, Teddy seems to implicate that it is not Sam but Teddy himself, who has taken the cheese-roll and he has sufficient evidences to prove it. He accepts it to save Sam from further accusation. The ‘Silence’ after Teddy’s acceptance implicates Lenny’s realization of his mistake. He keeps quiet as he feels ashamed for accusing Uncle Sam of thieving, without any evidence. Sam’s exit at this very moment suggests a lot. As he gets insulted without being guilty, he leaves the room in disappointment. Moreover, being aware of Lenny’s ill-tempered nature, he might have sensed a possible quarrel between Lenny and Teddy. Therefore, to keep himself aloof from further complications, he prefers to leave the room. The ‘Silence’ after Sam’s exit can be taken to implicate Lenny’s suppressed anger towards Teddy. As Teddy accepts that he has taken the cheese-roll, Lenny says ‘I made that roll myself. I cut it … … And you’ve eaten it’. Here, Lenny violates the maxim of quantity by giving more information about the cheese-roll. However, if is assumed that Lenny is being cooperative by providing the details, it can be interpreted as implicating the efforts taken by Lenny to prepare the cheese-roll. Lenny wants to suggest that he worked hard to prepare that roll; therefore, it was his right to eat the roll. Teddy should have thought a little before he ate the roll. He feels very sad as he could not eat the roll which he had prepared following the best recipe. Teddy realizes his feelings and asks him about what can be done to make it up. Therefore, Lenny says ‘I’m waiting for you to apologize’ suggesting him that he should say sorry for his mistake. Instead of apologizing, Teddy replies ‘But I took it deliberately, Lenny’. Here, Teddy violates the maxim of relation by not begging his
pardon. However, if Teddy's utterance is taken to be cooperative, it seems to implicate that he doesn’t feel his action worth apologizing. He wants to suggest that he would have said sorry, had he taken cheese-roll by mistake. However, he did not take it by mistake but he took it deliberately. Therefore, it is a deliberate action which doesn’t ask for apology. Moreover, the utterance can be further interpreted as implicating Teddy's assumption that being a brother, who has returned home after a long time; Lenny would not mind his taking a cheese-roll without prior permission. Therefore, he took the roll prepared by his younger brother. However, Lenny is adamant enough to ask Teddy to express apology for it.

**Concluding Remarks**

This interaction reveals Lenny’s mean and quarrelsome nature, who doesn’t hesitate to accuse his uncle of thieving. Moreover, he could not bear that his brother, who has come back after six years, has taken his cheese-roll. He becomes so narrow minded that he asks Teddy to apologize for taking it without his permission. He tries to suggest Teddy that he had prepared that roll with efforts, therefore, it was his right to eat. Teddy refuses to apologize on the ground that he didn’t take it by mistake. He tries to suggest Lenny that it is not an offence as he is Lenny’s brother as well as guest.

**5.4.9 Conversation Nine**

This is an exchange between Lenny and Joey after Joey comes downstage spending two hours with Ruth. Lenny could not believe that Joey couldn’t get all the way.

**Contextual Environment**

Teddy tries to convince Lenny that he took the cheese-roll deliberately because he was hungry. He thought that Lenny would not mind it; however, Lenny thinks it to be Teddy’s barefaced audacity. He goes on talking about his superficial opinions regarding Teddy. He calls Teddy as a great source of pride because he has set an example. Therefore, he expects a bit of grace and generosity of mind from Teddy. But he thinks that Teddy failed to fulfill his expectations. When Lenny expresses his feeling of disappointment towards Teddy, Joey comes down the stairs and enters the room with a newspaper in his hand.

**Conversation**

LENNY (to JOEY): How’d you get on?
JOEY: Er … not bad.
LENNY: What do you mean?
Pause.
What do you mean?
JOEY: Not bad.
LENNY: I want to know what you mean - by not bad.
JOEY: What’s it got to do with you?
LENNY: Joey, you tell your brother everything.
Pause.
JOEY: I didn’t get all the way.
LENNY: You didn’t get all the way?
Pause.
(With emphasis.) You didn’t get all the way?
But you’ve had her up there for two hours.

(HC, 65-66)

Implicature Analysis

Lenny is curious to know whatever happened upstairs with Joey, therefore, asks ‘How’d you get on?’ and Joey replies ‘Er … not bad’. Joey here seems to violate the maxim of quantity by providing less amount of information than expected. He seems to be uncooperative giving curt reply. However, if it is assumed that Joey is trying to be cooperative with his short reply, it can be taken to implicate that whatever happened there upstairs is not very significant or worth telling Lenny. It further implicates that Joey is upset due to some unexpected things which might have happened upstairs. Therefore, he seems to suggest, contrary to his experience, that nothing worth mentioning has happened. Lenny gets confused as he could not understand what Joey wants to convey. Though Joey says that everything is alright, Lenny notices that it is not so, therefore, he asks ‘I want to know what you mean - by not bad?’ Joey’s reply ‘What’s it got do with you?’ seems to violate the maxim of relation by not giving relevant information. In fact, he is expected to explain whatever he wants to convey, so that Lenny will understand it. This violation can be interpreted as implicating that Joey doesn’t want to tell anything to Lenny as he thinks that it is none of his concern. Joey doesn’t find any reason so that he will explain anything to Lenny. It further can be taken to implicate that whatever happened upstairs might be humiliating for Joey. Therefore, he doesn’t want to reveal it in order to save himself from being an object of mockery. But Lenny is very eager to know what Joey means; therefore, he asks ‘Joey, you tell your brother everything’. Lenny here seems to implicate that as he is Joey’s brother, it is necessary for him to know everything about him. He tries to assure Joey that they are brothers; therefore, he has got right to know everything about his brother. In other words, Lenny makes as emotional
appeal by referring to their relation, so that Joey would feel comfortable. Lenny indirectly suggests him that it is nothing humiliating to tell anything personal to a person so close in relation with him. Lenny’s appeal works and Joey tries to explain him saying ‘I didn’t get all the way’. Here, Joey seems to violate the maxim of manner by being vague. However, through this violation he wants to suggest that he could not become successful in whatever he was supposed to do upstairs. He doesn’t tell it clearly as he must be ashamed of it. Lenny seems to be surprised at this revelation. He could not believe that Joey didn’t get all the way; therefore, he repeats the same utterance with emphasis while asking ‘You didn’t get all the way?’ Moreover, Lenny’s next utterance ‘But you’ve had her up there for two hours’ implicates that Joey should have made love with Ruth as they were together for two hours. He seems incredible as he thinks that two hours is a time more than sufficient for a love-play. He is shocked to hear that Joey could not get all the way.

Concluding Remarks
Joey seems annoyed as well as ashamed of the fact that he could not have sex with Ruth, though they were together for a long time. Therefore he doesn’t want to talk anything about it. But Lenny is curious to know the details and makes an emotional appeal to Joey that he should tell him everything as they are brothers. As Joey tells him about his failure to have sex, he can’t believe him. He is of the opinion that Joey should have got all the way as they were together for such a long time.

5.4.10 Conversation Ten
In this extract, though Teddy is eager to take Ruth back to children, Max proposes to keep her. Teddy tries to convince Max that Ruth should go back but Max insists in her stay with the family.

Contextual Environment
Lenny comes to a conclusion that Ruth is a tease, and it is for this reason that Joey could not have sex with her. However, Teddy refuses it saying that it is Joey who hasn’t got the right touch. At this, Lenny and Joey narrate an incident when they seduced girls. Lenny claims that Joey has got more experience even than Teddy. Max expresses sympathy to hear about Joey and asks him to calm down. He assures Joey that he is not at fault. Max further thinks that it is good to have a woman in the house, therefore, he is of the opinion that they should keep Ruth.
Conversation

TEDDY: I’m afraid not, Dad. She’s not well, and we’ve got to get home to the children.
MAX: Not well? I told you, I’m used to looking after people who are not so well. Don’t worry about that. Perhaps we’ll keep her here.

Pause.

SAM: Don’t be silly.
MAX: What’s silly?
SAM: You’re talking rubbish.
MAX: Me?
SAM: She’s got three children.
MAX: She can have more! Here, if she’s so keen.
TEDDY: She doesn’t want any more.
MAX: What do you know about what she wants, eh, Ted?

TEDDY (smiling): The best thing for her is to come home with me, Dad. Really. We’re married, you know.

(HC, 69-70)

Implicature Analysis

Max proposes to keep Ruth and wants to know if she is ready to stay with them. However, Teddy takes objection to Max’s proposal saying ‘She’s not well, and we’ve got to get home to the children’. Here Teddy violates the maxim of quality by giving false information about Ruth’s health. Though she does not show symptoms of any illness, Teddy informs Max that she is not well. However, it can be taken to implicate Teddy’s belief that Max will not keep her to know that she is sick. Moreover, she has got children in America, who must be waiting for their mother. If she stays with the family, her children will be deprived of their mother. Teddy further implicates that her home is there in America; therefore, she should not stay with Max and family. However, Max is not convinced as he says ‘I’m used to looking after people who are not so well’. With this utterance, Max seems to implicate that Teddy should not worry about Ruth as he is there to take care of her. He is experienced in looking after people who are not well. Thus, he assures Teddy about her wellbeing. Further, he expresses his wish to keep her in the family. However, Sam seems to have contrary opinion as he says ‘Don’t be silly’. Here, Sam wants to suggest that Max’s idea of keeping Ruth is not wisely, therefore, he asks him to stop all these nonsense ideas. Though Max doesn’t think it so, Sam asks him to stop talking rubbish. Max’s utterance ‘Me?’ can be taken to implicate his belief that it is not he, but Sam, who is talking rubbish. Sam further tries to convince him by reminding that ‘She’s got three children’. Here, Sam seems to violate the maxim of quantity as he
gives unwanted information about Ruth. Max didn’t ask him about Ruth’s children; therefore, he was not supposed to inform him about them. However, if Sam’s utterance is taken to be cooperative, it can be interpreted meaningfully. By reminding Max of Ruth’s children, Sam here wants to suggest that they should not keep her, as she has got some responsibilities regarding her children. He thinks about Ruth’s children and suggests that her children must need her more than Max and family. However, Max misinterprets Sam’s utterance and proposes that she can have even more children here, if she wants to have. Therefore, Teddy retorts ‘She doesn’t want any more’. Here, Teddy violates the maxim of quality as he doesn’t have sufficient evidence to prove that Ruth doesn’t want more children. However, this violation can be taken to implicate his determination that they should not keep Ruth. Therefore, Max asks him ‘What do you know about what she wants, eh, Ted?’ and Teddy answers ‘The best thing for her is to come home with me, Dad. Really. We’re married, you know’. In this reply, Teddy violates the maxim of quantity by providing more information. He claims to know what is best for Ruth. As per his opinion, Ruth should go back to America. Though Max didn’t ask, he informs him ‘We’re married’. Through this violation, Teddy seems to implicate that Ruth should stay with him and not with the family. By reminding Max that he is married with Ruth, he wants to convey his lawful right to stay with her.

**Concluding Remarks**

Teddy here tries to register his humble resistance to Max’s proposal. He suggests Max that Ruth is not too healthy to keep for the family. Sam also doesn’t approve of the idea and tries to suggest that her children need her more than anyone else. However, Max seems to have made his mind to keep her, therefore, tries to outwit Teddy and Sam. Teddy suggests him that she is his wife and Max shouldn’t spoil his family.

**5.4.11 Conversation Eleven**

This is an extract in which Ruth talks about her terms and conditions which Lenny should fulfill if he wants her to stay with them. Lenny assures her that all her conditions will be satisfied.

**Contextual Environment**

Max realizes that Ruth should be provided with a little allowance as pocket money. Therefore, they decide to donate certain amount willingly. However, Lenny suggests that they need not bear any extra expense as she can earn money herself. He proposes to take
her to the Greek Street for four hours a night, where she could earn money as a prostitute. Max accepts the proposal; however, Joey is not happy to share Ruth with others. Lenny assures Joey that her clients will be very distinguished persons. He even requests Teddy to help them by distributing the business cards in America as their representative. Ruth is happy to hear that the family wants her to stay for some more days. Teddy tells her that she has to earn some money for herself as Max cannot afford to keep her. Lenny informs her that she will have to spent four hours every right in a flat to earn her living. Ruth demands that she would need a flat with three rooms and a bathroom as well as a personal maid.

**Conversation**

RUTH: I’d need an awful lot. Otherwise, I wouldn’t be content.
LENNY: You would have everything.
RUTH: I would naturally want to draw up an inventory of everything I would need, which would require your signatures in the presence of witnesses.
LENNY: Naturally.
RUTH: All aspects of the agreement and conditions of employment would have to be clarified to our mutual satisfaction before we finalized the contract.
LENNY: Of course.

*Pause.*

RUTH: Well, it might prove a workable arrangement.
LENNY: I think so.
MAX: And you’d have the whole of your daytime free, of course. You could do a bit of cooking here if you wanted to.
LENNY: Make the beds.
MAX: Scrub the place out a bit.
TEDDY: Keep everyone company.

(HC, 77-78)

**Implicature Analysis**

Lenny accepts her conditions and promises her to supply everything she would need. Ruth declares that she needs a lot of things and says ‘Otherwise I wouldn’t be content’. This utterance can be taken to implicate that if her needs are not fulfilled, she would not stay there. In other words, if they want her to be satisfied with them, they should take care that her needs are fulfilled. The utterance can be further interpreted as a warning to Lenny that Ruth will leave them if they neglect her demands. Lenny assures her that she would get everything. Ruth seems to violate the maxim of manner when she says ‘I would naturally want … … in the presence of witnesses’ and ‘All aspects of the agreement …
… finalized the contract.’ However, such violation can be taken as cooperative in certain situations in which it doesn’t seem arbitrary. In these two utterances, Ruth deliberately refers to all the details of signing an agreement which implicates that every detail and provision in the agreement is very much important for her. She doesn’t want to miss a single point; otherwise, it may create certain difficulties for her in future. Therefore, she wants to be more careful by taking into account all the minute details while finalizing contract with Lenny. She might be thinking that if they try to deceive her in future, she should have sufficient legal documents with her. She uses legal vocabulary such as ‘witnesses, conditions of employment, mutual satisfaction’ etc. It implicates her knowledge of the legal procedure which she seems to be familiar with. She wants to make Lenny aware that he should not take her lightly as she knows the procedure. On the other hand, Lenny’s responses to Ruth are noteworthy. His utterances ‘Naturally’ and ‘Of course’ project him as a helpless observer, who can’t help accepting Ruth’s conditions. He seems thunderstruck to come across Ruth’s knowledge of legal matters. ‘Pause’ after Lenny’s acceptance implicates his defeated state while Ruth stands victorious and dominant by forcing Lenny to accept her plan. Ruth’s utterance ‘Well, it might prove a workable arrangement’ implicates that it must not prove to be a workable arrangement. In other words, she is not sure about the workability of the arrangement. She can be taken to suggest that there may be certain changes in the arrangement in future. When Max says ‘And you’d have the whole of your daytime free’ he seems to suggest Ruth that she can utilize her leisure as she likes. On the contrary, they seem to suggest her that there are various tasks in the house which she could carry out, when they say ‘You could do a bit of cooking here if you wanted to, Make the beds, Scrub the place out a bit.’ Here, Max and Lenny seem to violate the maxim of manner by being prolix as they should have told her that she could do domestic work in the daytime. However, these utterances can be interpreted as implicating their suggestion that Ruth won’t have to work hard there in the house. They wants to suggest Ruth that the tasks such as cooking, making beds and keeping the place clean are the only things which she can do if she wishes. Moreover, they want to bring it to Ruth’s notice that these tasks are very simple. However, Teddy’s utterance ‘Keep everyone company’ seems to implicate a different kind of task. He wants to suggest Ruth that she has to accompany every member of the family. This utterance can be further interpreted as implicating that Ruth is supposed to fulfill the physical needs of all the family members.
Concluding Remarks
The passage reveals Ruth as a shrewd and an experienced professional. As she exhibits her knowledge of legal process, it becomes obvious that she is not new in the profession. She gives due significance to all the details of the agreement so that her future will be secured. Max tries to suggest her that she won’t have to work too hard. The only important thing she is supposed to do is that, as Teddy suggests her, she will have to satisfy their appetite.

5.4.12 Conversation Twelve
This extract depicts the final event in the play, where Max is doubtful whether Ruth will be suitable as a keep. He is afraid that she will deceive them.

Contextual Environment
Sam collapses saying that Jessie and MacGregor were together in the back of his car. Max thinks that he is dead; however, Joey declares that he is still alive. Therefore, Max regrets that he should have died as he has a diseased imagination. Ruth accepts the proposal and Teddy alone is about to leave for America. He regrets that Sam could not drop him to the airport. Max guides him by suggesting various routes to reach the airport. He gives his photograph to Teddy asking him to show it to his grandsons. Max seems restless as he has certain doubts in his mind regarding Ruth.

Conversation
MAX: … What … what … what … we’re getting at? What … we’ve got in mind? Do you think she’s got it clear?
  
  Pause.
  I don’t think she’s got it clear.
  
  Pause.
  You understand what I mean? Listen, I’ve got a funny idea she’ll do the dirty on us, you want to bet? She’ll use us, she’ll make use of us, I can tell you! I can smell it! You want to bet?
  
  Pause.
  She won’t … be adaptable!
  
  He begins to groan, clutches his stick, fall on to his knees by the side of her chair. His body sags. The groaning stops. His body straightens. He looks at her, still kneeling.
  I’m not an old man.
  
  Pause.
  Do you hear me?
He raises his face to her.
Kiss me.

(HC, 81)

Implicature Analysis

Max asks Ruth whether she thinks that he is too old for her. He makes it clear that she has to work in the house. He becomes more doubtful when Ruth doesn’t answer him. Therefore, he says ‘What … what … what … we’re getting at? What … we’ve got in mind?’ Here, Max violates the maxim of manner by being vague. However, these utterances can be taken to implicate Max’s confused state of mind. As he is excited due to Ruth’s negligence towards him, he is doubtful whether his wish will be fulfilled or not. He is not sure about the success of his plan. In fact, it was Max, who proposed to keep Ruth, but now he is afraid of her negligence. He thinks that she will spoil his plan. When he says ‘I don’t think she has got it clear’ he implicates that he is not sure whether Ruth has understood their plan. Moreover, when he says ‘You understand what I mean?’ he hedges the maxim of manner which implicates that Max is unable to overcome the obscurity while he wants to express his doubts. It further implicates that Max is trying his best to make all of them aware that they should be careful about Ruth. He tries to make them alert by saying ‘She’ll make use of us’. This utterance implicates Max’s fear that Ruth will deceive them after she gets established. He wants to suggest that once she got experience as well as money, she will no more entertain them. She will leave the family as soon as she realized that she doesn’t need their support anymore. Max further thinks that ‘She won’t … be adaptable!’ Here, Max seems to refer to her teasing when Joey was with her. He tries to suggest that Ruth is not suitable to be a prostitute as she has got a habit of teasing. If she doesn’t get rid this habit, it will spoil their plan of earning money by putting her in the profession. Then suddenly, Max says ‘I’m not an old man’. He seems to violate the maxim of relation as this utterance doesn’t seem relevant to the ongoing topic. He changes to topic abruptly which makes it irrelevant. However, if it is assumed that Max is being cooperative, the utterance can be interpreted as relevant. It can be assumed to implicate Max’s fear that Ruth may neglect him on the account of his age. He wants to suggest Ruth that he is not impotent, therefore, she should not neglect him. In addition, this utterance violates the maxim of quality as Max denies being an old man. In fact, he is an old man as it is obvious from his groaning and sagging. However, he tries to deny this fact in order to suggest Ruth that he is able to have sex with her. He rises to
Ruth and says ‘Kiss me’ which can be taken to implicate his urge that she must accept that he is not too old. He wants to prove his potentiality by asking Ruth to kiss him.

**Concluding Remarks**

This passage projects Max as an old man who is afraid that he will be neglected by Ruth on the basis of his age. He is doubtful about her faithfulness towards them, therefore, he warns them to be careful. He is disturbed due to Ruth’s indifference towards him. He is afraid that he will be deprived of the things which he longs for, as Ruth is giving more importance to Lenny and Joey. Therefore, he urges Ruth to kiss him which implicates that he wants to bring it to Ruth’s notice that she should not neglect him. However, she neglects his appeal and goes on caressing Joey, the youngest member in the family, which implicates her reply to Max.

**5.5 CONCLUSION**

To sum up, the present chapter meets the aim of analyzing the selected plays by applying the concept of conversational implicature. The selected conversational extracts have been analyzed with reference to observation, violation, flouting and various types of nonfulfillment of the maxims of the CP. While analyzing the pieces of conversation, due attention is paid to the types and properties of conversational implicature as well as various related concepts in pragmatics. A sincere attempt has been made to bridge the gap between what is said and what is implicated by the characters in the selected plays.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

6.0 PRELIMINARIES

The central objective of the present research activity is to investigate presupposition and conversational implicature in Harold Pinter’s selected plays within the frameworks developed in Chapter II and III. For this purpose, various potential conversational passages were selected from the plays and analyzed and interpreted on the basis of the theoretical frameworks. An attempt has been made to bring to the fore certain pragmatic observations and experiments with regard to the conversation in absurd plays. One of the basic purposes behind the analysis was to make explicit various aspects of presupposition and conversational implicature and to explore different layers of meaning by applying these pragmatic notions to Pinter’s selected plays. The present research activity investigated the utterances for deeper study into the pragmatic ‘unsaid’ and the ‘whatness’ lying at the bottom of conversation in the selected plays. Though the present research activity offers a personal interpretation of Pinteresque plays, it is not a literary approach. Here, literature has been taken merely as a background against which the pragmatic analysis has been accomplished.

6.1 OBSERVATIONS

The present research activity emphasizes the fact that the words alone do not mean but the participants who use them in certain contexts make them significant and alive. It lays stress on another fact that what can be communicated always exceeds the communicative power provided by the conventions of the language and its use. It makes obvious how language can turn out to be a dominant means to designate the intentions of the characters in Pinter’s plays. The pragmatic analysis reveals how the characters fight back for supremacy, how they struggle for compliance in society, lack of communication and incongruity in their private affairs. The present study offers a factual understanding of how language is infiltrated by Pinter to highlight absurd human life. It focuses on the fact that the characters use everyday language in order to tackle their situations and dictate each other. As Pinter points out:

Language is a highly ambiguous business. So often, below the word spoken, is the thing known and unspoken

(Pinter, 1962; as cited in Travers, 2001:322)
In other words, the conversation in Pinter’s plays is open for various distinct interpretations. Therefore, the present study emphasizes on providing a broader understanding of Pinteresque plays.

The following observations have been derived from the analysis of conversational passages (Chapters IV and V) from the selected plays in the light of the theoretical frameworks of presupposition and conversational implicature:

6.1.1 Presupposition

It has been observed that presupposition is an influential pragmatic concept which facilitates the way to arrive at exact meanings conveyed through the seeming absurd conversational activities. As it has been pointed out, presupposition performs a major role in understanding how context and background determine proper interpretation of utterances. The interactions among characters in the selected plays have been analyzed pragmatically taking into consideration the prior conditions which must be fulfilled so as to render the conversation meaningful. Following are the foremost observations derived out of the application of presupposition to the selected conversational passages from the three selected plays:

1. It has been observed that Meg’s presuppositions reflect her pleasure and excitement at the thought of having customers but Petey’s presuppositions reveal that he is not as pleased as Meg, in conversation 4.3.2. Further, the information regarding possible customers shared by Petey is cancelled by the plug ‘said’ as he is not sure whether they will come or not. On the other hand, when Meg talks about her boarding house, she uses a hole ‘heard’ which strongly preserves the information presupposed by her. As it has been pointed out, cumulative hypothesis works without exception for such verbs, therefore, the presuppositions in Meg’s utterances remain unchanged in the complex sentence as well.

2. The presuppositions shared by Meg in conversation 4.3.3 depict her affection as well as motherly care for Stanley. At the outset, though she seems to tease Stanley, she has already spared breakfast for him. This fact focuses on her peculiar relation with Stanley which is beyond a customer-lodger relation. As it has been mentioned earlier, presuppositions evaporate in certain circumstances where contrary assumptions are made. In other words, presuppositions can be cancelled by certain additional
premises. Though Meg’s utterance presupposes that Stanley slept last night, this presupposition is cancelled as he declares that he didn’t sleep at all.

3. The information about the expected visitors presupposed by Stanley in conversation 4.3.5 shows his restlessness at the thought of insecurity due to possible displacement. He seems to be haunted by the thought that the expected visitors might be after him and they might create problems in his secluded and peaceful life.

4. Stanley presupposes various facts regarding his concert which was spoiled in conversation 4.3.7. He believes that there were some conspirators who spoiled his concert intentionally as they didn’t want Stanley to be successful. Meg tries to convince him to earn money without leaving the house once again, as she presupposes that he had been away before also.

5. The amount of information presupposed by the characters in conversation seems to reveal their personalities and its effects on their relations. In conversation 4.3.9, the information shared by both Goldberg and McCann, throws light on their peculiar nature distinct from each other. It is revealed that McCann is not certain about his job but Goldberg is full of confidence and firm on his convictions. The presuppositions carried by them focus on the fact that McCann is confused but Goldberg knows the plan and acts accordingly.

6. Stanley tries to convince McCann that he is staying unwillingly in Meg’s house. In conversation 4.3.12, as he talks about his quiet and prosperous past, he seems to cancel his own presuppositions. It reveals that he is misleading McCann so that he and Goldberg should leave the house. He talks about a business; however, he doesn’t seem to have any.

7. In conversational analysis, presupposition has been treated as a condition for an utterance to have a truth value. In other words, an utterance with unfulfilled presupposition doesn’t have a truth value. This phenomenon has been observed in conversation 4.3.12, as Goldberg and McCann presuppose a large amount of information while they interrogate Stanley. However, they seem to ask questions to Stanley only to confuse him as their questions are self-contradictory. Therefore, presuppositions triggered by them are cancelled as sincerity of these questions can be challenged.
8. Meg shares a lot of information with Petey, in conversation 4.3.16, while talking about Stanley which seems to be the outcome of her angst towards him. She uses the plug ‘said’ which suggests that she doesn’t believe whatever she came to know. She thinks that Stanley and McCann might be friends though she doesn’t really seem to believe it.

9. Goldberg talks about the special treatment that Stanley needs. He presupposes, using a counterfactual conditional in conversation 4.3.17, that there is nobody who can take care of Stanley, so as to convince Petey that it is necessary to take him away. He wants to suggest Petey that they should take him to an expert as he cannot get proper treatment in the house.

10. Meg presupposes various things about Stanley while she talks about him in conversation 4.3.20. However, the presuppositions regarding Stanley’s whereabouts are cancelled as they are based on her guess and Petey also conceals the truth from her. Though he tells her that Stanley is still asleep, the fact is different and Petey doesn’t want to reveal it to Meg.

11. The information shared by Davies projects him as an eccentric type of person. In conversation 4.4.1, he presupposes that he left his wife for a reason worth neglecting. He further talks about his youthful days and regrets that now he has become old. It seems that, due to his old age and health, he has got inferiority complex. He feels insulted to do inferior jobs such as taking out rubbish. The presuppositions in this conversation throw light on Davies' character as a person who finds excuses to avoid responsibilities.

12. The counterfactual conditional depicts Davies' helplessness at the thought that he is an old man in conversation 4.4.2. He presupposes that he has got rights as a human being; therefore, no one should take liberty with him.

13. The information presupposed in conversation 4.4.5 reveals Davies as a hypocrite. Though he regrets that he could not go to Sidcup due to bad weather, he doesn't seem to be sincere. Then, he complains about his shoes in order to gather more reasons to postpone his visit to Sidcup. His hypocrisy is further depicted in conversation 4.4.6 as he presupposes that he didn't talk deliberately to the woman in the cafe. He wants to suggest that he got engaged in casual interaction coincidently implicating that he was not interested. He wants to suggest Aston that he is such a type of person whom
women prefer to propose. However, he is balanced enough to reject such odd proposals. By narrating this event, he seems to presuppose that he used to spend normal life, away from such temptations.

14. By presupposing that the bed in which Davies slept belongs to his mother in conversation 4.4.8, Mick wants to suggest that Davies shouldn't have slept in that bed. They started to argue as both of them interpret each other wrongly. Mick accuses him for abusing his dead mother. Though Davies presupposes that he has got a lot of respect for others, Mick is hard to believe and presupposes that Davies is a liar.

15. Aston shares various details with Davies, in conversation 4.4.10, such as fitting a bell and the queries by expected visitors, while explaining his plan. However, Davies seems afraid of someone; therefore, he is reluctant to accept the proposal. The information presupposed by Davies is cancellable as it is based on his guess; therefore, it lacks the truth value.

16. The information presupposed by Aston, in conversation 4.4.12, uncovers his past which has affected his present life to a great extent. When he realized that his talking too much was not normal, he became silent. Due to the hallucinations, he stopped visiting the cafe. This realization proves that now Aston is leading his life as a normal human being.

17. The common ground on which Davies' utterances are based carries certain presupposed information about Aston's past life in conversation 4.4.13. Davies shrewdly complains about Aston's abnormal behavior so that Mick should take some action against him. He wishes that Mick should be reminded that Aston is a psychic patient who used to suffer from hallucinations. Further, he wants to suggest Mick that Aston is not worth staying in the house. In fact, Davies tries to secure his place in the house replacing Aston, therefore, he points out his abnormalities.

18. In conversation 4.4.14, Davies presupposes that he gets bad dreams and believes that it is Aston who is responsible for it. Aston keeps annoying him throughout the night and as a consequence, Davies suffers from sleeplessness resulting in making noises. However, he confesses that he doesn't make noises deliberately. He tries to outwit Aston by calling him the root cause of their discomfort. But in conversation 4.4.16,
Mick realized that Davies is the core of all the troubles as he presupposes that there wasn't any trouble in the house before his arrival.

19. Though Davies tries to convince Aston that he has come back for his pipe, in conversation 4.4.17, the fact is different. He tries to hide his embarrassment as he came back even after getting expelled. In fact he has come back to Mick to try his luck once again. However, Aston's negligence conveys his decision that he won't entertain Davies any more.

20. Max presupposes a great amount of information about his knowledge of horses in conversation 4.5.2, in order to convince Lenny that he should not challenge him. But Lenny gets fed up due to Max's prattle and tries to annoy him by calling him a bad cook. In fact, Lenny’s purpose behind abusing Max is to overcome his own sense of inferiority. He wants to prove that though Max knows more about horses, he lacks skill as a good cook. Lenny feels triumphant as he underestimates Max.

21. Sam presupposes certain facts about Jessie in conversation 4.5.4. He reminds Max that he used to take care of Jessie in his absence and wants to suggest him that it is Sam whom Max used to trust more than others. By convincing Max that he is different from others, Sam tries to create an atmosphere of trust about him.

22. In conversation 4.5.7, Lenny pretends that he is really pleased to meet Teddy after a long time. Though he seems to express his happiness to Ruth, he didn't show signs of the same happiness when he met Teddy. Therefore, it can be said that Lenny is trying to create soft corner for Ruth's mind.

23. Max presupposes the fact that Lenny was talking to someone in the room. With a non-factive presupposition in conversation 4.5.8, Max realizes that Lenny is telling lies as he was neither thinking aloud nor was he sleepwalking. Max further presupposes that there must be someone whom Lenny is trying to hide in the house. Lenny doesn't want to disclose Teddy and Ruth's presence in the house but Max wants to know whom he was shouting at. Therefore, to get rid of Max's irritating questions, Lenny asks him about the real facts of his birth. He deliberately asks such question that Max gets furious and forgets to ask about Lenny's shouting.

24. Max presupposes various things while talking to Sam in conversation 4.5.9. He thinks that Sam has got feelings of resentment and asks him to give up these feelings. He reminds him of the promise he had given to their bed-ridden father, however, his
treatment to Sam shows that he has not kept his promise. Though he claims that Sam hates him, the fact is that Max himself is full of hatred for Sam.

25. Max presupposes that Teddy has returned after six years. Though Teddy informs him of their lawful relation, he goes on abusing Ruth as he presupposes, in conversation 4.5.10, that Teddy has brought a whore in his house. However, this presupposition doesn't sustain as it is denied by Teddy. While talking about a prostitute in the house, Max calls his own wife as a whore. He gets irritated as he presupposes a fact that neither Lenny nor Joey brought a whore in the house, but Teddy committed this crime.

26. The information presupposed by Max in conversation 4.5.11 reveals his flattery loving nature. As a result of unexpected praise by Ruth, he feels proud and boasts about his cooking in the family gathering. But he regrets Jessie’s death and imagines that she would have been equally delighted to see her grown up sons. He presupposes that his sons know the moral values in life and proudly informs Ruth that their mother taught them everything. In fact, this information doesn't seem authentic as the morality of all the family members, including Jessie, is in doubt. Max here presupposes the things which he has denied previously. Teddy presupposes that children at home must be waiting for them, thinking that Ruth will go back at least for the children. On the contrary, she blames Teddy for not loving the family and tries to blackmail him emotionally. In fact, it is she, who doesn't seem to love the children.

27. Max presupposes that Teddy didn't inform him about his marriage with Ruth as she belongs to the lower class, in conversation 4.5.13. But Max assures him that he doesn't have any objection regarding his marriage with Ruth, rather he is happy. In fact, he is trying to prove himself as a broadminded person who doesn't give importance to such trivial matters.

28. In conversation 4.5.14, by presupposing the fact that Teddy has to attend seminar there in America, Lenny wants to suggest him that he should leave now. Then, Lenny gets furious to know that someone has eaten his cheese-roll. Teddy realizes that Lenny will take some action against him, as he has eaten the cheese-roll. Lenny presupposes that Teddy's act of thieving is worth apologizing, but Teddy has contrary
opinion. He tries to convince Lenny that he would have apologized if he had taken it by mistake. Thus, Teddy wants to suggest that he took the roll intentionally.

29. Max presupposes the fact that Ruth is a prostitute in conversation 4.5.15. Lenny is surprised to hear that Joey couldn't go the whole hog, as he presupposes that two hours is a time more than sufficient for a love play. Max also feels sorry for Joey and presupposes that he might be disappointed. By presupposing the fact that she didn't satisfy Joey, Max thinks that Teddy must be getting the same treatment from her.

30. Ruth presupposes, in conversation 4.5.17, that she won't stay with them if they fall short to keep her satisfied. They want to keep her at any cost; therefore, she decides to make a legal contract. She presupposes that Lenny will sign the contract in front of witnesses. She further presupposes that they will finalize the contract only after they complete the legal process.

Thus, it has been noticed that the occurrences of structural and lexical presuppositions are more frequent than other types of presuppositions.

### 6.1.2 Conversational Implicature

The present study is an attempt to establish the concept of conversational implicature as a significant theory of language use in context, especially, in Pinteresque plays. It discusses in detail conversational implicature as a special kind of pragmatic inference. It studied the concept with its historical background, with special reference to the theory of implicature proposed by Grice. It reviewed the significant contributions of various linguists and philosophers who placed it as one of the noteworthy aspects in discourse analysis as well as in the analysis of day to day language use. Following are the observations derived out of the application of conversational implicature to the conversation in selected plays:

1. Conversation between characters in the plays implicates absurdity in their relationships. In conversation 5.3.1, Meg and Petey seem to realize that their conversation doesn’t have any purpose. While answering Meg's questions, Petey seem least interested in providing detailed information. His replies implicate his indifference. In fact, the conversation depicts the couple as least involved in each other.

2. The characters in Pinter’s plays are introverted in their personal life. As a result, they lack rapport and are vanished in their own bizarre world. In conversation 5.3.2, Petey and Stanley talk about weather outside. This casual conversation between them
implicates more than what it conveys literally. If there is nothing worth talking about, people usually talk about weather for the sake of conversation. Therefore, Stanley asks Petey about weather so that there should not be silence. Moreover, his curiosity for the weather outside depicts his suppressed wish. In other words, he is afraid of the open life, however, it seems that he longs for it. His interest for outside is revealed when he asks, 'Warm?' and his fear for outside is exposed as he asks, 'Cold?'

3. Projection of the desperate situation of human beings in real world has been depicted in Pinter’s plays. In conversation 5.3.3, there is a vast disparity between what Stanley asks and what he means to know from Meg, while talking about tea. Meg expects that Stanley should praise her as Petey did, but she gets disappointed due to Stanley bitter comments. With the help of metaphor, resulting out of flouting the maxim of quality, Stanley suggests her that the tea has become so thick and cold as if it is gravy. Consequently, she takes it as a challenge to her skill as a good cook. To overcome this feeling of disappointment, she tries to dominate Stanley so as to feel triumphant.

4. Lulu’s warning to Stanley to keep away from the parcel in conversation 5.3.4 implicates that there is something either meant for Stanley or something of his interest. Further, it has been observed the he realizes meaninglessness and boredom in the way he lives; therefore, he tries to project himself as a happy person who goes out for morning walk and is clean and up to date. However, Lulu offers him a compact to suggest that he is boasting about himself.

5. Characters in Pinter’s plays have an unknown fright for outside world and they feel insecure. Consequently, they prefer to live in isolation in their own world away from reality. The conversation 5.3.5 seems to convey that Stanley feels life vibrating within him but he is afraid of its destructive potential. He fears his possible engulfment by Meg's possessive maternity on one hand and Lulu’s sexuality on the other. But his behavior implicates that he has lurking desire for both as he could not leave the house and, at the same time, wishes to go outside.

6. Goldberg describes McCann as life and soul of any party in conversation 5.3.6. Though this comparison is categorically false, it is an instance of metaphor resulting from flouting the maxim of quality. Goldberg here implicates that as life and soul play crucial role in proper functioning of body, McCann is an expert who facilitates
proper arrangement of a party. In other words, Goldberg wants to assure Meg that she should not worry about the party as McCann will shoulder the responsibility.

7. The relationships of the characters in the plays are distorted; therefore, they talk about inappropriate things giving rise to implicatures. In conversation 5.3.7, Stanley abuses Meg with an intention to create imprecise image of Meg in McCann's mind. Stanley wishes that McCann should not believe information given by Meg that it is Stanley's birthday. However, McCann blames him for spreading rumors about her and, by referring to Stanley’s cigarette near a paper; he makes him aware of the possible danger. McCann's utterance implicates that, instead of advising others to be careful, Stanley should be careful about his own safety.

8. Stanley deliberately talks about McCann's honesty, in conversation 5.3.8, to suggest that McCann is different from Goldberg, who is not honest. Stanley praises him for his honesty in order to appeal him and to create soft corner for him in his mind. He tries to convince McCann that he lived his life peacefully without bothering about anything and away from controversies. He praises Ireland and Irish people as he thinks that McCann is an Irishman. His praise implicates that he wants to establish friendly relations with McCann, as he has many Irish friends.

9. Most of the times, the characters seem unaware of each other’s feelings which results in communication gap and raises implicatures. In conversation 5.3.10, Meg avoids telling Petey the reason behind her feeling better, which implicates her realization that her fear was groundless. She regains her vitality at the apprehension that she is out of danger. Moreover, it has been observed from her attitude towards Petey and Stanley that she cares Stanley more than Petey, her husband. She didn't feel guilty for being unable to give breakfast to Petey, but for Stanley, she feels. Further, Goldberg praises her for a nice cup of tea which implicates that he wants to divert her attention from Stanley. He is sure that Meg likes flattery and if she is praised for something, she will forget Stanley.

10. The language used by the characters in Pinter’s plays implicates the intentions they have behind the literal import. In conversation 5.3.11, Goldberg deliberately uses obscure languages to suggest Petey that Stanley’s condition cannot be improved unless he is taken to an expert, that is, away from the house. He uses circumlocution to implicate that Stanley’s condition is critical, so that Petey shouldn’t prevent them
from taking him away. Goldberg wants to prove that he is not responsible for Stanley’s nervous breakdown; therefore, he tries to suggest Petey that it is a result of birthday celebration.

11. Failure to communicate and inability to articulate their feelings leads the characters to absurd situation. The interaction between Goldberg and McCann in conversation 5.3.12 implicates that they have lost the energy and enthusiasm which they reflected at the beginning. McCann is shocked to see Stanley's condition and feels pity for him. He gives vague information about Stanley, from which it cannot be concluded whether Stanley's condition has improved or has become more critical. It implicates McCann’s dejected state of mind. He asks Goldberg to go upstairs because he is so miserable that it is painful for him to talk about Stanley's pitiable condition.

12. The characters seem to compete for supremacy as they struggle to outwit each other through their verbal battle. The conversation between Goldberg and Lulu, in conversation 5.3.13, can be treated as a debate. Goldberg appeals Lulu’s age and health, which implicates his shrewd intention to seduce her once again. However, Lulu has realized his purpose and tries to project herself as a girl who cares for moral values in life. Her utterances implicate her attempts to prove herself as a different type of girl, though she doesn't seem to be.

13. Language has been used as a weapon by the characters in their efforts to fulfill their motifs. It implicates their veiled agenda beyond spoken words. In conversation 5.3.14, Petey's attempts to prevent Goldberg and McCann from taking Stanley away with them implicate that he is worried about him. By informing them that Stanley is his guest, Petey implicates that it is his personal problem and they shouldn't interfere. Goldberg becomes impatient to realize that Petey is trying to create problem for them, therefore, he invites him to join them, implicating that they will give him the same treatment if he comes in their way.

14. Paralinguistic features such as intonation also raise implicatures which convey meaning contrary to what a speaker utters. In conversation 5.4.1, when Davies claims that taking out the bucket of rubbish is not his job, Aston utters 'Uh'. If Aston's reply is interpreted at the level of what is said, it means that he is paying attention to what Davies is talking. However, 'what is meant' by him in saying 'Uh' can vary. If uttered with rising tone, it may be taken to implicate Aston's disagreement. Aston seems to
convey that taking out a bucket is Davies’ job and he should not avoid it. Davies rightly interprets Aston's meaning but points out that the person who gave him orders wasn't his boss. As pointed out earlier, Aston's question 'What was he, a Greek?' and Davies reply 'Not him, he was a Scotch' traces back to Grice’s example 'He is an Englishman; he is, therefore, brave' (1975:44-45). Davies’ utterance implicates that the person was inferior in social status as he was a Scotchman, and not a Greek. In other words, he implicates that Greeks are superior to Scotchmen.

15. Aston doesn't mention directly that he wishes to build a shed in the garden but his utterances, in conversation 5.4.3, implicate the fact. As he mentions that he has to clear the garden first, it conveys his intention. Moreover, Davies' vague comments about Buddha implicate his lack of knowledge about the topic, though he doesn't express it literally.

16. Pauses and silences, most of the times, exhibit that the characters avoid to communicate meaningfully in order to escape from intricate situations. In conversation 5.4.4, Davies falsely accuses the Blacks for making noises which implicates that he is trying to save himself by pointing fingers to others. On the other hand, Aston's meek utterances implicate his helplessness as he couldn't strike out Davies' false claims. The 'pauses' between their turns implicate Davies' want of words to prove himself innocent and Aston's lack of confidence to insist on the fact that it was Davies who was making noises. At the level of ‘what is said’ Aston’s utterance 'Hmmnn' can be taken to implicate the assurance of attentiveness on the part of a hearer. But it may convey certain implied meaning if it is uttered with proper intonation. At the level of ‘what is implicated’ the utterance implicates Aston's belief that he knows who was making noises. Aston knows that Davies is so shrewd that he wants to keep himself on the safer side by turning the limelight to the Blacks. He gives curt reply which implicates that he wants to avoid further arguments with Davies.

17. In Pinter’s plays, characters use language as a means of communication as well as a device to save themselves from getting involved in complications. In conversation 5.4.5, when Davies informs Aston about his plan to visit Wembley, Aston utters 'Un-uh'. The expression 'Un-uh' can be taken to implicate various propositions. If uttered casually, it implicates Aston's lack of interest in the details provided by Davies. On the other hand, if the same expression is uttered with rising intonation, it implicates
Aston's curiosity to know the reasons behind his proposed visit to Wembley. Further, it may be taken as a sign of attentiveness implicating 'Go on, I am listening'. Davies' inability to give precise reply implicates that he is giving false information about his past visit to Wembley.

18. The interaction between Aston and Davies in conversation 5.4.7 contains incomplete and vague utterances which implicates their inability to communicate their thoughts due to lack of proper expressions. It further implicates their excitement and confusion, as they are trying to explain various things at the same time but are unable to do so. In other words, they have a lot to say but they lack proper expressions.

19. Davies’ utterances implicate a lot of information while he talks about references in conversation 5.4.9. The vagueness in his utterances implicates that he must be trying to conceal something from Mick. He seems to find excuses when he talks about bad weather. Though he suggests that he is willing to visit Sidcup, he doesn't show eagerness to go.

20. Davies' intention to remind Mick of Aston's previous psychological condition is revealed in conversation 5.4.10. He complains for trivial matters which implicates that he wants to focus Aston's abnormal behavior. He tries to prove that Aston is careless and psychologically as well as physically weak person, therefore, unfit to look after the house. It implicates Davies' shrewd purpose to take Aston's place in the house.

21. In conversation 5.4.12, though Davies offers his help to Mick in renovation of the house, his offer means more than its conventional meaning. Davies' offer implicates his suggestion that Mick doesn't need Aston's help anymore. He wishes that Mick will expel Aston if he gets someone ready to work for him. Davies reminds Mick that Aston is his brother, implicating that, being his brother, he can talk to Aston about his plan very frankly. Davies here emphasizes the fact that brotherhood is a relation more close than friendship, therefore, Mick should talk to Aston.

22. In conversation 5.4.13, Davies provides false information about Aston which implicates that he wants to provoke Mick against him. However, Mick seems to recognize Davies' shrewdness. When he asks about Aston's reaction to Davies as a caretaker, he conceals the fact. It implicates that Davies deliberately provides false
information because he is afraid that Mick might cancel his offer if he comes to know Aston's opinion.

23. In conversation 5.4.14, Mick comes to a conclusion that Davies is a fraud. Davies once again points his finger towards Aston for misleading Mick. It implicates his intention to remind Mick that Aston is not a normal person; therefore, he might have given him false information about Davies being an interior decorator. As Mick gets enraged due to his falseness, Davies avoids answering him. He doesn't give precise reply which implicates Davies' realization that Mick didn't like his calling Aston as nutty.

24. The helplessness of the characters drags them into absurd condition in conversation 5.4.15; Davies becomes desperate to realize that his intention to take Aston's place in the house has been spoiled. His utterance implicates his humble attempts to ensure his stay there in the house as an assistant. He tries to suggest that he won't cause any trouble in the house. On the other hand, Aston's indifference implicates that he is firm on his decision to expel Davies. Therefore, he suggests him that he doesn't need any help, implicating that Davies should leave the house.

25. Instances of metaphor can be analyzed as implicating more than what they carry through the comparison of two dissimilar objects. Max abuses Sam by comparing him with a grub and a maggot in conversation 5.5.3. Though the comparison seems categorically false, Max suggests something which he couldn't express literally. With the help of metaphor resulting out of flouting the maxim of quality, Max implicates that Sam is as immature and useless as an insect between egg and pupa. Max warns him that he will have to leave the house as soon as he stops earning. But Sam reminds Max that the house was property of their parents which implicates that, not only Max but Sam also is the lawful heir of the house. Sam suggests that he has equal share in the house; therefore, Max couldn't expel him. At this, Max tries to suppress his voice by talking aggressively which implicates Max's intentions that Sam won't argue further if he is treated badly.

26. The interaction between Teddy and Ruth in conversation 5.5.4 reveals a kind of tension in their relation as they don't respect decisions taken by one another. Though Teddy urges her to cancel her decision to go out, she is firm. She assures him that she will come back soon, which implicates her suggestion that she will not leave him
forever. She assures him because she realizes that Teddy has got a sense of insecurity to think that she is going away from him. Moreover, Teddy insists that Ruth shouldn't go out as he wants to go to bed which implicates that his utterances carry sexual connotations.

27. Ruth's brisk replies in conversation 5.5.5 implicate that she is not interested in talking to Lenny. As she suggests him that they live in America, Lenny asks whether Teddy and Ruth stay together. Ruth's reply implicates that they live together as they are married. Lenny's choice of subjects seems meaningful as well as deliberate while asking her whether she visited Italy first and then came to home. It implicates that Ruth might not be willing to visit the home but Teddy brought her forcefully. Lenny wants to emphasize the fact that Ruth is not happy to meet the family.

28. Ruth's hesitation and discontinuity of speech in conversation 5.5.6 implicates that there is some secret about her past which is not worth disclosing publically. Teddy also tries to prevent Ruth from talking about her past which implicates the same facts. His reference to irrelevant details implicates that he wants to change the topic of their conversation by diverting their attention to other things. Moreover, Max points out that Teddy also has three children like him implicating that he tries to create a sense of affinity and closeness between them.

29. Silence in Pinter’s plays can be treated as an indication of incapacity and sense of inferiority on the part of the characters. Ruth's utterances implicate that she is not happy in America. After she talks about her birth in this area and her life in America in conversation 5.5.7, there is 'Silence'. Here, silence implicates that all of them are thunderstruck at her revelation about past life, so that they couldn't understand what to speak. They are shocked to witness various shades of her personality and her outspoken behavior. The silence further can be taken to implicate Ruth's dominance at the moment. She remains still as if a victorious queen and they are defeated therefore; they have chosen to be silent. Finally, Max reminds Joey of his schedule so that the silence should be broken.

30. Lenny is curious to know something from Joey in conversation 5.5.9, but Joey's replies implicate that he is not willing to tell anything. It further implicates that Joey is disturbed due to certain unpleasant incident and doesn't want even to talk about it. Therefore, Lenny reminds him that they are brothers, implicating that Joey shouldn't
conceal anything from him as there is nothing wrong to tell his brother everything. He seems to assure Joey that being a brother, he will definitely help him. However, Lenny is surprised to know that Joey couldn't have sex with Ruth.

31. Characters repeat their own utterances to emphasize what they say. In conversation 5.5.10, Teddy repeats that he is married with Ruth. Teddy informs Max that Ruth is not feeling well, which implicates that Ruth is not a suitable woman to keep. Sam's utterances also implicate that he doesn't like the idea to keep Ruth. By mentioning that she has got children, Sam implicates that she must go back to them. But Max seems firm on his decision and tries to outwit Sam and Teddy. When Teddy informs him that they are married, he wants to suggest Max that they should not keep Ruth because she is Teddy's wife.

32. The conversation 5.5.11 implicates Ruth's reality. Her knowledge of the legal process implicates that she is not new in the profession; rather she must be an experienced professional. She gives significance to every detail in the agreement so that her future will be secured. Max suggests her that she need not work hard in the house and Teddy implicates that she will have to satisfy the physical need of the family members.

33. Max's utterances implicate his fear that Ruth will not entertain him on the account of his age, in conversation 5.5.12. In fact, he is disturbed due to Ruth's negligence towards him. His restlessness implicates his doubt that he will be deprived of the things which he longs for. When he asks Ruth to kiss him, he wants to suggest her that she must not neglect him. However, she keeps fondling Joey which implicates what is going to happen with Max.

34. As it has been observed, most of the times, it is possible to infer more from silence than from words. As it is said, there can be meaningless speech and meaningful silence. Therefore, the present activity underlines the fact that there is a need for words as well as silence in conversation, and silence in Pinter’s plays, as Hollis points out, is actually ‘dramatic representation of silence as a presence’ (1970:17). In the other words, as words can be alluring by their multiple meanings, silence can be equally polysemantic. Therefore, the present activity attempted to make silence visible from a pragmatic perspective and rendered it meaningful due to contextual elements. The instances of silence analyzed in Chapter V reveal that the characters
remain silent when they think that communication is not possible due to certain shocking events.

To sum up with reference to Yule, pragmatics is indeed an appealing field of study as one can grasp the meaning and purposes of people, their assumptions and goals, the actions they participate in while speaking. But at the same time, it is frustrating ‘because it requires us to make sense of people and what they have in mind’ (1996:4). Thus, the present thesis intended, and hopefully managed, to analyze Pinteresque plays with pragmatic approach. Let’s conclude with Pinter’s own words, as cited in Brown (1972:16):

A categorical statement, I find, will never stay where it is and be finite. It will immediately be subject to modification by the other twenty-three possibilities of it. No statement I make, therefore, should be interpreted as final and definitive; they may even be almost final and definitive; but I don’t regard them as such tomorrow and I wouldn’t like you to do so today.

6.3 PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The present researcher is well aware of the fact that a research activity should be handy in the process of teaching and learning. Though a research is based on intangible ideological standards, it has to be useful in classroom activities. As the present research endeavor is mainly concerned with investigation of presupposition and conversational implicature in drama, the theoretical model devised here could facilitate the teaching-learning process, especially in language classes. The pragmatic framework developed in the thesis could be useful in rendering the classroom teaching of drama, especially absurd plays, interesting and interactive. It might prove helpful in unscrambling the obscurity depicted in the events in absurd communicative activities. Pinter makes an intentional use of subtle conversational strategies in character delineation and in describing their complex relationships in social and domestic life. One can get the heart of such multifaceted arrangement of relationships among the characters by investigating presuppositions and conversational implicatures in their day to day conversation. The kind of study undertaken in the present research facilitates comprehension of the thematic as well as structural facets of a play resulting in the better understanding of a work of art.
6.4 FUTURE RESEARCH POSSIBILITIES

Presupposition and conversational implicature are noteworthy concepts in pragmatic analysis of conversation. Such analysis is helpful in bringing out significant insight in the function and nature of communication, may it be everyday conversation or dramatic dialogues. The present research activity has confined itself to the analysis of selected conversational passages from the selected absurd plays in the light of presupposition and conversational implicature. Due to limitations of space, the present study could not analyse each and every dialogue in the selected plays. One can undertake such a comprehensive study in case of other types of plays, everyday conversation, even communicative activities from fiction, which might prove to be extremely worthwhile venture.