

A Pragmatic Study of Selected Short Stories

Asst.Lect. Aya Flayih Hasan Abd-Al Nabi (Corresponded Author) ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ Al-Mustansiriyah University, College of Education, aya.f@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq

Copyright (c) 2026 Asst.Lect. Aya Flayih Hasan Abd-Al Nabi

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31973/bmyg1d55>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Publication Dates

(Received 2025-05-27) (Revised 2025-06-11) (Accepted 2025-06-12) (Published 2026-09-15)

Abstract:

In pragmatic studies, there must be pragmatic tools and strategies used to analyze utterances. This study is based on using conversational implicatures to conduct a pragmatic analysis. Conversational implicature is one of the most important and interesting pragmatic tool that may be produced in conversations. In literary works like short stories, characters speak to each other, communicate, argue, make fun, criticize and even lie to each other. They may convey different information and meanings by their utterances, and conversational implicature is one way to achieve that by saying something and meaning something else. This study aims at identifying and analyzing conversational implicatures produced by the characters of the three selected short stories. This study tries to answer the question: how is conversational implicature as a pragmatic strategy used by the characters of the three selected fictional works?. Grice's cooperative principle is used in this study to explain and analyze conversational implicatures. The characters in these short stories produce utterances just like people in real life. Their utterances could be direct without any implied meanings, and they also could be indirect. The characters may violate one or more of the maxims suggested by Grice in their conversations, accordingly, conversational implicatures are produced. This study identifies the violations of the maxims and analyzes them in terms of what implied meanings are there behind that violation.

Keywords: Implicature, conventional implicature, conversational implicature, cooperative principle, maxim

دراسة تداولية لقصص قصيرة مختارة

م.م. اية فليح حسن عبد النبي (المؤلف المراسل)

الجامعة المستنصرية، كلية التربية

تواريخ المنشور

الإستلام	النسخة النهائية	الموافقة	النشر الإلكتروني
(2025/5/27)	(2025/6/11)	(2025/6/12)	(2026/9/15)

(مُلخَصُ البَحْثِ)

إن اعتماد الأساليب والمفاهيم التداولية هو امر اساسي في جميع الدراسات التداولية من اجل تحليل النصوص والكلام. تقوم هذه الدراسة على اعتماد مفهوم (التضمين الحواري) كنموذج لتحليل النصوص. يعد التضمين الحواري أحد اهم المفاهيم التداولية واكثرها إثارة للاهتمام والتي قد تستعمل في الحوار من قبل المتحدثين. اما فيما يخص القصص القصيرة كنصوص مستعملة للتحليل في هذه الدراسة، فإن هذا النوع من النصوص يتضمن حوار بين الشخصيات، حيث ان الشخصيات يتحدثون مع بعض، يتواصلون، يتجادلون، يمزحون، ينتقدون بعضهم بعضاً، وحتى يقومون بالكذب على بعض. تقوم الشخصيات بإيصال الكثير من المعلومات والمعاني من خلال حواراتهم ويبرز التضمين الحواري كأحد اهم الأساليب للقيام بذلك. حيث يقوم هذا المفهوم على ان يقول المتحدث شيء ما ويعني شيء اخر. إن هذه الدراسة تهدف الى تحديد وتحليل اساليب التضمين الحواري المستعملة من قبل الشخصيات في القصص الثلاث المختارة. تحاول هذه الدراسة الاجابة عن السؤال: كيف يتم استعمال اسلوب التضمين الحواري كأحد الادوات التداولية من قبل الشخصيات في القصص الثلاثة؟ يعتمد تحليل النصوص في هذه الدراسة على استعمال (مفهوم التعاون) الذي وضعه غرايس كقاعدة لتحليل النصوص القصصية. إن الشخصيات في القصص الثلاث تتحاور مع بعضها كما هو الحال بالنسبة للأشخاص في الحياة الواقعية، قد تكون حواراتهم مباشرة بدون معاني ضمنية، وقد تكون ايضا غير مباشرة. احيانا تقوم الشخصيات بانتهاك مبادئ واحد او أكثر من مبادئ مفهوم التعاون في حواراتهم. نتيجة لهذا الانتهاك ينتج التضمين الحواري. إن هذه الدراسة تسعى لتوضيح وتحليل كيفية إنتهاك مبادئ مفهوم التعاون من قبل الشخصيات، وما المعاني الضمنية للحوارات بين الشخصيات.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التضمين، التضمين التقليدي، التضمين الحواري، مفهوم

التعاون، المبدأ

1.1 Introduction

Conversational implicature can be described as a pragmatic tool, strategy, style or even a pragmatic phenomenon. Saying something and meaning something else or indirectly deliver your message is a style that is used by many speakers. According to Hurford, implicature is produced when an utterance meaning is opposed to a sentence meaning, or it is a method used by speakers to work out the indirect illocutions of utterance (Hurford, 1983) . Grice suggests that speakers are supposed to pay attention to four maxims that he defines as (cooperative principle) in order to be understood, informative and conduct a successful communication. Grice says “Make your contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (Grice, 1975, p. 45) . Speakers do not follow Grice maxims all the time; they violate one or more of the maxims in their conversations. Speakers presume that the listener still understands them,

and the implied meaning that they are trying to deliver is the conversational implicature. In this way, conversational implicatures are produced when speakers do not observe the four maxims of the cooperative principle.

In this study, three short stories are selected to analyze the conversational implicatures produced by the fictional characters in their conversations. Characters in fictions talk and communicate throughout the fictional work. Their speeches could be direct with clear messages and sometimes indirect. Sometimes, speakers prefer to say something and mean something else leaving the task to the listener to understand the implied message. This way of expressing things indirectly is a violation to one or more of Grice maxims. This violation results in the phenomenon that is called conversational implicature.

This study aims at identifying and analyzing speeches with conversational implicatures produced by the fictional characters in the three selected short stories. It is hypothesized that fictional

characters speak, joke, lie and express different ideas in their speeches just like real people in real life. Accordingly, they may violate maxims, speak indirectly, and produce conversational implicatures.

In this study, the speeches of the characters are checked to identify and analyze what maxim or maxims are violated by the character and what implied meaning or message is supposed to be understood by the listener. The context of each short story helps to identify the implied meaning behind speeches that have violated Grice maxims and what implied messages are to be understood from the produced conversational implicatures.

Implicature

Talking, chatting or even gossiping are all forms of communication. When speakers communicate with others, every form of these mentioned above actually implies something to be communicated indirectly. The Implicature is an indirect way to tell something. According to Wright “proposed that what is meant is not what is said” (Wright, 1975, p. 379) . The difference between what is said and what is implied makes

it difficult to understand the speaker. However, the shared experiences and knowledge that the interlocutors have make conversations run smoothly.

Grice suggests that “every utterance is considered to have a specific meaning- that meaning of the speech is referred to as Implicature” (Grice, 1975, p. 44) . Implicature is also introduced as the conclusion of what is said and the shared knowledge between the speaker and the hearer in a given context (Kridalaksana, 2011). In this way, Implicatures in speech are not a problem, and they do not need to be expressed explicitly because interlocutors have something in common (Wijana, 1996) . Implicatures are also described as tools or elements outside the text, or outside the speech. In most conversations, there must be two elements; the speech or what is directly said, and Implicatures. Any conversation can run smoothly and effectively when the relationship between the two elements is well managed (Parker, 1986).

Levinson explains Implicatures by saying that when there is no semantic

relationship between the utterance and the implied meaning, it can be assumed that an utterance will be interpreted by many Implicatures. Sometimes, it is not understood, so the hearer might make mistakes in capturing the Implicature communicated to him/ her (Levinson, 1991) .

Grice suggests that implicatures are of two types: conventional implicature and conversational implicature (Grice, 1975).

Conventional Implicature

This type can be understood as implication that is general and conventional, in which everyone has known and understood such implication. This type of implications requires experience and general knowledge that enable the listener or the reader to understand certain conversations. Conventional Implicature is not temporary, it has more durable meaning. It can be understood because the meaning which is old and already understood in general. This type of Implicature is not that interesting to linguists, because the type of implication here is firm and do not have much meaning. The more

interesting in pragmatics is conversational Implicature (Brown & Yule, 1983).

Yule suggests that conventional Implicatures are not based on the maxims and the cooperative principle, moreover, they don't have to occur in conversations, they are more associated with certain words that result in extra meanings when these words are used (Yule, 1996). In this type of Implicature, context is not that important to convey or understand conventional Implicature. Levinson suggests that this type of Implicatures is non-truth conditional, it means that conventional Implicatures are not derived from super ordinate pragmatic principles like the maxims; instead they are attached to certain lexical items by convention (Levinson, 1983) .

Conversational Implicature

This concept was introduced for the first time by the philosopher Paul Grice in a lecture at Harvard University in 1967. Then, his article (Logic and Conversation) discussed the problems of language meaning that cannot be solved by the general linguistics theories (Grice, 1975) .

Studying language meaning in relation to Conversational Implicature is very crucial side of Pragmatics, because Conversational Implicature is highly related to the practical use of language, verbal and non-verbal (Edmondson, 1981). This type of Implicature appears in conversations, so it is temporary and non-conventional. It is a combination of Language and situation in which the same speech may not produce Implicature under the change of situation (Levinson, 1991)

In any conversation, the hearer tries to interpret the speaker's utterance and that may contain many possible misunderstandings. Leech suggests that interpreting an utterance is "A matter of guesswork..." (Leech, 1983, p. 30). In this concern, Grice defines Conversational Implicature as "A different (opposite, additional, etc) pragmatic meaning of an utterance with respect to the literal meaning expressed by utterance" (Mey, 1998, p. 371). In this way, Conversational Implicature is what we call the implicit meaning produced by speakers in conversations, or it

happens when the speaker indirectly tries to discuss or express something in a conversation. Stalnaker comments on conversational Implicatures by saying that "conversational Implicature is a kind of speaker meaning, a kind distinguished by the source of the expectations in terms of which speaker-meaning is defined" (Stalnaker, 1989, p. 527)

According to what is mentioned above, conversational implicatures are indirectly stated, have no semantic relationship with the utterance in which they require extra linguistic elements to be understood, and they occur when speakers want to deliver implied messages.

Cooperative principle

The cooperative principle consists of four maxims that are suggested by Grice and explained by many others. (Palmer, 1981, p. 173) Discusses these maxims as follows:

The maxim of quantity "makes your contribution as informative as required"

The maxim of quality "do not say what you believe to be false"

The maxim of relation “be relevant”

The maxim of manner “avoid ambiguity, be brief, be orderly”.

In most conversations, it is assumed that interlocutors are going to provide an appropriate amount of information; they are honest, relevant and trying to be clear as much as they can. But surprisingly, these maxims are frequently flouted or violated. In fact, conversational Implicatures result from the violation of the four maxims; conversational implicatures occur when people do not observe or neglect one or more of the maxims. In fact, violation of these maxims does not mean the failure in the conversation. Sometimes, violations might be intended by the speaker to create certain effects of what was said (Implicature), as in jokes, lying or making fun (Nababan, 1987) . Grice also explains that when an utterance does not appear to conform to the maxims, it does not mean that the utterance is nonsense; rather it is assumed that an appropriate meaning is there to be inferred. It means that when a maxim is flouted, an

Implicature is created (Grice, 1975).

Accordingly, interlocutors can convey meanings by limitless number of utterances, and it's the hearer's job to think of the intentions. It means that cooperative principle allows the speakers to make their utterances harder to interpret, and expect the hearer to do his best in order to interpret them.

Methodology

In this paper, three short stories are analyzed according to Grice Cooperative Principle. The three short stories are (*the fool, the typewriter, the wall*) written by the American writer (Richard Evanoff). He is originally from Massillon, Ohio, USA but has lived in Japan for most of his adult life. Richard teaches intercultural communication and international ethics in Tokyo. He has many published works over years including the three selected short stories. These short stories are being selected because the characters produce speeches (conversations) that imply conversational implicatures. The number of conversational implicatures differs from one story to another and this will be

discussed in the analysis of the stories.

The four maxims of the Cooperative Principle that are suggested by Grice are used to analyze speeches in the three short stories. Qualitative and quantitative analysis are used in this study to identify and explain the violation of maxims in speeches that are produced by the fictional characters. These stories are fictions that imply speeches produced by the characters. Those characters talk, make fun, suffer, hate or even love. Passing through different feelings and circumstances will affect the speeches of the characters (just like people in real life). As a result, they may violate one or more of the maxims. This violation creates conversational implicatures. Because of certain circumstances, the characters neglect or violate the maxims but that does not mean the failure of communication or the failure of conversation. The characters may violate these maxims intentionally or unintentionally to create special effect, to convey meanings indirectly. It is the role of the listener to understand what is behind the literal meaning.

The procedure used in analyzing speeches is to check the speech (conversation) that implies conversational implicature and define the type of violation or what maxim has been violated by the speaker. This leads to analyze what hidden meanings the speaker wants to convey or what implied information that are expected to be understood by the listener.

Analysis and Discussion

The three short stories are qualitatively analyzed according to Grice's maxims. The first story is (*The Fool*), it is about a king who has summoned all wise men and asked them about the secret of life. Those wise men are unable to provide the king with the answer that he needed. So he decides to send them to a prison. Then the king asks his guards to get him a man who has spent years in a prison. That man is very old, thin and his arms and legs are bound with chains. The conversations between the king and the wise men, and the conversations between the king and old man imply six conversational implicatures that are analyzed as follows:

"I have given you Philosophy! I have given you science".

This speech is said by the king to the men whom supposed to be wise. In this speech, the king is violating the maxim of quantity. Instead of saying that he has offered those wise men a good education and knowledge, he says that he has given them philosophy and science. Those men are educated people, yet they cannot provide the king with the answer that he needs. Few words are used here to express many implicit meanings; the king indirectly conveys meanings through this conversational implicature.

"I have riches, power, and authority; I do not as yet know the meaning of life"

Another speech said by the king to his guards after he asks them to send the wise men to prison. This speech implies meanings and information that are not mentioned directly. In this speech, the king is violating the maxim of relation; riches, power and authority have nothing to do with being wise or not. Understanding the meaning of life has nothing to do with these things.

Accordingly, the king is being irrelevant in this speech and he is indirectly stating that he is not wise.

"I have not used my legs for such a long time"

This speech is said by the old man to the king. This man has spent years chained in prison, that's why he has not used his legs for so long. In this speech, the old man is violating the maxim of quantity; he has not given any details about his inability to walk because of being chained for years in prison. The old man has not given the right amount of information and the result is a conversational implicature.

"I have not seen even one drop of sunlight. How do you expect me to be able to tell time under such circumstances?"

This speech is also said by the old man to the king, when the king asks him about the time he has spent in prison. The man's answer implies no specific time; the old man here is violating the maxim of manner. The old man has not been clear enough about the period of time he has spent in prison. His way of telling the king about the time results in a conversational implicature. The

man tries to say that he has spent a long time in prison unable to see the sun, that's why he cannot count the years.

"I do not have a name"

Another speech is said by the old man to the king when the king asks him about his name. The old man here is violating the maxim of quality. No one is with no name, but that is the man's way to tell the king that he has spent years alone in prison, no one talks to him or even calls him by his own name. Violating this maxim by the old man results in a conversational implicature.

"If there be no answer, there can also be no question"

This speech is also said by the old man to the king. This speech implies a conversational implicature in which the old man is violating the maxim of manner. The speech of old man is ambiguous, instead of saying that there is no such secret (the secret of life that the king has already asked about), the old man says that there is no answer because of the absence of such question. The way of expressing his ideas concerning the king's question is not clear enough and the result is a conversational implicature.

The six previous conversational implicatures belong to the short story (*the fool*). The four maxims are violated by the characters of this story but in different speeches and different ways. Each speech shows a violation to only one of these maxims. This violation doesn't mean the failure of conversation or communication that the characters have conducted. These speeches are still understood, the context enables the reader to understand the conversational implicatures implied in these speeches.

The second short story selected in this study is (*The Typewriter*). This story is about a sick man who is unable to accomplish plans and dreams because of his illness. His wife tries to help him but he is already depressed and frustrated. His doctor and his wife try to advise him to rearrange his priorities. The man's conversation with his wife and the wife's conversation with the doctor show conversational implicatures as follows:

"I would advise you to put your affairs in order as quickly as possible"

These words imply the essence of what the doctor has said to the man since the man cannot remember the exact words said by the doctor. In this speech, the doctor is violating the maxim of quantity. The doctor doesn't say that the man has to rearrange his responsibilities, and take care of his wife whom he has neglected because of the psychological conditions that he has reached out of his sickness. Instead, the doctor just uses these words as an advice. This violation of the maxim of quantity creates a conversational implicature.

"But if you don't do it, it will all be left to me,"

This speech is said by the wife of the man to her husband. She is violating the maxim of quantity. The wife is trying to say that there are many duties and responsibilities that her husband must fulfill, but instead, he is trying to leave them all for her. The husband is thinking of his writings only, his illness is the reason behind neglecting all his responsibilities. Using these few words by the wife to express many things results in a conversational implicature.

"Well, consider what he's going through,"

These words are said by the doctor to the man's wife. The doctor here is trying to explain that the man is suffering and his wife has to take this point into consideration before judging his behavior. The wife doesn't have to expect a lot from her husband because of his sickness. The doctor here is violating the maxim of quantity; he hasn't expressed clearly what the wife has to do or how the man's sickness might affect his relationship with his wife. The doctor doesn't ask the wife directly to stop blaming her husband. Instead, he has just mentioned these words as an advice; his contribution in the conversation lacks the enough amount of information. Accordingly, a conversational implicature is made because of violating the maxim of quantity.

"There's so much he'll never able to be accomplish"

These words are also said by the doctor to the wife. And again, the doctor is violating the maxim of quantity. The doctor is trying to tell the wife that her husband's illness will be a kind of an obstacle in the way of

achieving his dreams. The doctor's speech is very brief; he hasn't expressed his detailed thoughts about the man's sickness. The doctor's brief contribution in the conversation creates a conversational implicature.

The four previous conversational implicatures belong to the short story (*The Typewriter*). In all the four speeches, the maxim of quantity is violated by the man's wife and the doctor in their conversations about the health conditions of the sick husband. They are not making their contributions in the conversation as informative as possible, and they are not giving the right amount of information.

The third selected short story in this study is (*The Wall*). This story is about the narrator who has started the story with a description of the garden, the wall around the garden, the gate and other details in his home. This story shows only two conversational implicatures as follows:

"I am what I am, holy mother"

This speech is said by the narrator to his mother when she

tries to stop him from leaving home. The narrator here is violating the maxim of quantity. With few words, the narrator is trying to express many things; like he will not be different, and she cannot stop him or make him change his mind and stay with her. His contribution is not informative enough. In the same speech, the narrator is also violating the maxim of manner. He is not clear enough about his decision to leave, and what makes him so decisive. With few ambiguous words, the narrator has violated two maxims and creates such a conversational implicature.

"Thank you" I cried, "for the morning!"

This speech implies a unique conversational implicature. It is not part of a conversation between two speakers as usual. It is said by the narrator when he kneels before the sun as if he is talking to God. He thanks God for being free again after escaping from prison and living in the forest. Here the narrator is violating the maxim of quantity again. With few words he wants to express many things. The amount of words is not enough to be informative

but the context shows what the narrator wants to say. He also violates the maxim of manner; it's not clear whom he is talking to or why he is so grateful. With few ambiguous words he wants to thank God for being free again. This is a very unusual type of conversational implicatures in which the speaker is the narrator and the listener is God (not another speaker or interlocutor as usual). The narrator violates these two maxims freely as if he knows that he is being understood by the listener.

The short story (*The Wall*) shows only two conversational implicatures. This story differs from the two previous short stories in which it mostly contains narration and description. Most of the actions are said and described by the narrator, and the two conversational implicatures are implied in speeches that belong to the narrator. The narrator has violated the maxim of quantity in both speeches, in addition to the maxim of manner. The second speech is very unique one in which there is no other interlocutor; the narrator is being grateful to God for being alive and free.

Quantitative Analysis

The three selected short stories are quantitatively analyzed in this section to show: what maxims are violated, the number of violated maxims in each speech, the number of conversational implicatures in each story, the number of the violated maxims in each story and the percentages of violation.

Table 1 shows the four maxims of the cooperative principle, what maxims are violated in each short story and the number of the violated maxims in each speech. The short story (*The Fool*) shows a violation of the four maxims in different speeches. Speakers have violated all the maxims; and one maxim is violated in each speech.

The short story (*The Typewriter*) shows a violation of one maxim only which is the maxim of quantity. In all the four conversational implicatures in this story, the maxim of quantity is the only violated maxim. The short story (*The Wall*) shows a violation of two maxims; quantity and manner. The two speeches in this story show a violation of both maxims, and it is the only

story that shows a violation of two maxims in one speech.

Table 1 reveals that (*The Fool*) is the only story that shows a violation of four maxims in the six speeches. Each speech implies a violation of one maxim. The short story (*The wall*) comes after concerning the number of the violated maxims; in which two maxims are violated by the characters of this story. While (*The Typewriter*) shows a violation of one maxim in four speeches.

Table 2 shows the number of conversational implicatures, the number of the violated maxims and the percentages of violation in each short story. The short story (*The Fool*) implies six conversational implicatures and shows a violation of the four maxims. This variation in violating all the maxims results in a %100 as a percentage of violation. The short story (*The typewriter*) implies four conversational implicatures and only one maxim is violated in all four speeches; which is the maxim of quantity. Because of violating only one maxim, the percentage of violation in this story is %25. The short story

(*The Wall*) shows two conversational implicatures and in both of them two maxims are violated; the maxims of quantity and the maxim of manner. The percentage of violation in this story is %50.

Table 2 shows that (*The Fool*) has the highest percentage of violation; the four maxims are violated in six conversational implicatures. Each speech shows a violation of one maxim only. The short story (*the Wall*) shows %50 as a percentage of violation, in which the two speeches imply a violation of two maxims. While (*The Typewriter*) shows the lowest percentage of violation which is %25; violating one maxim only in four conversational implicature results in the lowest percentage.

Conclusions

Conversational Implicature is a pragmatic strategy appears in the utterances produced by the characters of the three selected short stories. This study hypothesizes that characters in fictional works speak, communicate and produce utterances just like real people in real life. The analyzed utterances of the characters show that characters sometimes

do not follow Grice's maxims, they violate one or more of these maxims in order to convey meanings indirectly. The violation of these maxims results in conversational implicatures. This study aims at identifying and analyzing conversational implicatures produced by fictional characters. This analysis shows that characters sometimes neglect or they do not observe the four maxims suggested by Grice in his cooperative principle. The violation of these maxims by the characters does not mean the failure in communicating or in conveying meanings. Sometimes that violation might be intended to create conversational implicature.

The three selected short stories analyzed in this study are written by the same American writer; however the length, the style, the type of characters and the way of communication shown by the characters are not the same. The variation in these aspects results in a variation in the number of conversational implicatures and the type of the violated maxim in each story.

The first story (*The fool*) implies six conversational implicatures; most of them are in the conversation between the king and the old man. The maxims that are violated in this story are: quantity, quality, relation and manner. It means that the four maxims have been violated by the characters but in different speeches. Each speech shows a violation to one maxim only. The mostly violated maxims in (*The Fool*) are: the maxim of quantity is violated in two speeches, and the maxim of manner is also violated in two other speeches. The maxim of relation is violated only in one speech and also the maxim of quality.

The short story (*The Typewriter*) implies four conversational implicatures, and the maxim of quantity is the only maxim that is violated in the four speeches. The contributions of the wife and the doctor are not as informative as required.

The short story (*The Wall*) implies two conversational implicatures and in both of them the maxims of quantity and manner are violated. In both speeches, the narrator's contributions are not as

informative as required and not clear enough.

Despite being written by the same author, the three analyzed short stories show different number of conversational implicatures and different types of violations. The circumstances and actions have definitely affected the characters feelings and thoughts. Consequently, their way of expressing thoughts and feelings through speeches and their way of producing conversational implicatures will be a reflection to what they have been through. In this way, what a speaker says and how to say it is a result of the life that he is having.

Bibliography

- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Edmondson, W. (1981). *Spoken Discourse*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. *Syntax and Semantics*, 41-58.
- Hurford, J. R. (1983). *Semantics of Coursebook*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kridalaksana, H. (2011). *Kamus Linguistik*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principle of Pragmatics*. USA: Longman Group.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S. (1991). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Mey, J. L. (1998). *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. New York: Elseiver.
- Nababan, P. (1987). *Ilmu Pragmatik: Teori dan Penerapannya*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- Palmer, F. R. (1981). *Semantics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Parker, F. (1986). *Linguistics for Non Linguist*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Stalnaker. (1989). On Grandy on Grice. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 526- 527.
- Wijana, I. D. (1996). *Dasar- dasar Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.
- Wright, R. A. (1975). *Meaning non- natural and Conversational Implicature*. *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol.3.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

<https://www.richardevanoff.com/fiction/short-stories>

Table 1

The story	Maxim of quantity	Maxim of quality	Maxim of relation	Maxim of manner	The number of the violated maxims in each speech
The Fool	√	√	√	√	One maxim in each speech
The Typewriter	√				One maxim in each speech
The Wall	√			√	Two maxims in each speech

Table 2

The story	The number of conversational implicatures	The number of the violated maxims	percentage
The Fool	6	4	%100
The Typewriter	4	1	%25
The Wall	2	2	%50