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RESUMEN: El estudio, con la intención de obtener una comprensión profunda del significado, ha analizado Implicatura conversacional en la obra de teatro de Usman Ali El prisionero (2018) aplicando Teoría de la implicación de Paul Grice (1975). La implicación conversacional es el fenómeno en el que un hablante dice una cosa y, por lo tanto, transmite otra. Además de la Implicatura, las funciones de las expresiones implicadas se han identificado a la luz de la Teoría del Acto del Habla. El estudio resultó en lograr formas de implicatura con respecto al incumplimiento de máximas de cantidad, calidad, relación y forma. El investigador también identificó dos tipos de implicatura conversacional: (1) implicatura generalizada (2) e implicatura particularizada junto con funciones de enunciados implicados.
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ABSTRACT: The study, with the intention of obtaining a deep comprehension towards meaning, has analyzed the conversational implicature in Usman Ali’s play The Prisoner (2018) by applying Theory of Implicature by Paul Grice (1975). Conversational Implicature is the phenomenon wherein, a speaker says one thing and thereby conveys something else. Besides Implicature, functions of implicated utterances have been identified in the light of Speech Act Theory. The study resulted in to achieve forms of implicature with respect to flouting of maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner. The researcher also identified two types of conversational implicature: (1) generalized implicature (2) and particularized implicature along with functions of implicated utterances.
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INTRODUCTION.
The study explores linguistically the purpose of the play The Prisoner (2018) written by Usman Ali in pragmatic perspective, who is renowned Pakistani English playwright having the residency of the University of IOWA and is the founder of Ali’s theater in Pakistan. He has also been awarded Taufiq Rafat Prize for drama in 2014.
The Prisoner (2018) is actually four panel play, which is acted in Jail of District Mandi Bahhudin of Province Punjab in Pakistan. The story revolves, regarding clash between two persons and society,
who love each other in untraditional and taboo ways, around two prisoners i.e. Sohrab & Rustm and two policemen i.e. Veera & Beera. In this perspective, branch of Pragmatics i.e. Implicature is invoked, which is defined as intended meaning of the speaker (Cruse, 2006). Basically, Implicature consists of two types; Conventional and Conversational Implicatures. Former deals with conventional meaning, whereas, latter explains intending meaning of the speaker and is further divided into two types; Generalized Implicature, which depends upon the general background for understanding the meaning, and Particularized Implicature, which needs particular and specific background to comprehend the intending meaning.

Simultaneously, Cooperative Principle is used to achieve the purpose. Cooperative Principle is, actually, linguistic term which means the cooperation among the speaker and listener, in the scenario, they cooperate with each other regarding turn taking and listen in order to get logical consequence. The problematic situation has to be faced by reader and listener, when they are unable to comprehend the intending meaning of the writer and speaker, consequently, communication fails to achieve the desired goal. This type of events leads towards embarrassing situation for both speaker or writer and listener or reader. There is common observation that failure in communication causes social and economic loss in the life of human being (Lee, 2017). That’s why, there are four maxims, which need to be followed in order to get desired communication (Grice, 1989). They are Maxims of Quality, Quantity, Relevance and Manner. Maxims are inevitable for conversation in order to convey intended meaning.

According to Cutting, these maxims are considered as the pillars for the smooth and successful communication (Cutting, 2002). In this way, utterances of the said play have been examined through the theory of Implicature in order to drive out the hidden or intended meaning of the text and implicated utterances have further been analyzed to determine the function of each utterance by employing Speech Act. Produced utterances also display functions along with meaning of the
utterance. Accordingly, there are five major groups, which are classified by Searle (1975); first one is Assertive/Representative, which asserts or represents something or some idea, like suggesting and conclusion, etc. Second is Directive, it actually gives direction to the addressee, like asking, ordering or direction, etc. Third is Commissive, it actually gives the idea about future working, like promising, planning, etc. Fourth is Expressive, it deals with the expression of the feeling of speaker, like thanking, apologizing, etc. Fifth is Declarative, this type of statement shows the change of the state of world.

DEVELOPMENT.

Research Objectives.

Followings are the objectives of the study:

➢ To identify the Conversational Implicature in the utterances.
➢ To sort out the implicated utterances with respect to Generalized Implicature and Particularized Implicature.
➢ To observe the four Maxims of Cooperative Principle among the implicated utterances in order to point as to which type of maxim was flouted for implicature.
➢ To pinpoint the functions of the implicated utterances with respect to Representative/Assertive, Directive, Commissive, Expressive and Declarative.

Research Questions.

This research intends to address the following questions:

1. Which types of Conversational Implicature are found in The Prisoner?
2. How Maxims are flouted in order to create Conversational Implicature for successful conversation?
3. Which type of functions of utterances is performed by Conversational Implicature?
Significance of the Study.

The study is crucial and beneficial in various aspects as it would open the door for reader and listener to comprehend the reading and speaking in more apt viewpoint. It is commonly observed that speaker usually faces problem in order to convey his or her intended meaning, which consequently goes to failure of communication. Simultaneously, listener feels oneself in trouble in order to comprehend the actual meaning of the speaker. In this way, statements “this is not what I meant” and “why don’t you say what you mean” are common to hear.

So, the study specifically deals with the intended meaning of the speaker for producing fruitful conversation. The study is also partially helpful for the writer or playwright to know about the functions of the utterances used in the play The Prisoner by Usman Ali. Further, significance of the study can also be observed that the study intends to be carried out on the English play by Pakistani writer, which will definitely helpful to draw the intention of national and international readers towards Pakistani literature, in this way, it will not only be beneficial to attract audience toward Pakistani literary theatre but also proved fruitful to motivate new Pakistani English playwrights to work for the Pakistani English Literature.

It will further persuade Pakistani readers and writer to equip with the pragmatic feature in order to get the desired results through communication. The study is also important as it fills the gap by analyzing the Play, because no work has been found on the play with linguistic perspective.

Delimitation of study.

Due to time constraints, the study would be delimited only to one play by Usman Ali The Prisoner (2018) and only Conversational Implicature for intending meaning and Speech Act Theory for classification of implicated utterances would be studied.
Literature review.

Communication is way of conveying intending between speaker and listener (Nanda, 2015). It is as crucial to human society as blood to human body.

Linguistically, one of the most important fields which deals with the crux of communication, is Pragmatics. Pragmatics is field of linguistic, which goes to discuss the meaning of the conversation with reference to context (R. Horn & Ward, 2006). Further, H.P Grice introduced the term “Implicature” to explain the relation between intention and meaning, it is actually is sub field of Pragmatics, which elaborates the aspects of intended meaning of the speaker without being the part of utterances. Implicature, basically, is divided into two kinds; Conventional Implicature and Conversational Implicature (Yule, 1996).

Conventional Implicature is defined as the conventional meaning of utterance. Whereas, Conversational is defined as the intending meaning of the speaker, it has further two types, which are Generalized Conversational Implicature and Particularized Conversational Implicature (Griffiths, 2006). Generalized Conversational Implicature is the conversation, which needs no specific background knowledge between speaker and listener and can be understood by any one. Contrarily, Particularized Conversational Implicature is known as the implicature, which needs specific background knowledge in order to understand the utterance of speaker. Similarly, there is Scalar Implicature, which is actually the type of Generalized Implicature and it denotes the implicature, which identify the quantity of the things.

Cooperation is indeed a basic need in order to achieve successful conversation. For this purpose, Paul Grice (1989) defined Cooperative Principle to communicate in effective way. These principles are based on four Maxim, which are Quality, Quantity, Manner and Relevance. By violating these maxims, people create conversational implicature (Laharomi, 2013).
Simultaneously, the paper attempts to identify the purpose of the utterance with respect to speech act, as defined by Searle (1975), there are five types of speech act, which are Representative/Assertive, Directive, Commissive, Expressive and Declarative. First deals with statement of fact, Second goes to elaborate direction, ordering and requesting etc. towards listener, Third explains the commitment of the speaker to perform the future act like promising, pledging etc., Fourth shows the expressiveness of speaker psychological and emotional state like praises, compliments etc (Searle, 1979).

Nanda (2015), in the article Implicature in John Green’s The Fault of Our Stars elucidated two types of implicature, which were Generalized Implicature and Particularized Implicature. These types of implicature were found more in dialogues as compared to narration. The results showed that flouted maxims are maxims of Quality and Manner, whereas, maxim of Relation was focused by the writer, which shows that implicature is basically business of author, it depends upon him or her as to how significantly and usefully, he or she utilized it in order to achieve purpose.

In the article “Conversational Implicature in English Listening Comprehension”, Haiyan emphasized that Implicature may provide assistance to learners for better understanding regarding implicated meaning. Therefore, the Grice’s Conversational Implicature Theory is mandatory for both non-English learners and English learners. It was also observed by the researcher that listeners may be equipped with the theory as it helps to learn to infer intended meaning to put their learning in successful way (Wang, 2011).

**Research methodology.**

The study has gone to utilize the theory of Implicature by Grice (1975) in order to recognize the developing procedure of Conversational Implicature and to pinpoint the type of Conversational Implicature.
The research has used the Speech Act Theory by Searle for classification of implicated utterances with respect to functions i.e. Representative/ Assertive, Directive, Commissive, Expressive and Declarative. Qualitative and quantitative approaches have been utilized. The play The Prisoner has been thoroughly read and 15 No. random utterances, which show Conversational Implicature, have been picked out. After taking samples, same have been analyzed in order to sort out with respect to Generalized Conversational Implicature and Particularized Conversational Implicature. Besides, functions of implicated utterances have been identified with the help Speech Act. In this way, collected data have been analyzed qualitatively keeping in view the research questions.

**Data Analysis.**

The 15 No. implicated random statements of the play have been picked up in order to identify the type of implicature, flout of maxims and functions of the statements. Table shows the violation and function & type of Conversational Implicature as followings:

**Datum No. 1.**

Rustum: What will they do with us?

Sohrab: The strap is fancy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flouting of Maxim</th>
<th>Function of Speech Act</th>
<th>Type of Conversational Implicature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Relevance</td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>Particularized Implicature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Context.**

The dialogue occurs in the panel one of the play, where both participants, which are main characters of the play, were put in the jail cell, and while clapping their hands and gazing at each other, they start discuss different issues in the prison.
Analysis.

In the scene, Rustam asks a simple question about their fate in the jail as to how they treat with them and what the future of their captivity is. In response, Sohrab indirectly refuses to answer the question and instead of answering, he starts to comment on the surroundings. That’s why, he starts to praise the strap. In this way, he violates the maxim of relevance, the answer is expressive, whereas, Particularize Implicature has been observed.

Datum No. 2.

Veera: The villagers want prisoners.

Beera: The prisoners.

Veera: Rustum and Sohrab.

Beera: But we are the police.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flouting of Maxim</th>
<th>Function of Speech Act</th>
<th>Type of Conversational Implicature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Manner</td>
<td>Representative/ Assertive</td>
<td>Generalized Implicature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context.

The dialogue occurs in the panel one of the play, where Veera and Beera, who are the police personnel and put the Rustum & Sohrab in jail, communicate with each other.

Analysis.

In the scene, Veera explains the demands of the villagers to his senior police officer i.e. Beera. He explains villagers want that Rustum and Sohrab should be given to them. In answer, Beera replied “but we are police”. In this statement, Beera violates the maxim of manner and answers the demands of villagers. Although the maxim of manner is exploited and message is indirect but the crux of the
message appeals a lot. In this way, he conveys that we are police and our aim is to provide protection to the society. He further means to say that we protect the society from anarchy. The statement also camouflages itself with generalized implicature.

**Datum No. 3.**

Beera: We have to maintain law and order.

Veera: They are more in numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flouting of Maxim</th>
<th>Function of Speech Act</th>
<th>Type of Conversational Implicature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Manner</td>
<td>Representative/ Assertive</td>
<td>Generalized Implicature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Context.**

The dialogue occurs in the panel one of the play, where Veera and Beera, who are the police personnel and put the Rustum & Sohrab in jail, communicate with each other in response to the rumors in the village.

**Analysis.**

Beera explains that Police are for maintaining law & order but, in reply, Veera says “they are more in numbers”, the statement apparently does not convey any meaning, but indirectly suggests that police do not matter, but quantity does matter. In other words, institution does not matter when there is matter of quantity. Veera anticipates the danger of chaos due to collision between society and police in an indirect way. However, generalized implicature has been observed in the statement, whereas, maxim of manner has been flouted.
Datum No. 4.

Beera: There is a power in their handshake.

Veera: There is more power in my stick.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flouting of Maxim</th>
<th>Function of Speech Act</th>
<th>Type of Conversational Implicature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Manner</td>
<td>Representative/ Assertive</td>
<td>Particularized Implicature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context.

The utterances are uttered in the panel one of the play, in which Veera & Beera, policeman & Police officer respectively, discuses about the prisoners, who are Sohrab and Rustum.

Analysis.

Beera reveals the apprehension that both prisoners i.e. Sohrab & Rustum are united and ready to face any calamity because they love each other more than enough. In reply, Veera says that stick is more powerful than any love or friendship etc. Apparently, words “handshake” & “stick” conveys no meaning in the sentences. However, according to the context, both words are used while observing particularized implicature, which denotes that handshake stands for brotherhood and stick stands for corporal punishment and law & order. Linguistically speaking, both statements reveal the conversational implicature while ignoring maxim of manner. Because both utterances are stated in indirect way and particularized implicature has been utilized.

Datum No. 5.

Rustum: (wiping the blood from the face) He does not know how to beat.

Sohrab: But we know to love.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flouting of Maxim</th>
<th>Function of Speech Act</th>
<th>Type of Conversational Implicature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Relevance</td>
<td>Representative/ Assertive</td>
<td>Generalized Implicature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Context.**

These statements are uttered in the panel one of the play after beating of both Sohrab & Rustum from police and they start to discuss about their suffering during beating by police.

**Analysis.**

Rustum comments about the beating by police in indirect way that they do not know as to how to beat. This statement shows police is criticized indirectly and it also depicts that both participants have been brutally beaten. In response, Sohrab says “But we know how to love”. This utterance portrays the soft corner of the participants that instead of brutal beating they are still motivated for love. In this way, they are personified for love and police stands for brutality. Maxim of Relevance has been violated by Sohrab as he does not only answer to Rustum directly but relevant answer is also ignored. Generalized Implicature has been observed in the statement as it depicts that police is so brutal, that they even do not know how to beat, similar, they are so innocent and loveable that they know to spread love.

**Datum No. 6.**

Sohrab: His hand absorbs the pain of others.

Beera: What does my hand do?

Sohrab: It injects pains into others.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flouting of Maxim</th>
<th>Function of Speech Act</th>
<th>Type of Conversational Implicature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Quality</td>
<td>Representative/ Assertive</td>
<td>Generalized Implicature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Context.**

There are three statements, which are occurred in the panel one of the play. Sohrab, who is prisoner, is talking with the policeman i.e. Beera. Both are talking about the corporal punishment to prisoners by police.

**Analysis.**

Sohrab says “his hand absorbs the pain of others”. In this way, he praises his companions i.e. Rustum, who is his bosom friend. This statement violates the maxim of quality because practically it does not seem good or true that a hand of a person can suck the pain of others. However, flouting of maxim of quality and generalized implicature has been done for praising and encouraging. In response to the question of Beera, he says “it injects the pain into others”. This statement again shows the violation of maxim of quality as apparently it does not seem to be acceptable that hand of a person can inject the pain into others. Hands of person can cause the pain for other but they cannot themselves insert pain in others. Simultaneously, the statement is implicated with generalized implicature, which shows that they are the reason for others’ pain or they create the problems and pains for others.

**Datum No. 7.**

Beera: Who are they to give us deadline?

Veera: Yes sir.
### Context.

The utterances are pronounced in response to the briefing by policeman to his officer regarding the mob’s threat that they will set the police station on fire if police do not work according to the will of the mob. The scene is performed in panel two of the play.

### Analysis.

Police officer astonishingly asks from his junior as to how can they damage police station because they are the public and police is law enforcement agency with weapons and all necessary tools for maintaining law & order in the society. However, Veera responds only “Yes Sir” instead of answering the question of his officer. This shows the violation of maxim of relevance, which ultimately leads to entitle the statement as “Commissive Speech Act” and it consequently, creates particularized implicature. The statement indirectly shows the committeemen with his boss that he is ready and stands with his boss to face any hindrance by public. The uttered statement also shows the obedience of the subordinate to his senior because it is common and foremost duty of the policeman to obey his senior in chaotic circumstances.

### Datum No. 8.

Veera: It is the last packet of cigarettes.

Beera: You smoke a lot.

Veera: Outside the passage is blocked.
The statements are occurred in panel two of the play, when, both senior and junior policemen are talking about the prevailing situation in the surroundings in wake of arrest of two prisoners i.e. Rustum & Sohrab. Suddenly, senior asks cigarette from junior and he explains him that the packets of the cigarette is come to an end.

**Analysis.**

The utterance from junior to his senior “Outside the passage is blocked” shows the violation of maxim of manner as it is not clear message and is in ambiguous situation. In this way, he indirectly conveys to his boss that cigarette comes to an end and purchasing of the new cigarette is not possible as police station is blocked and surrounded by the mob. The statement also shows the particularized implicature as it indirectly gives message while its function shows representative/ assertive situation as it gives information in representative and suggestive way.

**Datum No. 9**

Rustum: Breathing coming from you.

Sohrab: Hunger is killing everyone.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flouting of Maxim</th>
<th>Function of Speech Act</th>
<th>Type of Conversational Implicature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Manner</td>
<td>Representative/ Assertive</td>
<td>Particularized Implicature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flouting of Maxim</th>
<th>Function of Speech Act</th>
<th>Type of Conversational Implicature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Relevance</td>
<td>Representative/ Assertive</td>
<td>Particularized Implicature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Context.
In this scene of panel two of the play, conversation between Sohrab & Rustum occurs, they talks about the noise of the other prisoners in the jail cell. The noise is produced by other prisoners due to their beating by police. In this way, Rustam & Sohrab talks about the sufferings of the other prisoners.

Analysis.
The utterance comes from Sohrab in response to Rustum’s statement that he is listening to breathing of Sohrab while ignoring the noise of other prisoners. But, Sohrab responds “Hunger is killing everyone”. This statement shows the infringement of maxim of relevance as the response is not according to the utterances of Rustum, which is “Breathing coming from you”. In this way, maxim of relevance is ignored in order to change the topic. He further uses particularized implicature for the sake of diverting attention from loveable comments to bitter realities in the surroundings. So, he uses assertive function of the statement to let the Rustum realize that surroundings are suffering from bitter consequences.

Datum No. 10
Sohrab: You cannot pass two tests.
Rustum: Failure in one is compulsory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flouting of Maxim</th>
<th>Function of Speech Act</th>
<th>Type of Conversational Implicature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Manner</td>
<td>Representative/ Assertive</td>
<td>Particularized Implicature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Context.**

In this scene of panel, two of the play, conversation between Sohrab & Rustum occur, Sohrab feels hesitation for telling about his love story and his beloved, whereas, Rustum tries to coax the Sohrab to tell about his girlfriend whom he loves but now she is not with him.

**Analysis.**

These dialogues occur when Sohrab tries to avoid telling about his girl friend. During conversation, Sohrab comments “you cannot pass two tests” which triggers the intentions of listener or audience towards aestheticism. It uses particularized implicature because it does not actually true that a person cannot pass two tests.

It is very possible and seems to be reasonable that a person can pass multiple tests at one time. However, the statement takes the listener their personal conversation that one is acceptable and second or two is nothing in love. Responsively, Rustum’s comment “failure in one compulsory” shows break the maxim of manner. Although, it fulfills the maxim of relevance to some extent but its manner is ambiguous to explain the statement. Pragmatically, it deals with the particularized implicature that shows that utterance is made in wake of first one but meaning of the utterance shows the confirmation of earlier statement i.e. the statement of Sohrab. It definitely discusses the pros and cons of love that a person can love only one person at one time and consequently it has to be detached from other person with same relation. The function of the statement is representative/ assertive.

**Datum No. 11.**

Rustum: You should have eloped with her.

Sohrab: They were honorable.
Context.

These utterances have been spoken in panel two of the play, there is discussion of Sohrab’s girlfriend and their marriage. After preliminary discussion of the Sohrab’s love, both start to discuss the reasons of unhappen marriage of Sohrab.

Analysis.

Sohrab comments “They were honorable” about the family of his beloved girlfriend, whom he wants to marry. Actually, statement comes in response to the comment of Rustum that Sohrab should have married her in elopement. Sohrab’s utterance lacks of clarity, in this way, it violates the maxim of manner because Sohrab does not vividly responds the utterance of Rustum. Instead, he indirectly gives the reason as to why he was unable to marry her. Generalized implicature has been utilized to convey the message. In this context, it is conveyed indirectly that he is ready to elope but he does not only respect her but also his family. Similarly, it is commonly known ill-omen and bad to elope in our society. Moreover, the statement’s function seems to be representative/ assertive as it gives the info and concludes the reason for failing of his marriage.

Datum No. 12.

Rustum: Do you hear the music in noise?

Sohrab: You are strange?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flouting of Maxim</th>
<th>Function of Speech Act</th>
<th>Type of Conversational Implicature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Relevance</td>
<td>Representative/ Assertive</td>
<td>Generalized Implicature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Context.**

These utterances have been spoken in panel two of the play, there is discussion between Sohrab and Rustum in the jail. Meanwhile, and prisoners are making noising and protesting that they have no water to drink and no food to eat. Prisoners’ slogans become prominent and the voice of their conversation becomes faint gradually.

**Analysis.**

Rustum simply questions with respect to erupted noise around them, which triggers Sohrab to ask question from Rustum too instead of answering the question of Rustum. The answer in response to Rustum question is actually breaks the norm of relevance because it does not fulfill the criteria of relevance to the question. Further, Sohrab indirectly conveys the message that he cannot hear the music in the noise in as much as astonishing way as he can. It shows that the question of Rustum is actually wrong. In this way, conversation implicature has been used with the help of generalized implicature as the comments shows the general impression that question of the questioner is not upto the mark and lack of sense. Statement also shows the assertive function of the utterance due to its representative way.

**Datum No. 13**

Rustum: They do not know about desires?

Sohrab: Are not they human beings?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flouting of Maxim</th>
<th>Function of Speech Act</th>
<th>Type of Conversational Implicature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Manner</td>
<td>Representative/ Assertive</td>
<td>Generalized Implicature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Context.**

These are the statements at the opening of the panel three of the play, where, both participants, being prisoners, have assumed that they would be hanged, so they start to discuss about their last wish.

**Analysis.**

Rustum apparently says that policemen have no feeling with disappointed mood. Responsively, Sohrab goes to questions his line as “are not they human being”. This question indirectly asks that are policemen animal etc if they have no desire. Because it is universally acknowledged truth that human being has feelings and emotions etc. The statement shows generalized implicature because no special contextual knowledge is required to understand this question as it is common truth. Further, Rustum has broken the maxim of relevance and irrelevantly goes to question correctly. Simultaneously, his style of speaking of statement shows the assertiveness/ representativeness.

**Datum No. 14.**

Sohrab: Do not they love?

Rustum: It is merely a word for them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flouting of Maxim</th>
<th>Function of Speech Act</th>
<th>Type of Conversational Implicature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Quality</td>
<td>Representative/ Assertive</td>
<td>Generalized Implicature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Context.

This dialogue occurs in the panel three of the play, where, both participants, after assuming their death in jail, go to discuss the abstract notions of the world.

Analysis.

Rustum’s answer to the Sahara’s question leads towards violation of maxim of quality because it is a simple question, which can be answered by only yes or no but it gives unnecessary information, which is not actually required. The answer also utilized generalized implicature in order to respond to the question. It indirectly shows that policemen are feeling less and, in this sense, they are devoid of feeling, which entitles them as inhuman because they have no human feelings. The function of the statement is representative because it goes to suggest instead of relevant answer.

Datum No. 15.

Sohrab: (holding Rustum’s hand) They will not give us a grave.

Rustum: They are dogs.

Sohrab: Do not disrepute dogs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flouting of Maxim</th>
<th>Function of Speech Act</th>
<th>Type of Conversational Implicature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Quality</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Generalized Implicature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context.

In this dialogue of panel four of the play, both Sohrab & Rustum are talking about the behavior of people or mob, who are their fatal enemy, towards their death, bury and grave.
Analysis.

While discussing about the presupposed attitude of the mob towards the death of both participants, Rustum comments about the people that they are dogs. But Sohrab responds “do not disrepute dogs”. This statement goes to flout the maxim of quality as it is not truth in practice life. A man can never be equal to the dog because a dog is an animal but man is crown creature. Further, utterance utilizes the generalized implicature in order to accentuate the characters and behaviors of the people against both of them. It actually means that they become so mean that they become devoid of human’s features and become dog. In this way, Sohrab uses directive format to respond to the statement of Rustum.

CONCLUSIONS.

After discussing aforementioned data and its analysis, the study goes towards conclusion, where, results and crux of the whole research is discussed. Following Figure-I shows that, out 15 statements, 9 No. statements are generalized implicature, whereas, 6 No. statements are particularized implicature, which shows the more tendency in the play towards generalized implicature.

![Figure-I](image-url)
Figures-II indicates the breakup of the data into flouting of maxims of Quality, Manner, Quantity and Relevance. This shows that mostly i.e. 7 No. implicated utterances have flouted the maxim of Quality. Similarly, 5 No. implicated statements violated the maxim of Relevance, whereas, 2 No. utterances have disobeyed the maxim of Quantity.
Figure-III sheds light over the functions of implicated speech act, which is split up into four categories i.e. Expressive, Representative/ Assertive, Commissive & Directive. This illustrate that 12 No. implicated statements carries the function of representativeness/ assertiveness and only 1 No. statement is used for the function of expressive. Simultaneously, 1 No. statement has been used for Commissive and 1 No. utterance is utilized for the purpose of direction.

To sum up, the whole debate, the study addresses the research questions as to which type of conversational implicature has been used, resultantly, it shows that mostly generalized implicature has been used by the playwright in the play for the purpose of creating implicature and to accentuate the linguistic perspective of the play. Further, the analysis also addresses the question regarding the flouting of maxims for creating the implicature in the play. Furthermore, the analysis of the work also goes to elaborate the functions of the implicated utterances that show that mostly representative method has been used in the play.

The study, in short, concludes that The Prisoner carries rich quality of linguistics aspects, which does not only pave the ways for other Pakistani English Literature but also focuses towards the promotion of Pakistani English Literature for new Pakistani playwright and researchers.
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