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ABSTRACT

NANI PUSPITA NINGRUM (2010). The Violation and The result of the Conversational Maxims in Lewis Carroll’s Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland. Yogyakarta: Department of English Letters, Faculty of Letters, Sanata Dharma University.

This study discusses a novel by Lewis Carroll entitled Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland. This novel was chosen because it is a fantasy story that contains many conversations by characters with various characteristics. Therefore, the writer can easily collect the utterances as the data. While the topic of conversational maxims was chosen because conversational maxims are part of the requirements of any successful communication. Thus, it is important to discuss.

Two problems are formulated in this study, namely about the violations of the conversational maxims that occur in Carroll’s Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland and the results of those violations.

This study uses theory of conversation as discussed by Cutting, Grice’s theory of conversational maxims, their violation, and flouting as discussed by O’Grady and Cruse. This study applies Pragmatics approach because the theory of conversational maxims originates from the linguistic field of pragmatics. The data were collected from the novel Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland in the form of the characters’ utterances which violate the conversational maxims.

There are two results of the analysis. Firstly, the violations of conversational maxims are divided into four types, namely the violations of the maxim of quantity, the violations of the maxim of relevance, the violations of the maxim of manner, and the violations of the maxim of quality. Actually, there are a total of 55 violations of the conversational maxims, but this study only examines five examples from each type of conversational maxim. These violations are done by nearly all the characters, such as Alice, the Footman, Cheshire Cat, the Duchess, the Pigeon, the Caterpillar, the March Hare and the Mad Hatter.

Secondly, there are some results of the violations of the conversational maxims. The conversation partners might feel offended, angry, frustrated, or confused. Both the speaker and the conversation partner might need to make repeated clarifications to understand the utterances better. Sometimes, their conversations are stopped altogether because of the violations. Sometimes either the speaker or the conversation partner becomes reluctant to continue the conversation, and usually the conversation becomes pointless or useless.
PLAGIAT MERUPAKAN TINDAKAN TIDAK TERPUJI

ABSTRAK


Terdapat dua masalah yang dirumuskan dalam studi ini, yaitu tentang pelanggaran-pelanggaran terhadap maksim percakapan dalam novel Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland dan akibat dari pelanggaran-pelanggaran maksim percakapan tersebut.

Studi ini menggunakan teori percakapan yang dibahas oleh Cutting, teori maksim percakapan Grice dan pelanggarannya yang dibahas oleh O’Grady dan Cruse. Studi ini menerapkan pendekatan Pragmatik karena teori maksim percakapan memang berasal dari bidang linguistik pragmatik. Data penelitian ini diperoleh dari novel Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland dalam bentuk ucapan-ucapan dalam percakapan tokoh-tokoh novel tersebut yang melanggar maksim percakapan.

Terdapat dua hasil analisis. Pertama, pelanggaran maksim percakapan dibagi ke dalam empat jenis, yaitu pelanggaran maksim kuantitas, pelanggaran maksim relevansi, pelanggaran maksim cara, dan pelanggaran maksim kualitas. Sebelumnya, total terdapat 55 pelanggaran maksim percakapan, namun studi ini hanya membahas lima contoh pelanggaran dari setiap jenis maksim. Pelanggaran-pelanggaran ini dilakukan oleh hampir semua tokoh dalam novel ini, seperti Alice, the Footman, Cheshire Cat, the Duchess, the Pigeon, the Caterpillar, the March Hare and the Mad Hatter. Kedua, ada beberapa akibat dari pelanggaran maksim percakapan. Rekan bicara tokoh yang melanggar maksim percakapan dapat merasa tersinggung, marah, frustrasi, atau kebingungan. Tokoh yang melanggar maksim maupun rekan bicaranya perlu mengklarifikasi ucapan mereka secara berulang. Kadang kala, percakapan mereka bahkan terhenti sepenuhnya. Kadang kala, baik tokoh yang melanggar maupun rekan bicaranya menjadi enggan melanjutkan percakapan, dan sering kali percakapan mereka menjadi sia-sia.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

Language is a vital thing which cannot be separated from human life. Human beings are social beings, so relationships with other human beings become very important. Language functions as the chief means for human beings to express their thoughts and emotions, and to establish relationships with others. Microsoft Encarta Premium DVD defines language as “the principal means used by human beings to communicate with one another” (Comrie, 2005: 1).

As discussed by O’Grady, et al in Contemporary Linguistics, every language consists of elements such as sound pattern, morphological structures, and syntactic organization. Those elements are known as the form. However, as a means of communication between humans, language does not only consist of form, but also a message.

In order for language to fulfill its communicative function, utterances must also convey a message; they must have content. Speaking very generally, we can refer to an utterance’s content as its meaning (O’Grady, et al, 2005: 201).

Considering the characteristics of language discussed above, meaning becomes very important in any language. Different utterances create different meanings, and every language consists of rules that regulate the meaning. People cannot assign any meaning they want to the language they speak. If that happens, the communication will not be established successfully.
However, it must be remembered that meaning does not only depend on linguistic knowledge such as morphology, syntax, or lexicon. Meaning also depends on factors such as the context of the utterance, the identity of the speakers, place, time, and condition of the utterance. Pragmatics is a subfield of linguistics defined as “the study of the use of language in human communications as determined by the condition of society” (Mey, 2001: 6) and also “a general cognitive, social, and cultural perspective on linguistic phenomena in relation to their usage in forms of behavior” (Mey, 2001: 9). Thus, pragmatics relates utterances in conversation with the context of the conversation.

This thesis discusses one of the major theories studied in pragmatics, namely the Cooperative Principle. The Cooperative Principle was conceived by the philosopher H. Paul Grice. It is “the general overarching guideline for conversational interactions which obliges every speaker’s contribution to be appropriate to the conversation” (O’Grady, et al, 2005: 232-233). According to Grice conversation is “a co-operative activity in which participants tacitly agree to abide by certain norms” (Cruse, 2006: 40). The participants’ willingness to abide by the norms is summed up in the Cooperative Principle. This principle is manifested in the form of four conversational maxims, namely the maxim of relevance, quality, quantity, and manner.

In this thesis, those maxims are analyzed in the conversations found in a literary work. The literary work that will be used as the source for data collection is a novel entitled *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, which was written by Lewis Carroll and published in 1865. This work is chosen because it contains many
imaginative characters, setting, events, and conversations between the characters which are not normally found in reality. The imaginative elements in Lewis Carroll’s work are also discussed in an article in The Observer, a British newspaper. Carroll is described as an author who “possessed an admirable knack for creating alternative worlds” and “laboured unthinkably hard behind the scenes to give their writing the appearance of madcap tomfoolery” (http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/2001/aug/12/sciencefictionfantasyandhorror.douglasadams). The “alternative world” and “the appearance of madcap tomfoolery” in the article refers to the bizarrely imaginative setting, characters, and events in Carroll’s work.

Those imaginative elements, especially the conversations between the characters, make this work a good source of study on the conversational maxims, since this work provides clear examples of obedience as well as violations of the conversational maxims. In real life, normal speakers will always try to adhere to the maxims as much as possible and would not violate them without purpose, but in this novel, the characters both violate and obey the maxims in various ways; some of the violations are done on purpose, while some others are done without any purpose. From the conversations in this novel, the writer can get a full range of possible violations of the maxims which the writer cannot easily get from real life conversations. Thus, the writer can study about the conversational maxims more intensively than merely through examples from real life conversations.

This topic is worthy to be studied because these conversational maxims are part of the rules that enable the existence of successful communication. By
analyzing this work, the writer can study the application of conversational maxims and discover what happens when the maxims are violated. In this study, only five examples of violations are chosen and discussed to represent the violations of each maxim, because the novel contains too many instances of violations of the conversational maxims. Five is chosen as the number of violations which are not too many, yet enough to illustrate the topic of this study.

B. Problem Formulation

To limit the topic that will be discussed in this paper, the problems are formulated into the following questions.

1. What violations of the conversational maxims occur in Carroll’s *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*?

2. What are the results of the violations of the conversational maxims in Carroll’s *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*?

C. Objectives of the Study

This study aims to answer the questions formulated above. The first objective of the study is to identify the violations of the conversational maxims in Carroll’s *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*. The second objective of the study is to identify the result of the violations of the conversational maxims in Carroll’s *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*. 
D. Definition of Terms

1. Cooperative Principle

In *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*, Cooperative Principle is described as the principle suggested by the philosopher Paul Grice, who “portrayed a conversation as a co-operative activity in which participants tacitly agree to abide by certain norms” (Cruse, 2006: 40). The Cooperative Principle functions as the general overarching guideline for conversational interactions which obliges every speaker’s contribution to be appropriate to the conversation (O’Grady, et al, 2005: 232-233).

2. Maxims of Conversation

In *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*, maxims of conversation are defined as “rules of conversational conduct that people do their best to follow, and that they expect their conversational partners to follow” (Cruse, 2006: 101). Those maxims are part of Grice’s Cooperative Principle, which spell out in greater detail the consequences of the Cooperative Principle (Cruse, 2006: 101).

3. Violation

In *Pragmatics and Discourse*, violation of conversational maxims is described as a speaker’s deliberate failure to follow a maxim “when they know the hearer will not know the truth and will only understand the surface meaning of the words”, so the hearer wrongly assumes that he or she is cooperating with the speaker (Cutting, 2002: 40). Therefore, it is described as “unostentatiously, quietly deceiving” (2002:40).
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL REVIEW

A. Review on Related Studies


In the first study, Dessy Natalia Djajasaputra relates advertisement copies’ obedience to the conversational maxims in Grice’s Cooperative Principles to the audience-buying interest. As the source of study, she examines 20 car advertisements in 3 editions of a monthly magazine called Motor Trend, with 30 respondents to measure the advertisement’s ability to evoke audience-buying-interest. Her objectives are to discover the advertisement copies’ obedience to the conversational maxims, the ability of advertisement copies which obey the maxims to evoke audience-buying-interest, and the correlation between the frequency of advertisement copies’ obedience to the maxims and the frequency of audience-buying-interest (Djajasaputra, 1998: 4-5).

As the result of this study, Djajasaputra finds a positive correlation between the advertisement’s obedience to the conversational maxims and its
audience-buying-interest. In other words, advertisements that obey the conversational maxims will evoke higher interest in the audience to buy the products; on the contrary, advertisements that do not obey the conversational maxims will evoke lower interest in the audience to buy the product (1998: 38-39). Additionally, Djajasputra also discovers some reasons of the violation of the maxims, such as the advertisement makers’ wrong interpretation of the target audience’s needs or expectation, their attempt to make exclusion to their intended target market, and their use of exclusive advertisement forms which are not understood by the audience, such as analogy, euphemism and symbolism (1998: 61).

In the second study, Laura Hidalgo analyzes the books in the Alice series, namely Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland and its sequel Through the Looking Glass, using the theory of reference from the field of pragmatics. According to Hidalgo, Alice books describe highly different worlds. The world of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland is described as a “dream world” and “a world of total freedom, where no rules seem to apply and arbitrariness characterises social and linguistic behaviour”, while the world of Through the Looking Glass, which is modelled upon a game of chess, is “a world governed by a rigid system of rules” (Hidalgo, 1998: 112). There is also Alice’s world or “the ‘real world’ as we understand it” (1998: 112). In this study, Hidalgo analyses the use of deictic terms as a type of reference in those worlds.

Reference is an important linguistic function which enables humans to introduce and maintain information in discourse, without having to repeat the
same information over and over (Hidalgo, 1998: 113). In order to be interpreted adequately and correctly, reference depends on the context or pragmatic clues. In the fictional worlds of the Alice books, pragmatic principles, including reference, work differently from the way expected by the readers and Alice.

Hidalgo concludes that reference is important in setting the limits of the text world boundaries and describing the laws governing space and time relations. Since the fictional worlds of Alice books differ from us in their uses of language system as system of communication, they appear as distorted versions or mirror images of our own world. Thus, the characteristics of the world we inhabit are systematized through language.

The two studies above are chosen because they discuss the same work or topic. The first study discusses the same topic, namely the conversational maxims, but with different application. The first study tries to apply conversational maxims to written discourse with specific purpose, namely advertisement. The second study discusses the same novel and also uses theory from the field of linguistics, to be precise pragmatics. It is very interesting because it shows that the novel Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland provides good materials for linguistic analysis. This study develops some of the views and findings in the related studies above, such as analysis on conversational maxims by Djajasaputra and the concept of different worlds by Hidalgo.
B. Review on Related Theories

1. Theory on Conversation

Joan Cutting in her book *Pragmatics and Discourse* defines conversation as “discourse mutually constructed and negotiated in time between speakers”, which is “usually informal and unplanned” (2002: 28). A talk may be classified as conversation if it fulfills the following points.

1. Not primarily necessitated by a practical task
2. Any unequal power of participants is partially suspended
3. The number of the participants is small
4. Turns are quite short
5. Talk is primarily for the participants not for an outside audience (Cook in Cutting, 2002: 28).

Meanwhile, as discussed in *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*, the linguist H. Paul Grice defines conversation as “a co-operative activity in which participants tacitly agree to abide by certain norms” (Cruse, 2006: 40). The participants’ willingness to abide by the norms is summed up in the Cooperative Principle, a set of guideline proposed by Grice (in Cruse, 2006: 40).

Based on the descriptions above, classroom exchanges, doctor-patient interviews, and TV quiz shows are not classified as conversation. For example, in the teacher-pupil exchange in a lesson is not a conversation because it does not have equal power balance. Additionally, it is necessitated by a practical task. The doctor-patient interview also has unequal power balance, and is also necessitated by a practical task of diagnosing and prescribing. While the quiz show is intended primarily for an outside audience rather than the contestants only (Cutting, 2002: 28).
2. Theory on Cooperative Principle and Conversational Maxims

O’Grady, et al in *Contemporary Linguistics* defines *Grice’s Cooperative Principle* as the general overarching guideline for conversational interactions which obliges every speaker’s contribution to be appropriate to the conversation (O’Grady, et al, 2005: 232-233). According to Grice, by accepting to take part in the conversation, a speaker implicitly endorses this principle:

Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged (in Cruse, 2000: 355).

Grice’s Cooperative Principle is elaborated through a set of maxims, which are known as the *conversational maxims*. O’Grady, et al define conversational maxims as the guidelines that ensure that conversational interactions actually satisfy the Cooperative Principle, namely that each speaker’s contribution is appropriate to the conversation. These maxims are responsible for regulating normal conversation (O’Grady, et al, 2005: 233).

The conversational maxims based on Grice’s Cooperative Principle are divided into four types: the *maxim of quantity*, the *maxim of relevance*, the *maxim of manner*, and the *maxim of quality* (O’Grady, et al, 2005: 233). Firstly, the maxim of quality is concerned with truth telling. It consists of two parts, namely:

1. Do not say what you believe to be false
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 355).

The part that obliges speakers not to say what they “believe to be false” (in Cruse, 2000: 355) is the same as forbidding speakers from lying. However, this maxim
does not only forbid speakers from lying directly. The next part also forbids speakers from saying anything if they do not have enough evidence to support their statement. It means that the speakers must only say something that they know and understand enough.

Secondly, the maxim of quantity is concerned with the amount of information conveyed by an utterance. This maxim also consists of two parts.

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange in which you are engaged.
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 356).

Both the first part and the second part give almost similar instructions to the speakers to just give the necessary amount of information in every conversation. The first part obliges the speakers to give statements which are “as informative as is required” for the “current purposes” of their conversation at the moment (in Cruse, 2000: 356). It means that the speakers must be sensitive and pay attention to the current topic of the conversation, so they can identify what kind of information and how much information is needed for the conversation. Meanwhile, the second part explicitly forbids speakers from giving more information than the amount of information which is required or needed in the current conversation. Therefore, after the speakers identify what kind of information and how much information is needed for the conversation, they must be able to be selective in giving statements. They must be able to omit the statements which contain unnecessary information.

Then, the maxim of relevance only consists of one component, namely “Be relevant” (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 356). The point of this maxim is that a
merely truthful and informative statement is still not enough to form an acceptable contribution in a conversation. The statement must be relevant to the conversation partner’s utterance. It means that the speakers must be sensitive and pay attention not only to the topic of the conversation, but also to the conversation partner’s utterance and their own previous utterances, so they can produce a response which is relevant enough.

Lastly, the maxim of manner is concerned with the way an utterance is conveyed. It consists of four components, namely:

1. Avoid obscurity.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Avoid unnecessary prolixity.

The speakers must avoid obscurity, which means that they must not use words or expressions which are too weird, unusual, or hard to understand, even though the words or expressions might be truthful, relevant, and the amount of information might be enough as required. An ambiguous utterance is an utterance which is not clear or can be interpreted in more than one way. To avoid ambiguity, the speakers must pay attention to their own previous utterance and the conversation partner’s utterance, so they can understand the context of the conversation and produce an utterance which is clear and not easily misinterpreted.

The word “prolixity” means very long or “tediously wordy” (Cruse, 2000: 357). To avoid prolixity, the speakers must must not give statements which are too long or which contain too many words. The word “orderly” refers to recounting events in the order that they occurred. The speakers can also make it more clear about the order by using time signals. Cruse states that without
appropriate time signal, the speakers must tell about the events that occur the earliest, followed by later events (2000: 357). For example, the statement “I have breakfast and go to campus” means that the breakfast occurs first, followed by going to campus.

3. Theory on Violation and Flouting of the Conversational Maxims

Conversational maxims are not always followed. When a speaker fails to follow the conversational maxims, his or her failure can be divided into two categories: flouting and violation of the conversational maxims.

“Flouting” happens when the speaker purposefully appears not to follow the maxims, while expecting the hearer to know the truth and infer the implicit meaning (Cutting, 2002: 37). Flouting of the maxims create what Grice calls as “conversational implicature” to the speakers (Cruse, 2000: 360). As described further by Cruse, the following are some characteristics of flouting.

(a) it is obvious to the hearer that the maxims are being flouted, (b) it is obvious to the hearer that the speaker intends the hearer to be aware that the maxims are being flouted, and (c) there are no signs that the speaker is opting out the co-operative principle (2000: 360).

When a competent hearer faces a speaker’s act of flouting, the hearer will presume that the speaker understands the maxims, and yet the speaker is obviously violating a maxim. Therefore, the speaker must mean something additional to what he or she is saying, which possibly has figurative meaning (Hancher, 1978: 4). As a result, the hearer will try to infer the figurative or implicit meaning, or the real meaning that the speaker actually wants to convey.
“Violation” of the maxims happens when a speaker deliberately does not follow a maxim while he or she knows “that the hearer will not know the truth and will only understand the surface meaning of the words”, so the hearer wrongly assumes that he or she is cooperating with the speaker (Cutting, 2002: 40). In contrast to the obviousness of flouting, violation is described as “unostentatiously, quietly deceiving” to the hearer (2002: 40).

Violation happens because of no apparent reason, or because of some reasons known to the speaker only. For example, if a speaker violates the maxim of quantity, he or she does not give the hearer enough information because he or she does not want the hearer to know the full picture. The speaker is not implying anything. He or she is just “being economical with the truth” (Cutting, 2002: 40). Another reason of violation is to cover up the truth. For example, a wife covers up the price of her new dress by answering “Less than the last one” to her husband, thus violating the maxim of quantity (2002: 40-41).

Based on the description above, the violation might or might not be detected or realized by the hearer. When a competent hearer faces a speaker’s violation of the maxims and the violation is detected, according to Michael Hancher, the result “will be linguistically aberrant, or ‘marked,’ and literally ‘remarkable’” (Hancher, 1978: 4). Alternatively, as a result, the hearer will assume that the speaker is secretly subverting the maxims for his or her own selfish purpose, for example when a criminal lies to hide his crime (Hancher, 1978: 4).
After all, however, conversational maxims ideally should be followed rather than violated or flouted. In his article, Hancher further describes the ability to realize the maxims as “an important part of a speaker’s communicative competence” (1978: 4-5). When any of the conversational maxims is violated, the result will be “linguistically aberrant, or ‘marked,’ and literally ‘remarkable’ ” (1978: 5).

C. Theoretical Framework

This part will describe how the theories above are used to answer the problems formulated in the first chapter. The theory of Grice’s Cooperative Principle and conversational maxims is used to answer all the questions, namely to identify the violations of the conversational maxims in the novel and the results of the violations. Cruse’s theory on violation of conversational maxims is also used to answer the second question about the results of the violations.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

A. Object of the Study

The object of this study is a novel entitled *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* by British author Lewis Carroll. Lewis Carroll is actually a pseudonym of Reverend Charles Lutwidge Dodgson, a mathematics dean in Oxford. The novel was written and published in 1865 by Macmillan (http://www.sparknotes.com/lit/alice/facts.html). Shortly afterwards, the original edition was sold to Appleton publishing house in New York. Since then, the novel has become very popular among children as well as adults around the world.

*Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* is a children’s fiction. It tells about a young girl named Alice, who enters a fantasy world through a rabbit-hole in a garden while waiting for her sister. In this fantasy world, she meets many bizarre creatures and experiences bizarre events. At the end of the story, Alice wakes up and discovers that all her adventures are just a dream.

Now, more than a century after the book was written, the novel has been reprinted countless times in over a hundred editions. It has been translated into 125 languages, including Indonesian. It has also been adapted into many motion pictures, animated movies, and play performances. One of the famous adaptations is the Disney animation with the shortened title *Alice in Wonderland*. This novel also has a sequel entitled *Through the Looking Glass* (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alice_in_Wonderland). It can be seen that this novel
has good quality, not only because of its ability to remain popular for over a century, but also because Carroll’s style in this novel has influenced other authors.

For instance, in the article entitled “Lewis Carroll in Cyberspace” in the British newspaper The Observer, Robert McFarlane describes the author Douglas Adams as one of the authors who are greatly influenced by Lewis Carroll. McFarlane describes both authors as writers who “possessed an admirable knack for creating alternative worlds”, “laboured unthinkably hard behind the scenes to give their writing the appearance of madcap tomfoolery”, and “had serious satirical points to make about the dogmatisms of their respective ages” (http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/2001/aug/12/sciencefictionfantasyandhorror.douglasadams). Based on that article, the readers can see that Lewis Carroll was an influential author, who had the ability to depict a fantasy world which is very unusual but interesting.

B. Data Collection

The data in this study is collected from the novel Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland by Lewis Carroll. The data is comprised of the characters’ utterances which violate the conversational maxims in their conversations. In the novel, there are at least 16 violations of the maxim of quantity, 18 violations of the maxim of relevance, 7 violations of the maxim of manner, and 14 violations of the maxim of quality. This data is collected in order to find enough instances of violations, so that the writer has sufficient materials to analyze the topic of this thesis, namely the violation of the conversational maxims.
C. Data Analysis

In order to answer the questions presented in the problem formulation, several steps are taken. Firstly, the writer reads the novel *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* and collects utterances by the characters in the novel. After that, based on the theories of conversational maxims, the writer divides the utterances into two groups, namely utterances which obey the conversational maxims and utterances which violate the conversational maxims. Then the writer further analyzes the utterances to discover what maxims are violated and why they are considered as violations. The violations of the conversational maxims are presented in a table, and lastly, the writer finds the results of the obedience and the violations of the conversational maxims.

Because there are too many instances of violations of the conversational maxims in this novel, only five examples from each category of violations will be discussed in this study.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS

In this chapter, the writer will answer the problems formulated in the first chapter. The writer will examine the violations of the conversational maxims in Carroll’s *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, why those utterances are considered as violating the maxims, and the results of the violations of the maxims. This chapter is divided into four parts, namely the part that discusses violations of the maxim of quantity, maxim of relevance, maxim of manner, and maxim of quality. Each part contains a table which discusses the violations of each maxim. These parts are analyzed in this order because the maxims are mentioned in such order by O’Grady, et al in *Contemporary Linguistics*, where the theory on conversational maxims is taken from. Meanwhile, the violations in each part are analyzed according to the chronological order from the novel.

A. The Violations of the Conversational Maxims

1. The Violations of the Maxim of Quantity

This part examines the utterances in the novel which violate the maxim of quantity. The maxim of quantity obliges speakers to make their contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the conversation they are participating in, and not to make their contribution more informative than is required (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 356). In this part, the writer discusses five
examples of violations of the maxim of quantity in *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*.

In the first example, the maxim of quantity is violated by Alice to the Mouse, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number: 1

‘Are you—are you fond—of—of dogs?’ The Mouse did not answer, so Alice went on eagerly: ‘There is such a nice little dog near our house I should like to show you! A little bright-eyed terrier, you know, with oh, such long curly brown hair! And it’ll fetch things when you throw them, and it’ll sit up and beg for its dinner, and all sorts of things—I can’t remember half of them—and it belongs to a farmer, you know, and he says it’s so useful, it’s worth a hundred pounds! He says it kills all the rats and—oh dear!’ cried Alice in a sorrowful tone, ‘I’m afraid I’ve offended it again!’ For the Mouse was swimming away from her as hard as it could go, and making quite a commotion in the pool as it went (Carroll, 1970: 43)

In this conversation, Alice tries to start a small talk with the Mouse by talking about a dog near her house. The part of Alice’s utterance that violates the maxim is her detailed explanation about the dog, especially the part “it kills all the rats”, which refers to one of the dog’s habits.

The maxim of quantity forbids speakers to make their contribution more informative than is required (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 356). Alice’s utterance violates the maxim of quantity because; she her contribution is more informative than is required in her effort to make small talk. She gets carried away with her fondness for the dog and mentions the dog’s appearance and habits in unnecessary details, thus being too informative. These unnecessary details include catching and killing rats, animals from the same species as the Mouse, Alice’s conversation partner at the moment.
In the second example, the maxim of quantity is violated by The Caterpillar to Alice, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number: 2

This time Alice waited patiently until it chose to speak again. In a minute or two the Caterpillar took the hookah out of its mouth and yawned once or twice, and shook itself. Then it got down off the mushroom, and crawled away in the grass, merely remarking as it went, ‘One side will make you grow taller, and the other side will make you grow shorter.’ ‘One side of what? The other side of what?’ thought Alice to herself (Carroll, 1970: 73).

The exchange above happens in the end of the Caterpillar’s conversation with Alice. The part of the Caterpillar’s utterance that violates the maxim is “One side will make you grow taller, and the other side will make you grow shorter.”

The maxim of quantity is concerned with the amount of information conveyed by an utterance and obliges speakers to make their contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the conversation (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 356). The Caterpillar’s utterance violates the maxim of quantity because it provides less information than is required about eating the mushroom. According to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, side means “either of the two halves of a surface, an object or a place divided by an imaginary central line” (Hornby, 1995: 1097). Thus, when someone talks about side, the object under discussion must be clear to both the speaker and listener. In its offending utterance, the Caterpillar does not provide information about the side of what object he actually means, whether through its words or gesture. It merely crawled away in the grass while talking to Alice.
In the third example, the maxim of quantity is violated by The Footman to Alice, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number: 3

‘How am I to get in?’ asked Alice again, in a louder tone.
‘Are you to get in at all?’ said the Footman. ‘That’s the first question, you know.’
It was, no doubt: only Alice did not like to be told so. ‘It’s really dreadful,’ she muttered to herself, ‘the way all the creatures argue. It’s enough to drive one crazy!’ (Carroll, 1970: 81).

This conversation happens outside a house. Both Alice and the Footman are standing in front of the closed door of the house. Alice wants to enter the house and asks the Footman. After the Footman violates the maxim of relevance several times, which will be discussed in the next part, Alice asks him for the third time about how she can get into the house. The part of the Footman’s utterance that violates the maxim is his question “Are you to get in at all?”.

The maxim of quantity forbids speakers to make their contribution more than required (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 356). The Footman’s utterance violates the maxim of quantity because if people ask how to get into the house until three times, it is obvious that they are interested in getting into the house and will get in if they already know the way. Therefore, there is no need to question whether or not they are “to get in at all”. By asking such question, the Footman states more than is required, thus violating the maxim of quantity.

In the fourth example, the maxim of quantity is violated by Cheshire Cat to Alice, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number: 4
'Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?'
'That depends a good deal on where you want to get to,' said the Cat.
'I don’t much care where—' said Alice.
‘Then it doesn’t matter which way you go,’ said the Cat.
‘—so long as I get somewhere,’ Alice added as an explanation.
‘Oh, you’re sure to do that,’ said the Cat, ‘if you only walk long enough.’
Alice felt that this could not be denied, so she tried another question.

In this conversation, Alice is asking the Cat for direction because she is lost and does not know anything about the place they are in. The part of the Cat’s utterance that violates the maxim is its responses “[which way Alice ought to go] depends a good deal on where you want to get to”, “it doesn’t matter which way you go”, and “you’re sure to [get somewhere] if you only walk long enough”.

The maxim of quantity obliges speakers to make their contribution as informative as is required for the purposes of their conversation (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 356). The Cat’s utterance violates the maxim of quantity because it only restates things already known by everyone and does not provide enough information.

Everyone knows that the way someone must take depends on where he or she wants to go. When the Cat repeats the obvious fact that it “depends a good deal on where she wants to go”, the Cat gives less information than is required. Then, it interrupts Alice and says that it “doesn’t matter” which way Alice goes, which does not give enough useful information to Alice. Lastly, everyone knows that people will surely reach a destination if they walk long enough. When the Cat
repeats that obvious fact instead of giving information about the place, once again the Cat gives less information than required.

In the fifth example, the maxim of quantity is violated by The Duchess to Alice, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number: 5

‘I quite agree with you,’ said the Duchess; ‘and the moral of that is—“Be what you would seem to be”—or if you’d like it put more simply—“Never imagine yourself not to be otherwise than what it might appear to others that what you were or might have been was not otherwise than what you had been would have appeared to them to be otherwise.”’

‘I think I should understand that better,’ Alice said very politely, ‘if I had it written down: but I can’t quite follow it as you say it.’

‘That’s nothing to what I could say if I chose,’ the Duchess replied, in a pleased tone.

‘Pray don’t trouble yourself to say it any longer than that,’ said Alice (Carroll, 1970: 122).

The quotation on the left is a fragment of the Duchess’ conversation with Alice, which contains several violations in several categories. The part of the Duchess’ utterance that violates the maxim is “Never imagine yourself not to be otherwise than what it might appear to others that what you were or might have been was not otherwise than what you had been would have appeared to them to be otherwise.”

The maxim of quantity forbids speakers to make their contribution more informative than is required for their conversation (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 356). The Duchess’ utterance violates the maxim of quantity because the Duchess gives more information than is necessary for their conversation. In their conversation, the Duchess and Alice are not discussing anything related to morals and Alice does not ask the Duchess anything about morals.
In the last example, the maxim of quantity is violated by violated by Alice to the birds, as shown in the following quotation.

Data number 6:

‘I wish I had our dinah here, I know I do!’ said Alice aloud, addressing nobody in particular, ‘she’d soon fetch it back!’
‘And who is Dinah, if I might venture to ask the question?’ said the Lory. Alice replied eagerly, for she was always ready to talk about her pet: ‘Dinah’s our cat. And she’s such a capital one for catching mice you can’t think! And oh, I wish you could see her after the birds! Why, she’ll eat a little bird as soon as look at it!’ this speech caused a remarkable sensation among the party. Some of the birds hurried off at once: one old magpie began wrapping itself up very carefully, remarking, ‘I really must be getting home; the night-air doesn’t suit my throat!’ and a canary called out in a trembling voice to its children, ‘Come away, my dears! it’s high time you were all in bed!’ on various pretext they all moved off, and Alice was soon left alone.
‘I wish I hadn’t mentioned Dinah!’ she said to herself in a melancholy tone (Carroll, 1970: 52-53)

Alice gives more information than is required or necessary for her conversation with the birds. In the first place, she starts the topic about Dinah without being asked, “addressing nobody in particular” (1970:41). Then, when answering the Lorry’s question, instead of just saying that Dinah in her pet cat, Alice mentions about Dinah’s habits in detail, which happen to include eating little birds.

2. The Violations of the Maxim of Relevance

This part examines the utterances in the novel which violate the maxim of relevance. The maxim of relevance obliges speakers to be relevant to the conversation partner’s utterance (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 356). In this part, the
The writer discusses five examples of violations of the maxim of relevance in Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland.

In the first example, the maxim of relevance is violated by Alice to the Mouse, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number: 7

‘Mine is a long and a sad tale!’ said the Mouse, turning to Alice, and sighing.
‘It is a long tail, certainly,’ said Alice, looking down with wonder at the Mouse’s tail; ‘but why do you call it sad?’ And she kept on puzzling about it while the Mouse was speaking.
‘You are not attending!’ said the Mouse to Alice severely. ‘What are you thinking of?’ (Carroll, 1970: 50-51).

In this conversation, the Mouse is telling Alice a story about its life based on Alice’s request. The parts of Alice’s utterance that violates the maxim are her statement about the mouse’s tail, namely “It is a long tail”, and her question about the mouse’s tail, namely “why do you call it sad”.

The maxim of relevance obliges speakers to be relevant or connect suitably to the conversation partner’s utterance (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 356). Alice’s utterance violates the maxim of relevance because her statement and question about tail does not connect suitably with the mouse’s utterance about its tale. Tail and tale are homophones, words that “are pronounced the same, but have different written forms” (Cruse, 2006: 80). Alice mistakes the Mouse’s word tale, which means “a story, often one that is simple to read or understand” (Hornby, 1995: 1219), as tail, which means “the movable part at the end of the body of a bird, an animal or a fish” (1995: 1215).
Due to the misunderstanding, Alice’s response does not connect suitably to the Mouse’s utterance.

In the second example, the maxim of relevance is violated by Alice to the Mouse, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number: 8

‘I had not!’ cried the Mouse, sharply and very angrily.
‘A knot!’ said Alice, always ready to make herself useful, and looking anxiously about her. ‘Oh, do let me help to undo it!’
‘I shall do nothing of the sort,’ said the Mouse, getting up and walking away. ‘You insult me by talking such nonsense!’
‘I didn’t mean it!’ pleaded poor Alice. ‘But you’re so easily offended, you know!’
The Mouse only growled in reply (Carroll, 1970: 52).

This is the continuation of the conversation above. The parts of Alice’s utterance that violate the maxim are her statement about the mouse’s knot and her offer to “help to undo it”.

The maxim of relevance obliges speakers to be relevant or connect suitably to the conversation partner’s utterance (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 356). Alice’s utterance violates the maxim of relevance because her statements about knot does not connect suitably with the mouse’s negation using not. Knot and not are also homophones. Alice mistakes the Mouse’s word not, an adverb used with auxiliary and modal verbs to form the negative (1995: 789), as knot, which means “a fastening made by tying a piece or pieces of string, rope, etc” or “a way of twisting hair into a small round shape at the back” (1995: 655). Due to the misunderstanding, Alice’s response does not connect suitably to the Mouse’s utterance.
In the third example, the maxim of relevance is violated by The Pigeon to Alice, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number :9

‘Serpent!’ screamed the Pigeon.
‘I’m not a serpent!’ said Alice indignantly. ‘Let me alone!’
‘Serpent, I say again!’ repeated the Pigeon, but in a more subdued tone, and added with a kind of sob, ‘I’ve tried every way, and nothing seems to suit them!’
‘I haven’t the least idea what you’re talking about,’ said Alice.
‘I’ve tried the roots of trees, and I’ve tried banks, and I’ve tried hedges,’ the Pigeon went on, without attending to her; ‘but those serpents! There’s no pleasing them!’

Alice was more and more puzzled, but she thought there was no use in saying anything more till the Pigeon had finished (Carroll, 1970: 75)

This conversation happens when the Pigeon sees Alice for the first time.

The part of the Pigeon’s utterance that violates the maxim is its repeated accusations about Alice as a serpent.

The maxim of relevance obliges speakers to be relevant or connect suitably to the conversation partner’s utterance (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 356). The Pigeon’s utterance violates the maxim of relevance because it is not relevant to Alice’s utterance and not relevant to the real condition. A speaker must pay attention to what his or her conversation partner says in order to give relevant response. The Pigeon does not listen or pay attention to Alice’s utterance that she is not a serpent.

The Pigeon does not have any reason to suspect Alice of lying, either, because serpent is defined in Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary as “a snake, especially a large one” (Hornby, 1995: 1073) and Alice does not have the physical appearance of a snake. Thus, the Pigeon’s accusation is not relevant at all. The Pigeon then gives further complains about serpents, such as its efforts to please
the serpents by trying roots of trees, banks, and hedges, which do not connect to
Alice’s utterance because Alice is not a serpent in the first place.

In the fourth example, the maxim of relevance is violated by The Footman
to Alice, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number : 10

‘How am I to get in?’ she repeated, aloud.
‘I shall sit here,’ the Footman remarked, ‘till tomorrow—’
At this moment the door of the house opened, and a large plate came
skimming out, straight at the Footman’s head: it just grazed his nose, and
broke to pieces against one of the trees behind him.
‘—or next day, maybe,’ the Footman continued in the same tone, exactly
as if nothing had happened.
‘How am I to get in?’ asked Alice again, in a louder tone.
‘Are you to get in at all?’ said the Footman. ‘That’s the first question, you know.’
It was, no doubt: only Alice did not like to be told so. ‘It’s really dreadful,’
she muttered to herself, ‘the way all the creatures argue. It’s enough to
drive one crazy!’
The Footman seemed to think this a good opportunity for repeating his
remark, with variations. ‘I shall sit here,’ he said, ‘on and off, for days and
days.’
‘But what am I to do?’ said Alice.
‘Anything you like,’ said the Footman, and began whistling.
‘Oh, there’s no use in talking to him,’ said Alice desperately: ‘he’s
perfectly idiotic!’ And she opened the door and went in (Carroll, 1970: 81-82).

This conversation happens in front of the closed door outside a house. This
is the second time Alice asks the Footman about how she can get into the house.
The parts of the Footman’s utterance that violate the maxim are his statements
about planning to sit there “till tomorrow or the next day”, “on and off, for
days and days”, his question whether Alice were “to get in at all”, and his
advise to Alice to do “anything she likes”. 
The maxim of relevance obliges speakers to be relevant or connect suitably to the conversation partner’s utterance (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 356). The Footman’s utterance violates the maxim of relevance because it is not connected at all to Alice’s question about entering the house. Stating his intention to sit outside the house for days or questioning whether Alice would enter the house certainly does not answer Alice’s question about how to enter the house. Furthermore, Alice asks the question “What am I to do?” in relation to entering the house. The Footman’s answer “anything you like” is not relevant because at the moment Alice is actually asking him about whether she can do what she wants, namely entering the house.

In the fifth example, the maxim of relevance is violated by The Duchess to Alice, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number: 11

‘I dare say you’re wondering why I don’t put my arm round your waist,’ the Duchess said after a pause: ‘the reason is, that I’m doubtful about the temper of your flamingo. Shall I try the experiment?’

‘He might bite,’ Alice cautiously replied, not feeling at all anxious to have the experiment tried.

‘Very true,’ said the Duchess: ‘flamingoes and mustard both bite. And the moral of that is—“Birds of a feather flock together.”’

‘Only mustard isn’t a bird,’ Alice remarked.

‘Right, as usual,’ said the Duchess: ‘what a clear way you have of putting things!’

‘It’s a mineral, I think,’ said Alice (Carroll, 1970: 121).

In this conversation, the Duchess initiates a small talk with Alice when they meet in the croquet match. The part of the Duchess’ utterance that violates the maxim is her statements that “flamingoes and mustard both bite”, about
the saying “Birds of a feather flock together”, and about Alice’s “clear way of putting things”.

The maxim of relevance obliges speakers to be relevant or connect suitably to the conversation partner’s utterance (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 356). The Duchess’ utterance violates the maxim of relevance because it is not connected at all to Alice’s utterance. First, the Duchess talks about Alice’s flamingo and Alice confirms the Duchess’ fear that it might bite. Then suddenly the Duchess changes the subject to mustard biting like flamingoes, which is not connected to Alice’s utterance. Next, the Duchess draws a new moral that “Birds of a feather flock together”, a saying that means “people of the same sort are found together” (Hornby, 1995: 108), which is further unrelated to flamingoes or mustard. Lastly, she praises Alice’s clarity, which is not connected to the discussion of flamingoes, mustard, or her new moral.

In the last example, the maxim of relevance is violated by the Duck to the Mouse, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number: 12

“Edwin and Morcar, the earls of Mercia and Northumbria, declare for him: and even Stigand, the patriotic archbishop of Canterbury, found it advisable—‘‘
‘Found what?’ said the Duck.
‘Found it,’’ the Mouse replied rather crossly: ‘of course you know what “it” means.’
‘I know what “it” means well enough, when I find a thing,’’ said the Duck; ‘it’s generally a frog or a worm. The question is, what did the archbishop find?’
The Mouse did not noyice this question, but hurriedly went on,’’—found it advisable to go with Edgar Atheling to meet William and offer him the crown. William’s conduct at first was moderate. But the insolence of his Normans—“
Besides violating the maxim of quantity, the Duck also violates the maxim of relevance in its conversation with the Mouse. The Mouse is explaining about the history of Britain. When the Mouse says that the archbishop of Canterbury “Found it advisable”, it uses the past tense of the word find which means “to discover something by experience,” as defined by Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (Hornby, 1995:435). It means that the archbishop discovers by experience that that it is advisable to go with Edgar Atheling. However, the Duck uses the word find with another meaning, namely “to discover something unexpectedly or by chance” or “to discover something or somebody by searching, inquiry, or effort” (1995: 435). The Duck demands the Mouse to explain what the archbishop found. The Duck’s utterance is not relevance to the Mouse’s utterance, thus the Duck violates the maxim of relevance.

3. The Violations of the Maxim of Manner

This part examines the utterances in the novel which violate the maxim of manner. The maxim of manner obliges speakers to avoid obscurity, ambiguity, unnecessary prolixity, and to be orderly (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 357). According to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, obscurity means “a thing that is not clear and is therefore difficult to understand” (Hornby, 1995: 798), prolix means “using too many words and therefore boring to listen to or read” (1995: 926), and prolixity is the noun form of prolix. Therefore, a speaker must always avoid using unclear or difficult words, ambiguous words, too many words, and disorderly
words unnecessarily. In this part, the writer discusses five examples of violations of the maxim of manner in *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*.

In the first example, the maxim of manner is violated by The Mouse to the Birds, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number: 13

‘I move that the meeting adjourn, for the immediate adoption of more energetic remedies—’

‘Speak English!’ said the Eaglet. ‘I don’t know the meaning of half those long words, and, what’s more, I don’t believe you do either!’ And the Eaglet bent down its head to hide a smile: some of the other birds tittered audibly (Carroll, 1970: 47).

This conversation happens when the Mouse leads a group discussion with the other animals. The Mouse is giving its advise to the group to take an action to dry themselves. The part of the Mouse’s utterance that violates the maxim is his sentence “I move that the meeting adjourn, for the immediate adoption of more energetic remedies”.

The maxim of manner obliges speakers to avoid obscurity, ambiguity, unnecessary prolixity, and to be orderly. This maxim forbids speakers to use unclear or difficult words, ambiguous words, too many words, and disorderly words (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 357). The Mouse's utterance violates the maxim of manner because it uses difficult and highly formal language style, which contains obscurity and unnecessary prolixity not understood by anyone.

In the second example, the maxim of manner is violated by Alice to the Caterpillar, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number : 14

‘Who are *you*?’ said the Caterpillar. This was not an encouraging opening
for a conversation. Alice replied, rather shyly, ‘I-I hardly know, sir, just at present—at least I know who I was when I got up this morning, but I think I must have been changed several times since then.’

‘What do you mean by that?’ said the Caterpillar sternly. ‘Explain yourself!’ (Carroll, 1970: 67).

This conversation happens when Alice first encounters the Caterpillar in the forest. The part of Alice’s utterance that violates the maxim is “I-I hardly know, sir, just at present—at least I know who I was when I got up this morning, but I think I must have been changed several times since then”.

The maxim of manner forbids speakers to use unclear or difficult words, ambiguous words, too many words, and disorderly words (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 357). Alice’s utterance violates the maxim of manner because she uses too many words and disorderly words to explain her identity, in response to the Caterpillar’s question about who she is. The information expressed in her answer is true, but her answer is unclear, ambiguous and too wordy.

In the third example, the maxim of manner is violated by The Footman to Alice, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number: 15

How am I to get in?’ she repeated, aloud.

‘I shall sit here,’ the Footman remarked, ‘till tomorrow—’

At this moment the door of the house opened, and a large plate came skimming out, straight at the Footman’s head: it just grazed his nose, and broke to pieces against one of the trees behind him.

‘—or next day, maybe,’ the Footman continued in the same tone, exactly as if nothing had happened.

‘How am I to get in?’ asked Alice again, in a louder tone.

‘Are you to get in at all?’ said the Footman. ‘That’s the first question, you know.’

It was, no doubt: only Alice did not like to be told so. ‘It’s really dreadful,’ she muttered to herself, ‘the way all the creatures argue. It’s enough to drive one crazy!’

The Footman seemed to think this a good opportunity for repeating his
remark, with variations. ‘I shall sit here,’ he said, ‘on and off, for days and days.’
‘But what am I to do?’ said Alice.
‘Anything you like,’ said the Footman, and began whistling.
‘Oh, there’s no use in talking to him,’ said Alice desperately: ‘he’s perfectly idiotic!’ And she opened the door and went in (Carroll, 1970: 81-82).

This conversation happens in front of the closed door outside a house. Alice is asking the Footman about how she can get into the house. The part of the Footman’s utterance that violates the maxim is his statements about planning to sit there “till tomorrow or the next day”, “on and off, for days and days”.

The maxim of manner forbids speakers to use unclear or difficult words, ambiguous words, too many unnecessary words and disorderly words (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 357). Besides violating the maxims of quantity and relevance as discussed in the previous parts, the Footman’s utterance also violates the maxim of manner because it is too long and contains too many unnecessary words. His answer is too long because he does not only state that he shall sit there for a long time, but inbetween Alice’s questions, he keeps stating that he shall sit there “till tomorrow”, “or next day”, “on and off, for days and days” (1970: 81-82). His answer contains too many unnecessary repetitions such as “on and off, for days and days”, which are also known as prolixity.

In the fourth example, the maxim of manner is violated by The Duchess to Alice, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number: 16

‘The game’s going on rather better now,’ she said, by way of keeping up the conversation a little.
‘Tis so,’ said the Duchess: ‘and the moral of that is—“Oh, ’tis love, ’tis
love, that makes the world go round!’”
‘Somebody said,’ Alice whispered, ‘that it’s done by everybody minding
their own business!’
‘Ah, well! It means much the same thing,’ said the Duchess, digging her
sharp little chin into Alice’s shoulder as she added, ‘and the moral of that
is—“Take care of the sense, and the sounds will take care of themselves”’
(Carroll, 1970: 120-121).

In this conversation, the Duchess initiates a small talk with Alice when
they meet in the croquet match. The part of the Duchess’ utterance that violates
the maxim is her statements “‘Tis so, ’tis love, ’tis love, that makes the world
go round!” and “the moral of that is—‘Take care of the sense, and the sounds
will take care of themselves””.

The maxim of manner obliges speakers to avoid obscurity, ambiguity,
unnecessary proximity, and to be orderly (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 357). Besides
violating the maxim of relevance as discussed above, the Duchess’ utterance
violates the maxim of manner because it is obscure, unnecessarily long, and
disorderly. Obscure words mean difficult or unclear words. Alice tries to make
small talk by commenting on the ongoing croquet game, but the Duchess responds
by drawing the moral using obscure words “’tis so” and “tis love” repeatedly. The
meaning of “it is so” and “it is love” intended by the Duchess in this context is
also unclear. When the Duchess talks about love making the world go round, it is
not clear in what way love can make the world go round and in what sense she is
mentioning love.

Then, Alice teases her by repeating a moral she states earlier, and the
Duchess responds by drawing another moral using obscure words, telling Alice to
“take care of the sense” while “the sounds will take care of themselves”. The
meaning in this context is also unclear. When the Duchess says “Take care of the sense, and the sounds will take care of themselves”, it is not clear what she means by “the sense”, “the sound”, and “to take care”. As shown in the quote, the Duchess’ answers are also unnecessarily much longer than Alice’s utterances.

In the fifth example, the maxim of manner is violated by The Duchess to Alice, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number: 17

‘Oh, I know!’ exclaimed Alice, who had not attended to this last remark, ‘it’s a vegetable. It doesn’t look like one, but it is’
‘I quite agree with you,’ said the Duchess; ‘and the moral of that is—“Be what you would seem to be”—or if you’d like it put more simply—“Never imagine yourself not to be otherwise than what it might appear to others that what you were or might have been was not otherwise than what you had been would have appeared to them to be otherwise.”’

‘I think I should understand that better,’ Alice said very politely, ‘if I had it written down: but I can’t quite follow it as you say it’
‘That’s nothing to what I could say if I chose,’ the Duchess replied, in a pleased tone,
‘Pray don’t trouble yourself to say it any longer than that,’ said Alice (Carroll, 1970: 122).

This is the continuation of the Duchess and Alice’s conversation in the croquet match above. The part of the Duchess’ utterance that violates the maxim is her statements “Be what you would seem to be” and “Never imagine yourself not to be otherwise than what it might appear to others that what you were or might have been was not otherwise than what you had been would have appeared to them to be otherwise”.

The maxim of manner obliges speakers to avoid obscurity, ambiguity, unnecessary prolixity, and to be orderly (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 357). The Duchess’ utterance violates the maxim of manner because it is obscure,
ambiguous, and unnecessarily long. In response to Alice’s statement about
mustard as a vegetable, the Duchess draws another moral, which she ironically
calls “simply” put. This is the longest of all the morals that the Duchess ever
states. Not only extremely long, but this moral is also unclear, difficult to
understand, wordy, and ambiguous. Structurally, it consists of endless multiple
clauses which contradict one another, such as “Never imagine yourself not to be
otherwise” as the main clause, as well as “what it might appear to others”; “what
you were or might have been”, “what you had been” as the relative clauses.
Those relative clauses actually contain more relative clauses, so the sentence
becomes so complicated.

In the last example, the maxim of manner is violated by Alice to the
Caterpillar, as shown in the following quotation:

Data Number 18:

‘What do you mean by that?’ said the Caterpillar sternly. ‘Explain
yourself?’
‘I can’t explain my self,
‘I’m afraid, sir’ said Slic,’because I’m not myself, you see.’
‘I don’t see,’ said the Caterpillar.
‘I’m afraid I can’t put it more clearly,’ Alice replied very politely,’ for I
can’t understand myself to begin with; and being so many different sizesin
a day is very confusing’ (Carroll, 1970: 67-68).

This conversation is the continuation of Alice’s conversation with the
Caterpillar
in the first example above, which occurs in the forest. The part of Alice’s
utterance that violates the maxim is her statement that “I can’t explain
myself...because I’m not myself.”
The maxim of manner among others forbid speaker to use unclear or ambiguous words (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 357). The phrase to explain oneself means to give explanation about one’s utterance or action. When the caterpillar ask Alice to explain herself, it means that the Caterpillar asks Alice to give explanation related to her previous utterance that she “must have been changed several times” since the morning (Carroll, 1970: 67). Alice responds by saying that she cannot explain herself because she is not herself, refering to the changes she has undergone that day. Thus, she can be considered as violating the maxim of manner because her statement is unclear and ambiguous. Based on the truth value, her information is not exactly wrong. However, Alice’s response does not directly answer the Caterpillar’s question.

4. The Violations of the Maxim of Quality

This part examines the utterances in the novel which violate the maxim of quality. The maxim of quality forbids speaker to say what they believe to be false or say anything for which they lack adequate evidence (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 355). In this part, the writer discusses five examples of violations of the maxim of quality in *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*.

In the first example, the maxim of quality is violated by the Pigeon to Alice, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number: 19

‘Serpent!’ screamed the Pigeon.
‘I’m not a serpent!’ said Alice indignantly. ‘Let me alone!’
‘Serpent, I say again!’ repeated the Pigeon, but in a more subdued tone, and added with a kind of sob, ‘I’ve tried every way, and nothing seems to
suit them!"
“I haven’t the least idea what you’re talking about,” said Alice.
“I’ve tried the roots of trees, and I’ve tried banks, and I’ve tried hedges,”
the Pigeon went on, without attending to her; ‘but those serpents! There’s
no pleasing them!’
Alice was more and more puzzled, but she thought there was no use in
saying anything more till the Pigeon had finished.
“And just as I’d taken the highest tree in the wood,” continued the Pigeon,
raising its voice to a shriek, ‘and just as I was thinking I should be free of
them at last, they must needs come wriggling down from the sky! Ugh, Serpent!’

“But I’m not a serpent, I tell you!” said Alice (Carroll, 1970: 75-76).

This conversation happens when the Pigeon sees Alice for the first time.
The part of the Pigeon’s utterance that violates the maxim is its statements
“Serpent, I say again!” and “just as I was thinking I should be free of them at
last, they must needs come wriggling down from the sky! Ugh, Serpent!”.

Besides violating the maxim of relevance discussed above, the maxim of
quality forbids speaker to say what they believe to be false or say anything for
which they lack adequate evidence (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 355). The Pigeon’s
utterance violates the maxim of quality because there is no adequate evidence
that Alice is a serpent. Serpent is defined in Oxford Advanced Learner’s
Dictionary as “a snake, especially a large one” (Hornby, 1995: 1073), while snake
is defined as “any of various types of long reptile without legs, some of which are
poisonous” (1995: 1122). Based on the definitions, the Pigeon lacks adequate
evidence to accuse Alice as a serpent, since Alice is not large, does not look like a
reptile, has legs, and already explicitly denies that she is a serpent. Thus, the
Pigeon violates the maxim of quality.
In the second example, the maxim of quality is violated by the March Hare and the Mad Hatter to Alice, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number: 20

‘No room! No room!’ they cried out when they saw Alice coming. ‘There’s plenty of room!’ said Alice indignantly, and she sat down in a large arm-chair at one end of the table (Carroll, 1970: 93).

This conversation happens when Alice just enters the March Hare and the Mad Hatter’s house. The part of the March Hare and the Mad Hatter’s utterance that violates the maxim is their statement, ‘No room! No room!’.

The maxim of quality forbids speaker to say what they believe to be false or say anything for which they lack adequate evidence (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 355). The March Hare and the Mad Hatter’s utterance violates the maxim of quality because it lacks adequate evidence, which is proven by Alice’s statement that there is “plenty of room”. Not only lacking adequate evidence, but their utterance is also false, which is proven by Alice’s action of sitting down in an arm-chair. If there really were no room, Alice would not be able to sit there. Thus, the March Hare and the Mad Hatter violate the maxim of quality.

In the third example, the maxim of quality is violated by the Cheshire Cat to Alice, as shown in the following quotation.

Data Number: 21

‘But I don’t want to go among mad people,’ Alice remarked. ‘Oh, you can’t help that,’ said the Cat: ‘we’re all mad here. I’m mad. You’re mad.’ ‘How do you know I’m mad?’ said Alice. ‘You must be,’ said the Cat, ‘or you wouldn’t have come here.’ Alice didn’t think that proved it at all; however, she went on ‘And how do you know that you’re mad?’
'To begin with,’ said the Cat, ‘a dog’s not mad. You grant that?’
‘I suppose so,’ said Alice.
‘Well, then,’ the Cat went on, ‘you see, a dog growls when it’s angry, and
wags its tail when it’s pleased. Now I growl when I’m pleased, and wag
my tail when I’m angry. Therefore I’m mad.’
‘I call it purring, not growling,’ said Alice.
‘Call it what you like,’ said the Cat  (Carroll, 1970: 89).
(See Appendix data No:18 )

The Cat violates the maxim of quality in its conversation with Alice in the
forest. Alice is refusing to go to March Hare and Mad Hatter’s place, whom the
Cat just describes as mad. The Cat responds by stating that both itself and Alice
are also mad. The part of the Cat’s utterance that violates the maxim is its
statements “We’re all mad here. I’m mad. You’re mad” and “You must be
[mad], or you wouldn’t have come here”.

The maxim of quality forbids speaker to say what they believe to be false
or say anything for which they lack adequate evidence (Grice in Cruse, 2000:
355). The Cat’s utterance violates the maxim of quality because it lacks adequate
evidence. Mad is defined in Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary as “mentally
ill, insane” or “very foolish or crazy” (Hornby, 1995: 705). According to the Cat,
Alice is mad because she came to that place. Obviously, the action of coming to
an unknown place is not enough as indicator of mental illness, insanity,
foolishness, or craziness. Meanwhile, the Cat accuses itself of being mad because
a dog grows when it is angry and wags its tail when pleased, and it does the
contrary. Animals of different species naturally have different behaviors, so
comparing a cat and a dog’s behavior is also not enough as indicator of mental
illness, insanity, foolishness, or craziness. The Cat’s utterances are not true and
not supported by any adequate evidence. Thus, it violates the maxim of quality. In the fourth example, the maxim of quality is violated by the March Hare to Alice, as shown in the following quotation.

**Data Number: 22**

‘Take some more tea,’ the March Hare said to Alice, very earnestly. ‘I’ve had nothing yet,’ Alice replied in an offended tone, ‘so I can’t take more’ (Carroll, 1970: 101).

The part of the March Hare’s utterance that violates the maxim is its **statement**, “Take some more tea”. The maxim of quality forbids speaker to say what they believe to be false or say anything for which they lack adequate evidence (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 355). The March Hare’s utterance violates the **maxim of quality** because the utterance contains the words “more tea”, which the March Hare knows to be false. *More* is defined in *Oxford Advance Learner’s Dictionary* as “a greater or additional number or amount” (Hornby, 1995: 755). If someone takes “more” of something, it means he or she already took a number or amount of that thing before, and now takes a greater or additional number or amount. When the March Hare offers Alice to “take some more tea”, the prerequisite is that Alice already took some tea before. However, the March Hare is completely aware that Alice has not taken any tea. Thus, the March Hare utters something that he knows to be false and it violates the maxim of quality.

In the fifth example, the maxim of quality is violated by the Duchess to Alice, as shown in the following quotation.

**Data Number: 23**

‘Very true,’ said the Duchess: ‘flamingoes and mustard both bite. And the moral of that is—“Birds of a feather flock together”.’
‘Only mustard isn’t a bird,’ Alice remarked.
‘Right, as usual,’ said the Duchess: ‘what a clear way you have of putting things!’ (Carroll, 1970: 121).

Beside violating the maxims of relevance and manner as discussed in the previous parts, the Duchess also repeatedly violates the maxim of quality in her conversation with Alice. The part of the Duchess’ utterance that violates the maxim is her statements “Flamingoes and mustard both bite” and “Birds of a feather flock together”.

The maxim of quality forbids speaker to say what they believe to be false or say anything for which they lack adequate evidence (Grice in Cruse, 2000: 355). The Duchess’ utterance violates the **maxim of quality** because she lacks adequate evidence to call mustard a bird. The Duchess first mentions that flamingos and mustard both bite, then draws a moral that “Birds of a feather flock together”. Therefore, she implies that flamingoes and mustard are birds. In fact, mustard is a plant, defined in *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* as “a hot-tasting yellow or brown paste made from the crushed seeds of the mustard plant” (Hornby, 1995: 767). She does not have adequate evidence to draw the moral about mustard being a bird, thus she violates the maxim of quality.

In the last example, the axiom of quality is violated by the Cat to Alice, as shown in the following quotation.

Data number : 24

‘But I don’t want to go among mad people.’ Alice remarked.
‘Oh, you can’t help that,’ said the Cat: ‘we’re all mad here. I’m mad. You’re mad.’
‘How do you know I’m mad?’ said Alice.
‘You must be,’ said the Cat, ‘or you wouldn’t have come here.’
Alice didn’t think that proved it at all; however, she went on’ And how do you know That you’re mad?’
‘To begin with,’ said the Cat, ‘a dog’s not mad. You grant that?’
‘I suppose so,’ said Alice.
Well, then,’ the Cat went on,’you see, a dog growls when it’s angry, and wags its Tail when it’s pleased. Now I growl when I’m pleased, and wag my tail when I’m angry. Therefore I’m mad.’
‘I call it purring, not growling,’ said Alice.
‘Call it what you like,’ said the Cat (Carroll, 1970:89)

The Cat violates the maxim of quality in its conversation with Alice in the forest. Alice is refusing to go to Mat Hare and Mad Hatter’s place, whom the Cat just describes as mad. The Cat responds by stating that both it and Alice are also mad. Mad is defined in Oxford Advance Learner’s Dictionary as “mentally ill, insane” or “very foolish or crazy” (Hornby,1995:705). According to the Cat, Alice is mad because she come to that place. Obviously, the action of coming to an unknown place is not enough as indicator of mental illness, insanity, foolishness, or craziness. Meanwhile, the Cat accuses itself of being mad because a dog grows when it is angry and wags its tail when pleased, and it does the contrary. Animal of different species naturally have different behaviors, so comparing a cat and a dog’s behavior is also not enough as indicator of mental illness, insanity, foolishness, or craziness. The Cat’s utterances are not true and not supported by any adequate evidence. Thus, it violates the maxim of quality.
B. The Result of the Violations of the Conversational Maxims in Carroll’s *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*

1. The Result of the Violation of the Conversational Maxim of Quantity

As a result from the first example from data number: 1 Alice wants to start small talk with the Mouse, but in doing it, she makes her contribution more informative than is required. She gets carried away with her feeling of fondness for the dog near her house, and she mentions the dog’s habits in detail, which includes catching mice. She forgets that she is now talking to the Mouse, a member of the species usually caught by the dog. As a result of the violation, the Mouse is offended by Alice’s utterance, which it shows by bristling, trembling, cursing the cats, and finally swimming away. The Mouse is offended by Alice’s utterance and leaves her immediately. It is shown through the Mouse’s actions, namely swimming away from Alice “as hard as it could go” (1970: 43). Alice also feels the negative result, because she is left alone and feels sad, as shown in her “sorrowful tone” (1970: 43).

As a result of the violation from second example data number: 2, Alice feels confused. It is shown in her thought “one side of what?” The other side of what?” (1970: 73). As Alice must pause to wonder about that, their conversation is halted and cannot go smoothly until the Caterpillar later clarifies that he means the sides of the mushroom. If the Caterpillar had mentioned *one side of the mushroom* in the first place, such obstacle should not have happened.

As a result of the violation from third example data number: 3, Alice feels frustrated and angry because she cannot get the answer she needs after talking for
a long time. It is shown in her description about the creatures in Wonderland as “dreadful” and “enough to drive one crazy” in the way they argue (1970: 81).

As a result of the violation from fourth example data number: 4, Alice possibly thinks that she has not made her point clear enough. Therefore, to make her point clearer, she states that she does not much care about the destination, meaning that she does not have any specific destination in mind. Then, as a result of the next violation, Alice clarifies for the second time that she cannot name any specific destination, but she wants to reach any suitable destination, as shown in her words “so long as I get somewhere”. Lastly, as a result of this series of violations, Alice feels frustrated and gives up trying to ask the Cat for direction, and tries asking another question instead.

As a result of fifth example data number: 5, Alice becomes confused. It is shown in her words that she “can’t quite follow” the Duchess’ utterance, and her request to the Duchess not to “say it any longer than that” (1970: 122). Thus, the conversation is halted.

As a result of sixth example data number 6, Alice’s partners of conversation, the birds, are scared and leave immediately. Alice also realizes the bad effect of her violation in her last utterance in the quote above.

2. The Result of the Violations of the Conversational Maxim of Relevance

As a result of the violation of the conversational maxim of relevance from data number: 7, Alice feels confused, as shown in her action of “kept on puzzling about it” (1970: 50). While the Mouse feels irritated, as shown in its accusation
that Alice is “not attending” or not paying enough attention to its utterance. Thus, the conversation is halted.

The result of the second example of the violation of the conversational of relevance from data number: 8, the Mouse feels insulted, as shown in its words “I shall do nothing of the sort”, its actions of walking away from Alice, and its accusation that Alice insults it “by talking such nonsense” (1970: 52). Meanwhile, Alice feels panicked at the Mouse’s anger, as shown in her plea “I didn’t mean it”. Since the Mouse does not want to talk to Alice anymore, their conversation becomes hindered and cannot proceed.

As a result of the third example of the violation of the conversational of the relevance from data number: 9, Alice feels confused or “more and more puzzled”, as shown in her response “I haven’t the least idea what you’re talking about”. She also does not want to say anything more. Thus, their conversation becomes hindered.

From the data number: 10 as a result of the violation is Alice must repeat her question for the third time in frustration, as shown in her “louder tone”. Then she feels frustrated and angry, as shown in her description about the creatures in Wonderland as “dreadful” and “enough to drive one crazy” in the way they argue (1970: 81). Finally, she stops participating in the conversation, as shown in her comment that there is “no use in talking to him” (1970: 82).

The example of the conversational maxim of relevance from data number: 11, As a result of the violation, Alice starts losing interest in the conversation. It is shown in her lack of attention to the Duchess’ utterance and her preoccupation
with her own thought about mustard, in which she is busy pondering what kind of object mustard is. In other words, the conversation cannot proceed properly.

The last example of the conversational maxim of relevance from data number : 12. The Mouse ignore the Duck and goes on with its explanation.

3. The Result of the Violations of the Conversational Maxim of Manner

As a result of the violation of the Maxim of Manner from first Example Data Number: 13, the Mouse cannot get his point across because the Eaglet and the other members of the group cannot understand the meaning of the Mouse’s utterance, as shown in the Eaglet’s complain “I don’t know the meaning of half those long words”. Also, the Mouse loses the respect of the Eaglet and the other members of the group because they consider the Mouse ridiculous, as shown in their deliberate action of laughing at the Mouse: “the Eaglet bent down its head to hide a smile: some of the other birds tittered audibly” (1970: 47).

As a result of the violation of the maxim of manner from data number: 14, the Caterpillar is confused by Alice’s answer, as shown in its question to Alice “What do you mean by that?” and its command to explain herself. Thus, the conversation is halted.

As a result of the violation of the maxim of manner from data number: 15, Alice feels frustrated and angry, as shown in her description about the creatures in Wonderland as “dreadful” and “enough to drive one crazy” in the way they argue (1970: 81). Finally, she stops participating in the conversation, as shown in her comment that there is “no use in talking to him” (1970: 82).
As a result of the violation of the maxim of manner from data number: 16, Alice feels confused because she must follow the Duchess’ change of topics randomly. Furthermore, she cannot completely understand the Duchess’ meaning.

The example as a result of this violation taken from data number: 17, Alice is confused with the Duchess’ utterance, as shown in her statement that she “can’t quite follow it” and her request to the Duchess not to say the utterance in any longer way. The conversation is also halted because both the Duchess and Alice are distracted by the Duchess’ long moral. Alice is distracted by the difficulty to follow the Duchess’ words, while the Duchess is distracted by being “pleased” with her ability to say long morals.

The last example as a result of the violation of the manner from data number: 18, Alice’s response does not directly answer the Caterpillar’s question and this conversation to be difficult to understand or ambiguous.

4. The Result of the Violations of the Conversational Maxim of Quality

The first example for result of this violation taken from data number: 19, Alice feels “more and more puzzled” and frustrated by the Pigeon’s utterance. It is shown first in her statement that she “hasn’t the least idea” about what the Pigeon is talking about, and her repeated unsuccessful insistence that she is not a serpent. Lastly, Alice becomes reluctant to participate in the conversation, as shown in her thought that “there was no use in saying anything more till the Pigeon had finished” (1970:75).

As a result of this violation of the maxim of quantity from data number: 20, Alice feels “indignant” (1970: 93) and sits down anyway without being asked
by the March Hare and the Mad Hatter. It indicates that the conversation is pointless; it is the same as if the March Hare and the Mad hatter did not say anything at all.

Data number: 21 is the example As a result of this violation, Alice feels that the Cat’s utterance proves anything at all, as shown in her thought that it did not prove anything at all. Meanwhile, as a result of the violation of the maxim of quality from data number: 22, Alice replies to the March Hare “in an offended tone” (Carroll, 1970: 101). The fact that Alice feels offended by the March Hare’s utterance shows that the conversation does not function successfully.

The last example taken from the data number: 23 As a result of violation of the quality, the Queen’s violation, Alice opposes her and states that mustard is not a bird. The Duchess instantly agrees that mustard is not a bird, although a short while ago she just implied that mustard was a bird. Therefore, she provides an utterance that she knows to be false. As the last example of the result of this violation, Alice feels that the Cat’s utterance proves anything at all, as shown in her thought that it did not prove anything at all.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the writer will draw the conclusion of the discussion in the previous chapter about the violations of Grice’s conversational maxims in Lewis Carroll’s *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* and the results of those violations. The discussion is divided into four parts based on the four types of conversational maxims. Those four parts are the violations of the maxim of quantity, the violations of the maxim of relevance, the violations of the maxim of manner, and the violations of the maxim of quality.

Actually, there are so many instances of violations of the conversational maxims in Carroll’s *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*. There are at least 55 violations of the conversational maxims in total. However, this study only examines five examples from each type of conversational maxim, so there are twenty examples discussed in this study.

The maxim of quantity obliges speakers to make their contribution as informative as is required for their conversation. Therefore, the characters in *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* violate the maxim of quantity when their utterances are too informative or not informative enough for their conversation. In other words, the characters violate the maxim of quantity when they give too much information or when they do not give enough information. The examples of the violation of this maxim include the violation by Alice in her conversation with
the Mouse, by The Caterpillar in its conversation with Alice, by the Footman in his conversation with Alice, by Cheshire Cat in its conversation with Alice, and by The Duchess in her conversation with Alice.

As the results of the violation of this maxim, the conversation partners feel offended, angry, frustrated, or confused. They usually need to make repeated clarification to understand the utterances better, or they just stop the conversation altogether.

The maxim of relevance obliges speakers to be relevant to the conversation partner’s utterance. Therefore, the characters in Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland violate the maxim of relevance when they say something which is not related enough to their conversation partner’s utterances or to the topic of the conversation. The examples of the violation of this maxim include two violations by Alice in her conversation with the Mouse, the violation by The Pigeon in its conversation with Alice, by the Footman in his conversation with Alice, and by The Duchess in her conversation with Alice. As the results of the violation of this maxim, the conversation partners mostly feel confused. They might also feel irritated, frustrated, or angry. They often need to make repeated clarification to understand the utterances better, or they just stop the conversation altogether.

The maxim of manner obliges speakers to avoid obscurity, ambiguity, unnecessary prolixity, and to be orderly. Therefore, the characters in Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland violate the maxim of manner when they use obscure words or expressions, when they speak ambiguously, when they use too many complicated words, and when they use disorderly words unnecessarily. The
examples of the violation of this maxim include the violation by the Mouse in its conversation with the Birds, by Alice in her conversation with the Caterpillar, by the Footman in his conversation with Alice, and two violations by The Duchess in her conversation with Alice. As the results of the violation of this maxim, there is often a misunderstanding between the speaker and the conversation partner. The speaker cannot get his point across or is considered ridiculous, while the conversation partner cannot understand the speaker. As a result, the conversation partner mostly feels confused, frustrated, and sometimes angry. Both the speaker and the conversation partner must make repeated clarifications, and the conversation is halted because it is distracted by the irrelevant topic.

The maxim of quality forbids speaker to say what they believe to be false or say anything for which they lack adequate evidence. Therefore, the characters in *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* violate the maxim of quality when they say something untrue or when they say something although they do not have enough proof about it. The examples of the violation of this maxim include the violation by the Pigeon in its conversation with Alice, by the March Hare and the Mad Hatter in their conversation with Alice, by Cheshire Cat in its conversation with Alice, by the March Hare in its conversation with Alice, and by The Duchess in her conversation with Alice. As the results of the violation of this maxim, the conversation partners feel irritated, offended, frustrated, and sometimes confused. Sometimes they become reluctant to continue the conversation, and usually the conversation becomes pointless or useless.
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**APPENDIX I**

**ALL VIOLATION OF MAXIMS**

*IN ALICE’S ADVENTURES IN WONDERLAND*

Table 1: The Violations of the Maxim of Quantity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alice (to the Mouse)</td>
<td>‘I quite forgot you didn’t like cats.’ ‘Not like cats!’ cried the Mouse, in a shrill, passionate voice. ‘Would you like cats if you were me?’ ‘Well, perhaps not,’ said Alice in a soothing tone: ‘don’t be angry about it. And yet I wish could show you our cat Dinah: I think you’d take a fancy to cats if you could only see her. She is such a dear quite thing.’ Alice went on, half to herself, as she swam lazily about in the pool, ‘and she sits purring so nicely by the fire, licking her paws and washing her face—and she is such a nice soft thing to nurse—and she’s such a capital one for catching mice—oh, I beg your pardon!’ cried Alice again, for this time the Mouse was bristling all over, and she felt certain it must be really offended. ‘We indeed!’ cried the Mouse, who was trembling down to the end of his tail. ‘As if I would talk on such a subject! Our family always hated cats: nasty, low, vulgar things! Don’t let me hear the name again!’ (Carroll, 1970: 42).</td>
<td>Alice wants to start small talk with the Mouse, but in doing it, she makes her contribution more informative than is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alice (to the Mouse)</td>
<td>‘Are you—are you fond—of—of dogs?’ The Mouse did not answer, so Alice went on eagerly. ‘There is such a nice little dog near our house I should like to show you! A little bright-eyed terrier, you know, with oh, such long curly brown hair! And it’ll fetch things when you throw them, and it’ll sit up and beg for its dinner, and all sorts of things—I can’t remember half of them—and it belongs to a farmer, you know, and he says it’s so useful, it’s worth a hundred pounds! He says it kills all the rats and—oh dear!’ cried Alice in a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, Alice wants to start small talk with the Mouse, but in doing it, she makes her contribution more informative than is required.
sorrowful tone, ‘I’m afraid I’ve offended it again! For the Mouse was swimming away from her as hard as it could go, and making quite a commotion in the pool as it went (Carroll, 1970:43).

3 Alice (to the birds) ‘I wish I had our Dinah here, I know I do!’ said Alice aloud, addressing nobody in particular. ‘She’d soon fetch it back!’

‘And who is Dinah, if I might venture to ask the question?’ said the Lory.

Alice replied eagerly, for she was always ready to talk about her pet: ‘Dinah’s our cat. And she’s such a capital one for catching mice you can’t think! And oh, I wish you could see her after the birds! Why, she’ll eat a little bird as soon as look at it!’

This speech caused a remarkable sensation among the party. Some of the birds hurried off at once: one old Magpie began wrapping itself up very carefully, remarking, ‘I really must be getting home; the night-air doesn’t suit my throat!’ and a Canary called out in a trembling voice to its children, ‘Come away, my dears! It’s high time you were all in bed!’ On various pretexts they all moved off and Alice was soon left alone.

‘I wish I hadn’t mentioned Dinah? She said to herself in a melancholy tone (Carroll, 1970: 52-53).

4 The Duck (to the Mouse) “‘Edwin and Morcar, the earls of Mercia and Northumbria, declared for him: and even Stigand, the patriotic archbishop of Canterbury, found it advisable—’”

‘Found what?’ said the Duck.

‘Found it,’ the Mouse replied rather crossly: ‘of course you know what “it” means.’

‘I know what “it” means well enough, when I find a thing,’ said the Duck: ‘it’s generally a frog or a worm. The question is, what did the archbishop find?’

The Mouse did not notice this question but hurriedly went on, “—found it advisable to go with Edgar Atheling to meet William and offer him Alice repeats the same violation of the maxim of quantity in (1) and (2).

Again, Alice gives more information than is required or necessary for her conversation with the birds.

In (4), the Mouse is explaining about the history of Britain. When the Mouse says that the archbishop of Canterbury “found it advisable”, it uses the past tense of the word find which means “to discover something by experience,” as defined by Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (Homby,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>She drew herself up and said, very gravely, ‘I think, you ought to tell me who you are, first.’ ‘Why?’ said the Caterpillar. Here was another puzzling question; and as Alice could not think of any good reason, and as the Caterpillar seemed to be in a very unpleasant state of mind, she turned away (Carroll, 1970: 68).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>‘What size do you want to be?’ it asked. ‘Oh, I’m not particular as to size,’ Alice hastily replied; ‘only one doesn’t like changing so often, you know.’ ‘I don’t know,’ said the Caterpillar. Alice said nothing: she had never been so much contradicted in her life before, and she felt that she was losing her temper (Carroll, 1970: 72).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Then it got down off the mushroom, and crawled away in the grass, merely remarking as it went, ‘One side will make you grow taller, and the other side will make you grow smaller.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Caterpillar’s provision of more information than is necessary by asking “why”, because clearly the reason is because Alice wants to know about the Caterpillar, whom she just meets.

The Caterpillar also violates the maxim of quantity when responding to another statement from Alice. In (6), the words “you know” in Alice’s statement does not refer to the Caterpillar’s knowledge. As defined in Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, “you know” is an informal expression “used when reminding somebody of something” or “used in conversation to keep the attention of the person listening or to give one time to think what to say next” (Homby, 1995: 656).

In the end of its conversation with Alice, the Caterpillar violates...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alice</th>
<th>Shorter.</th>
<th>‘One side of what? The other side of what?’ thouh Alice to herself ‘of the mushroom,’ said the Caterpillar, just as if she had asked it aloud; and in another moment it was out of sight (Carroll, 1970: 73).</th>
<th>the maxim of quantity in (7). According to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, side means “either of the two halves of a surface, an object or a place divided by an imaginary central line” (Hornby, 1995: 1097).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Footman (to Alice)</td>
<td>‘How am I to get in?’ asked Alice again, in a louder tone. ‘Are you to get in at all?’ said the Footman. ‘That’s the first question, you know.’ It was, no doubt; only Alice did not like to be told so. ‘It’s really dreadful,’ she muttered to herself, ‘the way all the creatures argue. It’s enough to drive one crazy!’ (Carroll, 1970: 81).</td>
<td>In this conversation, Alice is standing outside the closed door of a house. She wants to enter the house and asks the Footman, who is also outside. After the Footman violates the maxim of relevance several times, which will be discussed later in the next part, Alice asks him for the third time about how she can get into the house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire Cat (to Alice)</td>
<td>‘Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?’ ‘That depends a good deal on where you want to get to,’ said the Cat. ‘I don’t much care where—’ said Alice. ‘Then it doesn’t matter which way you go,’ said the Cat. ‘—so long as I get somewhere’ Alice added as an explanation ‘Oh, you’re sure to do that,’ said the Cat; ‘if you only walk long enough.’ Alice felt that this could not be denied, so she tried another question. ‘What sort of people live about here?’ (Carroll, 1970: 88).</td>
<td>In (9), Alice does not know anything about the place she is in, so she asks the Cat for direction. Everyone knows that which ever way someone must take depends on where he or she wants to go. Thus, the Cat is expected either to ask Alice where she wants to go, or to give information about where the two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mad Hatter (to Alice)</td>
<td>‘What a funny watch!’ she remarked. ‘It tells the day of the month, and doesn’t tell what o’clock it is!’ ‘Why should it?’ muttered the Hatter. ‘Does your watch tell you what year it is?’ ‘Of course not,’ Alice replied very readily: ‘but that’s because it stays the same year for such along time together.’ ‘Which is just the case with mine,’ said the Hatter. Alice felt dreadfully puzzled. The Hatter’s remark seemed to have no sort of meaning in it, and yet it was certainly English. ‘I don’t quite understand you,’ she said, as politely as she could (Carroll, 1970: 96-97). According to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, “a small instrument for showing the time, worn on a strap on the wrist” (Hömby, 1995: 1343). Thus, a watch that does not show the time is unusual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Knave of Hearts (to the Queen)</td>
<td>When the procession came opposite to Alice, they all stopped and looked at her, and the Queen said severely ‘Who is this?’ She said it to the Knave of Hearts, who only bowed and smiled in reply. ‘Idiot!’ said the Queen, tossing her head impatiently (Carroll, 1970: 107). In (11), the Queen asks the Knave of Hearts about who Alice is. Clearly, she expects an answer about Alice’s identity. However, the Knave of Hearts only bows and smiles. He provides less information than required, even no information at all, thus violating the maxim of quantity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The Duchess (to Alice)</td>
<td>‘The game’s going on rather better now,’ she said, by way of keeping up the conversation a little. ‘Tis so,’ said the Duchess: ‘and the moral of that is—— “Oh, tis love, tis love, that makes the world go round!”’ ‘Somebody said,’ Alice whispered, ‘that it’s done by everybody minding their own business!’ ‘Ah, well! It means much the same thing,’ said the Duchess, digging her sharp little chin into Alice’s shoulder as she added, ‘and the moral of that is—— “Take care of the sense and the sounds will take care of themselves.”’ How fond she is of Ending morals in Things!’ Alice thought to herself (Carroll, The Duchess gives much unnecessary information. In (12), Alice makes small talk by commenting on the game, the Duchess gives the moral of Alice’s utterance. Then Alice teases the Duchess by repeating a sentence that the Duchess has said earlier. But the Duchess does not realize it. Instead,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 The Duchess (to Alice)</td>
<td>1970: 120-121).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘I quite agree with you,’ said the Duchess, ‘and the moral of that is—“Be what you would seem to be”—or if you’d like it put more simply—“Never imagine yourself not to be otherwise than what it might appear to others that what you were or might have been was not otherwise than what you had been would have appeared to them to be otherwise.”’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘I think I should understand that better,’ Alice said very politely, ‘if I had it written down: but I can’t quite follow it as you say it,’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘That’s nothing to what I could say if I chose,’ the Duchess replied, in a pleased tone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Pray don’t trouble yourself to say it any longer than that,’ said Alice (Carroll, 1970:122).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>she gives yet another moral of Alice’s utterance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Again, the Duchess gives much unnecessary information. In (12), the Duchess gives another, very long moral. In their conversation, they are not discussing about morals and Alice does not ask the Duchess about morals, so the Duchess gives more information than is necessary, thus violating the maxim of quantity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>14 The Queen (to Alice)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Then the Queen left off quite out of breath, and said to Alice, ‘have you seen the Mock Turtle yet?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘No,’ said Alice. ‘I don’t even know what a Mock Turtle is’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘It’s the thing Mock Turtle Soup is made from,’ said the Queen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘I never saw one, or heard of one,’ said Alice (Carroll, 1970: 124).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In (14), Alice just states that she does not know what a Mock Turtle is. If the Queen responds to Alice’s utterance, the expected response is an explanation about what a Mock Turtle is. However, the Queen only states that Mock Turtle is, “the thing Mock Turtle Soup is made from” (1970: 124).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15 The Hatter (to the King)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Take off your hat,’ the King said to the Hatter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘It isn’t mine,’ said the Hatter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Stolen!’ the King exclaimed, turning to the jury, who instantly made a memorandum of the fact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘I keep them to sell,’ the Hatter added as, an explanation; ‘I’ve none of my own, I’m a hatter’ (Carroll, 1970: 147).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | The King’s utterance in (15) is meant as an order. By ordering the Hatter to "take off your hat", the King must mean the hat that you are wearing now rather than the hat which is your possession, since the
| 16 | The King (to the Queen, White Rabbit, and the jurymen) | ‘What’s in it?’ said the Queen.
‘I haven’t opened it yet,’ said the White Rabbit, ‘but it seems to be a letter, written by the prisoner to—to somebody.’

‘It must have been that,’ said the King, ‘unless it was written to nobody, which isn’t usual, you know.’

‘Who is it directed to?’ said one of the jurymen.

‘It isn’t directed at all,’ said the White Rabbit, ‘in fact, there’s nothing written on the outside’ (Carroll, 1970; 157). |

| King | cannot possibly know whether the hat currently worn by the Hatter is his own possession or not. The expected response is not an utterance from the Hatter, but the action of taking off the hat on his head. Thus, by saying that the hat is not his, the Hatter provides more information than is required and violates the maxim of quantity. |

<p>| This conversation happens in a trial in the courtroom. In (16), a new evidence has just been found in the form of an anonymous letter. As the White Rabbit informs the others about the letter, it suddenly realizes that the intended recipient of the letter is unknown, so it says the letter is written by the prisoner “to somebody”. Everybody already knows that all letters are normally dedicated to somebody, and in this case, the White Rabbit says somebody because it does not know the intended recipient. The King’s response is therefore completely unnecessary. He gives more |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The King (to the White Rabbit)</td>
<td>‘Read them,’ said the King. The White Rabbit put on his spectacles. ‘Where shall I begin, Please your majesty?’ he asked. ‘begin at the beginning.’ the King said gravely, ‘and go on till you come to the end: then stop’ (Carroll, 1970: 158).</td>
<td>This is still part of the conversation happens in the trial after they found an anonymous letter as an evidence. In (17), the King orders the Rabbit to read that evidence, and the Rabbit asks the King where to begin. Here where refers to a point in the letter from which the Rabbit should start reading. However the King’s answer gives more, information than is required, thus violating the maxim of quantity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Alice (to the Mouse)</td>
<td>‘Mine is a long and a sad tale!’ said the Mouse, turning to Alice and sighing. ‘It is a long tail, certainly.’ said Alice, looking down with wonder at the Mouse’s tail; ‘but why do you call it sad?’ And she kept on puzzling about it while the Mouse was speaking. ‘You are not attending!’ said the Mouse to Alice severely. ‘What are you thinking of?’ ‘I beg your pardon,’ said Alice very humbly (Carroll, 1970: 50-51).</td>
<td>In (18), Alice mistakes the Mouse’s utterance tale, which according to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary means “a story, often one that is simple to read or understand” (Homby, 1995: 1219), as tail, which means “the movable part at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 19 Alice (to the Mouse) | “I had *not!*!” cried the Mouse, sharply and very angrily.  
“A knot!” said Alice, always ready to make herself useful, and looking anxiously about her. “Oh, do let me help to undo it!”  
“I shall do nothing of the sort,” said the Mouse, getting up and walking away. “You insult me by talking such nonsense!”  
“I didn’t mean it!” pleaded poor Alice. “But you’re so easily offended, you know!” The Mouse only growled in reply (Carroll, 1970: 52). | The same case happens in (19), where Alice mistakes the Mouse’s utterance *not*, an adverb used with auxiliary and modal verbs to form the negative (1995: 789), as *knot*, which means “a fastening made by tying a piece or pieces of string, rope, etc” or “a way of twisting hair into a small round shape at the back” (1995: 655). |
| 20 The Duck (to the Mouse) | “Edwin and Morcar, the earls of Mercia and Northumbria, declared for him; and even Stigand, the patriotic archbishop of Canterbury, found it advisable—...”  
‘Found what?’ said the Duck.  
‘Found it,’ the Mouse replied rather crossly; ‘of course you know what “it” means.’ | Besides violating the maxim of quantity, the Duck also violates the maxim of relevance in its conversation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Scene</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 21   | The Caterpillar (to Alice) | ‘I think, you ought to tell me who you are, first.’  
‘Why?’ said the Caterpillar.  
Here was another puzzling question, and as Alice could not think of any good reason, and as the Caterpillar seemed to be in a very unpleasant state of mind, she turned away. (Carroll, 1970:68). | Alice asks the Caterpillar about its identity first. Since they are discussing the topic of identity, the expected answer must be related to the Caterpillar’s identity. The Caterpillar’s answer *Why*? in (21) is not relevant with Alice’s utterance and their current topic. |
| 22   | The Pigeon (to Alice) | ‘Serpent!’ screamed the Pigeon.  
‘I’m not a serpent!’ said Alice indignantly. ‘Let me alone!’  
‘Serpent, I say again!’ repeated the Pigeon, but in a more subdued tone, and added with a kind of sob, ‘I’ve tried every way, and nothing seems to suit them!’  
‘I haven’t the least idea what you’re talking about,’ said Alice. | The Pigeon does not listen or pay attention to Alice’s utterance that she is not a serpent. Serpent is defined in... |
. ‘I’ve tried the roots of trees, I’ve tried banks, and I’ve tried hedges,’ the Pigeon went on, without attending to her; ‘but those serpents! There’s no pleasing them!’

Alice was more and more puzzled, no use in saying anything more till the Pigeon had finished (Carroll, 1970:75).

Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary as “a snake, especially a large one” (Homby, 1995: 1073).

Instead, but she thought there was the Pigeon keeps insisting that Alice is a serpent. It gives further complains about serpents, such as the comments about trying roots of trees, banks, and hedges, which then become irrelevant with Alice’s utterance.

---

| 23 | The Footman (to Alice) | ‘Please, then,’ said Alice, ‘how am I to get in?’
‘There might be some sense in your knocking,’ the Footman went on without attending to her, ‘if we had the door between us. For instance, if you were inside, you might knock, and I could let you out, you know’ (Carroll, 1970: 80-81). | Alice is standing outside the closed door of a house. She wants to enter the house and asks the Footman, who is also outside. All of the Footman’s responses in (23) are totally irrelevant to Alice’s utterances. First, Alice asks “How am I to get in?” (1970: 80). The expected response from the Footman must be something related to how to get into the house, either a
specific way such as knocking, or even a statement that he does not know the way. However, the Footman’s response assumes that Alice wants to meet him instead. To support his assumption, he gives a hypothetical example about Alice being inside and him being outside; if Alice knocked from the inside, he could let her out.

In (24), Alice repeats the same question to the Footman for the second time after failing to get a relevant answer. This time, the Footman’s response is not even related to their current topic about opening the door or entering the house. Instead, it is just a statement about the Footman’s intention to sit outside the house for days. Again, this response is not relevant to

<p>| 24 | The Footman (to Alice) | How am I to get in?’ she repeated, aloud. ‘I shall sit here,’ the Footman remarked, ‘till tomorrow—’ At this moment the door of the house opened, and a large plate came skimming out, straight at the Footman’s head: it just grazed his nose, and broke to pieces against one of the trees behind him. ‘—or next day, maybe,’ the Footman continued in the same tone, exactly as if nothing had happened. ‘How am I to get in?’ asked Alice again, in a louder tone. ‘Are you to get in at all?’ said Footman. ‘That’s the first question, you know.’ It was, no doubt: only Alice did not like to be told so. ‘It’s really dreadful,’ she muttered to herself, ‘the way all the creatures argue. It’s enough to drive one crazy!’ The Footman seemed to think this a good opportunity for repeating his remark, with variations. ‘I shall sit here,’ he said, on and off for days and days. ‘But what am I to do?’ said Alice. ‘Anything you like,’ said the Footman, and began whistling. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The Duchess (to Alice)</td>
<td>‘Oh, please mind what you’re doing!’ cried Alice, jumping up and down in an agony of terror. ‘Oh, there goes his precious nose’; as an unusually large saucepan flew close by it, and very nearly carried it off. ‘If everybody minded their own business,’ the Duchess said in a hoarse growl, ‘the world would round a deal faster than it does’ (Carroll, 1970: 84).</td>
<td>In (25), Alice is distressed about the Cook’s action of throwing heavy things around, which endangers everyone in that house, and warns her to mind what she is doing. By “mind what you’re doing”, Alice wants the cook to stop her dangerous action of throwing heavy things. As a response, the Duchess draws a kind of moral which is not related to the cook or her action. &quot;Everybody” in the Duchess’ utterance does not refer to anyone particular in the house; “minding their own business” in her utterance does not describe any specific action in the house, and “the world would go round a deal faster” has no relation at all with their current topic of conversation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 26 | The Duchess (to Alice) | ‘Which would not be an advantage,’ said Alice, who felt very glad to get an opportunity of showing off a little of her knowledge. ‘Just think of what work it would make with the day and night! You see the earth takes twenty-four hours to turn round on its axis——’

‘Talking of axes,’ said the Duchess, ‘chop off her head!’
Alicé glanced rather anxiously at the cook, to see if she meant to take the hint (Carroll, 1970: 84).
| In response to the Duchess’ statement about the world going around faster in (25), Alice explains about the earth’s rotation. In her explanation in (26), she mentions the word *axis*, which is defined as “an imaginary line through the centre of an object, around which the object turns” in *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* (Homby, 1995:71).

Here, Alice is referring to the axis of the earth, around which the earth rotates. As a response, the Duchess mentions *axes*, which is the plural form of both *axis* and another different word *axe*. Since they are discussing the topic of earth’s rotation on its axis, the word *axes* mentioned by the Duchess is expected to be the plural of *axis*. Instead, in the Duchess’
‘Have some wine,’ the March Hare said in an encouraging tone.
Alice looked all round the table, but there was nothing on it but tea ‘I don’t see any wine,’ she remarked.
‘There isn’t any,’ said the March Hare.
‘Then it wasn’t very civil of you to offer it,’ said Alice angrily.
‘It wasn’t very civil of you to sit down without being invited,’ said the March Hare.
‘I didn’t know it was your table,’ said Alice; ‘it’s laid for a great many more than three.’
‘Your hair wants cutting,’ said the Hatter. He had been looking at Alice for some time with great curiosity, and this was his first speech.
‘You should learn not to make personal remarks,’ Alice said with some severity; ‘it’s very rude’ (Carroll, 1970: 93-94).

After the March Hare violates the maxim of quality, which will be discussed later in the next part, Alice gets into argument with the March Hare about the table in (27). Suddenly, the Hatter responds by commenting about Alice’s hair without being asked. The Hatter’s utterances is not relevant at
28. The Mad Hatter (to Alice) | Alice sighed wearily. ‘I think you might do something better with the time,’ she said, ‘than waste it in asking riddles that have no answers.’
   ‘If you knew Time as well as I do,’ said the Hatter, ‘you wouldn’t talk about wasting it. It’s him.’
   ‘I don’t know what you mean,’ said Alice.
   ‘Of course you don’t!’ the Hatter said, tossing his head contemptuously. ‘I dare say you never even spoke to Time!’

In (28), Alice reproaches the March Hare and the Hatter because they give her ariddle without any answer. By saying “wasting the time”, Alice refers to pointless activities such as asking riddles that have no answer. Then the Hatter responds by talking about Time as a person, with the pronoun he, instead of a thing, with the pronoun it. This response is not relevant to Alice’s utterance about wasting time or doing pointless activities, so the Hatter violates the maxim of relevance.

29. The March Hare (to Alice) | ‘They were learning to draw,’ the Dormouse went on, yawning and rubbing its eyes, for it was getting very sleepy; ‘and they drew all manner of things—everything that begins with an M——’
   ‘Why with an M?’ said Alice.
   ‘Why not?’ said the March Hare. Alice was silent (Carroll, 1970: 103).

In (29), the Dormouse is telling getting a story about three sisters who that draw everything that begins with an M. That is an unusual
| 30 | The Mad Hatter (to Alice) | The Dormouse had closed its eyes by this time, and was going off into a doze; but, on being pinched by the Hatter, it woke up again with a little shriek, and went on: ‘—that begins with an M, such a piece of story, so Alice enquires why they draw everything that begins with an M. As defined in Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, why is an interrogative adverb meaning “for what reason or purpose” (1995: 1363). Therefore, Alice expects the answer to contain the three sisters’ reason or purpose in drawing things that begin with an M. However, the March Hare responds by saying “Why not”, which is defined in Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary as an idiom used to make or agree to a suggestion (1970: 1363). The March Hare’s response is not relevant with Alice’s question, thus violating the maxim of relevance. | In (30), the Dormouse is narrating a story and Alice is |
as mouse-traps, and the moon, and memory, and muchness—you know you say things are “much of a muchness”—did you ever see such a thing as a drawing of a muchness?’”

‘Really, now you ask me,’ said Alice, very much confused, ‘I don’t think—’

‘Then you shouldn’t talk,’ said the Hatter.

This piece of rudeness was more than Alice could bear: she got up in great disgust, and walked off (Carroll, 1970: 103).

confused because the Dormouse’s story is incoherent. In response to the Dormouse’s question, Alice is about to answer that she never saw any drawing of a muchness by saying I don’t think I ever saw any. According to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, the word think has several meanings, such as “to use the mind in an active way to form connected ideas” and “to have a particular idea, opinion or belief about something or somebody” (Homby, 1995: 1241). In her utterance, Alice uses the word think with the second meaning, namely to state that she has the belief that she never saw a drawing of a muchness. Then, not only does the Hatter interrupt Alice’s utterance, but he also perceives Alice’s use of the
| 31 | The Duchess (to Alice) | ‘The game’s going on rather better now,’ she said, by way of keeping up the conversational little.  
"Tis so," said the Duchess: ‘and the moral of that is———“Oh, ’tis love, ’tis love, that makes the world go round!”’ (Carroll, 1970: 120). | word *think* with the first meaning, namely that Alice does not use the mind in an active way to form connected ideas. Because the Hatter thinks Alice does not use her mind to form connected ideas, he tells her not to talk. |
| 32 | The Duchess (to Alice) | ‘Somebody said,’ whispered, ‘that it’s done by everybody minding their own business!’  
‘Ah, well! It means much the same thing,’ said the Duchess, digging her sharp little chin into Alice’s shoulder as she added, ‘and the moral of *that* is———“Take care of the sense, and the sounds will take care of themselves.”’  
‘How fond she is of finding morals in things!’ Alice thought herself (Carroll, 1970: 120-121). | In (31), Alice tries to make small talk with the Duchess by commenting on the croquet game that the King, Queen, and the Cards are playing at the moment. The Duchess is expected to respond with the same topic. Instead, she draws a moral about love making the world go round, which is not related at all to their current topic or condition around them. In (32), Alice Alice teases the Duchess who just says that “love makes the world go round” by reminding her of her earlier moral, which says that the world will go round |
| Page | The Duchess (to Alice) | ‘I dare say you’re wondering why I don’t put my arm round your waist,’ the Duchess said after a pause: ‘the reason is, that I’m doubtful about the temper of your flamingo. Shall I try the experiment?’

‘He might bite,’ Alice cautiously replied, not feeling at all anxious to have the experiment tried.

‘Very true,’ said the Duchess: ‘flamingoes and mustard both bite. And the moral of that is—“Birds of a feather flock together.”’

‘Only mustard isn’t a bird,’ Alice remarked.

‘Right, as usual,’ said the Duchess: ‘what a clear way you I have of putting faster if to everybody minds their own business. However, the Duchess does not realize Alice’s sarcasm and even draws yet another moral about “Take care of the sense, and the soimds will take care of themselves” This new moral is not related at all to the two previous morals, to their topic of conversation, or to the condition around them. The Duchess’ utterance is not relevant to Alice’s utterance in any way, thus she violates the maxim of relevance. | In (33), the Duchess initiates a conversation again after Alice remains silent for a while. The Duchess talks about Alice’s flamingo and Alice confirms the Duchess’ fear that it might bite. Then suddenly she talks about |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>things! ‘It’s a mineral, I think,’ said Alice (Carroll, 1970: 121).</td>
<td>mustard, which also bites like flamingoes, and draws a new moral that “Birds of a feather flock together”. According to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, <em>birds of a feather flock together</em> is a saying which means “people of the same sort are found together” (Hornby, 1995: 108).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>The Duchess (to Alice)</td>
<td>In (34), the Duchess responds to Alice’s guess that mustard is a mineral by saying that she knows of a large mustard-mine around there. According to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, <em>mineral</em> is “a substance that occurs naturally in the earth and is not formed from animal or vegetable matter”, while <em>mine</em> is “a place where coal or other minerals are extracted from below the surface of the ground” (Homby, 1995: 741).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Then the Duchess draws yet another moral, namely “The more there is of mine, the less there is of yours.” In the Duchess’ moral, the word mine has a completely different meaning, namely the possessive pronoun of singular first person. The Duchess’ utterance is not relevant, thus she violates the maxim of relevance.

Table 3: The Violations of the Maxim of Manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The Mouse (to the Birds)</td>
<td>‘I move that the meeting adjourn, for the immediate adoption of more energetic remedies.’ ‘Speak English!’ said the Eaglet. ‘I don’t know the meaning of half those long words, and, what’s more, I don’t believe you do either!’ And the Eaglet bent down its head to hide a smile: some of the other birds tittered audibly (Carroll, 1970:47).</td>
<td>In (36), the Mouse is giving its advise to the group to take an action to dry themselves. In doing it, the Mouse uses very difficult and formal language style, which contains obscurity and unnecessary prolixity. Words like I move, meeting, adjourn, immediate, adoption, energetic, and remedies can be replaced with words that are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Character (to the Caterpillar)</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>‘Who are you?’ said the Caterpillar. This was not an encouraging opening for a conversation. Alice replied, rather shyly, ‘I hardly know, sir, just at present—at least I know who I was when I got up this morning, but I think I must have been changed several times since then’ (Carroll, 1970:67).</td>
<td>In (37), the Caterpillar asks Alice about her identity. Alice answers by saying that she knew her identity this morning, but she does not know it now. The information conveyed in Alice’s answer is true, and she actually undergoes several changes on that day. However, instead of directly stating her name or where she comes from, her answer is unclear, ambiguous and too wordy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>‘What do you mean by that?’ said the Caterpillar sternly. ‘Explain yourself!’ ‘I can’t explain myself I’m afraid, sir’ said Alice, ‘because I’m Here, not myself, you see,’ ‘I don’t see,’ said the Caterpillar. ‘I’m afraid I can’t put it more clearly,’ Alice replied very politely, ‘for I can’t understand it myself to begin with; and being so many different sizes in a day is very confusing’ (Carroll, 1970: 67-68).</td>
<td>In (38), the Caterpillar asks Alice to explain herself. Here to explain oneself means to give explanation about one’s utterance or action. Alice responds by</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 39 | The Footman (to Alice) | How am I to get in?’ she repeated, aloud.  
‘I shall sit here,’ the Footman remarked, ‘till tomorrow——.’  
At this moment the door of the house opened, and a large plate came skimming out, straight at the Footman’s head: it just grazed his nose, and broke to pieces against one of the trees behind him.  
‘——or next day, maybe,’ the Footman continued in the same tone, exactly as if nothing had happened.  
‘How am I to get in?’ asked Alice again, in a louder tone.  
‘Are you to get in at all?’ said the Footman. ‘That’s the first question, you know.’  
It was, no doubt: only Alice did not like to be told so. ‘It’s really dreadful,’ she muttered to herself, ‘the way all the creatures argue. It’s enough to drive one crazy!’  
The Footman seemed to think this a good opportunity for repeating his remark, with variations. ‘I shall sit here,’ he said, ‘on and oft, for days and days.  
‘But what am I to do?’ said Alice.  
‘Anything you like,’—said the Footman, and began whistling.  
‘Oh, there’s no use in talking to him,’ said Alice desperately: ‘he’s perfectly idiotic!’ And she opened the door and went in (Carroll, 1970: 81-82). | saying she cannot explain herself because she is not herself, referring to the changes she has undergone that day. Although the information is not exactly wrong, but Alice’s answer is unclear and ambiguous. Thus, she violates the maxim of manner. Besides violating the maxims of quantity and relevance as discussed in the previous parts, the Footman violates the maxim of manner in his conversation with Alice in (39). Alice and the Footman are outside the door of a house, Alice wants to get in the house and ask the Footman how she can do it. Not only is his answer irrelevant to Alice’s question, but his answer is also too long. He does not only state that he shall sit there for a long time, but
40 The Duchess (to Alice)  ‘The game’s going on rather better now,’ she said, by way of keeping up the conversation a little.

‘Tis so,’ said the Duchess: ‘and the moral of that is—“Oh, ’tis love, ’tis love, that makes the world go round!”’

‘Somebody said,’ Alice whispered, ‘that it’s done by everybody minding their own business!’

‘Ah, well! It means much the same thing,’ said the Duchess, digging her sharp little chin into Alice’s shoulder as she added, ‘and the moral of that is—“Take care the sense, and the sounds will take care of themselves”’ (Carroll, 1970: 120-121).

inbetween Alice’s questions, he keeps stating that he shall sit there “till tomorrow”, “or next day”, ”on and off, for days and days” (1970: 81-82). His answer contains prolixity, thus he violates the maxim of manner.

Besides violating the maxim of relevance as discussed above, the Duchess also repeatedly violates the maxim of manner in her conversation with Alice. The Duchess always replies by concluding the moral from everything Alice says. In (40), Alice tries to make small talk by commenting on the croquet game currently played by the King, the Queen, and the Cards. The Duchess responds by drawing the moral. Alice teases her by repeating a moral that she states earlier, and the Duchess responds by
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Character (to Character)</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 41   | The Duchess (to Alice)   | 'Only mustard isn’t a bird,' Alice remarked.  
\quad ‘Right, as usual,’ said the Duchess: ‘what a clear way you have of putting things!’  
\quad ‘It’s a mineral, I think,’ said Alice.  
\quad ‘Of course it is,’ said the Duchess, who seemed ready to agree to everything that Alice said; ‘there’s a large mustard-mine near here. And the moral of that is—’the more there is of mine, the less there is of yours.’”  
\quad ‘Oh, I know!’ exclaimed Alice, who had not attended to this last remark, ‘it’s a vegetable. It doesn’t look like one, but it is’ (Carroll, 1970; 121-122). | In (41), Alice is talking about mustard in response to the Duchess’ utterance about mustard. Again, the Duchess responds by drawing a moral about “The more there is of mine, the less there is of yours.” This moral is also long, unclear and ambiguous. It is not clear whether or not she is talking about possessions literally or what possession she is talking about. It is difficult to understand the meaning of her utterance. |
| 42   | The Duchess (to Alice)   | ‘I quite agree with you,’ said the Duchess; ‘and the moral of that is—’“Be what you would seem to be”—or if you’d like it put more simply—“Never imagine yourself not to be otherwise than what it might appear to others that what you were or might have been was not otherwise than what you had been would have appeared to them to be otherwise.”  
\quad ‘I think I should understand that better,’ Alice said very politely, ‘if I had it written down: but I can’t quite follow it as you say it’ | In response to Alice’s utterance in (41) about mustard being a vegetable although it does not look like a vegetable, the Duchess draws another’ moral in (42), |
‘That’s nothing to what I could say if I chose,’ the Duchess replied, in a pleased tone.
‘Pray don’t trouble yourself to say it any longer than that,’ said Alice (Carroll, 1970: 122).

namely “Be what you would seem to be” or “Never imagine yourself not to be otherwise than what it might appear to others that what you were or might have been was not otherwise than what you had been would have appeared to them to be otherwise” This is the longest of all the morals that the Duchess ever states. Not only extremely long, but this moral is also unclear, difficult to understand, wordy, and ambiguous. Structurally, it consists of endless multiple clauses which contradict one another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>The Pigeon (to Alice)</td>
<td>‘Serpent!’ screamed the Pigeon. ‘I’m not a serpent!’ said Alice indignantly. ‘Let me alone!’ ‘Serpent, I say again!’ repeated the Pigeon, but in a more subdued tone, and added with a kind of sob, ‘I’ve tried every way, and nothing seems to suit them!’ ‘I haven’t the least idea what you’re talking about,’ said Alice. ‘I’ve tried the roots of trees, and I’ve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Besides violating the maxim of relevance discussed above, the Pigeon also does a series of violations of the maxim of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Character (to Alice)</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>The Pigeon</td>
<td>‘No, no! You’re a serpent; and there’s no use denying it. I suppose you’ll be telling me next that you never tasted an egg!’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘I have tasted eggs, certainly,’ said Alice, who was a very truthful child, ‘but little girls eat eggs quite do, you know.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘I don’t believe it,’ said the Pigeon, ‘but if they do, why then they’re a kind of quality in its conversation with Alice. In (43, the Pigeon and Alice just meet for the first time and the Pigeon insists that Alice is a serpent that will take its eggs, despite Alice’s repeated denials. <em>Serpent</em> is defined in <em>Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary</em> as “a snake, especially a large one” (Homby, 1995: 1073), while <em>snake</em> is defined as “any of various types of long reptile without legs, some of which are poisonous” (1995: 1122). Based on the definitions, the Pigeon lacks adequate evidence to accuse Alice as a serpent, since Alice does not look like a reptile, has legs, and already denies that she is a serpent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In (44), the Pigeon still continues to insist that Alice is a serpent. This time, the Pigeon accuses Alice as a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>The March Hare and the Mad Hatter (to Alice)</td>
<td>‘No room! No room!’ they cried out when they saw Alice coming. ‘There’s plenty of room!’ said Alice indignantly, and she sat down in a large arm-chair at one end of the table (Carroll, 1970: 93).</td>
<td>This conversation happens when Alice just enters their house. Their utterance about no room lacks adequate evidence, which is proven by Alice’s statement that there is “plenty of room”. Not only lacking adequate evidence, but their utterance is also false, which is proven by Alice’s action of sitting down in an arm-chair. If there really were no room, Alice would not be able to sit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 46 | The Cat (to Alice) | ‘But I don’t want to go among mad people,’ Alice remarked.  
Oh, you can’t help that,’ said the Cat:  
‘we’re all mad here. I’m mad. You’re mad?  
‘How do you know I’m mad?’ said Alice.  
‘You must be,’ said the Cat, ‘or you wouldn’t have come here.’  
Alice didn’t think that proved it at all; however, she went on:  
‘And how do you know that you’re mad?’  
‘To begin with,’ said the Cat, ‘a dog’s not mad. You grant that?’  
‘I suppose so,’ said Alice.  
‘Well, then,’ the Cat went on, ‘you see, a dog growls when it’s angry, and wags its tail when it’s pleased. Now I growl when I’m pleased, and wag my tail when I’m angry. Therefore I’m mad?  
‘I call it purring, not growling,’ said Alice.  
‘Call it what you like,’ said the Cat (Carroll, 1970: 89). | The Cat violates the maxim of quality in its conversation with Alice in the forest. In (46), Alice is refusing to go to March Hare and Mad Hatter’s place, whom the Cat just describes as mad. The Cat responds by stating that both it and Alice are also mad. Mad is defined in Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary as “mentally ill, insane” or “very foolish or crazy” (Homby, 1995: 705). According to the Cat, Alice is mad because she came to that place. Obviously, the action of coming to an unknown place is not enough as indicator of mental illness, insanity, foolishness, or craziness. Meanwhile, the Cat accuses itself of being mad because a dog grows when it is angry and wags its tail when pleased, and it does |
the contrary. Animals of different species naturally have different behaviors, so comparing a cat and a dog’s behavior is also not enough as indicator of mental illness, insanity, foolishness, or craziness. The Cat’s utterances are not true and not supported by any adequate evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>47</th>
<th>The March Hare (to Alice)</th>
<th>‘Have some wine,’ the March Hare said in an encouraging tone. Alice looked all round the table, but there was nothing on it but tea. ‘I don’t see any wine,’ she remarked. ‘There isn’t any,’ said the March Hare. ‘Then it wasn’t very civil of you to offer it,’ said Alice angrily (Carroll, 1970:93-94).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Any act of offering presumes and requires the existence of the object being offered. If someone offers something, he or she is understood as expressing the information that the object actually exists. By offering Alice to “have some wine” in (47), the March Hare is indirectly expressing that there is some wine there. However, it then says that there is no wine, which
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>The March Hare (to Alice)</td>
<td>“Take some more tea,” the March Hare said to Alice, very earnestly. “I’ve had nothing yet,” Alice replied in an offended tone, “so I can’t take more” (Carroll, 1970: 101),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>The Duchess (to Alice)</td>
<td>‘Very true,’ said the Duchess; ‘flamingoes and mustard both bite. And the moral of that is—“Birds of a feather flock together”’ (Carroll, 1970: 121).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
maxim of quality in her conversation with Alice. In (49), the Duchess mentions that flamingos and mustard both bite, then draws a moral that “Birds of a feather flock together”. Therefore, she implies that flamingoes and mustard are birds, although she actually does not have adequate evidence that mustard is a bird.

| 50   | The Duchess (to Alice)       | ‘Only mustard isn’t a bird,’ Alice remarked. ‘Right, as usual,’ said the Duchess; ‘what a clear way you have of putting things!’ (Carroll, 1970: 121). Secondly, when Alice says that mustard is not a bird in (50), the Duchess instantly agrees that mustard is not a bird, although a short while ago she just implied that mustard was a bird. Therefore, she provides an utterance that she knows to be false. |
| 51   | The Duchess (to Alice)       | ‘It’s a mineral, I think said Alice. ‘Of course it is,’ said the Duchess, who seemed ready to agree to everything that Alice said; ‘there’s a large mustard-mine near here. And the moral of that is—“The more there is of mine, the less there is of yours”’ (Carroll, 1970:121-122). Thirdly, when Alice states her guess that mustard is a mineral in (51), the Duchess instantly agrees again and says that there is a |
large mustard-mine nearby, although previously she did not say anything about mustard-mine and a short while ago she implied that mustard was a bird. Therefore, her utterance about mustard-mine lacks adequate evidence, and she also provides an utterance that she knows to be false.

<p>| 52 | The Duchess (to Alice) | ‘Oh, I know!’ exclaimed Alice, who had not attended to this last remark, ‘it’s a vegetable. It doesn’t look like one, but it is.’ ‘I quite agree with you,’ said the Duchess (Carroll, 1970: 122). |
|    |                        | Lastly, when Alice discovers that mustard is a vegetable, the Duchess instantly agrees again, although a short while ago she implied that mustard was a bird and then stated that mustard was a mineral. She provides an utterance that she knows to be false, thus violating the maxim of quality. As a result of violations (51) to (52), Alice does not pay attention to the Duchess’ utterances and instead focuses on her... |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 90</th>
<th>PLAGIAT MERUPAKAN TINDAKAN TIDAK TERPUJI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>The Gryphon and the Mock Turtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They had not gone far before they saw a Gryphon sitting in the distance, and, as they came nearer, Alice could hear it singing, as if its heart would break, ‘Come out, come out, into the light!’ She pitied it so much, that she asked the Gryphon and the Mock Turtle, who looked at them with large eyes full of tears, but said nothing (Carroll, 1970).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In (§3), the Gryphon and the Mock Turtle are discussing the theme of sorrow. The Gryphon asks the Mock Turtle about his sorrow, and the Mock Turtle replies, saying he is ‘sitting sad and lonely’ and that he has no sorrow. Alice then asks the Mock Turtle if he has no sorrow, and he replies that he does not go successfully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>However, the evidence from the novel shows that the Mock Turtle is ‘sitting sad and lonely’ and that he has no sorrow. Therefore, the evidence supports the idea that the Mock Turtle has some sorrow. The Gryphon has some evidence that supports the idea that the Mock Turtle has some sorrow. The Gryphon’s evidence is not supported by adequate evidence, thus it violates the maxim of quality. The novel does not describe any visible result of the Gryphon’s violation, but most readers will consider the Gryphon’s evidence as not adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>521.621 35 nI.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 54 | The King (to the Hatter) | ‘Take off your hat,’ the King said to the Hatter.  
‘It isn’t mine,’ said the Hatter.  
‘Stolen! ’ the King exclaimed, turning to the jury, who instantly made a memorandum of the fact. ‘I keep them to sell,’ the Hatter added as an explanation;  
‘I’ve none of my own. I’m a hatter’ (Carroll, 1970; 147). | Although the Hatter also violates the maxim of relevance by stating the hat is not his instead of taking it off directly, which has been discussed in the previous part, the King also lacks adequate evidence to accuse that the hat was stolen. Even if the hat is not the Hatter’s, it might be borrowed or found instead of stolen. In fact, as the Hatter explains later, the hat was not stolen but is the Hatter’s own product, which he keeps to sell. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 55 | The King and the Queen Mad (to the White Rabbit) | ‘Are they in the prisoner’s handwriting?’ asked another of the jurymen.  
‘No, they’re not,’ said the White Rabbit, ‘and that’s the queerest thing about it.’ (The jury all looked puzzled.)  
‘He must have imitated somebody else’s hand,’ said the King. (The jury all brightened up again).  
‘Please your Majesty said the Knave, ‘I didn’t write it, and they can’t prove I did: there’s no name signed at the end.’  
‘If you didn’t sign it,’ said the King, ‘that only makes the matter worse. You must have meant some mischief; or else you’d have signed your name like an honest man’  
‘That proves his guilt,’ said the Queen. | This conversation happens in a trial in the courtroom. The Knave is the prisoner and the suspect in the trial. A new evidence has just been found in the form of a letter. The letter is not in the Knave’s handwriting and is not named. The King accuses the |
| 56 | The Queen | ‘Let the jury consider their verdict,’ the King said, for about the twentieth time that day. ‘No, no!’ said the Queen. ‘Sentence first—verdict afterwards.’ ‘Stuff’ and nonsense!’ said Alice loudly. ‘The idea of having the sentence first!’ (Carroll, 1970: 160-161). | The Queen violates the maxim of quality in her conversation in the courtroom. In a trial, *sentence* means “the punishment given by a lawcourt” (Homby, 1995:1071) and *verdict* means “a decision reached by a jury on a question of fact in a law case” (1995: 1324), as defined in *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary*. Knave of imitating somebody else’s handwriting and not signing the letter deliberately with bad intention. Continuing the King’s utterance, the Queen says that it proves the Knave’s guilt. Both the King and Queen have not read the content of the letter. Their utterances are not supported by any adequate evidence that the letter was written by the Knave at all. |

\[ \text{‘It proves nothing of the sort!’ said Alice. ‘Why, you don’t even know what they’re about!’ (Carroll, 1970: 157-158).} \]
Obviously, the jury must reach a decision about the offense and the suitable punishment first, then only afterwards, the lawcourt can give punishment based on the jury’s decision. Therefore, the verdict must come first, followed by the sentence afterwards. In (56), the Queen forces the court to reverse the order by having the sentence first and verdict afterwards. She gives an utterance which she knows to be false because it contrasts with the correct proceedings of the court. As a queen, of course she already understands the correct proceedings of the court.