

# A Cooperative Principle Analysis of Rhetorical Devices in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar

Salah Jameel Jabrael <sup>1</sup>, Abbas Fathil Lutfi <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>English Department, Faculty of Arts, Soran University<sup>2</sup> English Department, College of Languages, Salahaddin University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31918/twejer.2471.42>

Published: 21/07/2024

## Abstract

This paper aims to investigate the analysis of rhetorical devices pragmatically in terms of cooperative principle in particular its non-observance of conversational maxims in selected texts of Shakespeare's Julius Caesar play. In this research, the mixed method of qualitative and quantitative approaches was employed to describe and search for the rhetorical devices in the play, then for displaying the frequencies of rhetorical devices resulting from the observance of conversation maxims a table was drawn manually. However, the SPSS software version 22 is utilized to demonstrate the number and percentages of each maxim being broken. Next, the data were analysed. The pragmatic theory used to examine rhetorical devices is Grice's (1975) cooperative principle which includes the four maxims of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner; and non-observance such as flouting, violating, opting out, suspending and infringing.

It is hypothesised that the conversation maxims in cooperative principle can mostly convey the meaning of rhetorical strategies in the play. Furthermore, it is hypothesised that rhetorical devices are entirely dependent on the breaking of the four maxims of quality, quantity, manner, and relation. Correspondingly, it is hypothesised that the flouting among the five categories of non-observance of maxims would occur mostly in the rhetorical devices. As a result, the researcher explored many rhetorical devices. The results demonstrate that overall, twenty-one frequencies of rhetorical devices resulting from the non-observance of conversation maxims were used in the eight rhetorical devices in the play such as hyperbole, litotes, irony, tautology, rhetorical questions, euphemism, oxymorons, and paradox. Also, the results reveal that the number of examples of flouting the maxims of quantity is more than other types of maxims. Further, infringing constitutes zero frequency which suggests that the characters in the play communicate in their mother tongue.

**Keywords:** *Rhetorical Devices, Pragmatics, Grice's theory of implicature and the cooperative principle, the four maxims, non-observance of maxims*

## 1. Introduction

Researchers have given substantial consideration in recent decades to rhetorical devices (hereinafter RDs). According to Harris (2018), RDs, which are commonly classified as literary figures, include expressions used uniquely and creatively, either through individual words or concepts. Accordingly, the purpose of studying RDs is to strengthen contact by ensuring accountability, awareness, credibility, and even satisfaction among the addressees in a convincing and successful approach.

On the other hand, the cooperative principle (hereinafter CP) as a pragmatic theory plays a key role in the analysis of successful communication between the speaker and listener along with the four maxims of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner, non-observance of the maxims, and implicature; The CP reads: "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 this regard, Grice (1975) identified four maxims and conversational principles for successful communication.

The maxim of quality is based on truth and evidence; the maxim of quantity relies on being informative as required neither less nor more. The maxim of relevance counts on being relevant. Also, the maxim of manner has some features such as being clear, avoiding ambiguity and obscurity, and being brief and orderly. Also, Grice (1989) added another maxim called the social maxim which concentrates on being polite.

Moreover, Grice specified the non-observance of the four aforementioned maxims. This happens when interlocutors in a conversation do not follow the four maxims; thus, Grice's non-observance contains a maxim violation that occurs when there is false and untrue information that gives rise to misleading or deceiving interlocutors. However, the hearers are not aware of being deceived or misled by the speaker. Another category of non-observance is opting out in which the speaker is reluctant to collaborate for a specific reason; The speaker may also experience a clash when s/he cannot adhere to one maxim without disobeying another, i.e., s/he may observe one or more than one maxim, yet, s/he fail to follow another maxim.

On the other hand, Thomas (1995) added two other new maxims to non-observance: infringement and suspending. The former occurs when the speaker has some linguistic incompetence in communication which results in the inability to convey a message. However, the latter happens whenever there aren't any particular demands to be met, the communicator

could also turn to suspend a maxim, which occurs in culturally unique situations as well as in specified contexts (Thomas 1995). In addition, the most intriguing category of the non-observance for a maxim is to flout it because it results in implicatures.

Additionally, Grice branded two basic types of implicature: conventional implicature and conversational implicature. In this sense, conventional implicature is used by communicators to express their habitual implicatures without any context but via specific words. On the other hand, conversational implicatures are conclusions drawn from a remark based on both its meaning and certain assertions about the cooperative aspect of the typical verbal engagement. Also, conversational implicature can be subdivided into particularized conversational implicature (PCI), which requires a specific context, and generalized conversational implicature (GCI) does not require any context and or special knowledge to understand the extra meaning.

## 2. Rhetorical Devices and Pragmatics

Leech (1983) specifies rhetoric as the skilful application of communication in its broadest meaning, including the way it is performed in regular conversation and group discussions. Likewise, Harris (2018) argues that various techniques can be used in both writing and speaking to assist the author or talker in maintaining the public's focus as they read through their intended message.

There are several correlations between rhetorical devices (hence RDs) and pragmatics. Various types of RDs can be analysed pragmatically. In this sense, hyperbole (overstatement) as a rhetorical device can be analysed pragmatically. Hyperbole occurs when the quantity maxim is flouted and a speaker provides further information than is required. Also, hyperbole is one of the ways that flout the maxims of quality (Cutting 2002, P.37-38). Such manners of flouting maxims of quality are used to deliver an implied meaning. In this respect, an example of flouting the maxim of quality via hyperbole is (1) "I could eat a horse' or ...I am starving".

Note: the number of examples provided in this paper was placed between two brackets ( ).

In the case of (1) above, the speaker flouted the maxim of quality via exaggerating expressions such as eating a horse or starving which means, the speaker is extremely hungry rather than the denotative meaning of eating a horse or starving (Cutting 2002, p. 37).

On the contrary, Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 217-218) state that understatement (litotes) as a rhetorical device can give rise to flouting maxims of quantity and constructing implicature by saying less is required; for instance, An adolescent girl may use the phrase (2)

"He's all right" as a hidden critique to imply "I think he's bad" or as a secret complement to imply "I think he's fantastic."

Grice (1989, p.53) concedes that something is lacking in the analysis of irony. To express his reservations, he described the following context of the situation. When two friends were walking down the road and noticed a damaged store window, friend A commented, (3) Take a glance, the window of that store is in great condition.

The above example appears to be an irony where the opposite of the statement is true. In this regard, what was uttered is false (since both A and B witnessed the smashed window next to them) and what was meant was the total opposite of what has been said. This flouts the maxim of quality and the implication is that the window is broken. As a result, despite meeting all of the Gricean prerequisites, the irony does not appear, implying that there are certain basic issues with this, and therefore a different analysis is required ( 1989 ).

In contrast, Tautology emerges whenever the quantity maxim is flouted. According to Snider (2015), there is a connection between tautologies and conversational implicature. In this sense, Yamamoto (2012, p.14–15) illustrates how circumstance might signify a favourable or negative perception. She argues that since (4) "war is war", these instances may be used to infer multiple meanings depending on the situational context. The tautology here could well be phrased as the leader's utterance 'War is War' which implies a successful conflict, not a bloody one" in the [The leader of the firm that produces weapons is delighted to learn that a conflict will break out.] However, I'm worried that this fight won't continue very long. Leader: War is war (Nishikawa, 2003, p. 48).

Moreover, take into account the following quick conversation between two parents. When the wife queries her spouse by stating "Did the children ever tidy their rooms?". The husband replies, (5) "Well, boys will be boys," shaking his head. In this respect, the aforementioned phrase can easily be interpreted in terms of conversational implicature infers something specific, such as boys will misbehave, and it is sometimes tough to convince children to do what you desire (Gibbs & McCarrell, 1990, p.125-6).

On the other hand, the rhetorical question as a variety of RDs results in flouting the maxim of quantity and conversational implicature. Also, the rhetorical question has a relationship with flouting the maxims of quality and conversational Implicature. This occurs when a utterer can use the rhetorical question to suggest a conversational implicature created by disobeying the maxim of quality as s/he desires to emphasise that a known to her/his

audience and her/his is a strange person. For instance, (6) A: "John is a good friend to spend time with. B: Correct! Hasn't he been acting strangely lately?"

According to B's statement, John is not the appropriate man to hang out with because of his ambiguous behaviour (Al-Hindawi & Al-Juwaid 2017). Another example of a rhetorical question that breaks the quality maxim provided by Muslah (2015) is as follows: (7) "Do you have any disease? Or are you intoxicated? Are you trying to trick me?"

Mandla repeatedly examines his girlfriend in the above conversation to highlight a point that he is aware of. It is not anticipated that these inquiries will receive a reply. Based on the framework generated by Brown and Levinson (1987), these rhetorical questions are therefore regarded as a form of flouting of the maxim of quality.

Likewise, Euphemism is another rhetorical device that gives rise to the flouting maxim of quality. Likewise, an interlocutor can flout the maxim of quality by metaphor and Euphemism; for instance, (8) "My house is a refrigerator in January" or (9) "Don't be such a wet blanket- we just want to have fun" (Brown and Levinson (1987)). The hearers in the two above utterances would comprehend that the house is extremely cold, and somebody else is willing to decline the pleasure of other people. Consequently, in both utterances, the metaphor has been used to account for such intended meanings (implicature).

Another way of flouting the maxim of quality is by euphemism which can be illustrated in the following example: (10) "I am going to wash my hands". This instance means "I am going to urinate" (Cutting 2002,p.38). Other instances which have implied meanings encompass (11) 'She's got a bun in the oven' which means "She's pregnant" or (12) "he kicked the bucket" which makes sense as "He died". The implied meaning of the words is organised in a good manner so that the expressions can make sense of one thing.

In contrast, oxymoron as a rhetorical device can be created by flouting the manner maxim, particularly by disobeying the directive to "avoid obscurity" (Okunienè 2002, p.99). The instance that follows is from O. The Duel, a Henry short fiction in which one of the characters discusses his feelings for New York:

(13) "I despise its very vastness and power. It has the poorest millionaires, the littlest great men, the haughtiest beggars, the plainest beauties, the lowest skyscrapers, the doleful pleasures of any town I ever saw". ( Okunienè 2002).

In the above text, several words contain oxymorons such as ‘poorest millionaires’, ‘littlest great’, ‘lowest skyscrapers’, and ‘dolefulest pleasures’. Although they appear to be in contradiction with one another, they still convey the speaker's viewpoints and feelings. They are obscure and flout the maxim of manner. This implies that life in New York is extremely difficult and nobody can feel happy because of inequality and strong competition among the people. In other words, it implies that due to the capitalist system, social stratification is enormously vivid, and there is a growing gap between the higher class, lower class, and middle class.

On the other hand, a direct oxymoron has a relationship with generalized conversational implicature ( GCI ), whereas an indirect oxymoron with particularized conversational implicature ( PCI); consider the following: (14) “Of pure stained glory” is an example of an indirect oxymoron, therefore, a GCI in which the meaning of ‘pure’ and ‘stained’ can be made without context, but rather with two juxtaposed words; on the other hand, the meaning of (15) “ in their tinct, and added, of her wit” in which the meaning of tinct ( perfume ) and wit ( wisdom ) can be made via a specific context, which why it is an indirect oxymoron, and therefore, a PCI ( Hussein 2020, p. 14-15). On the contrary, paradox could be created as a rhetorical technique by flouting the maxim of manner, especially when certain phrases of ambiguity are utilized that appear to be self-contradictory and nonsensical claims, for example, the following text:

(16) “Women are a decorative sex. They never have anything to say, but they say it charmingly”. (Wilde)

On appearance, the above text represents a potential contradiction and ambiguity, however, when reading more closely, it makes a precise implication that is indeed correct (Okunienè 2002, p.99). On the contrary, the text flouts the maxims of quality and manner as it is not clear and true how women could be ‘decorative sex’ and how they could not ever communicate, but when they do speak, they are attractive. The novelist might imply that despite having hundreds of ways to be charming, women only have one method to be attractive and it is when they are physically beautiful.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1. Data Collection Procedure

The current study endeavours to identify the RDs employed in Shakespeare’s Julius Caesar play and their meanings pragmatically in terms of the CP with a particular focus on the non-observance of the maxims in conversation. The study contains the original text of the

play by Hudson (1950) entitled “The New Hudson Shakespeare Julius Caesar” published in the USA where the classic Shakespeare’s language with its complete acts, scenes, and page numbers are identified. Similarly, several pages of the book were devoted to elaborations on some difficult terminologies of the play which can be regarded as a good step for understanding Shakespeare’s language by the researcher. Even for the citations of the book, the researcher used the style of the verse drama as ( Act number, Scene number, and lines of the verse drama). This style was employed in eight extracts selected from the play in the data analysis section.

For the validity of the paper, the results of the study are displayed in two separate tables; firstly, the results of the frequencies and percentages of the observance and non-observance of the conversational maxims of quality, quantity, manner, and relation used in the eight RDs were presented. In this respect, a table was deliberately created to demonstrate the frequencies of RDs originating in the observance of conversation maxims. Nevertheless, the SPSS software version 22 has been employed to illustrate the number and percentage of maxims that are disobeyed. All of the data was then assessed. Secondly, the results of the two tables were debated in the second part.

Furthermore, the APA style, the 7th version was used in this paper. One of the main reasons for choosing this style is that it is the most updated version in the system of referencing and citations in the academic domain where the highest priority is given to paraphrasing beyond quotations and citations. In this respect, paraphrases may be used by researchers to simplify knowledge and incorporate ideas from diverse sources.

In addition, a mixed method including qualitative and quantitative methods was employed in this paper; the qualitative method aims to objectively describe and identify the foundation of data collection based on semantic characteristics (meaning of the components) along with pragmatic usage or the underlying meaning. Also, it demonstrates the manners and purposes of the selected extracts within Julius Caesar qualitatively. Likewise, the quantitative method was used to display the frequencies and percentages of the eight RDs resulting from the observance and non-observance of the conversation maxims in the play.

The paper also includes an analysis of the key RDs and the CP theory of Grice (1975) used to evaluate and understand Shakespeare’s Julius Caesar. Regarding the data collection, the original study sample includes a variety of RDs that are not randomly chosen from Shakespeare’s Julius Caesar. In this sense, eight RDs were selected and analysed from eight extracts of Julius Caesar; this is because of the length of the texts only eight extracts were selected to demonstrate how the RDs are used in such extracts.

Firstly, various excerpts from the play were utilised in the design and procedure of the study to determine various types of RDs.

Secondly, after studying the play several times, the investigator was capable of identifying some well-known RDs in the play; such RDs related to the pragmatic theory of the CP were then utilised during the analysis of data. Because of the capacity limitations of the study, eight different RD types were chosen.

In this study, hyperbole, tautology rhetorical questions, oxymoron, and paradox have been the effects of flouting the principles of quantity and manner; also, oxymoron gives rise to opting out of the maxim of quantity; whereas euphemism has been the implication of flouting the maxims of quality and manner, and suspending the quality maxim. On the other hand, litotes and irony have violated the four maxims of quality, quantity, manner, and relation.

When a speaker presents a query that is normally unrelated to the problem in question, or if an issue is not addressed directly, this flouting may take the form of quickly shifting the subject.

Eventually, the research's conclusions were evaluated. The fact that these RDs were selected because they could often present themselves pragmatically in terms of the cooperative principle, the analysis of RDs is based on this pragmatic notion as well. Thus, the pragmatic theory used in Julius Caesar contains Grice's (1975) CP including the four maxims and non-observance of maxims such as flouting, violating, opting out, suspending, and infringing. Correspondingly, non-observance of conversational maxims was used to display their relationship with their relevant RDs and conversational implicature, particularly the particularised conversational implicature (PCI); for instance, flouting the maxim has a relationship with particularised conversational implicature (PCI).

## 4. 1 Data analysis

The researcher used the mixed method for the analysis of RDs in Shakespeare's 'Julius Caesar pragmatically in terms of observance and non-observance of the maxims of conversation. Thus, the eight RDs such as hyperbole, litotes, irony, tautology, rhetorical questions, euphemism, oxymoron, and paradox are analysed in line with Grice's (1975) classification of the observance and non-observance of the maxims of conversation.

### 4.1.1 Hyperbole

“And they would go and kiss dead Caesar's wounds,

And dip their napkins in his sacred blood; Yea, beg a hair of him for memory.



And, dying, mention it within their wills,  
Bequeathing it as a rich legacy  
Unto their issue". (Act 3, Scene 2, lines 132-137)

There are clear examples of hyperbole in the above extract; the hyperbole is embodied by flouting the maxims of manner and quantity as it is not made clear why people would do all the things they do to Caesar's body after his death. Furthermore; not enough information is provided as to why people would do all these things for Caesar after his death. The implicature resulting from flouting the maxims is that in those days kings were seen as divine figures and their blood was sacred, so people would 'kiss their wounds', 'beg their hair', 'bequeath it as legacy', etc. as a way of showing respect to that holy being.

#### 4.1.2 Litotes

"I am no orator, as Brutus is;  
But, as you know me all, a plain blunt man,  
That love my friend, and that they know full well  
That gave me public leave to speak of him:  
For I have neither wit, nor words, nor worth,  
Action, nor utterance, nor the power of speech,  
To stir men's blood: I only speak right now;" ( Act 3, Scene 2, lines 215-221 )

Antony's speech 'I am no orator, as Brutus is' includes a litotes as a form of meiosis (understatement) in which Antony purposely is willing to demonstrate that his speech is not as important as Brutus's. The above statement violates the four maxims of quality, quantity, manner, and relation. He violates the maxim of quality as he is not telling the truth since the opposite of his statement is correct, i.e., he is a good orator because as a senior Caesar's senator, his speech convinces the Roman citizens during different public gatherings and he is famous for his oration amongst the people. On the other hand, Antony violated the maxim of quantity as he did not communicate with the audience successfully, since he did not provide sufficient information to prove his argument that he was not an orator, i.e., he provided less information regarding the above speech. Meanwhile, Antony violated the maxim of relevance, since his speech is not related to whether he is a better or worse orator than Brutus. However, he desires to provide further accounts of how Caesar was assassinated by the conspirators including Brutus. In this case, he violates the maxim of quantity and manner as well, since his speech is against the sub-maxim of manner " be clear" and " be brief". Also, his speech against the submaxim of quantity "be informative, not less nor more"; in this case, as

aforementioned, he was brief to elaborate further on his speech. The rationale behind violating the four maxims of quality, quantity, manner, and relation by Antony is to convince the Roman citizens of a revolution against the conspirators including Brutus. Nevertheless, his violation of the maxims is based on telling lies, and deceiving the conspirators, and the whole audience.

### 4.1.3 Irony

“This dream is all amiss interpreted:

It was a vision fair and fortunate.

Your statue spouting blood in many pipes,

In which so many smiling Romans bathed,

Signifies that from you great Rome shall suck

Reviving blood, and that great men shall press

For tinctures, stains, relics, and cognizance.

This by Calpurnia's dream is signified” . (Act 2, Scene 2, lines 83-90 )

The above extract is an irony because the opposite of Decius's statement is correct. This is because the interpretation of Calpurnia's dreams by Decius where Caesar's sculpture sprayed blood from many various locations to have a good suggestion violates the maxims of quality, quantity, manner, and relevance. It violates the maxim of quality since Decius does not tell the truth and lacks any evidence in his interpretation that Calpurnia's dreams can lead to a positive future and that Roman citizens will have a better life and bright future. Also, Decius by claiming that Caesar had certainly blood dripping all over delighted Romans violates the maxim of quality as he did not state something true. In this sense, in this context, Decius is willing to betray Caesar by stating that Caesar's blood will regenerate Rome, and everyone will desire a small portion of that glorious blood. In other words, Decius does not follow the CP to tell the truth regarding Caesar. Secondly, it violates the maxim of quantity since Decius provides too much information about the dreams in the above extract. Thirdly, his speech violated the maxim of relevance since it is not relevant to helping Caesar to listen to his wife and not participate in the senators' meetings, rather by misleading Caesar, he desires to change the topic and focus from dreams to persuading Caesar to take part in the senate's meeting where he can be killed by the plotters including Decius. Fourthly, the speech violates the maxim of manner since it is against the submaxims of 'be brief', 'be clear', and 'avoid ambiguity', i.e., Decius violates the aforementioned submaxims. The rationale behind violating of the maxims by Decius is that Decius is a member of a conspiracy group against

Caesar. In other words, Decius via telling lies conspires to deceive Caesar to bring him to the Senate to kill him.

#### 4.1.4 Tautology

“The evil that men do lives after them:

The good is oft interred with their bones;” (Act 3, Scene 2, lines 75-76)

Here, Antony’s speech is a tautology that flouts the maxim of quantity and manner; it flouts the maxim of the quantity since further information has not been provided by the speaker in the above two separate sayings; he provided less information in terms of what is stated above; In other words, less information regarding the sayings “The evil that men do lives after them” and “burying goodness with their bone” have been provided. In addition, the above statements flout the maxim of manner since it is against the submaxims of manner “be clear”, “avoid ambiguity” and “be brief”. Therefore, the statements might have different readings. One reading is that the statements include a particularized conversational implicature which implies that goodness can perish far more quickly than evil after a man dies. Also, this implies that avoiding doing evil is more crucial, even though it infers that one is forgotten more quickly after his death.

Likewise, this tautology can be further analysed in terms of particularized conversational implicature and might apply to Caesar, Brutus, and his group; Hence, Antony might imply that the remembrance of Caesar’s goodwill disappears more quickly than the impact of Brutus’s, and his group’s wickedness.

#### 4.1.5 Rhetorical Questions

“And do you now put on your best attire?

And do you now cull out a holiday?

And do you now strew flowers in his way?

That comes in triumph over Pompey’s blood?” ( Act 1, Scene 1, Lines 50-53)

In the above speech Murellus, a military commander used some rhetorical questions which can be commonly comprehended as questions and are not intended to be responded to by the crowd of the people of Rome. In this sense, such rhetorical questions can be accounted for in terms of non-observance in the CP in which Marcellus flouted the maxim of quantity

and manner. He flouted the maxim of the quantity as he provided more information than was required. On the other hand, he flouted the maxim of manner, he was not brief, but rather his speech contains redundancy in the phrase ‘do you know now’ repeated three times which is against the submaxim of manner ‘be brief; in so doing, he was interested in stressing emphasis on the point that the gathered people were disloyal to Pompey that did great things for them. Similarly, according to Murellus's rhetorical questions, the people of Rome are not the proper people to deal with due to their ambiguous behaviours. In other words, in terms of particularized conversational implicature, he implies that the people of Rome were not loyal, trustful, and faithful towards Pompey, instead, they celebrated the victory of Caesar over Pompey. As a result, the gathered people could infer that they were hypocritical in supporting both Pompey and Caesar in two different contexts, one when Pompey was in power and the other when Caesar defeated him and consolidated the power.

#### 4.1.6 Euphemism

“I know not, gentlemen, what you intend,

Who else must be let blood, who else is rank:” ( Act 3, Scene 1, Lines 152-153 )

There are likely to be two versions of euphemisms in the speech of Antony; one of them is 'gentlemen' as a reference to the group of conspiracy involved in Caesar's assassination. Perhaps the second one is 'blood' used as a euphemism instead of betrayal by the conspirators which gives rise to Caesar's death. As a result, Antony has not followed the quality maxim in the cooperative principle, because the meaning of the utterances of 'gentlemen' and 'blood' at the literal meaning levels has been changed; in other words, the aforementioned utterances contain implicit meaning. Therefore, it flouts the sub-maxims of quality 'say something true' and ‘say something that you have evidence’.

Also, there appears to be a suspending of the maxim of quality in the phrase “Who else must be let blood, who else is rank” where Antony desires to use a euphemistic expression instead of stating directly an unforgiving expression “whose turn will be next to be terrorized by the conspirators”, this is due to the nature of the situation where Antony has with the conspirators as he seems to be afraid of their dangerous action against himself because Antony via suspending the maxim of the quality indirectly is willing to inform the plotters that they will have another conspiracy after Caesar’s assassination. However, he appears not to reveal this piece of information, i.e. he tends to suspend it.

Additionally, Antony flouts the maxim of manner, as he has been ambiguous in using the words 'gentlemen' and 'blood' vaguely and impliedly; the former might imply the conspirators

and the latter implies that apart from Caesar, some other high-ranking officials including him are on the list of conspirators to be assassinated.

#### 4.1.7 Oxymoron

“Tut, I am in their bosoms, and I know  
Wherefore they do it: They could be content  
To visit other places and come down  
With fearful bravery, thinking by this face  
To fasten in our thoughts that they have courage.  
But it is not so”. ( Act 5, Scene 1, lines 7- 12)

In the above example, the expression 'fearful bravery' is employed as an indirect oxymoron by Antony in a contextual situation where Antony expected the armies of Cassius and Brutus, their enemies would not advance against them, but rather they would advance for negotiation. In this context, he employed the expression where both words 'fearful' and 'bravery' contradict one another. Based on the cooperative principle, in terms of the non-observance maxim, Antony flouted the maxim of manner since the expression contains an ambiguous meaning. It might mean that the armies are not such serious as to create fear; consequently, they can bravely confront them without any fear or perhaps it means the armies merely show their bravery to obscure their fear. Also, the phrase flouts the maxim of quantity, as less information has been provided. Correspondingly, by using 'fearful bravery', Antony used a particularized conversational implicature which implies that they should not be misled by the conspirator's representation of a deceptive act of boldness. In other words, there is a particularized conversational implicature where Antony suggests that the conspirators including Brutus and Cassius have plotted to deceive them by acting courageously and attempting to frighten them with their strength; which is why Antony implies that the conspirators are not such people via their performance can scare and overcome them. Also, it appears that by simply uttering 'fearful bravery', Antony is willing to opt out of the maxim of quantity since the phrase is less informative and against the sub-maxim of quantity' be informative say not more not less.

#### 4.1.8 Paradox

“ It is the bright day that brings forth the adder;  
And that craves wary walking. Crown him?--that;--

And then, I grant, we put a sting in him,  
That at his will he may do danger with.  
The abuse of greatness is when it disjoins

Remorse from power; and, to speak the truth of Caesar,".(Act II, Scene I, lines 14-19). There is a paradox in Brutus's statement which claims that the richness of a leader's aspirations can melt into contaminated clay when they take their authority positions for trust. At first glance, the utterance "The abuse of greatness is when it disjoins Remorse from power" appears to be contradictory and ambiguous, and with closer examination, it creates a definite meaning that in fact, it could be true. In other words, Brutus flouted the maxim of the manner in cooperative principle, especially when certain ambiguous and unclear expressions in his speech have been employed such as 'abuse of greatness', which means power corruption, melting of power corruption, and changing into contaminated clay, while people think positions of authority are out the of confidence. Additionally, the statement contains a particularized conversational implicature which implies that Caesar has taken the power in a manner that the most powerful people are powerless to oppose him. This could also infer that Caesar was a dictator and imposed his power on the Roman people.

## 5. Results and Discussion

This section contains two parts: results and discussion. The results part consists of two subsections; the first of which involves Grice's (1975) conversational maxims, i.e., maxims of quality, quantity, manner, and relevance where a table demonstrates the frequencies of eight RDs resulting from the observance of conversation maxims used in Julius Caesar. The second subsection indicates the five kinds of non-observance of the conversational maxim, i.e. flouting, violating, opting out, infringing, and suspending via ten tables which contain frequencies of eight RDs resulting from non-observance of conversation maxims. The second part discusses the results of the section.

### 5.1. Results

The first subsection of the results is illustrated in Table 1 which comes as follows:

Table 1. RDs and the Frequency of the Conversational Maxims Observance

RDs	Extracts number	Observance of the Maxims				Frequency	Percentage
		Quality	Quantity	Manner	Relation		

Hyperbole	4.1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Litotes	4.1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irony	4.1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tautology	4.1.4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rhetorical question	4.1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Euphemism	4.1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oxymoron	4.1.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Paradox	4.1.8	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall	8	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 1 shows that in all of the eight RDs, zero frequency and percentage of observance of the maxim in each of the quality, quantity, manner, and relation (relevance) occurred.

The following ten tables include the frequencies of eight RDs resulting from the non-observance of conversation maxims in the play:

Table 2. Frequency of Hyperbole Resulting from Flouting the Conversation Maxims

	Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Quantity	1	50.0	50.0	50.0
Manner	1	50.0	50.0	100.0
Total	2	100.0	100.0	

Table 2 demonstrates two instances of hyperbole resulting from flouting the conversation maxims (viz. the maxims of quantity and manner); each with a frequency of 50%.

Table 3. Frequency of Tautology Resulting from Flouting the Conversation Maxims

		Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Quantity	1	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Manner	1	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	2	100.0	100.0	

Table 3 reveals two examples of tautology resulting from flouting the conversation maxims (viz. the maxims of quantity and manner); each with a frequency of 50%.

Table 4. Frequency of Rhetorical Questions Resulting from Flouting the Conversation Maxims

		Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Quantity	1	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 4 displays one illustration of a rhetorical question resulting from flouting the conversation maxim of quantity with a frequency of 100%.

Table 5. Frequency of Euphemism Resulting from Flouting the Conversation Maxims'

		Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Quality	1	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Manner	1	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	2	100.0	100.0	

Table 5 indicates two illustrations of euphemism resulting from flouting the conversation maxims (viz. the maxims of quality and manner); each with a frequency of 50%.

Table 6. Frequency of Oxymoron Resulting from Flouting the Conversation Maxims

		Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Quantity	1	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Manner	1	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	2	100.0	100.0	

Table 6 demonstrates two instances of Oxymoron resulting from flouting the conversation maxims (viz. the maxims of quantity and manner); each with a frequency of 50%.

Table 7. Frequency of Paradox Resulting from Flouting the Conversation Maxims



		Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Quantity	1	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Manner	1	50.0	50.0	100.0
Total		2	100.0	100.0	

Table 7 proves two examples of paradox resulting from flouting the conversation maxims (viz. the maxims of quantity and manner); each with a frequency of 50%.

Table 8. Frequency of Litotes Resulting from Violating the Conversation Maxims

		Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Quality	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Quantity	1	25.0	25.0	50.0
	Manner	1	25.0	25.0	75.0
	Relation	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

Table 8 verifies four instances of litotes resulting from violating the four conversation maxims (viz. the maxims of quantity, quality, manner, and relation); each with a frequency of 25%.

Table 9. Frequency of Irony Resulting from Violating the Conversation Maxims

		Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Quantity	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Manner	1	25.0	25.0	50.0
	Quality	1	25.0	25.0	75.0
	Relevance	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

Table 9 substantiates four instances of irony stemming from violating the four conversation maxims (viz. the maxims of quantity, quality, manner, and relation); each with a frequency of 25%.

Table 10. ‘Frequency of euphemism Resulting from Suspending the Conversation Maxims

		Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	--	-----------	----------	---------------	--------------------

Valid	Quality	1	100.0	100.0	100.0
-------	---------	---	-------	-------	-------

Table 10 verifies an instance of euphemism resulting from Suspending the conversation maxim of quality with a frequency of 100%.

Table 11. Frequency of Oxymoron Resulting from Opting out of the Conversation Maxims

	Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Quantity	1	100.0	100.0

Table 11 verifies an example of an oxymoron resulting from opting out of the conversation maxim of quantity with a frequency of 100%.

#### 4.4. Discussion

The results reflect that in all the eight categories of RDs, there is no observance of the four maxims of conversation. This means that the whole RDs have equal frequencies and percentages in the four types of observance of conversational maxims, which is zero.

On the other hand, the results of the frequencies of the eight categories of RDs resulting from the non-observance of the conversation maxims demonstrate that the overall number of the maxim of quantity is eight which is the most compared with other categories of the conversation maxims ( see tables 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 11, p.20-23). These come as follows: hyperbole with ( 50% ), litotes with ( 25%), irony with ( 25%), tautology with ( 50%), rhetorical questions with ( 100%), oxymoron with ( 50%), opting out with ( 100%), and paradox with ( 50%) respectively. On the other hand, the maxim of manner with seven frequencies is less than the quantity maxim. However, the maxim of quality with four frequencies is less than the manner one, whereas the maxim of relevance with two frequencies is the least.

Also, the results of the total twenty-one frequencies in the RDs resulting from non-observance of conversation maxims depict that flouting with eleven instances is the most,( see tables 2,3,4,6 and 7, p.20-22), whereas violating with eight frequencies is less than flouting ( see tables 8 and 9).On the contrary, each of suspending and opting out with one frequency alike ( 100%) are less than violating ( see tables 10 and 11, p.23-24), whereas, infringing is less than both suspending and opting out, i.e., infringing with no frequency is less and has the lowest occurrence.

On the other hand, the results of the total number of frequencies in non-observance of the maxims in the RDs indicate that both litotes and irony have the most number since both together have eight instances, each one with four frequencies violates quality, quantity,

manner, and relevance with 25% respectively. However, each euphemism and oxymoron has three frequencies, where the euphemism once flouts the maxims of quality and manner, each one with ( 50%) and another time with a frequency of 100% suspends maxim of quality. On the other hand, there are three instances of the oxymoron, the first two examples flout maxims of quantity and manner, and the second instance opts out of the maxim of quantity with a frequency of 100%. Therefore, the number of frequencies in both euphemism and oxymoron is less than in litotes and irony.

The results of the entire number of instances in non-observance of the maxims in the RDs, on the other hand, suggest that each hyperbole, tautology, and paradox with two instances respectively are less than the number of examples in both litotes and irony. These three RDs each one with two frequencies of (50%) flouts the maxims of quantity and manner alike. Meanwhile, the number of instances in the three RDs is less than the number of illustrations in both euphemisms and oxymorons ( see tables 2, 3, 6, and 7, p. 20-22).

Conversely, the rhetorical question has only one instance with a frequency of (100%) where the number of instances is less than each of hyperbole, tautology, and paradox. Hence, the rhetorical question with the smallest frequency is the least kind of rhetorical device that flouts the maxim of quantity ( see Table 4). On the other hand, there are two examples of violating maxims of relevance, each one with a frequency of ( 25%). The first one happens in the litotes, and the second one is in irony ( see Tables 8 and 9, p.22-23).

## 6. Conclusions

Based on the aforementioned data and evaluation, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The non-observance of the maxims of conversation plays an important function in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar in meaning-building and meaning-interpretation processes; implicature which is an outcome of flouting the maxims seems to be a vital tool of communication in dramatic discourse. ( As in 4.1.1 , 4.1.4,4.1.5,4.1.6,4.1.7,4.1.8 , p.10,13-18)
2. With twenty-one frequencies of non-observance of the maxims in the eight RDs, flouting with eleven frequencies is the most, whereas violating with eight frequencies is ranked the second; conversely, both suspending and opting out with one frequency equally is the third. However, infringing with zero frequency ( zero per cent) is the last.
3. Flouting the maxims of quantity and manner gives rise to hyperbole, tautology, and paradox, whereas oxymoron flouts the maxims of quantity and manner and suspends

the maxim of quantity, conversely flouting the maxim of quality mostly occurs in euphemism ( see tables 2,3,4,5,6 and 7,p.20-22).

4. The maxims were flouted in numerous ways by the characters; via flouting the maxim of quality, something false was mentioned, whereas by flouting the maxim of quantity, greater or less knowledge was presented; conversely, by flouting the maxim of manner, ambiguous statements, and further wordiness were provided (As in 4.1.1, 4.1.4,4.1.5,4.1.6,4.1.7, and 4.1.8,p.10,13-18)
5. The maxims were violated in several manners by the characters in the play such as telling lies and deception, whereas there is only one specific case of suspending the maxim of quality used by Antony in the play; perhaps he desired to save his life from the conspirators who plotted to assassinate Caesar first, then Antony. (As in 4.1.2 and 4.1.3, p.11-12)
6. There is also solely one particular case of opting out of the maxims. On the other hand, infringing did not happen because there was successful communication between the speakers in the Roman language, i.e. they speak in their mother tongue, and they do not have any problems with their linguistic competence.
7. The maxims interrelate and are associated with one another; Whenever the quantity maxim is broken, the sub-maxim of manner 'be brief' is disobeyed, and the reverse is true ( see sub-sections 4.1.1, 4.1.4,4.1.6,4.1.7, and 4.1.8, p.10,13-18; tables 2,3,4, and 6, p.20-22).
8. The results of the zero frequency and the percentage in the eight RDs resulting from the observance of conversation maxims between the interlocutors of Julius Caesar indicate that they might not be interested in offering adequate details, expressing the whole truth, contributing significant contributions, or being as transparent as could be to achieve successful interaction (see 4.1.1, p.10).
9. The observance of the maxims including quality, quantity, relevance, and manner in the RDs did not happen. This might suggest that the RDs are entirely based upon the non-observance of the maxims. This stems from zero frequency and percentage resulting from the RDs in the observance of the maxims.
10. The rationale behind flouting of the maxims is because characters in literary language particularly in Julius Caesar's play are willing to encourage the interlocutors to think beyond their implied meanings which leads to implicature particularly particularized conversational implicature ( PCI).

11. The violation of the maxims occurs when the drama's interlocutors appear to hide the truth from the audience and mislead them such as what Decius did to Caesar via violating the maxim of quality, whereby Decius deceived and convinced him to proceed to the senate, which gave rise to his assassination by the conspirators including by Decius himself.
12. The total number of frequencies of the RDs resulting from the non-observance of the conversation maxims is twenty-one in which the quantity maxim with eight frequencies is the most. However, the manner maxim with seven occurrences is ranked second. Conversely, the maxim of quality with four frequencies is ranked third, whereas the maxim of relevance with two frequencies obtains the last ranking.
13. Euphemism results from flouting and suspending, whereas, oxymoron results from flouting and opting out of the maxims. Also, euphemism flouts both the maxims of quality and manner and suspends the maxim of quality. However, oxymoron flouts maxims of quantity and manner, and opts out of the maxim of quantity.
14. Irony and litotes share the same frequencies ( four frequencies ) and proportion ( 25%) for each of the four maxims of quality, quantity, manner, and relevance in violating the conversation maxims. This is because in both cases, the characters of the play tell lies and deceive one another.
15. Each hyperbole, tautology, and paradox shares identical frequencies ( with two frequencies ) and percentages ( with 50%) for each one respectively; they also flout the maxims of quantity and manner.

The research expects that this study would act as a venue for linguistic and literary academics in addition to a guide for other future investigations in pragmatics in terms of CP investigations of RDs.

## References

- Al-Hindawi, F. H., Mayuuf, H. H., & Al-Juwaid, W. R. (2017). Basic Tenets of Rhetorical Pragmatics. *Adab Al-Kufa Journal*, 1, 9-32
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse*. Routledge: London and New York.
- Gibbs, R. W., & McCarrell, N. S. (1990). Why boys will be boys and girls will be girls: Understanding colloquial tautologies. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 19(2), 125-145. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01068094>

- Grice, H.P. (1975). 'Logic and Conversation'. In P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, vol.3: *Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press, 41-58.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Harris, R. A. (2018). *Writing with clarity and style: A guide to rhetorical devices for contemporary writers*. Routledge.
- Hudson, H.N. (1950). *The new Hudson Shakespeare: Julius Caesar*. Gin and Company.
- Hussein, M. A. M. (2020). A Pragmatic Analysis of Oxymoron in Poetry: Tennyson's "Lancelot and Elaine" as an Example. *Alustath Journal for Human and Social Sciences*, 59(4), 1-16.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Nishikawa, M. (2003). Tautology from the Perspective of Ad hoc Concept. *Studies in Pragmatics*, 5, 45-58
- Muslah, A. F. (2015). Violating and flouting the Cooperative Principle in some selected short stories. *Journal of Babylon University*, 23(1), 62-71.
- Okunienè, E. (2002). Breaking the Maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principle in Literary Texts. *Kalbotyra*, 52(3), 94-104.
- Journal of Pragmatics*. 37, 433-460. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2003.12.007>
- Snider, T. (2015). Using tautologies and contradictions. In *Proceedings of sinn und bedeutung 19*, 610-627.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Routledge: London and New York.
- Yamamoto, N. (2012). An Examination of the Controversy over English Nominal Tautologies. *Human Culture Research Section Annual Report*, 28, 13-28.

## پوخته

نم توژیینهویه نامانجیهتی لیکۆلینهوه له شیکاری نامیره رهوانبیزیهکان بکات به شیویهکی پراگماتیک له رووی بنه‌مای هاوکارییهوه به تاییهتی به رهچاوکردنی بنه‌مای گفتوگۆیی له دهقه هه‌لیژێردراومه‌کانی شانۆنامه‌ی جولپوس سیزاری شکسبیردا. لهم لیکۆلینهوه‌یه‌دا، شیوازی تیکه‌لاری ریبازه چۆنایهتی و چه‌ندایه‌تییه‌کان به‌کارهینراوه بو وه‌سفکردن و گهران به‌دوای نامیره رهوانبیزیهکان ناو شانۆنامه‌که‌دا، پاشان بو پیشاندانی ریزه‌ی سه‌دی و دووبارهبه‌وه‌ی نامیره رهوانبیزیهکان که له نه‌جای رهچاوکردنی بنه‌ماکانی گفتوگۆوه سه‌رچاوه ده‌گرن، خشته‌یه‌ک به‌کارهینراوه. به‌لام به‌نامه‌ی ۲۲ی نهمه کالای ئیس پی ئیس (SPSS) به‌کارده‌هینریت بو نیشاندانی ژماره و ریزه‌ی سه‌دی هه‌ر ماکسیمیک که پیشیلکراوه. دواتر داتا‌کان شیکرانه‌وه. تیوری پراگماتیک که بو پیشکنینی نامیره رهوانبیزیهکان به‌کارده‌یت، پشت به بنه‌مای هاوبه‌شی گرایس (۱۹۷۵) ده‌به‌ستیت که چوار بنه‌مای کوالیتی، چه‌ندایه‌تی، په‌یوه‌ندی و شیواز و پابه‌ندنه‌بوون وه‌کو سه‌رپنجیکردن، هه‌لخه‌له‌تاندن، وازه‌ینان، راگرتن و پیشیلکردن له‌خۆده‌گرتیت. گریمانه ده‌کریت که بنه‌ماکانی گفتوگۆ له بنه‌مای هاوکاریدا زیاتر ده‌توانن مانای ستراتیژییه رهوانبیزیهکان له شانۆنامه‌که‌دا بگه‌یه‌نن. جگه له‌هه‌ش، گریمانه ده‌کریت که نامیره رهوانبیزیهکان به ته‌واوی وابه‌سته‌ی پیشیلکردنی چوار بنه‌ماکانی کوالیتی، چه‌ندایه‌تی، شیواز و په‌یوه‌ندین. به هه‌مان شیوه، گریمانه ده‌کریت که سووکایه‌تیکردن له نیوان پینج پۆلی رهچاونه‌کردنی بنه‌ماکاندا زیاتر له نامیره رهوانبیزیهکان رووده‌دات. توژیهره‌که زۆر نامیری رهوانبیزی لیکۆلیه‌وه. نه‌جایه‌کان ئه‌وه ده‌رخه‌ن که به گشتی بیست و یه‌ک جار نامیری رهوانبیزی که له نه‌جای رهچاونه‌کردنی بنه‌ماکانی گفتوگۆوه سه‌رچاوه ده‌گرن له هه‌شت نامیری رهوانبیزی ناو شانۆنامه‌که‌دا به‌کارهینراون وه‌ک زیاده‌یه‌وه‌ی، لیتوت، ته‌نز، تاوتو‌لوژی، پرسیا‌ری رهوانبیزی، جوانی، دژیه‌ک و... پارادوکس. هه‌روه‌ها نه‌جایه‌کان ده‌ریده‌خه‌ن که ژماره‌ی نمونه‌کانی سه‌رپنجیکردنی بنه‌ماکانی چه‌ندایه‌تی زیاتره له جوهره‌کانی تری بنه‌ماکانی گفتوگۆ. جگه له‌هه‌ش، پیشیلکاری ریزه‌که‌ی سفره که ئه‌وه پیشان ده‌دات که کاره‌کته‌ره‌کانی ناو شانۆنامه‌که‌ به زمانی دایکی خۆیان په‌یوه‌ندی ده‌کهن.

وشه‌ی سه‌ره‌کی: نامیره رهوانبیزیهکان ، پراگماتیک، تیوری ده‌ره‌اویشته‌ی گرایس و بنه‌مای هاوکاری، چوار بنه‌مای گفتوگۆ ، رهچاونه‌کردنی بنه‌مای گفتوگۆ

## تحليل المبدأ التعاوني للأدوات البلاغية في مسرحية شكسبير يوليوس قيصر

## المخلص

يهدف هذا البحث إلى دراسة تحليل الأدوات البلاغية بشكل عملي من حيث المبدأ التعاوني، ولا سيما عدم مراعاتها للقواعد الحوارية في نصوص مختارة من مسرحية شكسبير يوليوس قيصر. تم في هذا البحث استخدام الأسلوب المختلط بين المدخلين النوعي والكمي للوصف والبحث عن الأدوات البلاغية في المسرحية، ثم لعرض ترددات الأدوات البلاغية الناتجة عن مراعاة ثوابت المحادثة تم رسم جدول يدوي. ومع ذلك، تم استخدام الإصدار ۲۲ من برنامج اس بي اس SPSS لتوضيح العدد والنسب المئوية لكل مبدأ تم كسره. بعد ذلك، تم تحليل البيانات. النظرية التداولية المستخدمة لفحص الأدوات البلاغية هي مبدأ غرايس ۱۹۷۵ التعاوني الذي يتضمن المبادئ الأربعة للجودة والكمية والأهمية والطريقة؛ وعدم الالتزام مثل الاستهزاء والانتهاك وإلغاء الاشتراك والتعليق والتعدي .

من المفترض أن أقوال المحادثة في المبدأ التعاوني يمكن أن تنقل في الغالب معنى الاستراتيجيات البلاغية في المسرحية. علاوة على ذلك، يُفترض أن الأساليب البلاغية تعتمد كليًا على كسر المبادئ الأربعة المتمثلة في الجودة والكمية والطريقة والعلاقة. في المقابل، يُفترض أن الاستهزاء بين الفئات الخمس لعدم مراعاة المبادئ سيحدث في الغالب في الأدوات البلاغية. ونتيجة لذلك، استكشف الباحث العديد من الأدوات البلاغية. وأظهرت النتائج أنه في المجمل، تم استخدام واحد وعشرين تكرارًا للأدوات البلاغية الناتجة عن عدم مراعاة ثوابت المحادثة في الأدوات البلاغية الثمانية في المسرحية مثل

الغلو، والتهويل، والسخرية، والحشو، والأسئلة البلاغية، والتلطيف، والتناقضات، والتعبير. المفارقة. كما أظهرت النتائج أن عدد أمثلة مخالفة قواعد الكمية أكثر من أنواع القواعد الأخرى. علاوة على ذلك، يشكل الانتهاك ترددًا صفرًا مما يشير إلى أن الشخصيات في المسرحية تتواصل بلغتهم الأم.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الأدوات البلاغية، التداولية، نظرية غرايس التضمينية والمبدأ التعاوني، المبادئ الأربعة، عدم مراعاة المبادئ