

# The Use of Deception in Selected Literary Texts: A Comparative Pragmatic Study

<sup>1</sup>Zainab Kadhim Madhi, <sup>2</sup>Asst. Prof. Dr. Baidaa' Abbas Al-Zubaidy

## **Abstract**

*Language plays a vital role in communicating and transmitting information between people, as well as in performing several other important functions, deception being one of them. The importance of this study in linguistics is related to the wide social use of deception, and to the fact that it is one of the very important themes in literature. However, this field of research did not get what it deserved in research and study.*

*This Pragmatic study aims to explore the theatrical texts of the two historical periods (15<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries) in English literature by comparing them to highlight how the authors of poetic theatrical texts use the pragmatic aspects of language such as speech act theory and how to override the Grice principle in order to achieve certain social goals.*

*This study is designed to explore the linguistic features of deception in the Elizabethan era (Shakespeare's Hamlet) and the twentieth century (Elliot's Murder in the Cathedral) by comparing the deception methods used in both of them from the standpoint of the theory of pragmatics.*

*The researcher hypothesized that the text of Hamlet uses deceptive language more than the text of Murder in the Cathedral. The second hypothesis is that Grice's cooperative principle is overridden in terms of the quality and the manner maxims more than the quantity and the relevance maxims in both plays.*

**Keywords:** *deception, Literary Pragmatics, Manipulation*

## **1. Introduction**

As a means to an end, language can always be used to achieve specific purposes for both the addressors and addressees. One of such important purposes is to exert influence and affect attitudinal change. The latter purpose can be brought about through the use of many linguistic strategies, including deception, considered as a fundamental aspect of many strategic interactions both socially and in the field of literature. As far as drama is concerned, it offers a fertile area where playwrights employ various strategies, whether honest or dishonest, to attain their aims.

The term 'deception' can be defined as "intentionally causing someone to have a false belief that the deceiver believes to be false" (Carson 2010, 47). This definition needs to be further qualified to cover such cases

---

<sup>1,2</sup> University of Baghdad/ College of Education for Human Sciences/ Ibn Rushd/ Dept. of English  
Z.alssary@yahoo.com / baidaa.abbas@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq

as when A intentionally causes B to believe statement X, and X is false, but A neither believes that X is true nor believes that X is false.

This study aims at exploring the linguistic aspects related to the concept of deception from the pragmatic point of view and investigating the strategies of deception deployed in English drama during the Elizabethan and twentieth century eras. It also aims at describing the types of deception in the two selected plays: Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and Eliot's *Murder in the Cathedral*.

It is hypothesized that Elizabethan plays make use of strategies of deception more than the Twentieth Century ones and Grice's maxims are violated in terms of quality and manner more than quantity and relation in both eras.

## **2. Literature Review**

An account to the fundamental notion of deception, its types and links with pragmatics will be offered. A concise survey about the theoretical background referring to the pragmatic level of language used in the literary area, including the theory of speech act and the Cooperative Principle will be describe as well.

### **2.1 Deception: Basic Notions**

The definition of the concept of deception can be formulated differently from diverse viewpoints. Collins (2018: 11) sees deception as an act or a statement which misleads, hides the truth, or promotes a belief, concept, or idea that is not true. This is often done for personal gain or advantage. Deception can involve dissimulation, propaganda, and sleight of hand, as well as distraction, camouflage, or concealment. There is also self-deception, as in bad faith. It can also be called, with varying subjective implications: 'beguilement', 'deceit', 'bluff', 'mystification', 'ruse', or 'subterfuge'.

For Levin and McCornack (2014: 4), deception means misleading another person deliberately, willingly and/or with intent. It is – similar to the vast majority of deception theory and research - established on the idea that deception is essentially intentional.

#### **2.1.1 Theories of Cues to Deception**

The fundamental way to differentiate between fact and deceit lies in the use of the underpinning linguistic and grammatical cues found in discourse.

According to Levine and McCormack (2014:77), a great deal of the previous deception theories can be categorized as "cue theories". For instance, Ekman and Friesenc's (1969: 88) original leakage theory and its recent discrepancy, Zuckerman, Depaulo, and Rosenthal's (1981) four factor theory, interpersonal deception Theory (Buller&Burgoon,1996) and Virj's cognitive load paradigm (virj&Granhang,2012;virj, Granhang & porter,2010). These theories share the expectation which states that truthful people act in a distinct manner than lairs and the release of deception serial cues which can differentiate between truth and deceit fruitfully as well as deception cues appear depending on diverse psychological cases like feeling, apprehension, intellectual labors and/or tactic efforts to seem trusty.

Practically, the interpersonal theory in its simple frame is defined by Buller et al. (1996:219) as an active dialogue among people, when interpersonal exchange requires synchronic not postponed turns of speaking and chances for straightaway assessment reciprocal impact, it is interactive otherwise it is not.

Information Manipulation Theory (IMT) fails to clarify these asserted three clear matters: The production of deceptive message, the features of deceptive message, and the interpretation of the participants for such message, (Anolli and Ciceri, 2001:3).

For its part, a vast collection of conventional statement regarding deception factors like communicative tactics, doubt, relational familiarity, behavioural leakage and so forth has been based on the Interpersonal

deception theory (IDT). Conversely, IMT2 and TDT (Truth-Default Theory) could be described as non-cue theories, (ibid).

### **2.1.2 Types of Deception**

According to Utz (2005:50), there are myriad kinds of deception. Meanwhile Donath (1998) cares about the distinction among identify concealing, category deception, trolls and impersonation.

#### **1. Identity Concealment**

He (ibid: 19) adds the 'identify concealment' which habitually incorporates acts of deletion but not acts of perpetration. For instance, someone attempts to disguise through using incorrect name or an alias. Another instance, a Research that has been conducted by Wessel (2017) that sheds light on the anticipating the time at which the lesbian, gay, or bisexual (LGB) person may reveal their sexual attitude to the particular colleagues

#### **2. Category deception**

'Category deception' involves giving the impression or being a specific kind. 'Gender switching' is considered as the famous format of 'category deception' while other formats may include 'age deception' or strengthening of status. The bias of people to portray themselves perfectly is termed by Cornwell and Lundgren (2001) as misrepresentation. Besides it could be thought of as a modest shape of 'category deception', for example someone who tries to present himself or herself as more wealthy, slim, or charming, (ibid:17).

#### **3. Troll**

The character which has been innovated to disconcert the conversation in a group of news either through presenting instigating questions or through giving a pitiful advice can be called a troll, (ibid:14). For instance, the users on Twitter or Instagram or any other social network whose "follow me!!!" posts can be seen everywhere in any discussions, (Web source 1).

#### **4. Impersonation**

The procedure of pretense in order to act as another person is called Impersonation, (ibid: 18). If a particular person poses as if your twin brother that is considered impersonation. Some comic people or comedians who manipulate impersonation with the aim of imitation of the voices and stylishness of public and well-known figures or those how play the roles of historical figures in films can be considered as a form of impersonation which is harmless. Unfortunately, other types of impersonation are harmful, for instance, the taking of specific person's identity involving the bank data and social security number to rob his or her money, (Web source 2).

### **2.1.3 Deception from a Pragmatic Perspective**

#### **2.1.3.1 Assertives and Commissives acts in relation with Deception**

In so far as Williams (2002:74) defines the assertion as "a speech act in which something is claimed to hold". Whereas the term judgment can be utilized to refer to either a belief or an act by which a belief is created or fortified, so assertion is judgment. In addition, with assertion, the speaker either conveys an explicit expression or belief or the speaker intends the recipient to understand that he has that belief as well as the speaker may be purely repeating the assertion without any intention to persuade the recipient of anything, (ibid).

Bach & Harnish (1979:42) proposes that in assertive utterance " S asserts that P if S expresses: i. the belief that P, and ii. the intention that H believe that P." and assertive speech acts include (affirm, allege, assert, aver, avow, claim, declare, deny (assert ... not), indicate, maintain, propound, say, state, submit. yet, deception is

not confined to assertive speech acts, commissure speech acts are included in which the speaker expresses the intention that he does the action. These include: promise, threat, guarantee, and swear.

### **2.1.3.2 Breach of Grice's Maxims**

Carson (2010:43) proposes that specific type of deception creates conversational implicatures through breaking one or more of Grice's maxims.

### **2.1.3.3 Deception and Relevance Theory**

Relevance Theory of Sperber and Wilson (Sperber and Wilson 1986/1995: 119) is an effort to find out the major demands of Grice in which he states that the formulation and recognition of intentions is an important characteristic of the human communication. The “communicative principle of relevance” is the essence of the theory which declares the speaker is expressing that what he has just uttered is worthy to listen through the act of making utterances, i.e. it supplies cognitive effects worth of the processing labors necessary to work out the meaning. For this purpose, every act of communication can be describes as the following: the speaker conveys his intention to the addressee in an enthusiastic way, (Web resource 3).

According to this theory, deception is regarded as a double cognitive constraint getting the benefit of the potential fallibility of processing mechanisms of information, (Oswald, 2014: 8-9).

### **2.1.4 Deception Expression Strategies resulted from the Breach of Grice’s Maxims**

#### **1. Fabrication**

According to Leech (1983:178) fabrication can be described as something that is formed such as a lie. It includes something which is said by a speaker who himself believes to be truth less or lacks sufficient proof. Accordingly, fabrication results from the break of the quality maxim. It is regarded as intentional act of deviating from the fact. It is specific kind of falsification and misrepresentation.

#### **2. Dissociation/ Depersonalization**

Isabel (2013:32) assumes that deceivers separate themselves from the relevance or the liability with the lie. In deceptive communication, deceivers afford information which is impersonal in order to refer to another person's experience rather than them, as well as depending on impersonal pronouns like 'one' and 'there' to prevent being responsible for what they have said and to minimize their responsibility by participating in the responsibility of the information.

#### **3. Equivocation**

Equivocation can be employed as a strategy of deception. It is realized as forming an oblique, fuzzy or conflicting statement in order to trick or to hedge. It occurs as a result of the breach of manner maxim.

#### **4. Ostensible Promise**

When the speakers offer a promise which cannot be fulfilled, they violate the quality maxims because they say something that lacks appropriate proof.

## **2.2 Literary Pragmatics**

Since this study aims at working out the deception in literary texts so it concerns with the literary pragmatics which employs different procedures to study and analyze various texts of literary genera. Consequently, Leech (2008:6) asserts that the concept of literature can be specified in term of some misleading notion of literariness thus two accounts have to be considered, formal and functional.

Because literary pragmatics is concerned with literary texts so it has developed recently. Banfield (2003:475) states that: "*the term literary pragmatics does not have widespread use with a well-defined referent; it stands less for a unified theory than for an area of research*".

According to Chapman (2011:142), the relation between pragmatics and literature has two important and basic concerns. Firstly, Pragmatic theory is used in the analysis of literary texts in order to shed lights on specific aspects of how the meaning is conveyed and how the characters communicate with each other or how the narrator and the author interact with the reader. Secondly, what comprises a literary work has been discussed by using the pragmatics.

### **2.2.1 Speech Acts Theory (SAT)**

According to Chapman (2011:142), speech act theory and conversational implicature which are the basic schemas of the classical pragmatics are sustained to the study of literary works. Over and above, the various examined texts have gained invaluable glimpses by relevance and politeness theories.

Generally speaking, Berdini (2013:71) states that speech act theory can be characterized with two backgrounds; one of them is Austin's approaches which are held on the rules and agreements while the other is Grice's approaches which are held on the speaker's communicative willingness and speaker's awareness through inference. Important to realize, these two backgrounds is dated back to the Austins' characterization of the notion of illocutionary act.

### **2.2.2 The Cooperative Principle (CP)**

The powerful and the efficient use of the language can be characterized by four main maxims which are involved in the Gricean theory. These maxims or guidelines are clarified as follows, (Levinson, 1983: 101-02) :

#### **The Maxim of Quality**

Try to make your contribution one that is true, specifically:

- (i) do not say what you believe to be false
- (ii) do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence

#### **- The maxim of Quantity**

- (i) make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange
- (ii) do not make your contribution more informative than is required

#### **- The maxim of Relevance**

make your contributions relevant

#### **- The maxim of Manner be perspicuous, and specifically**

- (i) avoid obscurity
- (ii) avoid ambiguity
- (iii) be brief
- (iv) be orderly

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Introduction

Concerning the analysis of the data, (44) texts have been chosen from two plays: Shakespeare's "*The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*" and Elliot's "*Murder in the Cathedral*".

#### 3.2 Data Analysis

This section presents the analysis of the selected data according to the Eclectic model which merged between Searle's (1979) model "Expression and Meaning" of speech act theory regarding the classes of the illocutionary forces and Grice's (1989) model "Cooperative Principle" in order to identify the type of deception act found in the selected plays under investigation.

##### 3.2.1 Text (1)

#### The Analysis of the Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark

##### Act 1

##### Scene 3

##### P. 21

##### 1. Laertes

*"The perfume and suppliance of a minute; No more."*

Obviously, Laertes uses the assertive speech act as he claims that Hamlet's love is similar to the perfume which lasts only for a minute.

He also flouts the quality maxim since he uses metaphor expressions.

##### 2. Laertes

a. *"The virtue of his will: but you must fear,  
His greatness weigh'd, his will is not his own;  
For he himself is subject to his birth:  
He may not, as unvalued persons do,  
Carve for himself; for on his choice depends  
The safety and health of this whole state;  
And therefore must his choice be circumscribed  
Unto the voice and yielding of that body  
Whereof he is the head."*

It is noticeable that Laertes in the previous extracts uses the speech act of assertion since he advises his sister that she should not trust Hamlet even if he really loves her; because he is from royal family and they have special traditions.

He also flouts the quality maxim since he narrates his opinion without sufficient proof.

##### 3. Ophelia

*"I shall the effect of this good lesson keep,  
As watchman to my heart.  
But, good my brother,  
Do not, as some ungracious pastors do,  
Show me the steep and thorny way to heaven;  
Whiles, like a puff'd and reckless libertine,  
Himself the primrose path of dalliance treads,  
And recks not his own rede."*

Ophelia uses the commissive speech act as she makes a future promise that she will understand the lesson and keep it in her mind; though it is not clear whether she can fulfill it or not.

**Table No.1**

Page No.	Type of illocutionary force	The flouted maxim	Deception Strategy
21	1. Assertive speech act 2. Assertive speech act 3. Commissive Speech act	Quality Quality Quality	Fabrication Fabrication Ostensible promise

### 3.2.2 Text (2)

#### Scene 5

#### P. 52

##### 1. Hamlet

*“No; you'll reveal it.”*

Hamlet in the aforementioned quotation uses the commissive speech act because he bets that either Horatio or Marcellus will reveal the secret. This act can be regarded as long-term promise since it is not obvious whether Horatio and Marcellus will fulfill it.

##### 2. Marcellus

*“Nor I, my lord.”*

Marcellus resorts to commit the assertive speech act as he asserts that he is a person who can keep secrets, depending on his point of view.

Marcellus also flouts the quality maxim since he assumes that he will not reveal the secret without a proof.

##### 3. Hamlet

*“ There's ne'er a villain dwelling in all Denmark But he's an arrant knave.”*

Apparently, Hamlet uses the speech act of assertion as he proposes that there is a criminal in Denmark.

He breaches the quality maxim since he has not sufficient evidence. The impersonal pronoun (there) is employed to minimize the liability.

##### 4. Horatio

*“There needs no ghost, my lord, come from the grave To tell us this.”*

Horatio uses the assertive speech act in the aforementioned quotation because he presumes that it is obvious there is a corrupt criminal in Denmark; so, there is no need for a ghost to tell such thing.

Moreover, Horatio breaches the manner maxim since he gives ambiguous answer to Hamlet.

##### 5. Hamlet

- a. *“Why, right; you are i' the right;  
And so, without more circumstance at all,  
I hold it fit that we shake hands and part:  
You, as your business and desire shall point you;  
For every man has business and desire, “*
- b. *“Such as it is; and for mine own poor part,  
Look you, I'll go pray.”*

On one hand, Hamlet claims that it is better for him and for his friends (Horatio and Marcellus) to shake hands and then separate. Hamlet also gives a promise that he will pray and this may embed an ostensible promise since Hamlet may not fulfill the action.

On the other hand, Hamlet violates the manner maxim by not being clear in his statement.

**Table No. 2**

Page No.	Type of illocutionary force	The flouted maxim	Deception Strategy
32	1. Commissive speech act 2. Assertive speech act 3. Assertive speech act 4. Assertive speech act 5. Assertive speech act Commissive speech act	Quality Quality Quality  Manner Manner Quality	Ostensible promise Fabrication Fabrication Dissociation/Depersonalization Equivocation Equivocation Ostensible Promise

**3.2.3 Text (3)**

Act 2

~~Scene 2~~

~~P. 42~~

~~1. Lord Polonius~~

*‘And I do think, or else this brain of mine  
 Hunts not the trail of policy so sure  
 As it hath used to do, that I have found  
 The very cause of Hamlet's lunacy’*

In the previous extract Lord Polonius uses the assertive speech act since he affirms that he knows the reason for the madness of Hamlet.

In addition, he violates the quality maxim since he asserts that he knows the cause of Hamlet's madness without having adequate proof.

**2. Lord Polonius**

**‘Give first admittance to the ambassadors;  
 My news shall be the fruit to that great feast.’**

Lord Polonius uses the commissive speech act because he assures that his news will be the fruit of the feast. This action could be also considered as long term- promise because Lord Polonius may not fulfill.

**3. Queen Gertrude**

*‘I doubt it is no other but the main;  
 His father's death, and our o'erhasty marriage.’*

The queen uses the assertive speech act as she predicts that the cause of Hamlet's madness is more than the apparent reasons: his father's death and her marriage to his uncle.

Additionally, the queen flouts the quality maxim since she predicts that there is much more than what it is known without appropriate clue.

**4. King Claudius**

*‘Well, we shall sift him’*

The king uses the commissive speech act since he promises that he will garble Lord Polonius to know the truth. This action can embed long- term promise because the action may not be fulfilled.

**Table No. 3**

Page No.	Type of illocutionary force	The flouted maxim	Deception Strategy
42	1. Assertive speech act	Quality	Fabrication
	2. Commissive speech act	Quality	Ostensible promise
	3. Assertive speech act	Quality	Fabrication
	4. Commissive speech act	Quality	Ostensible promise

**3.2.4 Text (4)**

**P. 52**

**1. Rosencrantz**

*“I think their inhibition comes by the means of the late innovation.”*

Rosencrantz uses the assertive speech act because he predicts that the cause of their suppression is the late innovation.

Rosencrantz also breaks the quality maxim since he has no sufficient proof that the cause of the inhibition of the players is the late renovation.

**2. Rosencrantz**

*“ ‘Faith, there has been much to do on both sides; and the nation holds it no sin to tarre them to controversy: there was, for a while, no money bid for argument, unless the poet and the player went to cuffs in the question.”*

Rosencrantz uses the assertive speech act because he assures that people encourages the argument between the player and the poet.

He also breaches the quality maxim since there is not sufficient evidence that people have done that. The use of impersonal pronoun (there) is used to mediate the liability.

**Table No.4**

Page No.	Type of illocutionary force	The flouted maxim	Deception Strategy
52	1. Assertive speech act	Quality	Fabrication
	2. Assertive speech act	Quality	Fabrication Dissociation

**3.2.5 Text (5)**

**P. 57**

**1. Hamlet**

*“ It shall to the barber's, with your beard.  
 Prithee, say on: he's for a jig or a tale of bawdry, or he sleeps:  
 say on: come to Hecuba.”*

Clearly, Hamlet uses the commissive speech act since he says that this poem will be sent with the Lord Polonius's hair to the barber. As well as, this action can be considered as 'Ostensible promise' because Hamlet may not fulfill the action. Then Hamlet uses the assertive speech act because he says that Lord Polonius does not prefer such poems.

Hamlet breaks the quality maxim because of the use of metaphor in describing Lord Polonius's favourite songs.

**2. First player**

*“But who, O, who had seen the mobled queen—”*

It is clear that the First player uses the speech act of assertion as he declares that he has not seen the mobled queen.

Notably, First player here flouts the relevance maxim since his answer has no relation to Hamlet's statement.

**3. Lord Polonius**

*“That's good; 'mobled queen' is good.”*

Lord Polonius uses the assertive speech act as he asserts that 'mobled queen' is good.

He also violates the quality maxim because there is no adequate proof that 'mobled queen' is good.

**4. Hamlet**

*“Tis well: I'll have thee speak out the rest soon.”*

Hamlet uses the commissive speech act by giving a promise to the player that he will talk to him soon. This act can embed long- term promise since Hamlet may not fulfill this promise.

**Table No.5**

Page No.	Type of illocutionary force	The flouted maxim	Deception Strategy	
57	1. Commissive speech act	Assertive	Quality Quality Relevance	Ostensible promise Fabrication
	2. Assertive speech act			
	4. Assertive speech act	Quality	Fabrication	
	5. Commissive speech act	Quality	Ostensible Promise	

**3.2.6 Text (6)**

**Act 5**

---

**Scene 1**

---

P. 126

~~1. Hamlet~~

*“Why I will fight with him upon this theme  
Until my eyelids will no longer wag.”*

Hamlet uses the commissive speech act since he vows that he will fight Laertes because of Ophelia; this act may embed ostensible promise, because Hamlet may not keep his promise.

2. Hamlet

*“ I loved Ophelia: forty thousand brothers  
Could not, with all their quantity of love,  
Make up my sum. What wilt thou do for her?”*

Hamlet uses the assertive speech act by claiming that his love to Ophelia is equivalent to the love of forty thousand brothers.

Moreover, Hamlet breaks the quality maxim because he overstates in expressing the amount of love to Ophelia.

3. Hamlet

*“ Swounds, show me what thou'lt do:  
Woo't weep? woo't fight? woo't fast? woo't tear thyself?  
Woo't drink up eisel? eat a crocodile?  
I'll do't. Dost thou come here to whine?  
To outface me with leaping in her grave?  
Be buried quick with her, and so will I:  
And, if thou prate of mountains, let them throw  
Millions of acres on us, till our ground,  
Singeing his pate against the burning zone,  
Make Ossa like a wart! Nay, an thou'lt mouth,  
I'll rant as well as thou.”*

Hamlet uses the commissive speech act twice in the aforementioned extract. First, he promises that he will do whatever Laertes does. Second, he vows that he can keep up bragging. These two acts can be regarded as long-term promises since Hamlet may not fulfill them.

He also breaks quantity maxim by being more informative than is required.

4. Queen Gertrude

*“This is mere madness:  
And thus awhile the fit will work on him;  
Anon, as patient as the female dove,  
When that her golden couplets are disclosed,  
His silence will sit drooping.”*

The Queen uses the assertive speech act since she affirms that Hamlet is mad.

She also breaches the quality maxim as she uses metaphoric expressions.

5. Hamlet

*“Hear you, sir;  
What is the reason that you use me thus?  
I loved you ever: but it is no matter;  
Let Hercules himself do what he may,  
The cat will mew and dog will have his day.”*

Hamlet uses the speech act of assertion because he states that he loves Laertes; thus he wonders Laertes's bad behaviour towards him.

In addition, Hamlet violates the quality maxim by using metaphoric technique.

**Table No.6**

Page No.	Type of illocutionary force	The flouted maxim	Deception Strategy
126	1. Commissive speech act 2. Assertive speech act 3. Commissive speech act (2) 4. Assertive speech act 5. Assertive speech act	Quality Quality Quality (2) Quantity Quality Quality	Ostensible promise Fabrication Ostensible promise (2) Fabrication Fabrication

**3.2.7 Text (7)**

**The Analysis of the Murder in the Cathedral**

**Part 1**

**P. 11**

**1. Chorus**

*‘There is no danger  
 For us, and there is no safety in the cathedral.  
 Some presage of an act  
 Which our eyes are compelled to witness, has forced our feet  
 Towards the cathedral.  
 We are forced to bear witness.  
 The New Year waits, breathes, waits, whispers in darkness.  
 While the labourer kicks off a muddy boot and stretches  
 his hand to the fire,  
 Since golden October declineassd into sombre November  
 And the apples were gathered and stored, and the land  
 became brown sharp points of death in a waste of  
 water and mud,’*

The Chorus uses the assertive speech act five times in the aforementioned extract. They claim there is no occurrence of any danger; as well as there is not safety in the cathedral. Then they assert that some acts have obliged them to do in the cathedral. Next, they affirm that they are compelled to be witnesses. Finally, they state that as the New Year begins in Newyork, the worker puts off the muddy boot and warms his hand up with the fire.

The Chorus violates the quantity maxim since they take long time in narrating their ideas. They also flout the manner maxim by being not clear; they violate the quality maxim three times since they use metaphoric expression like "golden" and "sombre" as well and asserting things without sufficient proof. The impersonal pronoun (there) occurs in order to reduce the responsibility.

**Table No.7**

Page No.	Type of illocutionary force	The flouted maxim	Deception Strategy
----------	-----------------------------	-------------------	--------------------

11	1. Assertive speech act (5)	Quantity Manner Quality (3)	Equivocation Fabrication (3) Dissociation/ Depersonalization
----	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	---

3.2.8 Text (8)

P. 41

~~1. Chorus~~

*"The earth is heaving to parturition of issue of hell."*

The Chorus uses the assertive speech act since they assert that the earth sigh the question of the hell.

In addition, the Chorus violates the quality maxim as they exaggerate in the description.

Table No.8

Page No.	Type of illocutionary force	The flouted maxim	Deception Strategy
41	1. Assertive speech act	Quality	Fabrication

3.2.9 Text (9)

Interlude

P. 47

~~1. The Archbishop~~

- a. *"Dear children of God, my sermon this morning will be a very short one.  
"we re-enact the Passion and Death of Our Lord; and on this Christmas Day we do this in celebration of His Birth.  
So that at the same moment we rejoice in His coming for the salvation of men, and offer again to God His Body and Blood in sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.  
"at this same time of all the year that we celebrate at once the Birth of Our Lord and His Passion and Death upon the Cross,"*
- b. *"It was in this same night that has just passed, that a multitude of the heavenly host appeared before the shepherds at Bethlehem,"*

Apparently, the Archbishop uses the commissive speech act in the previous extract. He promises the audience that his sermon will be short; it can be regarded as long-term promise because it may not be fulfilled. It is obvious that there is impersonal pronoun (it) which has been employed to minimize the liability.

Table No.9

Page No.	Type of illocutionary force	The flouted maxim	Deception Strategy
----------	-----------------------------	-------------------	--------------------

47	1. Commissive speech act	Quality	Ostensible promise Dissociation/ Depersonalization
----	--------------------------	---------	--

### 3.2.10 Text (10)

#### Part 2

~~P. 53~~

#### ~~1. Chorus~~

- a. *“ Only the sea-bird cries, driven inland by the storm.”*
- b. *“Longer and darker the day, shorter and colder the night.”*
- c. *“The starved crow sits in the field, attentive; and in the wood*
- d. *“The owl rehearses the hollow note of death.”*

Chorus uses the speech act of assertion four times in their description in the aforementioned extract. Firstly, they assert that sea- bird cries when it is driven by the storm. Then, they state that the day is longer and darker while the night is shorter and colder in the spring. Next, they affirm that the starved crow sits in the field carefully while the owl practices the note of death in the wood.

They flout the quality maxim four times since they use metaphoric expression and overstates in their description.

**Table No.10**

Page No.	Type of illocutionary force	The flouted maxim	Deception Strategy
53	1. Assertive speech act (4)	Quality (4)	Fabrication (4)

### 3.2.11 Text (11)

P. 68

#### ~~1. Thomas~~

*“Go to vespers; remember me at your prayers.  
 They shall find the shepherd here; the flock shall be spared.  
 I have had a tremor of bliss, a wink of heaven, a whisper.”*

Thomas uses the assertive speech act in the previous extract. He claims that he feels shiver of bliss, wink of the heaven and whisper.

In addition, he flouts the quality maxim since he uses metaphor technique. The impersonal pronoun (they) has been utilized to mediate the liability.

#### 2. Chorus

*“Still the horror, but more horror  
 Than when tearing in the belly .  
 Still the horror, but more horror  
 Than when twisting in the fingers .  
 Than when splitting in the skull .*

*More than footfall in the passage .  
 More than shadow in the doorway .  
 More than fury in the hall.”*

Apparently, the Chorus uses the speech act of assertion as they state that terror continues, but more than that in many painful positions.

They break the manner maxim by being not clear.

**Table No.11**

Page No.	Type of illocutionary force	The flouted maxim	Deception Strategy
68	1. Assertive speech act  2. Assertive speech act	Quality  Manner	Fabrication Dissociation/ Depersonalization Equivocation

**3.2.12 Text (12)**

**P.73**

**1. Thomas**

*“Whether layman or clerk, shall you touch .  
 This I forbid.”*

Noticeably, Thomas uses the commissive speech act as he vows that the Knights will not touch any person. This act may embed long- term promise because he may not fulfill the action.

**2. First Knight**

*“No faith do I owe to a renegade ,  
 and what I owe shall now be paid.”*

Clearly, First Knight uses the commissive speech act because he promises that he will pay what he has owed; this act is regarded as long- term promise because the Knight may not fulfill the action.

**Table No.12**

Page No.	Type of illocutionary force	The flouted maxim	Deception Strategy
73	1.Commissive speech act 2. Commissive speech act	Quality Quality	Ostensible promise Ostensible promise

**3.3 Conclusions and Results**

It is significant to recollect here some notions that are value to take into account. First notion is that of deception. Deception is an act of tricking another one intentionally or readily. It can be considered as one of the essential merits of the language by which human beings are recognized from other living things.

Second notion is that one from the point of view of pragmatics which indicates that the deception is a speech act that has a link to implicature, because on one hand the assertive speech acts and the commissive speech act can be employed to convey deceptive intention, whereas on the other hand the breach of one or more of Grice conversational maxims carries out particular type(s) of deception.

Third notion is that of literary pragmatics. Literary pragmatic has a prominence in the investigation of literary works by employing various techniques.

Worth mentioning that the two eras of theatre (15<sup>th</sup> Century and 20<sup>th</sup> century) makes use of the deceptive strategies distinguishably. The speech act of assertion and commissive speech act have a higher number of occurrences in *'The Tragedy of Hamlet'* rather than in *'Murder in the Cathedral'*. *'The Tragedy of Hamlet'* has a higher number of the flouted maxims than in *'Murder in the Cathedral'*. Insofar as strategies resulted from the violation of Grice's conversational maxim are concerned; they have higher number of occurrences in *'The Tragedy of Hamlet'* than in *'Murder in the Cathedral'*.

Nevertheless, there are some similarities. Concerning illocutionary forces, there are two important findings. Firstly, it can be seen that the assertive speech act has the highest number of the occurrence in both of the plays. Secondly, the commissive speech act comes in the second place in respect to the illocutionary force. While with regards to the type of maxims flouted, the analyst can see that the maxim of quality is the most flouted one in both of the plays. It is also noticeable that breaching the maxim of manner comes in the second place out of the total number of the flouted maxims in both *"The Tragedy of Hamlet"* and *"Murder in the Cathedral"*. Regarding the strategies of deception, it can be observed that fabrication is the most frequently used strategy of deception in both plays. Second in density comes the use of the ostensible promise.

---

### References

- Anolli, L., Balconi, M., Ciceri, R.(2001). *Deceptive Miscommunication Theory (DeMiT): A New Model for the Analysis of Deceptive Communication*. New perspective on miscommunication press 2001.
- Bach, K., & Harnish, R. (1979). *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Banfield, A. (2003). *Unspeakable Sentences*. New York: Routledge.
- Berdini, F. (2013). *Speech Acts and Normativity: A Plea for Inferentialism*. Esercizi Filosofici
- Buller, B. D. , Burgoon, k, J. (1996). *Interpersonal Deception Theory*. Routledge.
- Carson, T. T. (2010). *Lying and Deception: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199577415.001.0001> Chilton.
- Chapman, S. (2011). *Pragmatics*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Collins, H. (2018)" . *Definition of 'deception' - English Dictionary"*. Cambridge Dictionary. Cambridge University Press.
- Donath, S. J. (1998). *Identity and deception in the virtual community*. In Kollock, P. and Smith, M. (eds). *Communities in Cyberspace*. London: Routledge1998.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1969). *Nonverbal leakage and clues to deception*. *Psychiatry Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Process*, 32, 88-106.
- [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Relevance\\_theory](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Relevance_theory)
- <https://www.lifewire.com/types-of-internet-trolls->
- <https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/impersonation>
- Isabel, P. (2013). *Cues to Deception in a Textual Narrative Context*. Aston University. (Unpublished Ph.D Thesis).
- Leech, G. (2008). *Language in Literature*. London: Pearson Education.
- Leech, G., (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman.

- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge [Cambridge shire] ; New York : Cambridge University Press.
- Oswald, S., (2014). *It is easy to miss something you are not looking for: A pragmatic account of covert communicative influence for (critical) discourse analysis*. Hart, C. & Cap, P. (eds.), Contemporary Studies in Critical Discourse Analysis, London: Bloomsbury. 97-120.
- Sperber, D., and Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell. Second edition with a new postface, 1995.
- Timothy, R. Levin, Steven, A. McCornack, A.(2014). *Theorizing about Deception*. Journal of language and social psychological.
- Utz, S.(2005). *Types of deception and underlying motivation: what people think*. Social sciences computer review.
- Williams, B. (2002). *Truth and Truthfulness: An Essay in Genealogy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.