

Nunnery Scene: A Pragmatic Analysis of Hamlet-Ophelia Encounter

QAISAR KHAN

*Faculty of Advanced Integrated Studies & Research
National University of Modern Languages (NUML)
Islamabad, Pakistan
kkaiserkhan@hotmail.com*

FARAZ ALI BUGHIO

*University of Sussex
United Kingdom*

ABSTRACT

In the recent past, the emergence of Pragmatics has added to the value of contextual intentions of speakers in a conversation. It has led to various research studies analysing utterances from a linguistic point of view exploring the words and sentences that constitute them. This research study aims to pragmatically analyse the dialogic patterns in a Shakespearian masterpiece, Hamlet. For the purpose of the study, the Nunnery Scene (Act III, Scene I) has been selected for pragmatic analysis with particular reference to context, cooperative principle, conversational maxims of Grice and implicature in qualitative paradigm. The findings reveal that these concepts are significant to the proper understanding and appreciation of the conversation.

Keywords: context; pragmatics; conversational maxims; implicature; dialogic conversation; context

INTRODUCTION

The nunnery scene which constitutes an important part of act III, Scene I Line 98-158 (see appendix) is central to the play *Hamlet* as it is a verbal display of feelings, emotions, and approach to the realities of life. The conversation is significant for meanings implicated by the speakers with reference to the topic of their discussion in the context of the action of the drama. In the plot, it records a conversation between two lovers, Hamlet and Ophelia, but is equally crucial for Claudius to ascertain the reason behind the apparently irrational behaviour of Hamlet. This analysis aims at exploring the pragmatic context, maxims of conversation and implicature as revealed during the analysis of the conversation. The paper analyses the crucial role context plays in the conversation, flouting of Grice's maxims of quantity, relevance and manner along with implicatures. It is an endeavour to highlight pragmatics as an important contributor to the understanding of human interactions in a context.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Historically, in the latter half of the 20th century, new schools emerged with the belief that a good linguistic description should go beyond sentence, and pointed to the fact that there are certain meanings and aspects of language that cannot be understood or embraced if its study is limited to the syntactic analysis of sentences. Thus, new linguistic disciplines emerged including Functionalism (functional grammars), Cognitive Linguistics, Sociolinguistics, Pragmatics, Text Linguistics and Discourse Analysis. All these new disciplines are interrelated, and sometimes it is very difficult to distinguish one from the other, due to the fact that all of them have common denominators.

Pragmatics refers to the study of language in action or the science of language use (Haberland & Mey 1977, pp. 1). To Kasher (1977: 106), ‘an investigation in the field of language study is assigned to pragmatics if reference is made in it, *explicitly* and *essentially*, to the user of a language’. In other words, it refers to the study of sign systems with respect to user relations. In comparison, syntactic and semantic studies are traditionally abstracted from actual user (Haberland & Mey 1977).

Regarding pragmatic investigation, domains and concepts, Anat Biletzki (1996) identifies two types of definitions of pragmatics- intensional and extensional. To illustrate his point, he gives examples of intensional definitions including, “the study of the relations of signs to interpreters” (Morris 1938, p. 84); “the study of indexical rules for relating linguistic form to a given context” (Bates 1976, p. 3); “a theory that has as its subject matter the relationship between a language, its subject matter, and the users of the language” (Martin 1971, p. 138); “the theory of the relation between the language users and the language structure” (Apostel 1971, p. 33); ‘the science of language use” (Haberland & Mey 1977, p. 1). On the other hand, examples of extensional definitions include, “Pragmatics is the study of deixis, implicature, presupposition, speech acts, and aspects of discourse structure” (Levinson 1983, p.27); “Pragmatics, for a natural language, concerns ‘illocutionary force’, ‘implicature’, ‘presupposition’, and ‘context dependent acceptability’”(Gazdar 1979, p. 2). This paper takes both intensional and extensional aspects of Pragmatics based on their relevance to the scope of the study.

Regarding the history of pragmatics, George Yule observes that earlier, the interest of the linguists mainly surrounded the discovery and analysis of abstract principles and formal systems lying at the very core of language. This interest resulted in putting aside (to a proverbial wastebasket) everyday usages of language on the ground that such material did not fit into the formal systems of analysis (Yule 1996, p. 6). It was this wastebasket that provided material for the field of pragmatics, which has now grown into an academic field. However, it is pertinent to assume that it does not have formal or institutionalized history (Biletzki 1996, p. 455).

To start with, it is important to identify two concepts of text and context for the understanding of conversational analysis. Text refers to all types of utterances and may include articles, interviews, and conversations both formal and informal while text linguistics is, with reference to David Crystal (1997) “the formal account of the linguistic principles governing the structure of texts”. Text satisfies seven criteria including cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality and intertextuality (Alba-Juez 2009, p. 6). Cohesion and coherence are text-internal while the rest are text-external. Further, the former elements constitute text while the later ones constitute the *context*. Schiffrin (1994: 363) points out that all approaches within pragmatic analysis view *text* and *context* as the two kinds of information that contributes to the communicative content of an utterance.

In terms of utterances, then, “text” is the linguistic content: the stable semantic meanings of words, expressions, and sentences, but not the inferences available to hearers depending upon the contexts in which they are used while context is a world filled with people producing utterances having social, cultural, and personal identities, knowledge, beliefs, goals and wants, and who interact with one another in various socially and culturally defined situations (Schiffrin 1994, p. 363). Similarly, a dramatic dialogue also borrows heavily from context to become more meaningful. A mere look at it only allows us to appreciate its semantic value while pragmatic approach, as elucidated above, is a step ahead in the explication of its text.

Grice (1975: 43-44) attempts to draw a line between semantics and pragmatics by explaining ‘saying’ and ‘implicating’. To him, semantics is about ‘what is said’ (truth-conditional content) while pragmatics concerns ‘what is implicated’ (non-truth-conditional)

(Recanati 2010, pp. 1-2). Ability of language users to ascribe truth-conditions to arbitrary sentences of language is traditionally related to their semantic knowledge or competence, which belongs to our language faculty and is an aspect of our knowledge of language. However, when context assumes importance, then the mere knowledge of language does not suffice. Grice also asserts that it is the intentions of the speaker, which determine the meaning of an utterance. This reference to the knowledge of intentions is identified as pragmatic competence, which is the ability to explain people's behaviour by ascribing intentions to them (Recanati 2010, pp.2).

With regard to understanding conversation, it is assumed that the speakers cooperate rather than confuse, or mislead each other. This assumption enables us to make sense of what is said and is summed up in cooperative principle of conversation introduced by Paul Grice (Pfister 2009, p.1274). Further elaboration of the principle is obtained through conversational maxims also called its sub-principles. It can be defined as the conversational contribution by speaker as much as required, at a particular stage for an accepted purpose in a conversational exchange (Grice 1967, p. 26). Its four sub-principles or maxims include maxim of quantity which asks the speaker to be as much informative as is required in a particular situational context keeping in view that such information should be appropriately exchanged. In other words, it should neither be too less nor too much as to distract the attention of the listener.

The second maxim is of quality that necessarily stresses the truth value of the conversational contribution. It delimits the speaker to avoid false or wrong statements along with that information for which the speaker lacks in providing evidence. As far as the third maxim or relevance is concerned, it stresses relevance which can be of vital importance to move the conversation in a definite direction. Lastly, the maxim of manner relates to the perspicuity of the speaker. It associates value with brevity and order with success in conversation as well as suggests avoidance of obscurity and ambiguity in expressional statements (Mooney 2004, p. 915). On first reading of the nunnery scene, it seems that the two lovers are unable to understand each other and fail to produce a meaningful conversation. But taking into consideration the cooperative principle and implicatures reinforced by the context of the conversation, it becomes meaningfully comprehensible.

To note, the unstated assumptions or maxims of cooperative principle are not strictly adhered to by speakers, in natural conversations on surface level. But this does not mean that the speaker is not aware of them, and therefore it is still assumed that they may be in action at deeper level (Attardo 1993, p.538). In other words, a speaker may deliberately flout a conversational maxim to convey more than what is actually said (Greenall 2009, p. 2295). The listener, in turn, infers meaning, which also allows the speaker to be more inclusive and meaningful in conversation. Such conveyance of more meaning than is actually stated is accomplished through conversational implicature (Grice 1989, p. 30). Such inferences by the listener shall also follow the assumption of cooperation. The intended meanings of a speaker are drawn by a listener from various sources including 'the actual words, the speech situation, encyclopedic background knowledge, shared cultural models, etc' (Kleinke 2010, p. 3346). An implicature is said to be a generalized one if it does not require special contextual knowledge for inference (Breheny, Katsos & Williams 2006, p. 434). These generalized conversational implicatures may also be termed scalar if it follows a scale of values such as for indicating the quantity of something with values like most, all, few, often etc where the assertion of one value implicates the negative of all others on the same scale.

However, not all implicatures are generalised ones. Mostly, conversations take place in a well-defined context where localized versions of meaning are found more acceptable and relevant (Mooney 2004, p. 902). In other words, in such an instance, inference from above cannot be exercised at the will of the listener. Therefore, those situations where special knowledge of the context is required to infer intended meanings are identified as

particularised conversational implicatures (Grice 1989, p. 37). Owing to their excessive currency and application in conversations as a whole they are typically referred to as implicatures. It is important to reiterate that implicatures are part of what is communicated but not what is said (Mooney 2004, p. 902); it is therefore possible for a speaker to deny his intentions. In other words, conversational implicatures provide a breathing space to the speaker to correct or revise his position by mere denial of implicated meanings as they are calculation of the listener via inference. It is important to note that it must be distinguished from implicature which points to the phenomenon of saying one thing but intending to communicate something else instead i.e. in close association to what is said (Bach 1994, p. 126).

This paper is inspired by a pragmatic approach to the study of language with the main focus on conversational context, Grice's maxims and conversational implicature. The objective is to highlight the significance of contextualised words to construct meaning in a representative manner.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

CONVERSATIONAL CONTEXT

This conversation takes place between two lovers, Prince Hamlet and Ophelia, who is the daughter of Polonius, chief counsellor at the king's court. The main issue surrounds Ophelia's decision to return all the love gifts which Hamlet has given her (line 102). It is because she feels that he does not love her any more (line 110). The conversation is however, not pre-planned on Hamlet's end because he expresses surprise when she reveals her mind. In the same way, it is the king's plot to have called Hamlet there to his purpose, which he reveals to Ophelia before this conversation (lines 34-41).

As far as the situational context is concerned, Hamlet does love Ophelia but he is obsessed with avenging the death of his father by his uncle Claudius (II-ii, 589-593). He is also preoccupied with the lustful and sinful marriage of his uncle with his mother, which drives him mad (I-v, 189-201). His uncle too, a cunning man as he is, leaves no chance of getting into Hamlet's mind and spies on him through Polonius and his other confidants. Prior to this conversation, he, along with Claudius, briefs Ophelia and directs her to talk to Hamlet while they remain in the background to ascertain if there is method in his madness (lines 34-41).

Interaction between Hamlet and Ophelia is asymmetrical where the former dominates. This domination is quantitative as he does most of the talking while Ophelia mostly responds. This gives another layer of dominance of topic to Hamlet as he keeps on introducing new topics and discussion points into the conversation. Hamlet's dominance is also interactional as he mostly directs and controls the flow of the conversation and is at the same time less controlled in his turns. This dominance springs from Hamlet's familial and educational background where he excels in comparison to Ophelia.

This conversation has all signs of an exchange between two people who know each other well. It also reveals that the two share a fair amount of knowledge and information regarding each other with reference to status, position and personalities. However, there is a marked difference between the intellects of the two which emerges to the surface after careful analysis of their exchanges.

FLOUTING OF GRICE'S MAXIMS

Throughout the conversation, it is noted that the two speakers do not strictly adhere to or observe Grice's (1967) maxims of quantity, relevance and manner, at least on the surface level. However, this does not imply that they do not succeed in making each other understand their respective viewpoints. The flouting, in fact, is a means to make the addressee conscious of implicatures in the speaker's utterances. This renders the conversation more meaningful and cooperative. It also allows the speaker to share what would otherwise be either difficult or inappropriate to state directly. A brief overview is given under separate headings later on followed by a detailed analysis of implicatures:

FLOUTING OF MAXIM OF QUANTITY

When Hamlet denies that he has given any love gifts to Ophelia as *I never gave you aught* (line 105), he apparently, flouts the maxim of quantity for being not sufficiently explanatory. It also questions the validity of the statement of Ophelia when she says that *I have remembrances of yours* (line 101). However, by implicature, the intended meaning is that he does not care about any such gifts when there is no love feeling attached to them. It may also be implicated that his denial is an indirect way of asking her to keep those tokens with her, which, in other words implies his love for her. Later on, when Hamlet tells her that he does not love her at all (lines 127-128), her reply that *I was the more deceived* (line 129) apparently violates the maxim of quantity. We feel that she should have been more elaborate about it but by implicature, she hints at all those moments which she has shared with him in privacy before the conversation. She avoids the details as both of them are well aware of their previous love encounters.

FLOUTING OF MAXIM OF RELEVANCE

During the conversation, Hamlet seems persistent in flouting relevance maxim. His utterances apparently do not correspond and connect with the ongoing conversation. He sounds irrelevant when he asks Ophelia *are you honest?* (line 112) and *Are you fair?* (line 114) in reply to her request to take back his gifts. However, by implicature, she understands what he says as he is doubtful about the intentions behind her statement. He does not believe that Ophelia can do this to him. Similarly, his extended elicitation regarding *nunnery*, *sinner*, *knave*s (lines 130-139) and his subsequent reference to paintings and marriages (lines 151-156) sound irrelevant to the ongoing conversation. However, they relate to the immediate discussion regarding the unexpected and unfaithful behaviour of Ophelia. Similarly, the implicated meanings also include a reference to the thoughts of Gertrude, Claudius, Polonius and the fate of his dead father, which haunts his mind before and during the whole conversation. However, much of it is not shared by Ophelia and this is observed in her invocations (lines 143 & 150) which point to her seemingly difficult position to really interpret Hamlet's thoughts in the context.

FLOUTING OF MAXIM OF MANNER

The conversation reveals that Hamlet also flouts the maxim of manner. He is evasive, illusive, allusive and obscure. As discussed in the context of the maxim of relevance, his reference to and discussion about the nunnery (line 130) and the subsequent discussion is ambiguous. But his obscurity relates to his vulnerable position particularly in front of his uncle. He fears his uncle's villainous nature and does not want to risk his life by alarming him about his revengeful thoughts. At the same time, he is not sure about the integrity and devotion of Ophelia to him. He remains unclear in his pronouncements lest she may disclose

it to her father. At the same time, it can also be implicated that someone may be overhearing them, which forces him to be illusive in his expressions.

CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE

On first seeing Hamlet, when Ophelia apparently inquires about his health *for this many a day* (Line 99), it is implied that she has not seen him for quite some time which indicates the distance that may have widened between them prior to this conversation. The decrease in frequency of their meetings is further hinted at by Ophelia when she informs him that she has *longed long* (Line 102) to return his gifts. By implicature, it means that she has already made up her mind to do away with her love affair with him but she could not do it for failure to meet him. However, this does not mean that she does not love him anymore. In fact, she still loves him dearly and this can be implicated when she says *Rich gifts wax poor when givers prove unkind* (line 110). She does not directly refer to him being unkind but it is implied that he has become irresponsive to her love which has led her to dejection.

When Hamlet comes to know about the intentions of Ophelia, his instant reply is *No, not I / I never gave you aught* (lines 104-105). This denial in such a blunt manner, on the surface level, seems contradictory to her statement but in the context, it implicates three possible interpretations. Firstly, he may be asking her to keep them as he still loves her. Secondly, he feels hurt when he hears her saying *longed long* (line 102) and he also intends to hurt her in return. Lastly, he denies any such remembrances or tokens as they appear mere tools or lifeless items to him which have become irrelevant in the absence of love. In continuation, the first of the three interpretations appears more appealing when Hamlet utters *Ha, ha!*, (line 112) which can be interpreted as stumbling blocks for him to reflect his confusion over Ophelia's decision. Here the implicature is that he suspects Polonius' orders forcing her to act the way she is doing and it can be implied from his question, *are you honest?... Are you fair?* (lines 112&114). Later on, when he emphatically points to the overpowering tendency of beauty over honesty by saying that *this was sometime a paradox, but now the time gives it proof...* (lines 122-124) it is implicated that he means his mother, who was a symbol of purity, honesty and chastity for him but then fell prey to her lustful beauty when she agreed to marry Claudius. By implicature, the *proof* also points to loveless and indifferent behaviour of Ophelia.

When Hamlet denies any love affair with her and says that *I loved you not* (lines 127-128), Ophelia's replies that *I was the more deceived* (line 129). Here it is implicated that this is not the first instance of his unkind attitude to her, and she has been subject to continuing deception from his side, and all that he did to her in the past also amounts to deceiving her. In other words, Ophelia feels all the more disappointed at his love-making with her if he did not mean love as the motive behind his past actions to her. In anger and disappointment, Hamlet reacts in a more scholarly and allusive manner by saying *get thee to a nunnery. Why wouldst thou be a breeder of sinners?* (lines 130-131). At one level, he is intending to express his pent-up anger at his mother's lust and her marriage with his uncle. To him, her mother has committed a sin and shall only beget sinners. At another level, the nunnery is a place where women cannot marry and can thus be protected from the lust of men. At the third level, he feels that the revenge he intends for the death of his father does not allow him to be at ease and thus love Ophelia and wants to marry her. He fears that Claudius can also harm Ophelia if she persists in his love. But at the same time, he does not want her to be intimately associated with anyone else. He therefore urges her to go to the nunnery instead of loving other person. His reference to *breeder of sinners* is also significantly meaningful. He has, at the back of his mind, the deeds of his uncle who has committed sins by having his father treacherously killed, usurped his father's crown, made his mother into his wife and above all pretending to be a good man. He also thinks of himself in the same way as he realizes that

although he loves Ophelia he cannot give meaning to their relationship. He strongly feels that this is a sin on his part to defy her love. In the backdrop of this confession of the sinful nature of man, he is led to add *what should such fellows as I do crawling between earth and heaven?* (lines 136-137). On the surface level, the explicature is that sinful fellows do not deserve to exist on this earth but the implicature is that how do *knaves* (line 137) aspire for redemption from heaven when they never do any service to themselves or to humanity or to their near and dear ones? Elsewhere he voices the same concern when he says, *my words fly up my thoughts remain below / and words without thought never to heaven go* (Act III, Scene III, lines 99-100). In other words, it is an indirect reference to the contradictions between men's nature.

Similarly, when he employs the word *sinner* (line 131) in his argument, as discussed above, he has also Polonius in his mind who is persistent in protecting and promoting the agenda of his villainous uncle. And this interpretation holds water as nowhere he is reminded of him when he questions Ophelia *where's your father?* (line 139). Upon knowing the whereabouts of Polonius, he says *he may play the fool no where but in's own house* (lines 141-142). Here are two possible implicatures. Firstly, he refers to Polonius' foolish tricks in the recent past when he has attempted to thwart the designs of Hamlet and secondly, it means that Hamlet has sensed Ophelia's behaviour as guided by Polonius, in which case he implicates that he may influence his family members but should not be allowed to fool others.

Hamlet is trying to get rid of the situation and says *farewell* (line 142) but Ophelia's invoking of the heavens irritates him and he is led to an outburst where he equally blames her and womenfolk for their potentially deceitful nature. He says *I have heard of your paintings too, well enough* (line 151). Here the word *too* carries more meaning in the sense that it is only one of the very many bad things he knows about women. When he retorts by saying that *it hath made me mad* (line 155), the implicature is the unfaithful Gertrude who in fact is the real cause of his insanity has led him to deny the state of being married and wish no further marriages. Again his addition that *all but one, shall live* (line 157) has significance for his uncle whom he has decided to punish by killing him for his sinful murder of king Hamlet.

To take the conversation as a whole, in the context of implicatures, it is said that the most prominent feature that emerges out of it is the marked difference between the two characters in terms of their intellectual preoccupations and opposition in their life's circumstances. The scholarly Hamlet always means more than what he says and his words are multilayered. He talks to Ophelia but he remains preoccupied with what has happened and what is going to happen. At the same time, he never feels shy in the expression of his inner thoughts which haunt him, as referred to in the context of the conversation. Ophelia is a fair and innocent lady who tries to please everyone and explores moments of joy in others. She has equal regard for all but she fails to realize the difference of opinions among the interests of these characters which puts her in trouble and risks her love with Hamlet. She is also not well-versed in the western classics and finds it difficult to be on board when Hamlet speaks. This is evident from his frequent questioning remarks such as *My lord?* (line 113); *What means your lordship?* (line 115); *could beauty, my lord, have better commerce than with honesty?* (lines 118-119); and her invocations (lines 143&150), which indicate her inability to adequately interpret and reply to Hamlet's outbursts. As referred to earlier, the seminal mind of Hamlet also realises her inability which is supported by his abrupt endings to his statements such as *I did love you once* (lines 123-124). *I loved you not* (lines 127-128). *Where's your father?* (line 139); *Farewell* (lines 142 &149). This interpretation is reinforced by the fact that at no such occasion Ophelia insists or at least attempts to make a proper reply. Rather she takes refuge in making nominal replies such as *indeed, my lord, you made me believe so;* (line 125) *I was the more deceived* (line 129), *at home my lord* (line 140) and of course her invocations (lines 143 &150).

CONCLUSION

This paper was an exercise in pragmatic analysis of a selected scene from Hamlet with a view to highlight the cooperative principle of conversation and the importance of implicatures. It also aimed at highlighting the conversational significance of flouting maxims of quantity, relevance and manner. The study is explicit in its findings that each communication situation operates under the cooperative principle and that the maxims are generally flouted on the surface level but at the deeper level, such flouting gives rise to implicatures. Such implicatures in turn render the conversation lively and more meaningful. It is also evident from the study that conversational context remains vital to appreciate the intended meanings of the speakers. Implicated meanings can best be understood when we adhere to the context and to assume cooperation at work during a piece of conversation. Application of pragmatic concepts of implicature and cooperative principle can enable us to explore various aspects and facets of conversation, which in the context of this study, have revealed that the nunnery scene encompasses more issues related to the plot of the drama than are generally assumed. The detailed analysis also points to the marked difference in personality of the scholarly Hamlet, who always means more than what he says and has the ability to express his inner thoughts in comparison to Ophelia who is preoccupied with the thought of pleasing everyone without properly appreciating the conflicting interests of these characters.

REFERENCES

- Alba-Juez, L. (2009). *Perspectives on discourse analysis: Theory and practice*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Apostel, L. (1971). Further remarks on the pragmatics of natural languages. In Yehoshua Bar-Hillel(Ed.), *Pragmatics of natural languages*, (pp.1-34). Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Attardo, S. (1993). Violation of conversational maxims and cooperation: The case of jokes. *Journal of Pragmatics* 19, 537-558.
- Bach, K. (1994). Conversational implicature. *Mind & Language* 9(2), 124-162.
- Bates, E. (1976). *Language and context: The acquisition of pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press.
- Biletzki, A. (1996). Is there a history of pragmatics? *Journal of Pragmatics* 25(4), 455-470.
- Breheny, R., Katsos, N., & Williams, J. (2006). Are generalised scalar implicatures generated by default? An on-line investigation into the role of context in generating pragmatic inferences. *Cognition*, 100(3), 434-463. doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2005.07.003
- Crystal, D. (1997). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. 4th ed. Blackwell: Cambridge, MA.
- Gazdar, G. (1979). *Pragmatics: Implicature, presupposition and logical form*. New York: Academic Press.
- Greenall, A. K. (2009). Towards a new theory of flouting. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41, 2295-2311.
- Grice, H. P. (1967). Logic and conversation. In: Grice 1989, pp. 22–40.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation: the William James lectures, II. In Cole, P., Morgan, J.L. (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press, Cambridge
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard UP, Cambridge, MA.
- Haberland, H., & Mey, J. L. (1977). Editorial: Linguistics and Pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics Volume 1* (1), 1-12.
- Kasher, A. (1977). What is a theory of use? *Journal of Pragmatics* 1 (2), 105-120.
- Kleinke, S. (2010). Speaker activity and Grice's maxims of conversation at the interface of Pragmatics and Cognitive Linguistics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 3345-3366.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, R.L. (1971). Some thoughts on the formal approach to the philosophy of language. In Yehoshua Bar-Hillel(Ed.), *Pragmatics of natural languages*, (pp.120-144). Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Mooney, A. (2004). Co-operation, violations and making sense. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36, 899-920.
- Morris, C. (1938). *Foundations of the theory of signs*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Pfister, J. (2010). Is there a need for a maxim of politeness? *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 1266-1282.
- Recanati, F. (2010). *Truth-conditional pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Cambridge: Wiley-Blackwell.
Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX

(Retrieved from <http://www.enotes.com/hamlet-text/act-iii-scene-i>)

“The nunnery scene” is Ophelia’s confrontation with her lover, prince Hamlet, in which he tells her “get thee to a nunnery.” Polonius (Chief Counsellor) and Claudius (King of Denmark) are listening in — they’re using her in an attempt to determine whether love for Ophelia is the true cause of Hamlet’s madness or not. On the other hand, Hamlet is overweighed by the unjust death of his father (King Hamlet), incestuous marriage of his mother (Gertrude) and uncle (Claudius) and his attempt to undo the past.

OPHELIA:

Good my lord,
How does your honour for this many a day?

HAMLET:

I humbly thank you; well, well, well. (100)

OPHELIA:

My lord, I have remembrances of yours
That I have longed long to redeliver.
I pray you, now receive them.

HAMLET:

No, not I!
I never gave you aught. (105)

OPHELIA:

My honour'd lord, you know right well you did,
And with them words of so sweet breath compos'd
As made the things more rich. Their perfume lost,
Take these again; for to the noble mind
Rich gifts wax poor when givers prove unkind. (110)
There, my lord.

HAMLET:

Ha, ha! Are you [honest?](#)

OPHELIA:

My lord?

HAMLET:

Are you fair?

OPHELIA:

What means your lordship? (115)

HAMLET:

That if you be honest and fair, your honesty should
admit no discourse to your beauty.

OPHELIA:

Could beauty, my lord, have better commerce than
with honesty?

HAMLET:

Ay, truly; for the power of beauty will sooner transform (120)
honesty from what it is to a [bawd](#) than the force of
honesty can translate beauty into his likeness. This was
sometime a paradox, but now the time gives it proof. I did
love you once.

OPHELIA:

Indeed, my lord, you made me believe so. (125)

HAMLET:

You should not have believed me; for virtue cannot
so [inoculate](#) our old stock but we shall [relish](#) of it. I
loved you not.

OPHELIA:

I was the more deceived.

HAMLET:

Get thee to a nunnery! Why wouldst thou be a (130)
breeder of sinners? I am myself indifferent honest, but yet
I could accuse me of such things that it were better my
mother had not borne me. I am very proud, revengeful,
ambitious; with more offences at my beck than I have
thoughts to put them in, imagination to give them shape (135)
or time to act them in. What should such fellows as I do,
crawling between earth and heaven? We are arrant knaves
all; believe none of us. Go thy ways to a nunnery. Where's
your father?

OPHELIA:

At home, my lord. (140)

HAMLET:

Let the doors be shut upon him, that he may play the
fool nowhere but in's own house. Farewell.

OPHELIA:

O, help him, you sweet heavens!

HAMLET:

If thou dost marry, I'll give thee this plague for thy
dowry: be thou as chaste as ice, as pure as snow, thou shalt (145)
not escape [calumny](#). Get thee to a nunnery. Go, farewell. Or
if thou wilt needs marry, marry a fool; for wise men know
well enough what monsters you make of them. To a nunnery,
go; and quickly too. Farewell.

OPHELIA:

O heavenly powers, restore him! (150)

HAMLET:

I have heard of your paintings too, well enough. God
hath given you one face, and you make yourselves another.
You [jig](#), you amble, and you lisp; and nickname God's creatures
and make your wantonness your ignorance. Go to, I'll
no more on't! it hath made me mad. I say, we will have no (155)
more marriages. Those that are married already—all but
one—shall live; the rest shall keep as they are. To a nunnery,
go.

Exit.