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Translation scholars have been applying the Gricean maxims as analytical tools to handle pragmatic issues in translation. Not always this genuine application is successful regarding that the maxims are culture-bound in nature and may not have the same utility in a different culture and/or in translation. Rarely any attempts have been done to adjust these maxims to the needs of translation. The present article, while does not intend to criticize the basic applicability of the maxims in translation, aims at reformulating them, within a framework of faithfulness, to be more flexible and responsive to the needs of translation. To illustrate this and evaluate the maxims, examples are analyzed and re-analyzed.
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1. Introduction

Pragmatics is the study of the intentions of the language user. Grice’s theory of meaning draws on the same notion of intentionality; he defines intention as the purpose for which an act is performed (Grice 1989). Grice (1989) talks about inferring as an intrinsic way of cooperation in conversation and theorizes this in his Cooperative Principle (CP), which consists of four maxims of quality, quality, relation, and manner. He remarks that these maxims are not always observed in conversation. They may be violated and create implicatures (Grice 1989). The addressee, based on the context, should work out the communicated implicature. The Gricean CP was employed by some leading translation scholars because they believe that translation is an act of intentional communication per se (Blum-Kulka 1981; Baker 1992; Neubert and Shreve 1992; Hatim and Mason 1990, 1997; Hatim...
In fact, for these scholars, translation is a kind of ‘intercultural cooperation’ between the two sides. They claim that to cooperate with the target receivers translators might violate the same Gricean maxims (or others) to convey a similar meaning. However, rarely any attempts have been done to adjust the Gricean maxims for cross-cultural contexts including translation since the maxims are culture-bound in nature (Chapman 2011; Wierzbicka 1991) and are in need of cultural and social adjustment (see Baker 1992; Machali 1999, 2012; Robinson 2003; Hatim 2006; Dynel 2009). Given the widespread use of the Gricean maxims in translation, the present article aims at reformulating them to the pragmatic needs of translation within the scope of Sperber and Wilson’s (1995) principle of relevance (the cognitive concept of faithfulness) and in the light of Clark’s (1996) Conceptual Common Ground theory.

2. The Gricean maxims in translation

2.1 The Gricean maxims

Grice (1989) formulated a general conversational principle to illuminate the process of communicating, and how speakers arrive at meanings that lie beyond what is actually said in conversation. He asserts that participants in any conversation assume that all speakers are cooperative on the basis of which they make sense of what is said. The cooperative aspect of communication is formulated in Grice’s Cooperative Principle in this way: “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” (Grice 1989, p. 22). Grice further breaks this Principle down into four basic maxims:

1. Few scholars approached pragmatic translation from a post-Gricean relevance approach (for example, Alves and Goncalves 2003; Alves 2007; Gutt 1991).
3. Although much research exist in the literature on ‘cross-cultural pragmatics’ (see Trosborg, 2010; Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989), few if any address the reverse, i.e. pragmatic translation.
4. This theory was applied to a translation by Gutt in 1991.
1. **Quantity**: Give the right amount of information: i.e.
   a: Make your contribution as informative as is required.
   b: Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.
2. **Quality**: Try to make your contribution one that is true: i.e.
   a: Do not say what you believe to be false.
   b: Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
3. **Relation**: Be relevant.
4. **Manner**: Be perspicuous:
   a: Avoid obscurity of expression.
   b: Avoid ambiguity.
   c: Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
   d: Be orderly.

Grice (1989, p. 33) mentions that these maxims are not always observed in conversation. Maxims may be violated. This gives rise to conversational implicatures. Therefore, the Gricean definition of ‘implicature’ is mainly bound to the assumption that human beings are intrinsically ‘cooperative’ in conversation.

2.2 (Non)-applicability of the Gricean maxims in translation

The application of the Gricean CP to translation is based on a number of presumptions. Robinson (2003) claims that there is little evidence to support the non-universality of the Gricean CP. He refers to the important role of the Gricean implicature for translators if they want to ‘act on the reader’ and ‘do something through their translations’ (Robinson 2003). He states that “the pathway to applying Grice in translation studies lies through the presumption of equivalence: whatever the source author or speaker does verbally, […] the translator must seek to follow it in as effective and representative a manner as possible.” Another presumption is the translator’s ‘violating’ the same maxims as violated by the original author or violating different maxims to preserve the same implicatures in the target text. As such, Grice’s maxims are thought to be able to serve as analytical tools to cope with translation in general (Robinson 2003, 134). An example, taken from the play ‘Waiting for Godot’ written by Samuel Beckett (1956) and translated into Persian by Mustafa Abedini Fard, supports this hypothesis:

(1) Estragon: Do you remember the day I throw myself into the Rhone?

[Do you remember the day when I threw myself into the Rhone River?]
Vladimir: We were grape harvesting.
ولادیمیر: رفته بودیم انگور چینی.

Vladimir: had gone—we grape picking
[Vladimir: We had gone to harvest grapes.]

As the example clearly illustrates, in the ST the maxim of quantity is violated by doing circumlocution instead of saying ‘YES’. In the Persian translation, the same maxim of quantity is violated to convey the same implicature.

Nevertheless, this is not always the case. As Hatim (2006, 9) points out, implicatures should be preserved in translation, albeit with the application of different maxims as languages and cultures differ in their pragmatic forces. He asserts that what is considered as flouting the maxim of quality and quantity in one culture (verbosity or silence, for example) may be a stylistic virtue in another, and if committed, no implicature would be in evidence (Hatim 2006, 30). Blum-Kulka (1981) states that if a maxim is violated in the source text, the same or a different maxim may need to be violated in the target text. Fawcett (1997) admits that implicatures should be made explicit in translation by compensating for the type of maxim violated. He believes that the Gricean maxims supply principles for translation of implicatures at two levels: At a macro level, the same maxims as those in the source language are violated in the target text. At a micro level, different languages apply different maxims in different ways in different situations. He suggests that this knowledge should be part of the translator’s competence (Fawcett 1997). According to Neubert and Shreve (1992) as well as Hatim and Mason (1990), Grice’s maxims are useful guidelines for translation. They argue that translators should adhere to the maxims unless this adherence impedes understanding, or it will not be acceptable by the target readers, or it looks irrelevant or it is not efficient or effective. As such, they highlight the role of the translator in assessing and enhancement of ‘relevance’ to the intended receivers. Neubert and Shreve (1992), though accepting Grice’s maxims as a useful framework for translation, criticize it in the sense that cooperation interacts with acceptability and does not consider other standards of textuality such as situationality. With necessary social and cultural adjustments, they have widely applied his paradigm to the cross-cultural realm.

Margala (2009, 100) claims, “with necessary cultural and social adjustments, [Grice’s] approach may be widely applicable [to translation].” She points out that it is still reasonable to assume that people generally follow the Gricean CP although

5. It is noticeable that the identification of the implicatures in the ST, originally conducted by Hassani (2013), is based on the four Gricean maxims of quality, quantity, manner, and relation. As for the TT, the conversations are compared with their ST and the authors decided if the same maxims are violated.
different languages have different cooperative principles (Margala 2009, 100). Overall, she expands Grice’s original paradigm to the cross-cultural and, more specifically, to translation. Hatim (1997, 187) further argues that to render implicatures the translator does not need to violate the same maxims in the target text because different pragmatic procedures can and do vary from one language to another.

Aghbar (1995) points out that in addition to conversation, Grice’s maxims can be conducive to evaluating translation of fiction, and how well the translator has conveyed the original author’s intention, but this comes true with translator’s modifications of the maxims. He has modified the maxims as follows:

1. **Quantity**: the translator may have to add or delete from the original text to make it more communicative to the readers as long as it does not add content information to or does not delete important information from the original text (he believes the additions to clarify the author’s intention should be made clear putting them in footnote);
2. **Quality**: the translator should not misinform the readers. That is, s/he should not translate something which is not intended by the author;
3. **Relation**: if part of the text is culturally foreign to the target readers, or they may not see any relationship because of their different world knowledge, the translator should provide additional information to fill the gaps and make it relevant to the readers;
4. **Manner**: the translator should communicate the author’s message to the target readers in a manner similar to that intended by the original author (Aghbar 1995, 77–78).

As Baker (1992, 230) confirms, ‘coherence’ and ‘implicature’ are two sense-making pragmatic topics which may potentially create difficulty in cross-cultural communication and translation (ibid.). Baker (1992) does not see the Gricean CP as a universal theory to function interculturally; hence suggests adjustments to the maxims for the target language/culture to prevent any distortion of intentions. Change of style due to the violation of different maxims from one language to another is also justifiable because this can be considered as a kind of ‘cooperation’ within a particular community of people (Baker 1998).

Venuti (1998, 23) looks at the application of the Gricean maxims to translation and claims that Grice does not address any cross-cultural issues that may arise in communication. He believes that the Gricean cooperativeness is an attempt that leads to translator’s ‘invisibility’ (due to global hegemony) which he seriously criticizes. He reformulates a different concept of (un)cooperativeness from that of
Grice and believes that translation can benefit from the Gricean maxims, but in an inverse way. Implicature as a feature of the foreign text reveals a gap between the foreign and domestic cultures for which the translator must compensate (Venuti 1998, 23). The domestic linguistic forms that are added to the foreign text to make it more sensible exceed the source text length, thus, violate the maxim of quantity. The problem lies in the fact that the target language may employ a different maxim to produce the source language implicature. To compensate for an implicature in the foreign text, a translator may add footnotes or incorporate the supplementary material into the body of the translation (for example explicitation, compensation, and so on).

In another set of examples from the same translation, as above, it will be shown that either a different maxim is violated or the same maxim is violated with some kind of modifications (for example explicitation), thus the maxims are not responsive to the translation and need adjustments:

(2) Villy: What's the matter?  
ویلی: مگه چی شده؟  
Villy: what matter is?  
[Villy: What's the matter?]

Charley: I heard some noise. I thought something happened. Can't we do something about the walls? You sneeze in here, and in my house hats blow off.

چارلی: سر و صدایی به گوشم رسید. ترسیدم اتفاقی افتاده باشه. راستی نمی تونیم یه کاری برای این دیوار ها بکنیم؟ شما این طرف عطسه می کنین، تو خونه ما مثل بمب صدا می کنه.

Charley: a noise to ear-my reach-did worried-I was something happen-did by the way cannot-we a something for these walls do-we you this side sneeze in house-our like bomb sound-it  
[Charley: I heard some noise. I thought something happened. Can't we do something about the walls? You sneeze in here and there is a bomb blast in my house.]

In the ST, the maxim of quality is violated. However, to convey the same implicature, the translator, though having violated the same quality maxim, has made modifications.

(3) Estragon: You fished me out.

استراگون: تو پریدی توی آب و هر جور بود منو آوردی بیرون

Estragon: you jump-did in water and any way me pull out-did  
[Estragon: You jumped into water and pulled me out in any way possible.]

6. ‘Cooperation’ is an ambiguous term in Grice’s Cooperative Principle (Hadi 2013).
In the ST, the maxim of relation is violated to convey the implicature. In the TT, the translator, though having preserved the same implicature by violating the maxim of relation, has made cultural adjustment.

(4) Linda: Just try to relax, dear. You make mountains out of molehills.

Linda: try calm be. Unduly yourself discomfort

In the ST, the maxim of quality is violated. In the TT, however, the translator has implied the same implicature through explicitation and has violated the maxim of quantity.

(5) Happy: Go to sleep. But talk to him in the morning, will you?

Happy: sleep. But morning with him talk, ok?

Biff [reluctantly getting into bed]: With her in the house, Brother!

Biff [reluctantly on bed lies down]: bro, when mum at home is it is not possible with him talk.

In the ST, the maxim of relation is violated. In the TT, the translator has conveyed the same implicature through explicitation and a violation of the maxim of quantity.

(6) Willy: You gonna put up a ceiling?

Willy: do you want ceiling you room fix?

Charley: How could I put up a ceiling?

Charley: no, I don't know
In the ST, the maxim of manner is violated. The translator, however, through making the implicature explicit in the TT has violated the maxim of quantity instead of manner to convey the same intended meaning.

2.3 A post-Gricean replacement

Since the Gricean CP does not consider the dynamic nature of the participants’ cognition as a crucial factor in inference and context-based interpretations and as a response to this flaw, the Principle of Relevance was put forth. In the Principle of Relevance, the communicator assumes and dynamically ‘selects’ what is/is not relevant to his/her receptor’s cognitive context, and accordingly adjusts (by adding or deleting any communicative clues) the utterance with the receptor’s cognitive context to facilitate the intended meaning. On the other hand, the receptor presumes that what the communicator is saying is relevant to him, hence, worthy of interpretation. The receptor also dynamically ‘selects’ those interpretations which are more relevant. In other words, based on the principle of relevance, context is ‘online’ and unlike the Gricean view, is selected ‘during’ the communication and not prior to it. Moreover, implicatures are highly context-dependant constructions, the interpretation of which is largely inferred from the user’s cognitive context. The Gricean CP, as applied to translation, neglects this important dynamic aspect of context. As a conclusion, the post-Gricean relevance theory and its basic principles are assumed to help to lead to adaptation and adjustments in question. For instance, Hatim and Mason (1990) suggest the translator’s assumption of the target receivers’ cognitive context as being what s/he needs to make explicit or keep implicit. They defined the maxims of ‘quantity’ and ‘relation’ and under the principle of relevance. The present study builds on relevance theory and its underlying principle of faithfulness.

3. Theoretical framework

3.1 Gutts’ application of the idea of faithfulness (from relevance theory) in translation

Relevance theory is founded on ‘cognitive’ and ‘communicative’ principles of relevance. In the former, it is believed that human cognition is geared toward maximization of relevance and in the latter, it is hypothesized that every utterance has a presumption of its own relevance, that is, the listener believes that the speaker is ‘cooperative’ and optimally relevant to his expectations. Therefore, what he has to do is to make inferences that fit his expectations to reach the intended interpretation
based on the clues given by the speaker. Sperber and Wilson (1995) believe that human attention and thought are automatically geared toward the information which seems personally relevant. As they remark, “to communicate is to imply that the information communicated is relevant” (Sperber and Wilson 1995, 697), thus, cooperation in conversation is guaranteed if both partners presume everything as ‘relevant’. This brings us to the main ‘principle of relevance’ as the core of relevance theory: “Every act of ostensive-inferential communication communicates the presumption of its own optimal relevance” (Sperber and Wilson 1995, 158).

Relevance theory defines two psychologically distinct modes of using language: the descriptive and interpretive use. A language utterance is said to be used descriptively when it is intended to be taken as ‘true of a state of affairs’ in some possible world. An utterance is said to be used interpretively when it is intended to ‘represent’ what someone said or thought (Sperber and Wilson 1995). The important point in interpretive use is that there should be a relationship of ‘interpretive resemblance’ between the original utterance and that used to represent it, that is, all explicatures and implicatures between the original and the representing utterances should resemble and be shared. Resemblance is a matter of degree. Translation, defined as restating in one language what someone said or wrote in another language, also falls under the interpretive use of language (Gutt 1998). Being constrained by the Principle of Relevance as explained above, the speaker will aim at creating resemblance in those aspects that she believes will satisfy the expectations of the listener and lead to optimal relevance. As a result, in interpretive use, the speaker’s utterance comes with a claim of faithfulness: “the speaker guarantees that her utterance is a faithful enough representation of the original: that is, resembles it closely enough in relevant respects” (Wilson and Sperber 1988, 137). Therefore, the Principle of Relevance as the core of relevance theory comes with a ready-made concept of ‘faithfulness’ which applies to the interpretive use of language (Gutt 1992, 1998).

It was noted earlier that translation falls under the interpretive use of language (Gutt 1991; Hatim and Munday 2004). As such, the conveyance of messages is based on interpretive resemblance. In other words, translation restates in one language what someone said or wrote in another language. As an instance of interpretive use, the translation will also be constrained by the notion of faithfulness (Gutt 1998; Hatim and Munday 2004). As Gutt (1998, 46) states, “the translator will design her translation in such a way that it resembles [the original] closely enough in relevant respects.” However, this resemblance rarely, if at all, achieves a full status. The question is to what extent translation should resemble the original. Back to the original theory and applying ‘presumption of optimal relevance’, Wilson and Sperber comment on faithfulness and claim “the speaker guarantees that her utterance is a faithful enough representation of the original, that is, resembles it closely enough in relevant respects.” (1988, 137 my emphasis) As they remark, what the reporter
intends to convey is presumed to interpretively resemble the original and it is presumed to have adequate contextual effects without requiring gratuitous processing effort. In other words, the resemblance is to be consistent with the presumption of optimal relevance (Wilson and Sperber 1988). As such, faithfulness is based on the presumption of optimal relevance. According to Gutt (1991), this notion of optimal resemblance, which he replaces for optimal relevance, seems to capture well the idea of faithfulness in translation. Put simply, the more closely the source and target texts resemble in relevant aspects, the more faithful they are. Faithfulness or interpretive resemblance guides the translator and translation theorists to determine in what respects the translation should resemble the original – only in those respects that can be expected to make it adequately relevant to the receptor language audience. They also determine that translation should be clear and natural in expression in the sense that it should not be unnecessarily difficult to understand (Gutt 1991). Accordingly, a successful translation is the one which resembles its original text and is relevant to target readers’ context.

3.2 Clark’s cooperative Common Ground Theory

As it was mentioned earlier, the Gricean maxims are criticized for being in need of social foundations and adjustments (Neubert and Shreve 1992); therefore, a socially-founded theory is necessary to justify the fact that the Gricean maxims would play the same pragmatic role for all the cooperative members of a linguistic society and holds the individuals together. Therefore, Clark’s (1996) Common Ground theory, as a justifying social theory for this purpose, is employed.

In his Conceptual Common Ground Theory, Clark (1996) defines ‘language as action’ and his central thesis is that ‘language use is really a form of joint action’, i.e. action carried out by people in coordination with one another. Conversation is one ‘joint activity’ in which the source of the conversants’ ability to cooperate is their common ground, the set of knowledge, beliefs, and suppositions that (they believe) they share. The conceptual Common Ground theory is the social foundation that facilitates interaction between cooperative members, holds the individuals of a social group together, and flourishes the domain of shared intentionality as something unique (Santibáñez 2012). Inspired by Clark’s (1996) theory of Common Ground, Santibáñez (2012, 485) explains that we are able to communicate in a cooperative form because from the very beginning it became advantageous to hominids, in particular to humans, to divide labor within the framework of joint attention.
3.3 The rationale

The motivation for this integration (of the idea of faithfulness to the Gricean maxims) can further be justified in the following way: first, relevance account of translation as theorized by Gutt (1991) is an extension of one of the Gricean maxims (i.e. relation) and subsumes and defines the other maxims (quantity, quality, and manner) in terms of it. Moreover, as Verschueren and Östman (2009, 103) also confirm, this subsumption “would make it more difficult to discuss conflicts (‘clashes’) between ‘relevance’ and other maxims” because “maxims seem to have different social and intellectual valuations.” They explain the failure of quality as a lack of moral rather than intellectual failure of quantity as a lack of communicative competence, while failure in manner suggests aesthetic shortcomings (ibid.). Second, the Principle of Relevance under relevance theory suffers from certain theoretical ambiguities. These include lack of a more objective and operational definition of ‘relevance’ (see Sanatifar 2016), what should indeed be relevant in translation, and how relevant should relevant be. These are the problems that made the authors re-employ to the Gricean maxims, but viewed in the light of the principle of relevance and faithfulness.

According to Gutt (1991), translation is a process of interpretive use of language which seeks interpretive resemblance. He clearly defines interpretive resemblance in terms of ‘faithfulness’. Among the Gricean submaxims, none accounts for faithfulness in the interpretation of implicatures. The four Gricean maxims and sub-maxims ostensibly account for the quality, quantity, relation, and manner of interpretations and fall short of being properly applicable to translation, i.e., the absence of a sub-maxim which ostensibly accounts for the faithfulness of interpretation. It is proposed in this article that the Gricean sub-maxims could become more applicable to translation (as an inferential-based communication) if they take advantage from another sub-maxim of ‘faithfulness’ with special reference to the principle of relevance. The researcher assumes that this lacking sub-maxim would handle the violation of the relevance-based translational concept of ‘interpretive resemblance.’ As the result of this ‘cooperation’, the Gricean sub-maxims are adjusted from and within a relevance theoretic perspective.

4. Reformulating the maxims

By drawing on the idea of faithfulness from the principle of relevance, and the theoretical rationale of integrating it with the Gricean maxims, and theoretically justifying the integration within the scope of Clark’s social theory, a sub-maxim
(italicized) is subsumed under each of the four maxims to adjust it for translational purposes:

1. **Quantity**: Give the right amount of information:
   a: Make your contribution as informative as is required.
   b: Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.
   c: *Be faithful to the amount of information as presented in the source text*

2. **Quality**: Try to make your contribution, one that is true:
   a: Do not say what you believe to be false.
   b: Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
   c: *Do not say what is unfaithful to the truth of the source text*

3. **Relation**: Be relevant.
   a: *Be faithful to the source text in relevant aspects*

4. **Manner**: Be perspicuous:
   a: Avoid obscurity of expression.
   b: Avoid ambiguity.
   c: Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
   d: Be orderly.
   e: *Be faithful to the style and/or manner in which the information is presented in the source text.*

Therefore, based on the idea of faithfulness and by observing the cooperative sub-maxim of faithfulness, a translator may maximally resemble the TT to the ST and by violating it, and not projecting enough and relevant contextual information, s/he may divert from faithfulness and resemblance.

Why is ‘faithfulness’ a common sub-maxim and is not standing as an independent maxim? It is already stated by Sperber and Wilson (1995) that all the four Gricean maxims can be rephrased in terms of one giant maxim of ‘relevance.’ For example, they remark that ‘quantity’ is ‘being relevant in size of what we say,’ ‘quality’ is ‘being relevant in the truth of the intention and meaning of what we say,’ ‘relation’ is ‘being relevant,’ and ‘manner’ is ‘being relevant in the manner of what we say.’ Therefore, the relevance-based concept of ‘faithfulness,’ as a basic principle in translation, can be a common sub-maxim under each of the four maxims. Nevertheless, the four maxims can be adjusted as follow:

1. **Quantity**: add enough communicative clues to the TT to make it faithful to the ST with regard to the amount of the information required;
2. **Quality**: do not mislead the target readers; make the TT faithful to the ST with regard to the truth of the information required;
3. **Relation:** make the TT faithful to the ST closely enough in relevant aspects if (part of) the text is not contextually shared between the translator and the target readers;

4. **Manner:** communicate the author's message in a way that is faithful to the ST in style and manner as the original author intends it.

It is noticeable that what makes Aghbar’s (1995) maxims different from the ones in this study is that Aghabar’s maxims as formulated for translation are not motivated theoretically. However, a more or less similar type of modification is theoretically justified within the scope of the Principle of Relevance in the adjusted maxims.

These maxims would be operational with pragmatic translation where the translator needs to overcome the difficulties of accomplishing 'interpretive' resemblance and faithfulness.

This application of the Gricean maxims to translation is, indeed, a practical realization of Sperber and Wilson’s (1995) theoretical statement that the Gricean maxims are too many and need to be summarized under one giant and single maxim of 'relevance' (i.e. an extension of Grice’s maxim of relation).

5. **Testing the reformulated maxims**

To test the explanatory power of the maxims as adjusted, the examples examined in Section 2.2 are re-analyzed and discussed within the relevance-based framework.

(2) Villy: What's the matter?

ودی: مگه چی شده؟

Villy: what matter?

[Villy: What's the matter?]

Charley: I heard some noise. I thought something happened. Can't we do something about the walls? You sneeze in here, and in my house hats blow off. (implicature)

چارلی: سر و صدایی به گوشم رسید. ترسیدم اتفاقی افتاده باشه. راستی نمی تونیم یه کاری برای این دیوار ها بکنیم؟ شما این طرف عطسه می کنین، تو خونه ما مثل بمب صدا می کنه.

Charley: a noise to ear-my reach-did worried-I was something happen-did by the way cannot-we a something for these walls do-we you this side sneeze in house-our like bomb sound-it

[Charley: I heard some noise. I thought something happened. Can't we do something about the walls? You sneeze in here and there is a bomb blast in my house.]
In the ST, Charley has violated the maxim of quality. To convey the same implication, the translator has violated the same maxim of quality but with some modification. Based on maxim 2, the translator has observed faithfulness to the truth of the information in the ST and, in this way, is cooperating with the target readers. Based on the translator’s assumption, employing a local expression, though it still violates the truth, will make the intended meaning more accessible to the target readers. In relevance theory terms, it provides more contextual effects at the cost of less processing effort. In other words, violating the same quality maxim, but of a different type, in TT has facilitated meeting the expectancy of relevance of the target readers.

(3) Estragon: You fished me out.

استراگون: تو پریدی توی آب و هر جور بود منو آوردی بیرون.

\[\text{Estragon: you jump-did in water and any way me pull out-did} \]

[ strains: You jumped into water and pulled me out in any way possible. ]

Vladimir: That’s all dead and buried.

\[\text{ولادیمیر: گذشته ها دیگه گذشته} \]

\[\text{Vladimir: pasts any more pasts} \]

[ Vladimiro: Let bygones be bygones. ]

In the ST, Vladimir has violated the maxim of relation to convey the same implication. In the TT, the translator has preserved the same implication by violating the same relation maxim, but with some modifications. Based on maxim 3, the translator has violated faithfulness to the relevance of the information as presented in the ST but assumes that a modified form of the expression (let bygones be bygones) would convey the same implication. The translator assumes that this is the most relevant interpretation of the implication to the target readers, which is both easier to understand and less demanding. In other words, employing a more familiar expression in the TT has facilitated meeting the expectancy of relevance of the target readers.

(4) Linda: Just try to relax, dear. You make mountains out of molehills.

\[\text{لیندا: سعی کن آروم باشی. بیخودی خوتو ناراحت می‌کنی} \]

\[\text{Linda: try calm be. Unduly yourself discomfort} \]

[ Linda: Try to be calm. You unduly discomfort yourself ]

Linda has violated the maxim of quality since the statement is not true. In the TT, however, the translator has implied the same implication through explicitation and violating the maxim of quantity. This shift of maxims from ST to TT could be justified in the following way: the translator (based on maxim 1) has violated faithfulness to the amount of information rather than faithfulness to the truth of it as presented in the ST; he has assumed that an explicitation of the expression You
make mountains out of molehills as You unduly discomfort yourself in the TT would convey the same implicature. He assumes that this is the most relevant expression of the implicature to the Persian readers, which is both easier to understand and less demanding. In other words, employing a more culturally familiar expression in the TT would facilitate meeting the expectancy of relevance of the target readers.

(5) Happy: Go to sleep. But talk to him in the morning, will you?

بهی: بگیر بخواب. اما صبح باش صحبته کن، خوب؟

Happy: Sleep. But morning with him talk, ok?

[Happy: Sleep. But talk to him in the morning.]

Biff [reluctantly getting into bed]: With her in the house, Brother!

بیف [با اکراه روز تخت دراز می کشید] داداش وقتی مامان خونه س نمیشه باشحرف زد.

Biff [reluctantly on bed lies down]: bro, when mum at home is it is not possible with him talk.

[Bro, when mum is at home, it is possible to talk with him.]

Biff has violated the maxim of relation to convey the implicature. In the TT, however, the translator has implied the same implicature through explicitation and violation of the maxim of quantity instead of relation. This explicitation could be explained in the following way: the translator (based on maxim 1) has violated faithfulness to the amount of the information as presented in the ST rather than faithfulness to the relevance of information. He assumes that an explicit form of the expression With her in the house. Brother! as Bro, when mum is at home, it is not possible to talk with him would convey the same implicature but in an easier and less demanding way. The translator assumes that this is the most relevant interpretation of the implicature to the target readers. In a relevance-based framework, this is assumed to facilitate meeting the expectancy of relevance to the target readers.

(6) Willy: You gonna put up a ceiling?

ویلی: می خواهی سقف اتاقتو تعمیر کنی؟

Willy: Do you want to fix your room’s ceiling?

[Charley: How could I put up a ceiling?]

Charley: No, I don't know

Charley has answered Willy’s question by a question; thus, has violated the maxim of manner to convey the implicature ‘NO’. In the TT, however, the translator has
used explicitation, and violation of the maxim of quantity instead of manner to convey the same implicature. This could be explained as follows: the translator has violated faithfulness to the amount of the information rather than faithfulness to style and manner in which it is intended in the ST. He assumes that an explicitation of the expression *How could I put up a ceiling?* as *No, I don’t know how* would convey the same implicature but in a less demanding way. In a relevance-based framework, this is assumed to facilitate meeting the expectancy of relevance to the target readers.

6. Conclusion

Translation (Studies) has widely benefitted from the Gricean theory as a major theoretical tool to tackle pragmatic issues (see Hatim and Mason 1990, 1997; Baker 1992). Even Gutt’s relevance model of translation, inspired by Sperber and Wilson’s (1995) relevance theory, is indirectly related to and a completion of the Gricean maxims. As Sperber and Wilson (1995) claim, relevance theory is an extension of one of the maxims – relation. So far so good, but the problem is when different cultures/languages use their specific maxims to convey the same intended meanings, for example, in translation. In such cases, employing the Gricean maxims genuinely is no longer able to justify the translator’s decisions. Therefore, some adjustments seem necessary to tackle such translational difficulties. This article, though did not intend to criticize the totality of the Gricean maxims and their application in translation, worked to make those adjustments.

In so doing, the authors appealed to the relevance-based principle of faithfulness to fit the Gricean maxims into the needs of translation and target readers. As such, the translator is able to justify his decisions on shifting from violation of one maxim to another. The translator is further able to explain why s/he has used explicitation and other procedures in translation. As the analyses of data indicate, in many cases, the translator has violated faithfulness to the source text in quantity, quality, relation, and manner so as to cooperate with the target readers to convey the same implicatures. According to the Principle of Relevance and based on the adjusted maxims, it is assumed by the translators that preserving the same implicatures through violating faithfulness in translation could be the most relevant interpretation of the implicatures and this, in turn, would facilitate meeting the expectancy of relevance of the target readers. In this new framework, the violation of the Gricean maxims is justified under ‘faithfulness’ within the borders of the principle of relevance, also highlighted by Gutt (1991).
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