THE CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN THE SERIES OF AL-ZEER SALEM (ABU LAILA AL-MUHALHAL) AS A PRAGMATIC APPROACH TO THE SPEECH OF REVENGE FOR KULAIB'S BLOOD

Lect. Dr. Adnan Rasmi Yasir
Department of Arabic language/College of Education for Women/ University of Thi-Qar, Iraq.
adnan.rasmi@utq.edu.iq
Lect. Dr. Sadeq Omair Jalood
Department of Arabic language/College of Basic Education/ University of Sumer, Iraq.
sadiq.umair.sh@gmail.com

Article history:		Abstract:
		The research revolves around the conversational Implicature as one of the deliberative arguments advocated by (Grace) in his research. It is based on the core idea that people in their conversations mean more than they say. Based on this, the imperative is the indirect or implicit speech that the speaker hides from his hearer. This paper dealt with the discourse of revenge as an annihilating discourse. The blood seeker (the Zeer) was intentionally - in my opinion - to use indirect speech with his enemies until he puts them in a circle of confusion and the question is what does he want? Why did he want this and not others....etc.

STUDY BACKGROUND

The search for a recent phenomenon of conversational necessitation dates back to the lectures that Grace gave at Harvard University in 1971 and 1987. Here a question arises in the mind: Is the dialogue imperative not present in the discourse of nations that preceded Grace, starting with Athens and ending with the ancient Arab metropolis? History tells us that the ancient Arabs knew this phenomenon, especially among rhetoricians and scholars of origins, as they researched it in their scientific works and studied it long ago.

From here we see that the historical development of this paper started from 1971 to 2019 and between this period a lot of research appeared related to this phenomenon; But it is taken that she meant the written text without the uttered. This leads us to say: This paper went in another direction, and examined the spoken text to ensure the communicative meaning.

Problem Statement

The problem of the study lies in a main question:
1 - How can the listener understand the required meaning? Sub-questions branch from this question that can be formulated as follows:
2- What are the mechanisms by which the listener pleads to know the intention of the speaker?
3- What is the consequence of the speech if the listener understands the unintended meaning?
4- How does the listener interpret a meaning that the speaker did not utter?

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aims at things that can be identified as follows:
1- Recognizing that the dialogue imperative is a saying that the speaker uses to express his indirect intentions, especially in embarrassing situations.
2- Recognizing that vengeance has customary rules and regulations that must be adhered to by the guardian of blood or those who demand vengeance. Violating them generates a discourse of hate, and consequently great losses occur between the two parties.
3- Documenting the biography of Al-Zeer Salem as the root of war and genocide.
4- Activating the spoken or oral text in communication. This goal is the most important of the previous goals; Because it is related to understanding, meaning, and communication.
5- Establishing an operator or informant concerned with spoken texts.

Research Questions of the study

The research raises a set of questions that can be asked as follows:
1- How does the speaker say a word and mean another meaning? Why does the speaker use the indirect meaning?
2- How does the listener understand this meaning?

Limitations of the study

This research paper has been in conflict with the dialogue imperative in the series Al-Zeer Salem,

specifically the revenge speech, taking into account the fact that this speech was made by the scriptwriter.

Significance of the study

The importance of the research comes from, among other things, the following:

1- This research can contribute to enriching the scientific aspect and motivating researchers to study the theory that Grace proposed in communication, and to know the tributaries that stem from it.

2- This research can contribute to directing researchers to the spoken text instead of the written text that has taken over the scientific studies.

3- This research can contribute to the establishment of a linguistic-dramatic workshop that is concerned with the study of spoken texts in drama.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The researcher will present the studies that contributed to feeding the research, as follows:

1- Customary and Conversational Implicature: A comparative study between Grace and the Shafi'i school: Abda Sayed Hammadi: Kuwait University, College of Graduate Studies, Dr., I, 1997 AD.

2- The conversational Implicature in linguistic circulation from awareness of the specifics of the phenomenon to setting the laws governing it: Al-Ayachi Adrawi, Dar Al-Aman, Rabat, 1, 2011 AD.

3- The Theory of Dialogue Waving between Modern Linguistics and Linguistic Investigations in the Arab-Islamic Heritage: Dr. Hisham Abdullah Al-Khalifa, Library of Lebanon Publishers, Beirut, 1, 2013 AD.

4- The necessity and consistency of the discourse: Dr. Reem Hammami: Presented by Dr. Abdullah Soleh, United New Book House, Beirut - Lebanon, 1, 2013 AD.

5- The theory of relevance or appropriateness in communication and perception: Dan Sperber and Deidre Wilson, translated by: Hisham Ibrahim Abdullah Al-Khalifa, review: Firas Awad Maarouf, United New Book House, Beirut - Lebanon, 1, 2016 AD.

INTRODUCTION

Conversation Implicature is one of the most important principles advocated by deliberation. This is because the meaning does not stop at the limits of the verbal image, but goes beyond that. Thus, the saying becomes a mosaic of interpretations.

The approach in question (the Conversational Implicature) represents an epistemological alternative to the semiotic approach that relies on the dualism in communication: encoding and decoding (Sperber and Wilson, 2016: p. 22). From here, inference was needed; To adjust the speaker's gestures and their interpretation.

As for the sample approach, we chose the series (Al-Zeer Salem), specifically the letter of revenge for the blood of (Kulaib); As a chaotic, perpetual discourse that violated the customs of blood money among the Arabs, and in sum, it is a private discourse, imposed by the situation, until it became higher than the situation itself. Because of the constant killing between the two teams.

The research was divided into an introduction accompanied by two main parts: the first concerned the general framework of the theory of conversational implicature, and the second discussed the procedural aspect, then the research conclusion, and a list of sources and references. In analyzing the discourse samples, we used a descriptive approach. Because it is the approach closest to our work.

First: The general framework of the conversational implicature theory (Younis Ali, 2004: 100)

Definition of the concept "Conversational Implicature"

The concept of conversational implicature raises a problem, which can be posed in the form of a question: "How is the way to get someone to think about something that was not said, and was not mentioned at all in the saying (Oriconi, 2008: 40), in other words: "How is it possible for the speaker to say One thing, and something else? Then how is it possible for the addressee to hear one thing and understand another" (Nahleh, 2011: 33-34). Herbert Puaul Grice found a solution to this problem, which is what he called the principle of cooperation (Abd al-Rahman, 1998: 238). So what is this principle based on in order for the discourse to be organized?

Cooperation Principle

Communication - according to Grace - is a rational activity, based on a general principle that states the following:

Make your conversational contribution, when you make it, appropriate to the direction and purpose of the conversation in which you participate. (Khalifa, 2013: p. 28).

And (Grace) expanded this general principle in four discursive rules he quoted from the German philosopher (Kant) (Hammadi, 1997: 99-100), which are: (Sperber and Wilson, 2016:pp. 72-73).

1. Quantity rule

1. Limit your input of information to the extent required in the conversation.

2. Do not make your contribution more information than is required.

2. Quality Base

Top rule: try to contribute honest information.

1. Don't say what you think is not true.

2. Do not say what you do not have enough evidence to be true.

3. Relation Rule
Let your words be relevant.

4. Manner's Style Rule (Leach, 2013: 133) and (Ramos, 2014: 90)
Top rule: Be clear.
1. Avoid ambiguity.
2. Avoid confusion and participation.
3. Speak briefly.
4. Put your words in the correct order.

Accordingly, the communicators usually assume that the statement they hear is sufficiently informative, truthful, relevant, and clear. On the basis of this assumption, the listeners reach an inference (Khalifa, 2013: 29).

To clarify the previous idea, we present the following conversational from the series (Al-Zeer Salem): (Hatem Ali, 2000: p. 25).
- Imru' al-Qays bin Aban: Where have you been?
- Al-Zeer Salem: Hunting.

The apparent meaning of the speech is that the principle of cooperation, and the rules that branch from it, are present in this conversational. The speaker (Al-Zeer Salem) gave a specific answer without adding or subtracting (the quantity), and he was honest in what he proposed (the type), and his article came It fits the situation (the occasion), and clearly answers his friend's question (the style). In this case, his saying does not generate a conversational implicature; Because there is no distinction between what he said and what he meant (Ismail, 2000: 89).

The previous rules aim - with Grace's note - one goal, which is to control the course of conversational, stressing that respect for these rules, as well as the principle of cooperation, is the way to reach the speaker's intentions, where every departure from them leads to a disruption of the conversational, or to any disruption of the process. In this case, the utterance moves from its apparent meaning to the hidden meaning that is required by the place. This is what Grace explored under the concept of conversationalal implicature (Adwari, 2011: 18).

Grace's starting point was that people in their conversations (Nahaleh, 2011: pp33-34):
• They may say what they mean.
• They may mean more than they say.
• They may mean the opposite of what they say.

The second case is the meaning of (Grace) "As it is impossible to communicate without what is hidden and implicit, so declaring everything in a message turns into a closed circle that has no end, so everything cannot be said." (Asheer, 2012:47)

The following conversational shows how the speaker intends to convey more than what he says:
- Wife: Would you like some coffee?
- Husband: The coffee will keep me awake.

We note that the answer (the husband) is not appropriate to the question (the wife) from a superficial point of view, so what is the link between vigilance and drinking or not drinking coffee? How do we understand the husband's answer as acceptance, or rejection? In order to understand the husband's answer, according to Anne Rupaul and Jacques Muschlar, we must present a number of possibilities related to his state of mind, and assume that his statement is appropriate for the context in which it is mentioned. (Rupaul & Muschlar, 2003: p. 20) The presence of coffee prevents drowsiness, and therefore sleep, and drinking coffee is not appropriate at night...etc. From the common or mutual knowledge, we conclude that the husband's intention was determined in his previous statement, that he does not want to have coffee, and therefore wants to sleep early.

In this regard, sperber dan says: "The speaker who intends a statement to be interpreted in a certain way, should also expect that the listener will be able to come up with a context that allows for that interpretation to be brought up. The context the listener is actually using may lead to misunderstanding. Suppose for example that the speaker wants to stay awake, He therefore wants to accept the coffee offered by his host, while the host assumes that the speaker does not want to stay awake, and therefore interprets (the coffee will keep me awake) as a refusal" (Sperber & Wilson, 2016:pp. 43-44).

The meaning of refusal in the example of coffee is originally an implicature meaning, generated as a result of a violation of the principle of appropriateness, and accordingly, the speaker was able to communicate the meaning to his hearer, and the latter must understand the speaker's purpose of this violation.

Therefore, the conversational implicature occurs by way of breaching or deviating from one of the four rules while respecting the principle of cooperation at the deepest level - in the language of the two generations - in communication, and this cooperation is assumed by the listener; In order to direct the speech towards a specific goal.

Based on the foregoing, the conversational implicature has been defined by several definitions, including:
• Implicature is the meaning that is generated outside of semantics (Armenko, 1986:p. 53)

• It communicates more communiqué than what is said. (Rubol and Mochlar, 2003:p. 56).
• The meaning of the literal connotation (Ramos, 2014: p. 102).
The speaker's position on the rules of speech

Grace's rules do not represent a fixed state in discourse, but speakers often violate and ignore them, and accordingly, the speaker's position can be divided into the following approach (Adwari, 2011:p. 11):
The first position: that the speaker explicitly observe the rules, leaving the task of expanding and highlighting what was said to direct inferences, based on the speaker's observance of the rules.
The second position: that the speaker intentionally violates the rules, or that he belittles them, in the words of (Grace). He wants the addressee to realize that this belittling is deliberate; In order to generate the intended conversational implicature (Khalifa, 2013: p. 33).

Referring to the conversational of the aforementioned series, we find that Al-Zeer's answer "hunting" to his friend's question, "Where have you been?" At the heart of the first position; This is because the speaker did not intend to violate the principle and rules of cooperation. Suppose the speaker wants, or intends to belittle those rules, then his answer - based on the assumption given - is, for example, "somewhere". Here, he has broken the quantum rule; Because it did not provide enough information to inform. Also, if he answered the question with "I was hanging by a rope of passion," he would have violated the gender rule; Because he says something that lacks sincerity. And if his friend asked him, and he answered, "I did not get a prey," he is violating the rule of occasion, as evidenced by the absence of a relationship - on a superficial level - between the hypothetical saying and the maqam. Whereas, if he had typed his answer with the phrase "I was racing an ostrich", he would have violated the rule of style; Because (the ostrich) is a lexim shared between the mare of Al-Harith bin Abbad, and the well-known bird.

What we have mentioned from supposed loads (answers) is from the share of the second situation, so the speaker - then - intends to exploit the rules; In order to generate an Implicature, which is something that made Grace pay great attention to the issue of intent, which he considered one of the main characteristics of discourse. Every conversational requires invoking intentions; So that there is cooperation between the interlocutors, and each of them understands the intention of the other (Adwari, 2011:101).

Implicature Types
Customary Implicature: It is an implicature generated by common words in the language. If these words change, the requirement is completely removed. This type of implicature is closely related to words. Because it is one of the consequential structures, and in this case it contradicts one of the distinguishing characteristics of the conversationalal implicature, namely: the possibility of separating by changing words (Khalifa, 2013: 36). Contrary to what the listener expects, towards: (Zayd is rich but miserly) (Nahleh, 2011: 36)

Bach emphasized in his research entitled (The Myth of customary implicature) that there is no such thing as customary implicature, and that the examples given by Grace are divided into two types: the first represents a part of (Al Maqil), and its example: But, therefore, for a directive, and the second represents its descriptions. The speaker in the use of sayings, which is what has been termed utterance modifiers, for example: (Frankly, Finally) (Khalifa, 2013: 37).

What (Bach) stated represents a point of view, which may or may not be accepted from him, and we are not going to enter into the implementation of the man's claim, but (Grace) when he mentioned the customary requirement he wanted to say: This type is not very reliable in communication; Because it lacks the reactions of the reception, the different contexts, and the information exchanged...etc.

Conversational Implicatures: This type of implicature represents the core of the deductive (Grace) approach in daily communication. Because it is reached by means of actual principles such as the rules of communication (ibid.: 36). In the following conversation:
- Where did the money disappear?
The janitor drives a new car.

He understands that the worker may have taken the money, because buying a car with modern specifications does not match the worker's modest monthly salary. This conclusion was reached by the context, the mutual knowledge, and the violation of the rules of communication...etc.
Grace also distinguishes between two types of imputation, the first being called: (generalized imputation), (Hamami: 2013:73-74.) and the second: (special imputation). This division is of little concern, as Neale puts it; Because it is a taxonomic division only (same source: 72), and therefore, it does not necessarily fall within the aforementioned (Grace) classifications (Khalifa, 2013: 34).
Characteristics of the conversational implicature
Conversational Implicature has characteristics that are unique to it from other branches of inference

that fall under deliberativeness, such as: the previous assumption, the theory of verbal verbs...etc (Al-Hamami: 2013:90). Grace tried to mention these characteristics as follows:

- Possibility to revoke

It means, canceling and removing the implicature, by adding a phrase, to the original sentence, without falling into the contradiction (Khalifa, 2013: 38). For clarity, we present the following conversational:

Author: Have you read my books?
Reader: I haven't read all your books.

The reader's answer requires that she read some of them, so if she follows her words by saying: The truth is that I have not read any of them. It eliminated the requirement (Nahleh, 2011: 39)

Conversational Implicature, in this feature, is closer to induction than to deduction. As induction is amenable to copying, and transferring, unlike deduction. To illustrate this, we give two examples; For the purpose of distinguishing deduction from induction:

deduction example
- man is mortal
- Socrates is a human being.

Socrates is mortal.

If the two premises are true, then the result (Socrates is mortal) is true of them, and it cannot be cancelled.

induction example
- I've seen thousands of swans.
- Every swan I saw was white.
- All swans in the world are white.

And if we suppose now that a black swan is seen, in this case the result will be null and void, and not be generalizable (Khalifa, 2013: 38-39), like the statement of the reader: "The truth is that I have not read any of it," in which the Implicature is invalidated, as mentioned previously.

Non-detachable

It means, that the conversational implicature is related to the semantic meaning of the saying, not its linguistic form (pp. 38-40) and its example: the saying given in sarcasm: (Zayd is a genius). If this phrase was replaced by other phrases such as: Zaid Aristotle, Zaid shrewd..etc., then the conversational implicature will still exist, as long as the previous statement does not match reality. Perhaps this characteristic is what distinguishes the conversational Implicature from the presupposition (Nahleh 2011: 40).

Calculability

It is intended for the listener to take deductive steps; To get what you need to talk. If, for example, it is said: (A woman of iron), it is understood from her that the speaker wanted to give the woman some of the qualities of iron: such as hardness, toughness and endurance (p. 41).

Non- Conventionality

It means, that the conversational implicature is not part of the positive meaning of the words (Khalifa, 2013:p. 41), and we have already mentioned this in the feature of non-separation.

Indeterminacy

It means that the implicature changes and differs from one context to another, and even within the same context; Because the context is given and not previously defined, but rather is formed during the process of inference (p. 42).

Returning to the example of (a woman of iron) referred to above, we find that it may have several interpretations other than what was mentioned, such as: that this woman is not sensitive, or that her heart is thick, or that she is cruel, or that she does not care about men..etc. And these interpretations can be true of the woman at the same time.

Grace did well when he put some data to achieve the process of inference according to which conversational inference is generated from it (Adwari, 2011: 104)
- The literal meaning of the speech, and the identification of referrals.

The principle of cooperation and its subsidiary rules.
- The two contexts: the linguistic and the non-linguistic of the discourse.

Background knowledge.

The interlocutors in the speech must realize these facts and assume them during the conversational process.

Second: The Procedure

The discourse, no matter how diverse its space, does not absolve itself of implicit human requirements or intentions that require contemplation from its author. to stand on it. The work of the interpreter here is very hard; For how can he understand a meaning or an intention that the speaker has not uttered? Perhaps I am not exaggerating when I say: The work of the interpreter is like the work of a miner. In sum, he works to capture the indirect meaning, or the necessitated one, with what is available to him of external diagnosables, other than the structure of the discourse, such as the place, the customs, the knowledge background...etc.

And since the speech of revenge was eternal, the blood guardian was not satisfied with being direct and clear with his opponents, but rather he sought to force some citizens, including what was stated in the following speech: (Hatem Ali, 2000: p. 8:11).

Al-Zeer: Is it morning?
Hyenas: Yes.
Al-Zeer: Has everyone woken up?
Hyenas: We all woke up.
Al-Zeer: And they all woke up early.
Hammam: No one was asleep.
Al-Zeer: Then all of them who are going to die have awakened.
Hammam: What are these words, Salem?
Al-Zeer: Are you asking me, Hammam? Do you not know that I will not spare any of the Bani Bakr? Or is it possible to keep one of them after Kulaib's death? Imagine, can any of you imagine that a man as great as a Kulaib could be killed by a trivial group like Jassas, Jass! spy! Imagine, Hammam, imagine that days forced you to trade a great man like a Kulaib for a trivial insect like a spy. espionage Impossible, impossible, and a thousand impossible. For a man as great as Kulaib, an entire tribe must be annihilated. How many tribes can belong to one blood with the Bani Bakr, there must be at least a hundred tribes, in order for them all to be destroyed in exchange for the blood of Kulaib. Whoever is related to the spy and his family must die.
Hammam: What are you going to do to me then?
Zeer: You? And what is your relationship with you? You're my brother, aren't you...?

It appears from the speech that the speaker (Salim Al-Zeer) violates the quantum rule; He provided information that contained some exaggeration and exceeded the required amount, and this can be specified in the following statements:
So all those who are going to die have awakened.
- Don't you know that I will not spare any of the Bani Bakr? Or is it possible to keep one of them after Kulaib's death?
In return for a man as great as Kulaib, an entire tribe must be annihilated. How many tribes can be attributed to one lineage with Bani Bakr, there must be at least a hundred tribes; To be exterminated in exchange for the blood of Kulaib.

And the exaggeration in the speech - here - was not from the daughters of chance, but came with a purpose, which is: to demand revenge, and not to retreat in it.

Accordingly, we find the repetition strategy: "Jassas, Jassas, Jass...", and "Impossible, impossible, and a thousand impossible" among the strategies that the speaker violated this rule. In sum, it is an increase, and this increase is one of the features of the speech, as the speaker (Zeer) wanted in the first load to belittle the extent of Jass, but he did not declare this intention, depending on others' understanding of him (Hammam and Hyenas). Recalling the previous

knowledge of (Jassas), we find that he is a weak, deceitful, treacherous person who has no opinion, and no one testified to him about chivalry...etc, while in the second payload he intended to glorify the slain (Kulaib) as the center of revenge. That is why the change of (Zeer) from the statement to the allusion was logical.

The speaker in his speech contradicted: "Imagine, Hammam, imagine that the days would force you to barter a great man like a dog for an insect as trivial as a spy." The rule of quality; Because he said something contrary to reality, by describing Jassas as (the insect). The attraction in the speech is that the speaker does not mean that small invertebrate animal, and the context does not suggest that, and here it is likely that the speaker intended the damage caused by a spy after killing a Kulaib, given that the act of the insect and the act of a spy are similar to harming the other. The intent may be to demean Jass and undermine him. It is this intent that is recommended by the research; For the reason - I find it nice - is that the maqam is a place of rapprochement between Kulaib and Jassas; That is, between a king, and a follower of a king. The active self in the production of the discourse (Zeer) glorified a Kulaib based on the bond of brotherhood, and despised Jassas; Because it is the basis of the red flag. And if we look at Al-Zeer's answer to Hammam's question, "You? What is your relationship with you? You are my brother.. we find it inappropriate for the position, and therefore it is a violation of the rule of occasion, which states the following: Let your words have an appropriate connection. In order to find the connection between them, there must be the ability to Preparing premises to infer contextual implicatures (Sperber and Wilson, 2016: 216)
This can be determined as follows:
- The speaker resorted to the technique of asking "You? And what is your relationship to you?" It indicates that there is nothing about Hammam.
The phrase "You are my brother" indicates that "Hammam" is the same as "Kulaib".
- The person who is in the status of a Kulaib does not fall into the circle of revenge, or the connection with a bodybuilder.

In sum, the Zeer is not expected to kill Hammam; Because it is beyond the limits of revenge. This intention is what is required in the discourse, and accordingly, we decide that the previous answer is appropriate and relevant to the matter.

Among the conversational reception in the series (Salem Al-Zeer) is the following speech (Hatem Ali, 2000: pp. 28:13):
Al-Zeer: What are you saying? My name go, where?

Al-Yamamah: To her husband, Ibn Murrah.
Al-Zeer: And did Shaiban go with her?
Shaiban: No, uncle, I did not go. I also came to see you, and to reassure you.
Al-Zeer: What will you be sure of?
Shaiban: On our revenge. Will you reconcile?
Al-Zeer: We reconcile! Listen to this ridiculous poetry that I uttered, but promised me that you would not narrate it on my tongue, so I will tell you both; To be sure of what you are asking about:
God does not reconcile among us those who reconcile them until the wolf of the goat reconciles its shepherd.
The green mule is born without a male   and you live from the dust and meet it
A sheep is milked from its teeth with milk   and a she-camel rushes, not grazing its pastures.

It appears from the following loads:
To reconcile...
The mule is born...
and you live...
Milk the sheep...
The camel speeds up...
that the transmitter violates the quantum rule; Because he intended to stretch the answer, and he could have stopped at the beginning of the transmission: (May God not be right from us..); Because it has all the news. This excessive reporting led him to violate the rule of quality; He said words lacking sincerity; Which means that he was not impartial in reporting; That is because the wolf - in fact - is not, O good shepherd of goats, and the mule gives birth to a male, and the sheep is milked from its udder, and the camel has a pasture in which it is reassured. The lack of integrity of the sender resulted in a violation of the rule of occasion, by assigning inappropriate meanings to the previous loads of the speech, and then it is a departure from the cultural tradition of the Arabs, with evidence that the producer of the speech considered this suggestion as absurd, and he stipulated that the participating parties should not narrate it on his tongue at the moment of uttering it.

The intention that (Al-Zeer) wanted behind the violation of the previous rules is: Refusal to make peace with Bani Bakr. We reached this intent through a series of inferences, or prerequisites, and they can be determined by the following:
(God does not reform) Banishment
Denial is equivalent to lying loads: until the wolf of the goats reconciles with its shepherd...
Lying payloads leads to refusal of reconciliation.
Refusal to compromise means refusal.

So, the rejection is the necessary and intended meaning, and on the basis of this meaning, the recipient (Shayban) understood the discourse, and took into account that the speaker (Al-Zeer) respects what is shared between them, and does not try to mislead him.

Among the conversational implicature is what was stated in the following speech (Hatem Ali, 2000: p. 29):

Bear witness against me, my brother, and bear witness against me, our women and our families: I pledge my brother: I will not care about amusement, and I will not care about drinking, and I will not smell perfume, and I will not be accused of oiling; Until every drop of Kulaib's blood took a man from Bani Bakr.

In this speech, the speaker violated the rules of quantity and style, and this can be determined as follows:
In his saying: I will not care about amusement, and I will not care about drinking, and I will not smell good, and I will not be accused of oiling... He begged in negative sentences without positive in presenting the news, knowing that negative sentences from a deliberative point of view are less useful when telling than their positive interviews (Leach, 2013:p. 134) ; This means that the speaker, in this case, violates the first branch of the quantum rule. This, if true, does not apply to previous loads. Because the speaker used the definitive negation, and gave a decisive answer to the partners, which prompted the scarcity of the news, however, he did not get rid of the trap of breaching that rule; Because he meant in the speech the repetition of the definitive (will not), and then it exceeded the required limit. What it means here is to prove the sincerity of the intention, and to establish a state of harmony, or what is called homogeneous harmony (Zenati, 2013: p. 154) between himself and revenge; Because the zeer before that was a drunkard who frequented bars, etc., and this does not fit with the custom of revenge. Because whoever demands revenge is supposed to have his mind in his head, and he knows where he is leading the tribe; That is why the zeer determined the instruments of ecstasy that he would take off; To be worthy of revenge. Perhaps exaggerating the final payload (until I take...) is another way to violate the quantum rule. The speaker here intends to deliver a message of ontological dimensions to embassies or media outlets, that he is in the process of retribution, and does not want to accept blood money.
As for the breach of the rule of style, its example is the detail in the loads; That is why (Al-Zeer) had to be brief and say: I will leave the amusement, and avenge my brother. But his desire for detail is due to a main reason, which is revenge itself, given that the killing of

(Kulaib) represents the base and focus of events, so the summary here may not correspond to the weight of the event (Kulaib's killing), and the partners may be worse, and in the end they may accuse the actor (Al-Zeer) of regression, or undo the punishment.

Among the conversational implicature is what was stated in the following speech (Hatem Ali, 2000: pp. 27:46):

Al-Zeer: How long have I been with you?

Abu Ghatfan: More than ten years ago.

Al-Zeer: Woe, ten years, ten years, and I am unaware of your revenge, Kulaib.

Ghatfan: Or will you resume your war?

Al-Zeer: Will I forget Kulaib's blood?

Abu Ghatafan: I heard that you killed many of your firstborn enemies.

Al-Zeer: I killed so many Bani Bakr by their Lord that I wept, and no one cries for them.

Abu Ghatafan: Or what is enough?

Al-Zeer: By God, I would not consent to killing them, so that I would cheer up a virgin wherever they are.

In the discourse, we find the linguistic subject (Al-Zeer Salem) violating the quantum rule by repeating the load of "ten years", and his intention - here - is to reprimand himself, unaware of the revenge (Kulaib). This matter with the partners' notes is normal - in the event that we recall the injury of the Zeer, as a result of which he lost his memory – but in the words of the Zeer it is not normal, rather it is a spleen; For this was his repetition of the load of justifications intent.

We also find the speaker in his saying: "Have I forgotten Kulaib's blood?" violates the appropriate rule; His answer to the partners is inappropriate, and not specific. In order to be relevant, we assume that the speaker does not want to mislead the listener, when he used the question in the sense of negation. Denial - here - is related to the question; Because it is a threat of revenge, and then not to resume the war.

On the basis of this assumption, we acknowledge that the answer is appropriate and has an indisputable relationship with the question. In this regard, Sperber believes that appropriate and relevant information is information that contributes to improving the overall representation of the world (Sperber and Wilson, 2016: 132).

The contemplator in the discourse finds the speaker intentionally violating the rule of style. In his saying: "Has he forgotten the blood of Kulaib" he used one thing, and intended another meaning; That is, he used an interrogative, with the intent of negating. This deed is a kind of quarrelsome leads to lack of clarity. The breach in the rule also appears in his saying: "By their Lord," as it is possible that the word "Lord" refers to (to God), and it may be to (Kulaib), but this use is

justified from the deliberative perspective, so the speaker intended (Kulaib) on the grounds that it The master of Bani Bakr and their owner, and here he wanted to venerate him over all his people. The result of this proposition is the impossibility of God being the one who is meant in the discourse. The breach is also shown in his saying:

I killed the firstborn children of their Lord so many times that I wept, and no one wept for them.

By God, I would not be satisfied with killing them so that I would dazzle a virgin wherever they are found.

The speaker here was not righteous in summary, and he had to be brief, saying in the first place: I killed many of them, and in the second place: I was not satisfied with killing them. But the lack of brevity is a sign of reading the psychological atmosphere of the active self, which is panting after revenge.

Among the conversational implicature in (The Al-Zeer Salem series) is what was stated in the following speech (Hatem Ali, 2000: pp. 21:31):

Al Jalila: In this war we only met occasionally.

Al-Zeer: Is there a need for us to meet?

Al-Jalila: I said: Perhaps some mercy remained in his heart.

Al-Zeer: The killing of my brother Kulaib removed mercy from my heart.

Al-Jalila: Why do you insist on talking as if you were the only one who lost his brother? Don't you know how many brothers I've lost so far? And how many of them did you kill? Did you forget that today I lost a brother?

Al-Zeer: I haven't forgotten, Jalila. I haven't forgotten. The talk of grudges and revenge suits me better than your talk of mercy.

Al-Jalila: Even me, do you want to avenge me?

Al-Zeer: If you were a man.

Al Jalila: But I am not a man. I am a woman as you can see, so what do you do?

Zaire: Nothing.

In this speech, the speaker (Zair) violates the rule of quality, specifically in his saying: "Killing my brother Kulaib removed mercy from my heart," as he attributed to killing something that was not one of his requirements, and here the speech lost the condition of honesty from the first sight, but if we examine the load from the side Deeper, we find that the speaker intends to deliver a message to the hearer and therefore, he is cooperating with him. The speaker's intent - based on the data of the station - is to block the ways of peace for his opponents, thinking that the venerable one is trying to entice him to peace, and that is by talking about mercy. Zeer accounts.

And the one who reflects on the interrogative loads:

Why do you insist on talking as if you were the only one who lost his brother?
Don't you know how many brothers I've lost so far?
How many of them did you kill?
Did you forget that today I lost a brother?
He finds that the venerable violates the rule of style in its third branch, which states to avoid brevity. What it means here is to drag (Al-Zeer) to the peace area, and try to win him over. These questions are openly disclosed. To reduce the revenge, which ate the green, and the dry.

We also note in the speech: "I did not forget, O Glorious one. I did not forget. And the talk of grudges and revenge suits me more than your talk about mercy" that the speaker violated the rule of quantum, so that he answered more than what was required of him, and he had to give a specific answer "I did not forget, O Jalila"; In order to maintain the relational thread between him and his partner. But the increase in the news came with a purpose, and it was not from the daughters of arbitrariness, as the Zeere - as it seems - does not recognize reconciliation, and looks for revenge as an eternal act, accomplished by the sword, not by forgiveness, or the acceptance of blood money, and this of course contradicts the hadith of (the venerable) about mercy. In sum, they are two opposing poles: one pole begging for mercy to end the revenge, and another one squabbling over it to continue it.

Intuition leads us to the fact that the answer of (Al-Zeer) "If you were a man" was not appropriate to the question of (Al Jalila); Therefore, we must find something that restores the relationship between this dissonant correspondence in the payloads of discourse. Here, in addition to the linguistic system, custom interferes in finding the link between the question of the venerable and the answer of the zeal, as custom does not allow revenge against the woman for reasons including: the woman's weakness in confrontation or the killing of the woman inflicts the blood of shame among the people and they may accuse him of cowardice.. .etc. And based on the custom of revenge, the intent that (Al-Zeer) waved at is to refuse to kill the venerable, or take revenge on her.

CONCLUSION

Language forces its users to speak in an indirect manner in the situations that the discourse requires. Implicature is one of those indirect methods, as it occurs by violating or exploiting the rules. When the speaker resorts to violating, he does not aim to mislead the listener, but rather wants to convey more than what he says, based on previous knowledge and

experiences between them. And the speech of revenge - here - even though it was produced in a hot incubator, its owner (the Zeer) communicated more to the conflicting parties with them than he says, and he waved to his intention, and for this, the necessity is an intentional principle, which does not look to arbitrariness, or what is known in the phrase thus found something.

The examiner of the discourse of revenge finds it walking in two forms: one that glorifies Al-Zeer, as a legendary hero, and another that places him in the corner of the crime; Because what he did is considered a violation of human beings, and a departure from the norms, and therefore, his speech can be classified among the speeches of extermination. The killing of (Kulaib) represented the main incubator for this discourse, as it contributed - that is, the killing - to his intellectual nourishment, and had an impact even on the speech's producer (the zeer), specifically, what I called a personalization coup, because the zeir before the revenge was a madman, a lover of wine. And women, and soon after that, turned into a person, who kills randomly, we don't know what he wants, until the situation reached him, he wants a live Kulaib, and this is undoubtedly a utopian practice, which has no place on the ground.

RESEARCH RESULTS:
After this presentation, the search produced the following results:
1- Conversational impulse is a complex phenomenon in daily communication, as it is not easy to read the thoughts of others.
2- Conversational Implicature is a theory that belongs to intent, not to arbitrariness.
3- Grace quoted the branching rules of the principle of cooperation from two different philosophies: the first represented by Aristotle and the second by Kant.
4- The spoken text is the text that is relied upon in the study of Implicature and other deliberative statements.
5- The speech of revenge can be classified within the terrorist discourse because it is a violation of human freedom.
6- The character of Al-Zeer Salem after the murder of his brother Kulaib can be considered a bloody criminal, like the character of Napoleon, Hitler...etc.

REFERENCES
1. Adrawi, A. (2011). Conversational necessity in linguistic circulation from awareness of the specifics of the phenomenon to setting the laws governing it. 1st Edition. Rabat: Dar Al-Aman, Rabat.

2. Abdel Rahman, T. (1998) Tongue and balance or mental proliferation. Casablanca: The Arab Cultural Center.
3. Adwan, M. (2000). Al-Zeer Salem series (Abu Laila Al-Muhalhal), written by: Mamdouh, directed by: Hatem Ali, Syria, 2000, episodes 1-40 on YouTube https://www.youtube.com
4. Ali, M. (20014). Introduction to Linguistics. Beirut: United New Book House.
5. Asheer, A. S. (2012). When we communicate, we change a cognitive pragmatic approach to communication mechanisms and pilgrims. 2nd Edition. Morocco: Africa of the East .
6. Ermenco, F. (1998). The deliberative approach. translated by: Dr. Said Alloush. Rabat: National Development Center.
7. Hammadi, A. S. (1997). Customary and Conversational Necessity: A comparative study between Grace and the Shafi'i School: Kuwait: Kuwait University, College of Graduate Studies.
8. Hammami, R. (2013). Relevancy and consistency of discourse: Presented by Dr. Abdullah Soleh. Beirut: United New Book House.
9. Ismail, S. (2005). Grace's intentional theory of meaning. Kuwait: Annals of Arts and Social Sciences.
10. Khalifa, H. A. (2013). The Conversational Waving Theory between Modern Linguistics and Linguistic Investigations in the Arab-Islamic Heritage. Beirut: Library of Lebanon Publishers.
11. Leach, G. (2013). Principles of pragmatism. translated by: Kinnin Abdelkader. Morocco: Africa East.
12. Nahle, M. (2011). New Horizons in Contemporary Linguistic Research: Cairo: Library of Arts, Cairo.
13. Oricione, C. K. (2008). Implicit. Beirut: Translated by: Rita Khater, revised by Dr. Joseph Shreim, The Arab Organization for Translation.
14. Ramos, Y. F. (2014). Introduction to the study of interchangeability: the principle of relevance and the theory of relevance and interpretation. translated and presented by: Yahya Hamdai. Baghdad: Nippur House, Iraq.
15. Rupaul, A. & Mochlar, J. (2003). Deliberation today is a new science in communication: . translated by Dr. Seif El-Din Daghfous, d. Muhammad Al-Shaibani, Beirut: The Arab Organization for Translation.
16. Sperber, Dan & Wilson, D. (2016). Relevancy or Appropriation Theory in Communication and Perception. translated by: Hisham Ibrahim Abdullah Al-Khalifa, review: Firas Awad Maarouf. Beirut: United New Book House.
17. Zenati, G. (2013). Philosophy on its way. 2nd Edition. Beirut: New United Book House.