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ABSTRACT

Authors use language to create their characters' physical descriptions, their (un)spoken emotions, and their relationship to other characters. The dialogue between characters is the most explicit way of letting the readers know what is happening in the story. But even in fictional conversations, characters may say one thing, but mean something else - they can mean the opposite of what they say, or imply something else, which often leads to a more accurate description of who they are. The characters' language use affects other characters and the story, creating interpersonal tensions and lending suspense to the plot, which keeps the reader's interest. Readers visualize and relate to these fictional people who (if authors do their jobs well) conversationally behave just like real people. Conversational implications can be analyzed to see how and why characters say what they do. When a character speaks in a certain way, such as not giving all of the information requested or holding back information, that character creates a "conversational portrait" - those deliberate uses of language and the meanings and repercussions of their words which pinpoint the personality of that character. These "conversational portraits" can
then be examined through Pragmatic analysis.

How can Pragmatics help make sense of fictional characterizations? Before this question can be answered, let's understand how Pragmatics makes sense of the language of real people. According to his textbook, PRAGMATICS, Jacob Mey writes: "Pragmatics is the science of language in relation to its users. That is to say, not the science of language in its own right, but the science as it is used by real, live people" (5). So why use Pragmatics for people who aren't real? Neil Bennison, in his analysis of Anderson, Tom Stoppard's "Professional Foul" protagonist, offered a "valuable starting point" for discussing characterization and Pragmatics first put forth by William Downes: "A real person is a theoretical entity for his interpreters, to which they assign those intentions that make sense of what he does. A character in Drama is an analogy of a person and is interpreted in the same way" (79-80). Bennison analyzed Anderson's conversational behavior and applied Pragmatic theories to demonstrate how Stoppard created a realistic, believable character who became an unlikely hero.

Pragmatics can examine how characters' language uncovers their complex actions and motivations. Paul
Grice’s Cooperative Principle Maxims are traditional Pragmatic classifications that have been used to analyze literary characterization. Rong Chen used Conversational Implicature and Cooperation along with Gricean Maxims to shed light on the thoughts and motivations of the jurors in Reginald Rose's post-courtroom drama, "Twelve Angry Men."

Actions and motivations are good starting points for discussing characterization, but uncovering a character’s personality that develops throughout the story seems like the next logical step, revealing how and why the character does things a certain way, or feels the need to do something else. I will apply Paul Grice's Maxims of conversational behavior to JANE EYRE's dialogue to build a Conversational Portrait of Jane Eyre. Grice’s Maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation and Manner will help me pinpoint Jane's motives and thoughts (as well as those she perceives of other characters) which her narration does not always directly spell out, and reveal her personality as it develops throughout the story. It would be impossible to cover all of the novel’s dialogue - even just Jane’s dialogues - in 50 pages, but I will include many examples of her dialogues to give as complete a Conversational Portrait as I can.
Here is a brief example of analyzing JANE EYRE through Grice: Jane visited Mr. Rochester, her former employer who wanted to be her husband, after she learned his wife died in a fire she started, and he was blinded and crippled while trying to save her. He did not see Jane enter his chamber, but upon hearing a woman’s voice and thinking she was the maid, he asked (in the second to last chapter):

“This is you, Mary, is it not?”
“Mary is in the kitchen.” (Bronte 441)

Jane violated the Gricean Maxim of Relation. It was not really necessary for Jane to tell where Mary was, only to confirm whether or not she was Mary. Jane chose not to say “I am Jane Eyre,” because she knew Rochester harbored no illusions of her coming back to him after learning of his lunatic wife on what was almost their wedding day. Jane’s rejection of him burned as hot as the fire that injured him (Berg 107). She knew Rochester would be shocked and unable to believe her if she had directly said who she was, so she first revealed herself to him by letting him hear her voice, which he could believe was hers since blindness prevented him from seeing her entering his parlor.

Jane’s conversational portrait now includes skillful
manipulation of withholding information without hurtful intent. Jane also held the direction of the conversation, in fact, she dominates this conversation with Rochester without resorting to the "oppressive societal condition," which her master and lover used to hold sway over their earlier talks and nearly put Jane in a terrible predicament (Mey 313).

I will divide my paper into 6 chapters. Chapters 1 and 2 will analyze young Jane’s conversational portraits at home in Gateshead and at school in Lowood. I will show how Jane grows up and her portrait expands as she becomes both servant and lover at Rochester’s manor Thornfield in Chapter 3. Jane fleshes out her portrait at her preacher cousin’s home, Moor House, in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 will present Jane’s strong, subtle portrait at Ferndean, Rochester’s lodge, where they make their home. I will construct Jane’s Conversational Portrait in the final pages, showing how that portrait of her Gricean Maxim violations reflect her mature personality.
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INTRODUCTION

Jane Eyre was a heroine who overcame her meager social standing to become a wealthy and happily married wife, mother and artist. According to Maggie Berg’s **PORTRAIT OF A LIFE**, Jane’s search for herself was spelled out through her use of the autobiographical form (9). I saw that Jane’s character and heroism came not from the autobiographical narrative, but from her evolving use of language. As she grew up, so did her language. And as her language grew, she defended herself from characters who tried to make her accept that she could never improve her social standing.

The idea of Jane’s evolution through language led me to examine her dialogues with the other characters in her story. She often went against what others expected from her when she spoke to them, and revealed aspects of her maturing personality in those conversations.

I analyzed several of Jane’s dialogues and applied H. Paul Grice’s Conversational Maxims, along with other Pragmatic principles like Implicature and Politeness, to create a Gricean Conversational Portrait. This portrait would help link breaks with Gricean Maxims to the developing emotions and motivations of a willful girl who
became a wise woman who survived and thrived in 19th Century English society. I used other Pragmatic forms along with Grice to give additional input of specific Maxim violations - for example, using Brown and Levinson’s research on “saving face” to help explain a Manner Maxim violation (Mey 72). I will use “breaks” and “violations” interchangeably throughout this paper. Although fifty pages could not cover all aspects of Jane’s growing maturity through Gricean violations, I gave as much detail and character as I could in the violations presented in this paper.

The four basic Gricean Maxims Jane violated throughout her story are Quantity, Quality, Manner and Relation. The Quantity Maxim says to make your contribution to the dialogue as informative as possible, and do not make the contribution more or less informative as required. The Quality Maxim says do not make your contribution false or without sufficient evidence. The Relation Maxim says make your contribution relevant. Finally, the Manner Maxim says make your contribution easily understood, brief, orderly, avoiding ambiguity and obscurity (Mey 65).

I waited until the near-end of this paper to compare Jane’s violations of Grice and implicit uses of language, or implicatures, with other literary characters who also
demonstrated effective Gricean Maxim breaks. I found that a linguistically mature Jane had much to offer in terms of characterization when compared with other characters who violated Grice and revealed parts of their personalities not found in the form of autobiography or the narration. I looked to the research of Rong Chen, Neil Bennison and Paul Simpson to find other effective Maxim breakers: the justice-seeking Juror #8 of TWELVE ANGRY MEN, Professor Anderson, the protagonist and reluctant hero of Tom Stoppard’s PROFESSIONAL FOUL, and the manipulative Professor and his unaware Pupil in Eugene Ionesco’s THE LESSON.

I followed Jane’s pilgrimage of Gricean violations from girlhood to womanhood, starting from her childhood residence at Gateshead, to Lowood, her boarding school of eight years - and then to her future employer’s home at Thornfield, to Moor House, home of Jane’s last surviving relatives - and lastly, on to Ferndean, her master’s new home, which she also made her home. (I attempted to show as much of the dialogue as possible, but some quotes were edited for space.)
CHAPTER ONE: GATESHEAD

Jane grew up at Gateshead Hall with her Aunt Reed and cousins John, Eliza and Georgiana. (Jane’s relationship with the Reeds was a less-than-happy one, and she chose not to reveal that they were her relatives until Chapter Two.) As the story opened, Mrs. Reed sent 10-year-old Jane away from the drawing-room, and would not send for the girl until the nurse, Bessie, reported that Jane was behaving herself. Jane, however, felt she had done nothing to warrant dismissal.

“What does Bessie say I have done?” I asked.

“Jane, I don’t like cavillers or questioners: besides, there is something truly forbidding in a child taking up her elders in that manner. Be seated somewhere; until you can speak pleasantly, remain silent” (Bronte 6).

Jane violated the Quantity Maxim by not leaving the room quietly, and she broke the Relation Maxim in questioning Mrs. Reed’s dismissal by asking about Bessie. Mrs. Reed did not like Jane questioning her orders, and she disliked Jane’s bluntness even more. Jane’s question forced a conversation Mrs. Reed neither expected to hear nor welcomed. Jane did not know that children were not supposed to question their elders, and certainly not in such a blunt manner. She did not even know how to ask her
question in a tactful manner. However, Mrs. Reed was largely to blame for Jane’s Gricean violations.

Mrs. Reed had no interest in preparing Jane in the ways of middle-class speech; she felt Jane’s low social status did not justify her being taught to speak like a middle-class girl (Mey 157). Mrs. Reed kept Jane ignorant of middle-class conversational skills and mores, then punished Jane for her lack of them, creating Jane’s linguistic “catch-22.” She could criticize her niece’s unexpected and audacious response, unnatural and unbecoming in a child, confirming in her mind that Jane could and would never behave like a “normal” child (King 4).

Jane did not know that she lacked tact and other middle-class mores, but she was aware that the Reeds would never treat her as a conversational equal. Yet when she spoke up for herself, Mrs. Reed later said Jane had “broken out all fire and violence” in her tenth year after spending the first nine being “patient and quiescent under any treatment” (Bronte 243). Jane’s power of speech unsettled her aunt. Later, when Jane turned on her cruel cousin, John, Mrs. Reed ordered the servants to lock Jane up in the Red Room, the bedroom of her late uncle, whom Jane believed haunted the room. (After that incarceration, Mrs. Reed
sought to control Jane’s newfound power of speech by isolating her as much as possible from the family.)

Jane was locked in the Red Room a second time and passed out. Mrs. Reed later summoned a servants’ apothecary to examine Jane. (It might have seemed out of character for Mrs. Reed to send for a doctor to see Jane, but then if Jane complained to him about her or her son, it would be Jane’s word against hers.) Jane was relieved to see Mr. Lloyd; he was “an individual not belonging to Gateshead, and not related to Mrs. Reed” (Bronte 18).

Mr. Lloyd asked Jane what made her so unhappy, and she allowed herself a pause before she answered:

“...I have no father or mother, brothers or sisters.”

“You have a kind aunt and cousins.”

“But John Reed knocked me down, and my aunt shut me up...”

“Don’t you think Gateshead Hall a very beautiful house? Are you not thankful to have such a fine place?”

“It is not my house, sir; and Abbot says I have less right to be here than a servant.”

“Pooh! you can’t be silly enough to wish to leave such a splendid place?”

“If I had anywhere else to go, I should be glad to leave it; but I can never get away from Gateshead till I am a woman” (Bronte 23).
Jane took time to think her answers through, rather than give an answer goaded by negative emotion, as with her blunt question to Mrs. Reed. This was the first time Jane exercised an adult constraint on her speech: she sacrificed speaking up for herself immediately, but gave a more careful, considerate, tactful answer (Mey 264). This constraint helped her break Gricean Maxims in a more positive manner to Mr. Lloyd; he was convinced that she had a definite wish to leave the Hall.

Jane violated Gricean Relation by telling what Mrs. Reed and John did to her. She did not address Mr. Lloyd’s comment about the Reeds’ relationship with her. If Jane had given a harsher yet truer answer - “My aunt and cousins are unkind, and do not treat me as a member of the family,” it would have sounded incredible to the physician; why else would Mrs. Reed summon him if she was unkind to her niece?

According to Brown and Levinson’s research on Politeness, Jane lessened Mr. Lloyd’s negative face (her family hated her) with this implicature: “The Reeds do not really care for me, they have hurt me without just cause, and would be happiest were I not here” (Mey 72).

Jane’s remark about Gateshead Hall violated Gricean Relation and Quantity. She did not address Mr. Lloyd’s
questions of the splendor of the Hall or her thankfulness to be living there. When she said Gateshead was not her home, her implicature is simple: "I am not at home here, and I would be happiest away from here." She added a comment of little relevance to Mr. Lloyd, but of great relevance to herself. Miss Abbott, Mrs. Reed’s personal servant, locked Jane up in the Red Room with Bessie’s aid, on the orders of their mistress. Abbott shared Mrs. Reed’s middle-class repugnance of this penniless girl. Jane implied that if even a servant could look down on her, then she had no wish to remain as a resident of the Hall.

Jane’s “womanly” final statement violated Gricean Quantity. She finished her last sentence with the idea of being unable to leave the Hall until she was “a woman.” This statement represented Jane’s first attempt to think of herself beyond a penniless and hated orphan girl. She was now able to conceive of herself as an adult, not a child that needed the doctor to rebuke her childishness with a “pooh” statement. A young, thoughtful Jane considered things her often enraged self never imagined: when Mr. Lloyd asked her if she wanted to go to school, Jane thought it over before deciding school would be better than Gateshead.

Mr. Lloyd eventually recommended that Mrs. Reed send
Jane away to school. As loathe as she was to teach Jane anything, Mrs. Reed was even more loathe to send Jane someplace where her lower-class existence could improve with education. She wrote to Mr. Brocklehurst, the harsh schoolmaster of Lowood, and he came to Lowood to interrogate Jane.

As Jane told him which books of the Bible she enjoyed, he asked:

"And the Psalms? I hope you like them."

"No, sir."

"No? Oh shocking! I have a little boy...and when you ask him which would he rather have, a gingerbread nut to eat, or a verse of a Psalm to read, he says: 'Oh! The verse of a Psalm! angels sing Psalms;' [he then] gets two nuts in recompense for his infant piety."

"Psalms are not interesting," I remarked.

"That proves you have a wicked heart; and must pray to God to change...your heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh" (Bronte 32-33).

Jane not only received no instruction in middle-class conversational ways, she also received no Biblical instruction from her supposedly Christian Aunt Reed (Imlay 82). But Jane enjoyed reading, and she strongly identified her sufferings with Old Testament stories of persecuted people - and their deliverances via God's wrath.
However, Jane’s self-administered Biblical training did not include Psalms, which Brocklehurst considered an important book of the Bible. His fervor for the Psalms seemed commendable, but the story of his young son belied his unchristian hypocrisy: he rewarded his son for the answer he wanted to hear, rather than finding out if his son truly understood the lessons of Psalms (King 15). Brocklehurst’s question and anecdote set up his implicit expectation: tell me how much you love Psalms, and I will call you a good child. (However, Mrs. Reed later told Jane that she had written to Brocklehurst, falsely implicating that Jane told lies. So even if she had tried to tell Brocklehurst what he had wanted to hear, he would have accused Jane of telling him what he wanted to hear. Jane would have been in jeopardy of a second linguistic “catch-22” – whatever she said risked getting her deeper into trouble with the other speakers.)

Jane’s disinterest in Psalms upheld Gricean Quality – she was being truthful – but was socially inappropriate because her version of the truth was not the same as Brocklehurst’s version of the truth. She did not know that she needed to repeat his hypocrisy to win his favor. She plainly told him the most truthful answer based on her
experience.

Jane violated Gricean Relation in the same way she bluntly questioned Mrs. Reed; she turned the flow of conversation from Brocklehurst’s panegyrics of the Psalms towards a conversation he did not welcome: this upstart little girl’s speech had convinced him of her wickedness.

Brocklehurst and Mrs. Reed verbally abused Jane for a few more minutes before Brocklehurst left Gateshead. After he left, Mrs. Reed abruptly ordered her to leave the room. An indignant Jane, heartsick at the prospect of a miserable school life, and disgusted by the outright mental and emotional abuse she had just endured, retaliated with this verbal assault:

“I am not deceitful: if I were, I should say I loved you, but I declare I do not love you: I dislike you the worst of anybody in the world except John Reed; and this book about the liar, you may give to your girl, Georgiana, for it is she who tells lies, and not I.”

“What more have you to say?”

“I am glad you are no relation of mine: I will never call you aunt again as long as I live. I will never come to see you when I am grown up; and if any one asks me how I liked you, and how you treated me, I will say the very thought of you makes me sick, and that you treated me with miserable cruelty.”

“How dare you affirm that, Jane Eyre?”
“How dare I, Mrs. Reed? How dare I? Because it is the **truth**. You think that I have no feelings, and that I can do without one bit of love or kindness; but I cannot live so: and you have no pity. I shall remember how you thrust me back—roughly and violently thrust me back—into the red room, and locked me up there, to my dying day; though I was in agony; though I cried out, while suffocating with distress, 'Have mercy! Have mercy, aunt Reed!' And that punishment you made me suffer because your wicked boy struck me—knocked me down for nothing. I will tell anybody who asks me questions this exact tale. People think you are a good woman, but you are bad; hard-hearted. You are deceitful!” (Bronte 36)

Jane broke the Gricean Quantity, offering so much retributive anger and passion beyond Mrs. Reed’s demand for Jane to affirm her statements. She also violated the Quality Maxim several times during her speech. Jane hyperbolized Mrs. Reed as the “worst of anybody in the world,” (except John), and, for the first time in her young life, passed judgment on both of these people who hated her, and who she hated with great fervor. She swore she would never call Mrs. Reed “aunt” ever again, to make the old lady suffer the torment of being coldly and pitilessly treated as she had always treated her niece. Jane also used hyperbolic language (“agony,” the “rough and violent” incarceration in the Red Room) to metaphorically convey her terror at being wrongly imprisoned with cruel and unusual
punishment.

The old lady was now afraid of Jane. Jane’s speech helped Jane burst free from all of the Reeds’ attempts to make her a quiet, passive lower-class slave of middle-class mistreatment. Mrs. Reed sent the violent young girl away to Lowood a few days later.

However, Jane also realized her scorn was as damaging to herself as it had been to Mrs. Reed. Pat MacPherson looked to John Conolly’s assessment of the origins of female insanity - Jane was in danger of losing restraint over her passions. MacPherson feared that a madwoman would take residence in young Jane’s emotional attic, a Bertha Mason full of frustrated and combustible passions, unless Jane found a method of self-control she would never achieve at Gateshead. (7). (As Jane’s life unfolded at Gateshead, young Edward Rochester, later Jane’s employer and lover, married the real Bertha, unaware of the sorrow she would bring him and Jane in later chapters.)

**SUMMARY OF THE GATESHEAD VIOLATIONS**

Jane Eyre’s Gricean Conversational Portrait starts with a rather brazen pencil outline of Maxim violations.

Jane broke the Relation Maxim three times. Her first Relation break directly addressed Mrs. Reed for the first
time, wanting an explanation for her punishment instead of just accepting it in passive silence. Jane showed Mr. Lloyd that she could not relate to living at Gateshead because it was not her home, and she knew that no one really wanted her there. She bluntly disrupted Brocklehurst's hypocritical anecdote about the Psalms by telling him the truth that she knew, not the truth he expected to hear.

Jane broke the Quantity Maxim four times in three of the four dialogues. Young Jane did not obey Mrs. Reed quietly; she questioned the old lady outright. Jane unleashed her fury when Mrs. Reed used Brocklehurst to destroy Jane's hopes for a happy and better life at school. Jane's first Quantity breach to Mr. Lloyd revealed she could not want to stay at a grand home where even the servants could openly revile her. Her second Quantity breach revealed a new Jane that, for the first time, saw herself past beyond her childhood sufferings. She didn't say "until I am older" - Jane said, "until I am a woman." The so-called "bad girl" had taken her first steps towards an adult sense of self, and towards her literary destiny as a feminist heroine.
Jane did not break the Manner Maxim - her bluntness prevented unclear or vague speech. Jane wanted everyone to know exactly what she thought, and to that end, she was successful. Her bluntness never won any arguments, and she didn’t achieve many friends, but she was always clear.

Jane broke the Quality Maxim in her last dialogue with Mrs. Reed. Jane’s anger toward her aunt in the last dialogue was mentally and emotionally justifiable, but she used childish anger. Her numerous Quality (truth) violations exacted an “eye-for-an-eye” revenge of Gricean untruthfulness. When Jane thought the situation over, her untruthful revenge proved an unsatisfactory way of dealing with her problems because she felt guilty in how she treated Mrs. Reed. Jane’s budding adult self wanted a better way of addressing bad situations.
CHAPTER TWO: LOWOOD

A few days later, Jane came to Lowood, her new home for the next eight years of her life. She began to learn about the school routines, and made friends with an older girl named Helen Burns. Jane was baffled by Helen’s unwillingness to speak up against Miss Scatcherd, a teacher who constantly punished Helen ranging from justifiable reasons such as not paying attention to class lectures to seemingly insignificant reasons like not cleaning her fingernails. Jane, anxious to identify with another girl who, to her, appeared excessively and unjustly faulted, told Helen that she would retaliate against people who treated her bad, and show love to those who treated her well. Helen told Jane the New Testament way of dealing with enemies:

“Love your enemies; bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate you and despitefully use you.”

“Then I should love Mrs. Reed, which I cannot do; I should bless her son, John, which is impossible” (Bronte 58-59).

Jane violated Gricean Relation by saying how Christ’s mandate in Matthew 5:44 would alter her relationships with both Mrs. Reed and John, rather than directly address the mandate. If she had given a harsher answer closer to what
she felt for the Reeds - "I cannot ever show them love, or bless them, or do good for them because they were cruel" - she would have risked losing Helen's sympathy, since Helen believed in forgiveness, and Jane did not wish to offend her new acquaintance. Jane minimized her feelings towards the Reeds so that Helen would not think Jane was completely impolite (Mey 69).

Jane also violated Gricean Quality in her sarcastic answer of loving and forgiving the Reeds. Her apparent unwillingness to forgive them was impolitely implied. However, she did not completely destroy all politeness, again, to keep Helen's sympathy. Jane's use of both considerate Politeness and sarcastic Expressiveness (plus her verbal irony of forgiving people she did not want to forgive) demonstrated her growing sophistication with adult speech strategies as semantic and linguistic double ironies in one sentence (Chen 36).

After three months at Lowood, Jane accidentally broke her slate during Mr. Brocklehurst's inspection, drawing his attention to her. He then warned the school and his family of her supposedly bad behavior, and she was left alone on a stool as punishment. Later, Helen came by to comfort Jane.
“Helen, why do you stay with a girl whom everybody believes to be a liar?”

“Everybody, Jane? Why, there are only eighty people who heard you called so, and the world contains hundreds of millions.”

“But what have I to do with millions? The eighty people I know despise me.”

“Jane, you are mistaken: probably not one in the school either despises or dislikes you: many, I am sure, pity you much.” (Bronte 69)

Jane violated Gricean Quality in both sentences. She believed Brocklehurst had turned all of Lowood against her, and successfully turned her Lowood life into a hellish existence (Berg 48). Her overwrought passions led her to claim “everybody,” or at least, the eighty people at Lowood, believed her to be a liar. Jane did not intend to include Helen in her “everybody” and “eighty people” statements (she knew Helen believed her), even though Helen was part of “the eighty people” and part of “everybody” who heard the claims. Jane gave in to her feelings of persecution, and she violated her linguistic truthfulness.

While Jane violated her truthfulness, she felt she was being truthful in being vocal about her feelings. Jane liked Helen a great deal, but was constantly amazed how Helen would never try to speak out against ill treatment. Jane also heard how Helen ended many discussions (“I live
in calm, looking toward the end,” “...death is so certain an entrance to happiness—to glory”) but did not realize until later how Helen’s calm suggested a self-sacrificing martyr (MacPherson 46-47). Although Jane respected Helen’s Christian nature, she viewed Helen’s martyrdom as a total repression of Helen’s own passionate nature (King 22). Jane could not die quietly to injustice, as she had bluntly told herself, “I was no Helen Burns.” Jane felt that her own ragings against injustice, though childish and often linguistically untruthful, were not better than Helen’s approach, but were better than Jane trying to adopt Helen’s quiet martyrdom, as Mrs. Reed had hoped Brocklehurst could impose on Jane.

Brocklehurst’s pompous, God-like pronouncements had mortified Jane. But Helen told Jane that the students and teachers disliked Brocklehurst, and were more sympathetic to Jane. The girls talked for a while longer until the kind superintendent, Miss Temple, found the girls and asked them to join her in her room. As Helen sat near the fire, Miss Temple asked Jane:

"Is it all over? Have you cried your grief away?"

“I am afraid I never shall do that.”
"Why?"

"Because I have been wrongly accused; and you, ma’am, and everybody else will now think me wicked."

"We shall think you what you prove yourself to be, my child. Continue to act as a good girl, and you will satisfy me."

"Shall I, Miss Temple?"

"You will...and now tell me who is the lady whom Mr. Brocklehurst called your benefactress?"

"Mrs. Reed, my uncle’s wife. My uncle is dead, and he left me to her care."

"Did she not, then adopt you of her accord?"

"No, ma’am, she was sorry to have to do it: but my uncle, as I have often heard the servants say, got her to promise before he died, that she would always keep me."

"Well now, Jane, you know, or at least I will tell you, that when a criminal is accused, he is always allowed to speak in his own defence. You have been charged with falsehood; defend yourself to me as best you can. Say whatever your memory suggests as true; but add nothing and exaggerate nothing" (Bronte 71).

Jane’s first two Gricean Quality violations – she could “never” cry her grief away, and “everybody else” would think of her as wicked – were again driven by feelings of persecution. Miss Temple wanted to hear Jane’s account of events, so Jane’s mind was back on herself again. Jane did not intend to include Helen into the
"everybody else" who now thought Jane was a bad girl, because Helen had already convinced Jane that she did not believe what the schoolmaster had "weakly and pompously repeated at second-hand from Mrs. Reed" (Bronte 70). Jane’s agitated feelings implied her fear that the students and teachers would despise her, even though Helen had told her that Brocklehurst was not revered, or even liked, by the people of Lowood.

Jane also violated Gricean Quantity when she told Miss Temple about the servants’ statement concerning Mrs. Reed’s vow to keep Jane in accordance with Mr. Reed’s dying wish. Miss Temple did not ask for the additional information about the servants, but Jane offered the servants’ statement to give Miss Temple more context as to why Mrs. Reed would not willingly act as a loving guardian for her orphaned niece.

Jane’s other phrases offered Miss Temple additional context about her less-than-loving relationship to Mrs. Reed. Mrs. Reed was "sorry" to have to be responsible to take this child of no money and social standing into her home. However, Mrs. Reed was not apologetic; the "sorry" in Jane’s context meant that Mrs. Reed felt it a great social and emotional imposition on her part to have to take
this child into her home and her care.

Mr. Reed got “his wife” to “promise” to take care of Jane. Jane did not say “my aunt,” in part because she was honoring her vow to Mrs. Reed never to call (or even refer to) her as her aunt. The implicature here was that there was no real sense of familial love between Jane and Mrs. Reed, so Jane simply referred to Mrs. Reed as “my uncle’s wife.” As for the “promise,” while “promise” and “vow” may often be regarded as synonyms, they were not the same thing, as Mrs. Reed was concerned.

According to Jacob Mey, “promises” lend an implication that they can be made, and are often broken, usually between two people, without much criticism. “Vows” are more solemn pledges, usually in the presence of more than two people (wedding vows, for example), and can not – and SHOULD not be broken without much deliberation and thought (171). Jane said Mrs. Reed “promised” her husband to take care of Jane, implying that her aunt felt that her husband’s dying wish was not enough of a reason or impetus to want to take loving care of Jane.

Jane retold her unhappy childhood at Gateshead without her bitter resentment, and found, to her surprise, her “restrained and simplified” tale “sounded more credible.”
After Jane and Helen's visit, Miss Temple wrote to Mr. Lloyd, and his account corroborated Jane's "defence" (Bronte 71). She assembled the school and cleared Jane from Brocklehurst's allegations. Jane's grief was alleviated, and she blossomed in school. Two months later, a typhus plague killed nearly half the student population, Helen Burns among them. Benevolent and wealthy individuals relocated the rest of the school population into better living conditions and shared Lowood's authority with Brocklehurst.

Jane later became a teacher, then obtained a governess position. Before leaving Lowood, she received a visitor from Gateshead: her former nurse, Bessie, and Bessie's little boy, Robert. Although much of Jane's childhood had been grim, she knew that her best times at the Hall had been spent with Bessie, even though the nurse had been powerless to protect Jane. After Bessie updated her on the Reeds, Jane asked:

"Did [Mrs. Reed] send you here, Bessie?"

"No, indeed: but I have long wanted to see you, and when I heard that there had been a letter from you, and that you were going off to another part of the country, I thought I'd just set off, and get a look at you..."
"I am afraid you are disappointed in me, Bessie." I said this laughing: I perceived that Bessie’s glance, though it expressed regard, did in no shape denote admiration.

"No, Miss Jane, not exactly: you are genteel enough; you look like a lady, and it is as much as ever I expected of you: you were no beauty as a child."

I smiled at Bessie’s frank answer: I felt it was correct, but I confess I was not quite indifferent to its import...

"I dare say you are clever though," continued Bessie, by way of solace..." (Bronte 92-93)

Jane violated Gricean Relation with her “disappointed” answer to Bessie, which did not directly relate to Bessie’s wanting to see her before she left for her governess post. Jane liked Bessie better than anyone at Gateshead, so she was more inclined to cater to Bessie’s positive face (Do you not believe I have improved for the better?) to preserve Politeness than she would have done for the Reeds (Mey 72).

Jane answered Bessie’s “frank” and “correct” response with a smile that implied agreement, but it also betrayed a kind of Manner Maxim violation. Jane had accepted that she was not beautiful, though it still pained her to hear that. Her smile was vague enough to imply a nonverbal agreement with Bessie, while concealing her unhappiness towards her
lack of looks.

(This was the only time I mentioned a nonverbal Gricean violation in this paper, because I wanted to keep this paper focused on Jane’s verbal Gricean breaks. I kept it since it appeared in the dialogue. I will also include this violation in my assessment of Jane’s Lowood violations and the ending Conversational Portrait analysis.)

However, Bessie saw how Lowood changed Jane from the "queer, frightened, shy, little thing" she nursed back at Gateshead into a gentile lady of accomplishments (Bronte 39). Jane was gratified to hear that kind of compliment from Bessie. Jane was already pleased that she had accomplished so much in her eight years at Lowood, and a compliment even from someone at Gateshead served as welcome praise, not sole affirmation of her self worth.

**SUMMARY OF THE LOWOOD VIOLATIONS**

Jane only violated the Manner Maxim in her smile that outwardly agreed with Bessie but also felt sadness about her lack of beauty. However, her statements still remained free of ambiguity and vagueness.

Jane broke the Quantity Maxim four times at Gateshead, but only once at Lowood: to tell Miss Temple about how she came into Mrs. Reed’s care, but not into her affections.
Jane broke the Relation Maxim three times at Gateshead, and only two times at Lowood. Her Gateshead violations only alienated Mrs. Reed, but, with Mr. Lloyd, she asserted herself as a woman. Her Lowood violations actually showed some of her first attempts at humor, in the form of sarcastic comments about the Reeds, and her "disappointed" answer to Bessie. Ironically, these Relation breaks emotionally bonded Jane to her unhappy past, in the form of sarcastic retort (she should love and bless her enemies) and in catering to positive face (Have I not improved?) Mrs. Reed had sent Jane to Lowood hoping that Jane would never thrive at school; Jane instead added Irony to her growing middle-class speech repertoire.

Jane broke the Quality Maxim twice at Gateshead - not repeating Brocklehurst's hypocrisy, and lashing out at Mrs. Reed. Her sarcasm served as one of five Quality Maxim violations at Lowood. Her angry, childish emotions dominated her truthfulness, as she found the idea of forgiving the Reeds impossible.

Her other violations came from including Helen and Miss Temple as part of everyone who believed Brocklehurst's lies about her, and how Jane could "never" be assuaged of that grief. Jane had hoped to make a good impression on
her teachers and fellow students, but she always dreaded the day when Brocklehurst would eventually make good on his threat to ruin her before all of Lowood. When he finished, Jane felt that he had succeeded because everyone left her after her punishment ended. She acknowledged that they had all gone into the refectory for tea time, but her grief led her into a mania of persecution — everyone abandoned me, and will never want any part of me thanks to him — which compromised her truthfulness.
CHAPTER THREE: THORNFIELD

Jane set out for Millcote and her post at Thornfield Hall. She took on the job of educating Adele Varens, the nine-year-old French ward of English landowner Edward Rochester, who was not at Thornfield during her arrival.

One evening, Jane went to post a letter at nearby Hay Common when a rider’s horse was felled by ice along the causeway, injuring its master in the process. Despite the rider’s insistence that he required no help, she refused to leave him, until she saw that he could mount his horse and ride off. The rider finally looked at her and said:

“I should think you ought to be at home yourself, if you have a home in this neighbourhood; where do you come from?”

“From just below; and I am not at all afraid of being out late when it is moonlight: I will run over to Hay for you with pleasure, if you wish it; indeed, I am going there to post a letter” (Bronte 116).

Jane violated the Quantity Maxim by confessing she was not afraid of being out late, volunteering to seek help for him, and telling him her initial reason for being out: the letter. Jane was intrigued by this new stranger in her life, and with his accident, there was just cause in offering to fetch help from Hay. She felt a sense of pleasure in offering her assistance to someone completely
new to her, to take part in an adventure away from her
governessing tedium and in passing a nice but passive
evening with Mrs. Fairfax, the kind housekeeper.

Jane was also glad of the opportunity to make a new
acquaintance without someone like Mrs. Reed or Mr.
Brocklehurst around to pronounce judgment on her and ruin
the stranger’s opinion of her before she had the chance to
make a first impression.

Jane also mentioned the letter, since she was already
en route to Hay. She showed consideration for the
stranger’s plight, and implied that he was not unduly
imposing upon her if he needed help. She was also not
afraid of him, and she let him know that she had no fear of
being alone, and could make her way back to Thornfield.

Jane helped the rider back to his horse, who urged her
to post the letter and return home as soon as she could.
Upon arriving at Thornfield, she learned the identity of
the rider in Hay Lane - her employer, Mr. Edward Fairfax
Rochester.

Two months after his arrival at Thornfield, Mr.
Rochester’s bed was mysteriously set on fire. Jane was
able to revive him and put out the fire. He seemed to know
how the fire started, but he told Jane not to tell anyone
what had happened, saying that he would make up a story about it for the servants. In gratitude, they shook hands, but then Rochester continued to hold her hands in his own.

"I knew," he continued, "you would do me good in some way, at some time;—I saw it in your eyes when I first beheld you...My cherished preserver, good-night!"

Strange energy was in his voice; strange fire in his look.

"I am glad I happened to be awake," I said:

"What! you will go?"

"I am cold, sir."

"Cold? Yes,—and standing in a pool! Go, then, Jane: go!" But he retained my hand, and I could not free it. I bethought myself of an expedient.

"I think I hear Mrs. Fairfax move, sir," said I.

"Well, leave me:" he relaxed his fingers, and I was gone (Bronte 154).

Jane violated the Relation Maxim three times in her dialogue with Rochester. Her "awake" comment had nothing to do with anything he said to her. His language full of "strange energy" sounded more than just the relief of a grateful master to his employee. Jane was not really certain how to answer Rochester's abundant gratitude, because his gratitude sounded like more than gratitude. She could not guess his exact emotions. She found it hard
to accept affection from him, since she believed their age and class differences made his having any feelings for her impossible. Even though he stood there holding her hands and speaking to her in a far beyond grateful manner, she did not fully understand his "strange energy," and she had no other concrete proof to convince her that he cared for her at all.

She tried to bring him back to dispassionate speech which would return them back to a socially acceptable appearance of the employer addressing his servant, so that he could dismiss her and allow her to return to her room. Her second Relation violation, "I am cold" had nothing directly to do with his question, "What? you will go?" Her violation implied that she would not go until he ordered her to, because she felt that as Rochester’s servant, she did not have the liberty of leaving him until he permitted her to quit his presence.

In a more concerted effort to compel Rochester into releasing her without losing face or overstepping Politeness, Jane lied about hearing Mrs. Fairfax moving. It was the first time she had ever "bethought herself this expedient" (Brontë 154). Since he would not let her go of his accord, she used the lie to remind Rochester that he
wanted to preserve an appearance for Mrs. Fairfax and the other servants in the morning, and standing in his room holding her hands was no way to preserve appearances. Her Quality violation worked: at last, he dismissed her.

Days after the attempt on his life, Rochester invited a small party of gentlemen and ladies to Thornfield, including Blanche Ingram, the young lady everyone believed he would marry. (No one at this point in the story was aware that Rochester was already married, except for Mr. Mason, who was mortally wounded by his crazed sister, and was tended to and sent away by Rochester to recuperate.)

As Rochester continued to happily entertain his other guests, Jane received news that John Reed had killed himself and that Mrs. Reed was dying. Rochester granted her leave to return to the old lady.

Jane believed that her old wounds of resentment and bitterness had been healed by the Christian forgiveness she had learned at Lowood. She even hoped that her childish outburst would be forgiven. But Mrs. Reed was in no forgiving mood. In a fit of delirium, she demanded,

"[A]re you Jane Eyre?"

"I am Jane Eyre."
I have had more trouble with that child than anyone would believe. Such a burden to be left on my hands—and so much annoyance as she caused me, daily and hourly, with her sudden starts of temper, and her continual, unnatural watchings of one's movements! I declare she talked to me once like something mad, or like a fiend—no child ever looked or spoke as she did; I was glad to get her away from the house. What did they do with her at Lowood? The fever broke out there, and many of the pupils died. She, however, did not die: but I said she did—I wish she had died!"

"A strange wish, Mrs. Reed: why did you hate her so?"

"I had a dislike to her mother always..." (Brontë 235)

Jane violated the Quality Maxim in her question to Mrs. Reed. Unlike her very first question to Mrs. Reed, Jane now possessed the comparable conversational skills to deal with Mrs. Reed on a more civilized and less blunt manner. Jane wanted to know why Mrs. Reed hated her, so she exercised another constraint on her speech by withdrawing her feelings from the conversation, instead of relying on them to dominate her speech. She allowed her aunt the space to answer the question as if it had been put to her by anybody but Jane Eyre. For years, Mrs. Reed had snubbed Jane of a reciprocal adjacency-pair exchange: she had refused to answer many of her lowly niece's questions (Mey 245). The adult Jane's willingness to be considerate
towards her aunt, at the sacrifice of her own feelings, led
Mrs. Reed into giving Jane the answer to her question.

Days later, after Mrs. Reed seemed to regain control
of her mental faculties, Jane seized the opportunity to
speak with her again. Mrs. Reed revealed she had twice done
Jane wrong. She admitted to breaking the promise to her
husband to adopt Jane. She also admitted to deceiving
Jane's rich Uncle Eyre (who had wanted to adopt the girl)
by writing to him, saying Jane had died of typhus at
Lowood, to prevent her niece from coming into wealth. Jane
appealed to Mrs. Reed:

"If you could but be persuaded to think no more
of it, aunt, and to regard me with kindness and
forgiveness---"

"You have a very bad disposition, and one to this
day I feel it impossible to understand: how for
nine years you could be patient and quiescent
under any treatment, and in the tenth break out
all fire and violence, I can never understand."

"My disposition is not so bad as you think: I am
passionate, but not vindictive. Many a time, as
a little child, I should have been glad to love
you if you would have let me; and I long
earnestly to be reconciled to you now: kiss me
aunt."

I approached my cheek to her lips: she would not
touch it. She said I oppressed her by leaning
over the bed; and...the glazing eyes shunted my
gaze.
“Love me, then, or hate me, as you will, you have my full and free forgiveness: ask now for God’s and be at peace” (Bronte 243).

Jane broke the Relation Maxim in her first sentence. Her pleas for Mrs. Reed to forgive and forget the past related to none of Mrs. Reed’s actions against her, or even Mrs. Reed’s assertion that Jane was her tormentor. Jane was more concerned with reconciling with her aunt so that her aunt could die in peace, rather than absorbing more of Mrs. Reed’s verbal abuse and being angry at that abuse.

Jane broke the Quantity Maxim in her second sentence. She added to her claims about her disposition the idea that she could have loved Mrs. Reed, and that she genuinely wanted her forgiveness. (On pages 234 and 241, Jane addressed her as Aunt Reed, thinking that there was no sin breaking the childish vow swearing she would never again call Mrs. Reed Aunt.) Jane continued to offer to Mrs. Reed every opportunity to reconcile with her.

Jane broke the Relation Maxim in her last sentence. Mrs. Reed continued to act coldly toward Jane. Jane at last stopped trying to persuade her, but she answered her aunt’s impenetrable silence with her forgiveness. The total absence of her old childish anger and sarcasm demonstrated truthfulness. Jane said she forgave her, and
genuinely meant it.

After Mrs. Reed died, and her surviving cousins went their separate ways, Jane returned to Thornfield. Jane, by this time, was deeply in love with Rochester, but she did not believe that he loved her. She did not tell him because she did not believe that a wealthy gentleman could have any interest in a poor little governess like her. She was ready to leave Thornfield when he married Blanche Ingram. As they discussed his marriage and her departure, Rochester insisted:

“No; you must stay! I swear it—and the oath [of marriage] shall be kept.”

“I tell you I must go!” I retorted, roused to something like passion. “Do you think I can stay to become nothing to you? Do you think I am an automaton? —a machine without feelings? and can bear to have my morsel of bread snatched from my lips, and my drop of living water dashed from my cup? Do you think, because I am poor, obscure, plain, and little, I am soulless and heartless? You think wrong! —I have as much soul as you, —and full as much heart! And if God had gifted me with some beauty, and much wealth, I should have made it as hard for you to leave me, as it is now for me to leave you. I am not talking to you now through the medium of custom conventionalities, or even of mortal flesh:—it is my spirit that addresses your spirit; just as if both had passed through the grave, and we stood at God’s feet, equal, —as we are!” (Bronte 257)

Jane violated the Quantity Maxim in her long speech claiming herself as Rochester’s equal in terms of heart,
soul and spirit. She was unhappy and angry that Rochester asked her to remain in his household after his marriage; such an arrangement would force her to abandon any and all hope of achieving his love. She saw herself forced to view her beloved master as someone who thought she had no feelings of any value, echoing the Reeds' middle-class snobbishness towards her as a child, and denying her adult heart, soul and spirit (MacPherson 56-57).

Jane decided that she could not allow Rochester to see her as nothing more than his paid servant (although at Gateshead, she was considered less than a servant). She did not just tell him she could not stay in his household; she told him many of her thoughts and feelings she had been keeping to herself ever since Blanche's arrival at Thornfield. Her declaration differed from her outburst to Mrs. Reed in that she was not just letting her emotions direct her speech. Jane used bald assertions - clear, concise statements generally less concerned with preserving Politeness ("You think wrong!" and "we stood at God's feet, equal!") to passionately defend her spiritual equality with Rochester regardless of their social inequality (Simpson 184). Her bold statements showed Rochester that Jane Eyre was indeed capable of deep, passionate love for him.
Jane also reversed the status of wealth and power when she told Rochester how she would have acted towards him if God had given her the middle-class conventions of beauty and wealth. At first glance, this statement seemed to follow her childish "eye-for-an-eye" response to enemies, but she was not implying that Rochester was her enemy. Rochester understood Jane's Lowood-based implicature based on Matthew 7:12 - "You ought to do unto others as you would have them do unto you," as he later quoted an analogous proverb, Matthew 7:1-2 - "...with what judgment [you judge you] shall be judged" (Bronte 299).

Jane did not use God to verbally assault Rochester. Her Lowood education had helped her language retain deference to her master and lover while at the same time expressing her deep love for him.

Rochester saw and wanted her spirit, and he could appreciate the value of her heart, soul and feelings (MacPherson 56). He then told her of how Blanche had called off the marriage, and convinced a skeptical Jane that he wanted her as his wife. Eventually, she agreed to marry him.

One evening, Jane coaxed him into singing for her, and he played and sang a song that ended on the romantic notion
that the lovers would die together. As Rochester finished, she asked,

"...whom he was going to marry now?"

“That was a very strange question to be put by his darling Jane” (Bronte 277).

Jane violated the Quality Maxim in an effort to offset her discomfort towards Rochester’s selfish ideas about her while still finding humor in the situation. Although Jane loved him dearly, she was uncomfortable with Rochester’s sultan-like attitude towards her. She resented his redefining her as either the lover upon whom he could lavish jewels and clothes, likening her to a enslaved harem girl, or as an angel that could purify him of all his past sins - including one damaging sin Rochester was hiding up in his attic (Berg 75). Jane had no wish to be viewed as anything other than just what she was: Rochester’s young governess with whom he happened to be in love.

The governess knew he wanted to marry her, but she decided not to cooperate with his illusions. She asked a "pragmatically ambivalent" question by implying that Rochester had decided to marry someone other than her. This way, she could diffuse the tension of the moment with humor (Bennison 96). She successfully pulled Rochester
"I care for myself. The more solitary, the more friendless, the more unsustained I am, the more I will respect myself. I will keep the law given by God; sanctioned by man. I will hold to the principles received by me when I was sane, and not mad—as I am now. Laws and principles are not for the times when there is no temptation: they are for such moments as this, when body and soul rise in mutiny against their rigour; stringent are they; inviolate they shall be. If at my individual conscience I might break them, what would be their worth? They have a worth—so I have always believed; and if I cannot believe it now, it is because I am insane—quite insane: with my veins running fire, and my heart beating faster than I can count its throbs. Preconceived opinions, foregone determinations, are all I have at this hour to stand by: there I plant my foot” (Bronte 322).

Jane violated both the Relation and the Quantity Maxims in her last long Thornfield speech. Rochester did not ask her, “Who cares for you?” In fact, her own feelings asked that question, and she answered herself before addressing his question, violating the Relation Maxim.

Jane’s violation of the Quantity Maxim asserted her freedom from Rochester’s hope that her feelings would overrule her conscience and her speech. But she had progressed too far in her maturity to allow her feelings to ever again completely dominate her command of speech or her principles. Rochester, defeated by Jane’s maturing command of her language and indomitable sense of self, reluctantly
allowed her to quit his presence. She fled from Thornfield before morning, taking a carriage with her last money. After the carriage left her at Whitcross, Jane realized too late that she had accidentally left her few possessions behind on the carriage, and found herself completely estranged from home, family, love, and employment. Her desertion of Rochester forced Jane to face homelessness, and a possible rainy death.

SUMMARY OF THE THORNFIELD VIOLATIONS

Jane did not violate the Manner Maxim. She found no need for vague speech. She could be direct with Rochester without intruding on Politeness or overstepping her position as his servant. Rochester welcomed speaking with her, and she prized their honest and direct dialogues.

Jane’s Quality violations of lying about Mrs. Fairfax’s presence and not reinforcing her identity to the raving Mrs. Reed showed Jane’s consideration of other people’s feelings as well as her own. She did not know exactly how Rochester felt, but she felt awkward: he did not want her to go even though he told her goodnight. She spared them both of them the embarrassment of their strange conversation. In the case of Mrs. Reed, Jane knew that she would rebuff her if she reinforced her identity on her
aunt. She instead distanced herself from Mrs. Reed’s insults, allowing her to rant without Jane feeling the sting of childish offense and anger.

Jane’s third Quality violation stemmed from teasing Rochester by asking him who he was going to marry that would “die in nameless bliss with him,” as suggested by his love sonnet (Bronte 277). She saw her passion for him and her goodness of heart misrepresented by his “slave/angel” song. Her Quality violation used humor to alleviate her discomfort and showed considerateness and respect for herself. She would not sacrifice her self-respect by making her language amenable to his illusions.

Jane’s six Relation violations showed consideration for Aunt Reed (forgive me; even you cannot forgive, I have forgiven you), Rochester (I’m glad I could assist you; I should allow you to dismiss me; I can remind you of our positions so that you will be able to dismiss me) and herself (I can care for myself, even if I must live without you).

Jane also violated the Quantity Maxim five times, once with Mrs. Reed, and four times with Rochester. She knew her aunt would die, but she made one last attempt to reconcile the enmity she felt for Jane, since Jane had long
since renounced her childish anger for her. Her violations in the Rochester dialogues showed him much about Jane’s nature. She was afraid of no one, and also helpful and trustworthy. She was as capable of love and was her master’s equal. She was incapable of violating her principles by being his mistress. She was also willing to leave Rochester to save their individual respects, as well as their respect for each other, even if that meant leaving the man she loved – a man who truly loved her, in spite of his questionable behavior.
CHAPTER 4: MOOR HOUSE

A destitute and rainsoaked Jane found herself on the doorstep of Moor House, home of the Rivers family. The young master, Rev. St. John Rivers, allowed her into his house, over his housekeeper's objections. His sisters, Diana and Mary, offered her some food. Jane told them her name was Jane Elliott, violating Gricean Quality, in order to keep them from discovering her connections to Rochester and Thornfield. She feared that her story would sound incredible to the family, and remained silent on other questions, violating Gricean Quantity. However, her refusal to give details was also partly due to malnutrition and fever. (I will talk about these Maxim breaks again at the end of the chapter.) She finally admitted to St. John:

"Sir, I can give you no details to-night."

"But what, then, do you expect me to do for you?"

"Nothing," I replied...Diana took the word:--

"Do you mean," she asked, "that we have now given you what aid you require? and that we may dismiss you to the moor and the rainy night?"

"I will trust you. If I were a masterless and stray dog, I know that you would not turn me from your hearth tonight: as it is, I really have no fear. Do with me and for me as you like; but excuse me from much discourse—my breath is short—I feel a spasm when I speak" (Bronte 343).
Jane violated the Relation Maxim by openly placing her trust among these new people. Diana had not asked her if she trusted them, but Jane felt it necessary to assert herself as someone who was imposing on their kindness, in a reversal of her gladly offering help to the injured Rochester in Hay Lane. Jane even compared herself with a stray dog in order to pose no threat on the family’s positive face (your charity rescued me as it would have rescued a stray dog) (Mey 72).

The Rivers siblings understood her implication: they were not faced with a beggar, as the housekeeper had initially thought, but a woman as civilized and well-educated as all of them, but in desperate need of refuge. The family decided to keep Jane with them, until St. John found her a new occupation as the mistress of his new school for girls.

After she closed the school for Christmas, St. John told Jane that her uncle John of Madeira had died and made her sole heiress of his twenty thousand pound fortune. St. John also revealed that he, Diana and Mary were Jane’s cousins, which also endowed Jane with a legacy of caring relatives. Jane immediately resolved to split the inheritance with her newly discovered family, over St.
John’s objection that she was acting impulsively - even though he understood her logic of dividing her fortune. When he mentioned the idea of Jane’s wealth possibly leading to marriage, she declared she would not marry again, leading St. John to object:

“That is saying too much; such hazardous affirmations are a proof of the excitement under which you labour.”

“It is not saying too much: I know what I feel, and how averse are my inclinations to the bare thought of marriage. No one would take me for love; and I will not be regarded in the light of a mere money-speculation. And I do not want a stranger--unsympathising alien, different from me; I want my kindred: those with whom I have full fellow-feeling. Say again you will be my brother: when you uttered the words I was satisfied, happy; repeat them, if you can, repeat them sincerely.”

“I think I can...your tastes and habits resemble Diana’s and Mary’s; your presence is always agreeable to me, in your conversation I have...found a salutary solace. I feel I can easily make room in my heart for you as my third and youngest sister” (Bronte 394-95).

Jane did not break the Quality Maxim, although it looked as though she had broken it. When she was at last able to give an account of herself, Jane implied that marriage would not be a welcome prospect in her life. But Jane still loved Rochester, in spite of the discovery of his lunatic wife; and, as she earlier narrated about
Rochester, "No one will ever love me so again" (Bronte 365). But Jane could not marry him, and she ruled out any possibility of marrying another man, whom she believed would only marry her for her money.

Jane instead violated the Quantity Maxim when she asked St. John to reaffirm what he had said earlier, "Jane, I will be your brother--my sisters will be your sisters." Jane did not need him to repeat the words to reestablish the family link. Her Maxim violation gave St. John an adjacency pair sequence: she asked him to reaffirm his family ties to her, and she waited for his reaffirmation to complete the sequence and confirm the reality of her being part of a family; something the Reeds never allowed Jane because they never wanted to consider her part of their family, until Mrs. Reed spoke out against Jane’s mother, her sister-in-law, eventually linking Jane to the Reed family (Mey 242, Bronte 235). St. John’s answer completed the adjacency pair, and she was satisfied.

This conversation also marked two very important misinterpretations between Jane and St. John. Jane asserted herself as someone who wanted family, not passion, as a new focus for her life. She had no interest in pursuing love and passion, however, she said this with an
implication that St. John misread. He redefined her as someone who had renounced passion for the charms of family and the hopes of a better life than the one she had left behind.

He had given Jane the news of her uncle's death and her fortune, he had revealed to her the Reed/Eyre/Rivers family lineage, he had given her employment when she could not find other work, and he had taken her into his home from the rainy night which Jane believed she would not survive. St. John's language began to betray a perception that Jane was indebted to him, since he had "played God" for her so many times (MacPherson 62). His preoccupation with evangelism, judgment and accountability of one's actions, combined with his "God-like" behavior for his new sister, forecasted an "inexorably deadly" change in his conversational and personal relationships with Jane (Imlay 57).

Jane, in turn, misinterpreted St. John. When they first met, she was a complete stranger to him. In time, he had found "a salutary solace" in her company by letting her into his confidence, particularly about his struggles with choosing a missionary's life and his feelings for the strikingly beautiful heiress Rosamond Oliver. Jane felt
quite comfortable in this discourse, as she had been with Rochester when he had taken her into his confidence. Jane and St. John’s conversational cooperation thrived because St. John treated her as someone unrelated to him. She had hoped that the discovery of their cousinship and adopted brotherhood and sisterhood would make St. John more willing to adopt her as both sister and conversational equal.

Afterwards, Jane was hurt when he did not honor his promise to treat her as a sister; St. John began to treat his sister more like a stranger. St. John only took Jane into his confidence once more, with his relief that Rosamond Oliver (who had loved him for so long, but he would not love) had decided to marry another man. Jane noted that “I was out of practice in talking to him: his reserve was again frozen over, and my frankness was congealed beneath it” (Bronte 402).

Six months after their cousinship was established, St. John took Jane for a walk. After half an hour of silence elapsed, St. John delivered a shocking proposal: he wanted her to be his missionary wife, and accompany him to India. Jane did not love him, and while his idea of a missionary life seemed a noble reason to leave England and Rochester forever, his idea of a missionary marriage was unbearable.
Jane knew he did not, and would never, love her, and the idea of marrying a man who could perform marital duties in loveless fashion appalled Jane. She felt that his callous yet supposedly Christian behavior as a husband would kill her faster than toiling under the hot climes of India.

Jane offered a counterproposal: she would agree to go with St. John to India if they did not marry. St. John rejected her offer by boldly distinguishing what he wanted from their marriage:

"...I tell you it is not the insignificant private individual—the mere man, with the man’s selfish senses—I wish to mate: it is a missionary."

"And I will give the missionary my energies—it is all he wants—but not myself: that would be only adding the husk and shell to the kernel. For them he has no use: I retain them."

"You cannot—you ought not. Do you think God will be satisfied with half an oblation? Will He accept a mutilated sacrifice? It is the cause of God I advocate: it is under His standard I enlist you. I cannot accept on His behalf a divided allegiance: it must be entire."

"Oh, I will give my heart to God, you do not want it."

I will not swear, reader, that there was not something of repressed sarcasm both in the tone in which I uttered this sentence, and in the feeling that accompanied it" (Bronte 413).

Jane’s respective Quantity, Relation and Quality
violations declared her sense of self, posing an unwelcome, and (in his mind) unchristian, rebellion against St. John’s religious bullying. He failed to realize how strongly Jane took spontaneous and selfish pleasures in teaching her Morton pupils, or in learning German with Diana Rivers, or in teaching drawing to Mary Rivers (Berg 101).

Jane took no pleasure in being a student of St. John, because he only saw (and approved of) her struggle to aid him in his labors, not in the part of herself that felt pleasure in her labors. There would be no place for her pleasures if she married St. John, because he saw Jane’s pleasures as “ties of the flesh” which, in his mind, compromised her ability to learn missionary labors and be his idea of a good missionary wife and teacher (Bronte 398). Her Quantity violation defended her right to take pleasure in her activities, whether she was working as a missionary or as a teacher and student. Although she always looked for God’s sanction in all of she did, she never totally separated her human pleasure from her actions (King 69).

Jane’s Relation violation answered St. John’s pompous disapprovals of her selfishness by answering his hypocrisy. He spoke to Jane as if he were God’s will incarnate,
demanding that she obey his version of God’s will. She ignored answering the words of his pompous speech, choosing not to answer a bad situation with anger, as Helen Burns had taught her back at Lowood.

When she was a 10-year-old child facing Lowood’s harsh schoolmaster, Jane did not know that only a hypocritical answer would earn approval. She now faced the handsome but harsh minister of the Morton Parish, and knew that the only way to earn his sanction was to go along with his plans for a missionary life without resistance. Jane chose not to seek St. John’s holier-than-thou approval by complying with his wishes. She saw in him a religious John Reed, who bullied her with religion instead of brute force, with his Brocklehurstian arrogance, an even more appalling version of Rochester’s “slave/angel” mentality – “be an unhappy, loveless servant for God now; be one of the chosen later.”

In time, Jane’s Christianity could forgive St. John’s misuse of God and perverse attempts to inappropriately claim her services and her life for her cousin’s “long-cherished scheme” (MacPherson 81, Bronte 416). Sadly, his hypocritical language made him unfit for Jane to wed.

Jane’s Quality violation asserted her dependence upon God and her independence from St. John. Her “repressed
sarcasm” differed from her sarcasm towards the Reeds at Lowood because she was not attempting to win over St. John as she had tried to win over Helen. Her youthful sarcasm was based on her unforgiving view of the Reeds, which proved unsuccessful with Helen because Helen could forgive the sinner while hating the sins. Jane used Helen’s behavior as a model for her own; she forgave St. John and despised the perversity of his behavior. However, she also retained her selfish displeasure – her sarcasm betrayed her resentment for St. John – as well as her selfish pleasure. This time, her language did not portray him as a flawed man: his own language revealed his hypocritical behavior.

SUMMARY OF THE MOOR HOUSE VIOLATIONS

Jane did not break the Manner Maxim in this section for two main reasons. In the beginning of this section, she wanted to give as clear and honest an account of herself to the new family who willingly took her in, so that they could see she was an honest and capable woman. Later on, Manner violations seemed unnecessary to Jane because St. John was acutely aware of what she said (although not everything she meant). Jane wanted St. John to know her strong, passionate objections to his idea of a loveless marriage.
I decided to talk about the Relation and Quantity violations together, because these violations said more about Jane’s language and character when separated by her legacies of money and family rather than by separate Maxim groupings. (Although I mentioned it in passing, her refusal to give an account of herself the first night was more an act of Jane showing considerateness for her own health before satisfying the family’s natural and expected curiosity about her.) Before her legacies, Jane looked to the Rivers family to accept her, first as a guest dependent on their charity with her first Relation break – you have saved me; do with me and for me as you will – then as a relation asking St. John to repeat the words of family ties with her first Quantity break – repeat the words, repeat them sincerely.

After her legacies, Jane’s language felt constrained because St. John treated her like a stranger once their relationship was revealed. Then, when St. John made his abyssal marriage proposal – although he considered his proposal sanctioned by God – Jane sadly discovered that St. John was the equivalent of every bad male influence in her life imposing on Jane’s character and integrity. Her second Quantity violation asserted her right to enjoy the
personal and spiritual joy in her labors and her private activities (I retain myself, of which you have no use, especially for marriage). Her second Relation violation rebelled against his hypocrisy (my heart is God's, not yours; you have no right to change, ignore or destroy it).

"Jane Elliott" violated Gricean Quality violation and forced her to give up truthfulness for her own personal safety and consideration towards the family to keep from the more incredible parts of her past.

Another Quality violation came from Jane's "repressed sarcasm" towards St. John's marriage proposal. She subtly expressed her growing resentment of him without entirely destroying Politeness, asserting her independence of him as both a Christian and a woman.
CHAPTER 5: FERNDEAN

Jane returned to Thornfield Hall, only to find it burned to the ground, as she had foreseen in a dream. The host of a nearby inn (a butler of Mr. Rochester’s late father) explained that rumors that circulated about a mysterious lunatic held at Thornfield. She asked:

“And this lady?”

“This lady, ma’am,” he answered, “turned out to be Mr. Rochester’s wife! The discovery was brought about in the strangest way. There was a young lady, a governess at the Hall, that Mr. Rochester fell in—”

“But the fire,” I suggested.

“I’m coming to that, ma’am—that Mr. Edward fell in love with. The servants say...he would marry her.”

“You shall tell me this part of the story another time,” I said; “but now I have a particular reason for wishing to hear about the fire. Was it suspected that this lunatic, Mrs. Rochester, had any hand in it?” (Bronte 434).

Jane violated Gricean Relation by bringing the host back to the subject of the fire, taking the focus of his story away from her involvement with Rochester. As she had done with the dying Mrs. Reed, Jane put herself aside to recall the host to her subject: the madwoman who set Thornfield ablaze.

Jane also violated Gricean Relation by not telling him
that she was the governess he was speaking of, because she feared he would not tell her any more information. As he went on, Jane rightly saw that he blamed her for causing Mr. Rochester’s despair. She exercised control over the conversation by revealing only what she wanted known (her interest in the fire), just as Rochester had done to her with Blanche and Bertha, and St. John had done to her in revealing Jane’s connection to his family and her late uncle’s inheritance.

Jane went to Ferndean Manor, Rochester’s lodge, and her widowed master. Once she convinced him that she was really in the room with him, and not a dream, they spent the evening together in his parlor. Still, Rochester continued to doubt that Jane would stay with him.

"Where is the use in doing me good in any way, beneficent spirit, when, at some fatal moment, you will again desert me--passing like a shadow, whither and how to me unknown; and for me, remaining afterwards undiscoverable?"

"Have you a pocket-comb about you, sir?"

"What for, Jane?"

"Just to comb out this shaggy black mane. I find you rather alarming, when I examine you close at hand..."

"Humph! The wickedness has not been taken out of you, wherever you have sojourned."
“Yet I have been with good people;...possessed of ideas and views you never entertained in your life: quite more refined and exalted.”

“Who the deuce have you been with?”

“If you twist in that way you will make me pull the hair out of you head; and then...you will cease to entertain doubts of my substantiality.”

“Who have you been with, Jane?”

“You shall not get it out of me to-night, sir; you must wait till to-morrow; to leave my tale half told, will, you know, be a sort of security that I shall appear at your breakfast-table to finish it” (Bronte 446).

Jane violated Gricean Relation to successfully take Rochester’s mind away from his gloominess back to his stern, gruff yet honest persona that Jane always found so appealing. In their earlier dialogues, Rochester held control over the topic and tangents of their dialogues. Jane now used Relation violations (the comb, being with good people, Rochester yanking his head) to direct their conversation. She piqued his curiosity as to what had happened to her in the past year to keep him from lapsing back into his morose mood. Her last Relation violation, her promise to finish her unfinished tale, kept him in suspense, and also served as a good place for Jane to end her tale so that she could rest after her long journey.

I contrasted this conversation with the last scene of
Tom Stoppard’s television play, PROFESSIONAL FOUL. The reluctant hero of the play, Professor Anderson, listened to Professor McKendrick’s smug outcome for another professor, Chetwyn, who was supposed to have traveled with them. Chetwyn had been detained by the Czechoslovakian police for possessing a dissident’s picture and papers. When asked why he had been searched, Anderson gave short answers to build up McKendrick’s suspense, whereas Jane used long tangents to build up Rochester’s suspense (Bennison 95).

Jane and Anderson respectively violated the Relation Maxim and the Quantity Maxim (his violations include “the police thought I had something”; “I did in a way”). Earlier, Anderson could not hold McKendrick’s suspense because McKendrick had caught him in a couple of awkward situations, just as Rochester had caught Jane in some awkward situations. In those instances, Rochester and McKendrick both held conversational dominance. Jane and Anderson reversed the dominance in their favors by violating Gricean Maxims to withhold information and keep their conversational partners in suspense.

Jane recounted her experiences at Moor House, and in particular, her relationship with St. John Rivers. Rochester at first did not believe Jane when she told him
that Rivers wanted to marry her. When she did, he gave her permission to leave, but Jane stubbornly refused, telling Rochester he would have to remove her himself. He mused:

"Jane, I ever like your tone of voice: it still renews hope...sounds so truthful. When I hear it, it carries me back a year...I forget that you have formed a new tie. But I am not a fool--go"

"Where must I go, sir?"

"Your own way—with the husband you have chosen."

"Who is that?"

"You know--this St. John Rivers."

"He is not my husband, nor ever will be. He does not love me: I do not love him. He loves (as he can love, and that is not how you love) a beautiful young lady named Rosamond. He wanted to marry me only because he thought I should make a suitable missionary's wife, which she would not have done. He is good and great, but severe; and, for me, cold as an iceberg. He is not like you, sir: I am not happy at his side, nor near him, nor with him. He has no indulgence for me--no fondness. He sees nothing attractive in me; not even youth--only a few useful mental points...I must leave you, sir, to go to him?"

"What, Jane! Is this true? Is such really the state of matters between you and Rivers?"

"Absolutely, sir. Oh, you need not be jealous! I wanted to tease you a little to make you less sad: I thought anger would be better than grief. But if you wish me to love you, could you but see how much I do love you, you would be proud and content. All my heart is yours, sir: it belongs to you; and with you it would remain, were fate to exile...me from your presence for ever" (Bronte 451-52).
Jane broke Gricean Relation by not telling Rochester right away that she was not marrying St. John, and intensified Rochester’s fears of her leaving by refusing to leave his knee. Rochester took Jane’s bait and did not pick up on the fact that Jane had no husband. He picked on Jane’s subtle innuendo that “the oath of marriage would be kept,” as he had once promised about Blanche Ingram. Jane’s manipulation of keeping Rochester from seeing his own innuendo in a slightly different manner demonstrated her ability to lovingly torment him as he had tormented her. Jane’s beautifully subtle language, plus her wealth, now enabled her to make it difficult for Rochester to accept losing her to someone else.

Jane, prompted by Rochester to go with “the husband she [had] chosen...St. John Rivers,” broke Gricean Quantity by going into St. John’s feelings for Rosamond Oliver and Rivers’ lack of feelings for her, just as Rochester had revealed to Jane how Blanche could never make a good wife. Finally, to quash further doubts about her love for him, Jane again broke the Quantity Maxim by going into a long speech about her love for her wounded but beloved master. Jane not only understood Rochester’s heart, but also his hold over her through his language choices. She took him
to the point of despair before allowing him to know the truth about Rivers, Rochester and herself.

I contrasted Jane and Rochester's exchange of conversational dominance with the exchange of dominance between the Professor and the Pupil of Eugene Ionesco's play THE LESSON. The female Pupil was allowed to dominate the dialogue early on by the Professor. Once he had her so lulled into a false sense of security in her conversational skills he carefully reversed the dominance in his favor and demolished his Pupil's confidence. (The Professor noted that he had broken many other pupils the same way, and had plans to break all others who came to him.) Rochester did interrogate Jane, and she politely responded to all of his questions. However, Jane intended only to tease her master with her Maxim violations, while the Professor deliberately planned all of his pupils' verbal demises (Simpson 180).

A few moments later, Rochester said:

"Ah! Jane. But I want a wife."

"Do you, sir?"

"Yes: is it news to you?"

"Of course: you have said nothing of it before."

"Is it unwelcome news?"
"That depends on circumstances, sir--on your choice."

"Which you shall make for me, Jane. I will abide by your decision."

"Choose then, sir--her who loves you best."

"I will at least choose--her I love best. Jane, will you marry me?" (Bronte 452-53)

In this dialogue, Rochester waited for Jane to take the initiative (read: responsibility) to make him hers, since she had emphatically declared her great love for him. He first began with "I want a wife." Jane answered with "Do you, sir?" - a Manner violation that said, "I do know that you wish to marry me" and preserved their romantic tension.

When Rochester asked if the news was welcome or not, he again waited for Jane to declare that she would marry him. Jane answered with two Quality violations: of course, they had previously discussed marriage, and the news was indeed welcome by Jane, because she knew that Rochester loved her and wanted to marry her. Both Quality violations continued to gently goad Rochester into him asking Jane for her hand in marriage. Rochester then said he would abide by her choice, prompting Jane to give him full responsibility - "Choose then, sir--her who loves you best." Rochester at last made a sincere proposal, and Jane accepted it.
I compared this conversation with the last three pages of TWELVE ANGRY MEN. Juror Eight, the compassionate, rational juror who had been fighting for the defendant’s right to a fair deliberation, now had only one piece of evidence to disprove: the old woman who reportedly saw the murder of a father by his son. He had convinced all but three jurors, Three and Ten, the two most hostile jurors, and also Four, the other rational juror who was not yet convinced of the defendant’s innocence.

Eight violated the Relation Maxim six times during the discussion of the old woman. As Two cleaned his glasses, Four asked him if they were a nuisance. Eight then asked what the jurors did to find out the time at night. Four listened to his chiming clock, and Two put on his glasses to see his clock. Eight then asked if Two wore his glasses to bed, to which Two replied that no one wore glasses to bed. Eight next pointed out that the old woman wore glasses. Nine and Eleven concurred that she wore strong bifocals. Even Four admitted that he had not considered this in his earlier assessment of her.

Eight’s first three Relation violations had everybody in agreement that the woman was in bed, at night when the crime took place, and that she wore glasses. Eight’s
fourth Relation violation did not address Four's change in his assessment. Eight told the jurors that even if the woman had been awake in bed and looking out her window the instant the crime took place, she could not prove the defendant had been the killer. He reasoned that she could not have had time to put on her bifocals to see the crime the instant she glanced out her window. The jurors agreed that the woman knew the boy and his father had been at odds with each other. But Eight proved that the flaw in her testimony could not directly link the boy to the crime.

As an angry Three tried to protest, Eight used two final Relation violations to address the room if anyone still thought the boy was guilty. Ten and Four believed at last there was a reasonable doubt. Three finally admitted his "not guilty" verdict only at the very end of the play, when the other jurors agreed with Eight's logic, and shook their heads in contemptuous pity at him.

Juror Eight used six Relation violations to argue the old woman's testimony and win over two reluctant jurors. Jane achieved her goal of a true proposal of marriage from Rochester by using a Manner violation to sustain the romantic tension instead of directly answering Rochester's desire for a wife. She also used two Quality violations to
put the sole responsibility of supplicating marriage on Rochester. He had lied to Jane about Bertha, and had been humbled by Jane’s desertion, the destruction of Thornfield and his crippled body. He knew Jane was the only hope he had now for true happiness, and he now proposed to her with no “slave/angel” illusions of her womanhood, and no mad wife hiding in his attic. Her Gricean violations helped her to overcome the criticism that she could never find or deserve true love and affection because she was a poor, plain and disconnected governess.

Jane and Rochester married, he regained part of his sight, and Jane bore him a son. She ended her story with comments on her family’s happiness, and updates on Adele and the Rivers family.

SUMMARY OF THE FERNDEAN VIOLATIONS

Jane violated the Manner Maxim with her answer (“Do you, sir?”) to Rochester’s desire for a wife (Bronte 452). Jane did not have to answer him directly, like a child to an adult; Jane was the adult, keeping him in suspense and preserving their romantic tension.

Jane only violated the Quantity Maxim twice in the same dialogue. When Rochester’s fear of losing Jane became a real possibility, Jane finally revealed how she felt
about her cousin, and his real affection for Rosamond Oliver. Rochester at last saw what Jane had withheld from him except in hints he did not catch: that St. John asked her to marry him, but they were not man and wife. Jane further confessed her love for Rochester by revealing that she had teased him to relieve his sadness.

Jane's two Quality violations implied her love for Rochester, but also goaded him into making Jane a humbler supplication for marriage she could wholeheartedly accept.

Jane's first two Relation violations kept the host off the subject of her, and on her desired topic, the Thornfield fire. She used three Relation breaks of a pocket-comb, her association with good people, and her comment about Rochester yanking his head to put her beloved master in suspense of her experiences since leaving him, which he wanted to hear about, but she would not elaborate on until she was ready to do so. Her final Relation violation came when she decided not to tell Rochester right away she was not marrying St. John. Her Relation breaks all stayed on subjects Jane wanted to discuss and allowed suspense between herself and Rochester until she disclosed the truth about St. John and her great love for Rochester.
CHAPTER SIX: JANE EYRE’S GRICEAN CONVERSATIONAL PORTRAIT

Young Jane heavily relied on Relation and Quantity violations at Gateshead. Her three Relation and two of her four Quantity violations allowed her to speak out for the first time against Mrs. Reed’s wish for silent obedience to orders, decry her lack of love and respect at the Hall, tell the truth as she knew it, and lash out when blatantly abused in front of Brocklehurst. Jane’s adherence to the Manner Maxim told Mrs. Reed and Mr. Lloyd how miserable life at Gateshead was for her, and told Mr. Brocklehurst exactly what she thought. Although she was clear, Jane was also blunt in her childish demands for respect and fair treatment, and she lacked the adult capacity to consider the consequences of her words. Jane’s emotions dominated her speech, and the clearest example of this was her sole violation of the Quality Maxim with her wrathful outburst on Mrs. Reed. Jane later discovered her need for revenge was no better than Mrs. Reed’s abuse, and she started thinking about how to express herself in a calmer way. To her credit, Jane had started that process with her other two Quantity violations with Mr. Lloyd, when she thought before she spoke, and reasoned that she could not stay in a hostile place, and formed the idea of being a woman as the
only way she could leave. She had begun her progression towards adult female speech.

At Lowood, Jane depended on her Quality violations, which often compromised her linguistic truthfulness. She used four of her five Quality breaks to promote herself as the martyr of Lowood when she felt that Brocklehurst had ruined her reputation. Fortunately, Jane began to learn a different talent for speech besides persecution: humor. Her fifth Quality break and first Relation break showed her first uses of Irony and Sarcasm to talk about the Reeds. After she had exhausted herself from all her martyr talk, and a lot of crying, Jane calmed down and thought about her situation, and used only one Quantity break to explain how she became Mrs. Reed’s burden rather than her child. Her truthfulness in that Maxim break convinced Miss Temple to act as an impartial audience towards Jane’s version of events, which she calmly explained to the superintendent. Later on, after Jane grew into womanhood, her second Relation break and sole Manner break enabled her to ask for Bessie’s opinion of her, and accept the nurse’s criticism.

By the time she reached Thornfield, Jane had learned valuable lessons of forgiveness and tolerance at Lowood, and had also learned how to let calm, rational thought,
rather than emotion, guide her speech. Jane enjoyed her discussions with Rochester, and saw no need to break the Manner Maxim. She was direct without being impolite. Her three Quality violations (lying outright in one instance) showed consideration for her unforgiving aunt and her employer, whom Jane could not believe had feelings for her, and later, when she teased him about who he would marry, based on his "slave/angel" song. Jane's six Relation breaks demonstrated her genuine attempts at reconciliation with her aunt, her attempts to help Rochester release her from his presence as both employer and lover, and to show consideration for her morals and integrity. Jane used only one Quantity violation with her Aunt Reed to reconcile with her, rather than demand an answer to her aunt's unfair judgment or lash out at her cruelty. Jane's other four Quantity breaks helped Rochester see Jane as a strong woman unafraid of him, helpful and trustworthy, capable of expressing passion without childish anger, yet willing to set passion aside to protect morality.

At Moor House, Jane had to protect herself even while staying in the care of the Rivers family. She used an alias, breaking the Quality Maxim, to protect herself from
discovery of her past. She used her "repressed sarcasm" to again violate the Quality Maxim to express her anger in a restrained yet potent way towards St. John's God-like and perverse attempts to infringe on Jane's life. She adhered to the Manner Maxim again because she was quite intent on being clear on what she wanted for herself over St. John's arguments. Two Quantity breaks and one of two Relation breaks treated the Rivers family with respect even while she was dependent on them to trust her. Her last Quantity break and second Relation break declared her right to serve God as she saw fit, and also declared her right to her passionate womanhood.

Jane saw the burned Thornfield before the host told her Rochester could be found at Ferndean. She used two of her six Relation breaks to divert the host's attention from herself, and tell her what she needed to know. She used three more Relation breaks to hold off telling Rochester about her Moor House life until she was ready to tell him everything, and her final Relation break came in not telling him immediately that she was not marrying Rivers. She then used her two Quantity violations to reveal her feelings for St. John and for Rochester. She saved her Quality and Manner breaks for last. Her sole Manner break
compelled Rochester to take responsibility for proposing to Jane without any deceptions (Blanche) or secrets (Bertha). Her two Quality breaks diverted his attempts to make Jane beg him to marry her. They both knew how much they loved each other, but she gently goaded him on into a proposal Jane could accept with all her heart. Jane Eyre finally achieved love and respect on her own terms.

LAST THOUGHTS ON JANE EYRE

This paper could not begin to cover the wide scope of Jane’s emotions through Gricean Maxim breaks. It could, however, begin as a blueprint for analyzing Jane through Grice in other literary genres.

I could write a Feminist paper using Jane’s Quality violations to show how Jane’s feminism was repeatedly denied, but never destroyed, by her Aunt Reed’s cruelty. I could also link Jane’s Manner, Quantity and Relation breaks to show how she protected her femininity from the womanly misconceptions of Rochester and Rivers.

I could write a Freudian paper analyzing Jane’s maturing Maxim breaks with the Freudian concepts of id, ego to superego, especially in her love/hate relationships with Mrs. Reed, Rochester and Rivers. I could argue that Jane’s dependence on Quantity violations at Gateshead reflected
her uncontrollable, immature id. I could then argue that as Jane used fewer Quantity violations, and relied more on Quality, Relation and Manner breaks at Thornfield, Moor House and Ferndean, the mature Jane developed a stronger superego that enabled her to discover her sense of self.

I touched on other Pragmatic devices in my analysis of Jane’s Gricean Conversational Portrait, and I could easily devote an entire paper to any one of these devices to explore Jane’s character. I could use Brown and Levinson’s Politeness theory to underscore Jane’s maturity by saving the faces of characters who dislike her. I could assess Jane’s relationships with other characters by a careful study of adjacency-pair situations (questions-and-answers, disagreements, arguments, etc.). I could also show how Jane’s (non-)use of Politeness overcame other people’s criticisms in her efforts to improve her life.
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