



GRICEAN MAXIM VIOLATION(S) IN THE MURDER CASE OF JAMAL KHASHOGGI: A FORENSIC LINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE

Zakir Hussain Radfar^{1✉}, Dadang Sudana², and Wawan Gunawan³

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

Article Info

Article History:
Received May 2020
Accepted July 2020
Published September 2020

Keywords:
forensic linguistics,
implicature, Jamal
Khashoggi, murder, Saudi
Arabia

Abstract

The murder of Jamal Khashoggi in the consulate of Saudi Arabia in Turkey is still controversial. The judgment relies on valid and reliable evidence. This study is vital due to investigating a murder case based on pragmatic meanings as language evidence broadcasted in media. This research employs Grice's conversational implicature to investigate the murder of Jamal Khashoggi by analyzing the exposed recorded tapes of Jamal Khashoggi and the accused inside the consulate, the utterances of Khadija Changiz, the fiancée of Jamal Khashoggi, and Adel al Jubeir's statements, the foreign minister of Saudi Arabia as a representative of the Saudi Arabian. The design of this research is a case study, and content analysis is used to analyze the data based on Mayring's (2000) qualitative content analysis. Based on the findings of the study, the recorded tapes of Jamal Khashoggi and the accused are outlined as ambiguous language. Saudi Arabia denied the murder by saving face, misleading the hearer, and skipping the questions, but later on, affirmed the murder and promised to bring justice. Hence, the results of this study will affect the verdict on the judicial decree, and the accusations will be prosecuted, and justice will be served to Jamal Khashoggi.

INTRODUCTION

In a few years, forensic linguistics has gained peoples' attention in the world. The term forensic linguistics was first coined by Svartvik (1968), and now there are so many organizations that support the development of forensic linguistics. For instance, the University of Birmingham in Europe has built an organization called Forensic Linguistics: The International Journal of Speech, Language, and the Law (Coulthard, 2005). Forensic linguistics is a branch of the linguistic studies (Ariani et al., 2014; Leonard et al., 2017; Ramezani et al., 2016) and is taken from a Latin word 'forensis' (Wasikata, 2014) which investigate the language usage in crime and assisting the police, court, law in case of the criminal issues.

According to McMenemy (2002), forensic linguistics is the scientific study applied to forensic purposes and contexts, directly associated with linguistics, applicable and interdisciplinary knowledge connecting language, crime, and law (Olsson, 2008, p. 11). In other words, it is the application of scientific knowledge to language in the context of civil, law, and criminals. Therefore, some linguists are interested in the language of written law, originality, and language use in forensic procedures, and thus the study starts from the judicial point of arrest to the trial and sentence stage (Ariani et al., 2014). In line with this view, Momeni (2012) cited that forensic linguists are boosting their works in the communication and advertisement, which includes sound identification, identification of writer of a written text, miscommunication between lawyers and client, perjury, problems related to the legal texts, libel, problems with brands, interpretation, and translation of communication in courts and recorded interviews as evidence. Also, there are some areas that forensic linguistics covers. Ariani et al. (2014) pointed out some specific areas such as document examination, software forensic, semiotic, plagiarism, linguistic, and lawyer's interaction. Hence, forensic linguistics is not only limited to the crimes like murder, suicide, bribe or stealing and assisting the police in courts but also is applied to various issues by scientifically accepted principles of linguistic analysis to legal evidence and using the descriptive linguistic technique (Malcolm & Coulthard, 1997) such as phonology and phonetics, lexis, syntax, pragmatics, discourse, and text analysis (cited in Ariani et al., 2014).

Further, there has been a spate of interest in forensic linguistics and much research conducted in the field of forensic linguistics in various areas such as investigation in the police report (Sumaljag, 2018), research about fraud in the Judicial System as a Language Crime (Momeni, 2012), analyzing suicide note cases (Sudjana, 2013), studying bribery case in Indonesia (Waskita, 2014), exploring an authorship identification (Neito et al., 2008), applying Forensic linguistics in detecting of deviant teaching in Malaysia (Nordin, 2016), and reviewed

forensic linguistics in the light of crime investigation (Ramezani et al., 2016). As a result, no study investigated an international murder case broadcasted in Media. Hence, this research attempted to examine the murder of Jamal Khashoggi that occurred in early October 2018 in Turkey.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Forensic linguistics is a new approach to applied linguistics which is using scientific mechanisms (Ramezani et al., 2016) derived from other sub-areas of descriptive linguistics such as phonetics and phonology, lexis, syntax, pragmatics, semantics, discourse, dialectology, and text analysis used in courts to solve legal cases (Coulthard, 2005). According to McMenamain (2002, p. 86), forensic linguistics is the scientific study applied to forensic contexts, including civil, law, and crime. It is defined as a field of study that deals with analyzing language in the context of crime, judicial procedure, and dispute law (Udina, 2017). Based on these definitions, forensic linguistics is directly related to the linguistics and interdisciplinary knowledge that connects language, crime, and law (Olsson, 2008, p. 11). According to Udina (2017), forensic linguistics is a new approach using scientific techniques and other subfields such as phonetics, stylistics, pragmatics, dialectology, and semantics in courts, a police investigation to solve crimes and legal issues. Hence, most crimes and legal issues are relying on legal texts (Olsson, 2008), which is implicated in a legal and criminal context like letters, books, essays, contracts, and theses (Sudjana & Fitri, 2013). Further, Olsson (2008) clarified with more examples, for instance, “a parking ticket, a will, a contract, a health department letter, a thesis; almost anything that spans from plagiarism, insurance contracts, trademarks and patents to court procedure, confessions, hate crimes, and murder.” To sum up, in line with Shuy (2007) that forensic linguistics includes a wide range of topics such as the language used in trials by judges, lawyers, and witnesses, further, the language of the law, language used in civil as well as in criminal cases.

On the other hand, pragmatics is a significant field of linguistics. According to Yule (1996), pragmatics deals with the appropriateness of linguistic choice to the context. In other words, Luo and Gao (2011) believed that pragmatics is the study of the use of language in communication, especially the relationship between sentences, context, and situations in which utterances are deployed. Some other authors believed pragmatics as the study of language in use (Akinwotu, 2013 cited in Basra & Thooyibah, 2017; Levinson, 1983). For instance, implicature employed in this research is a part of pragmatics. Implicature is something meant, implied, or suggested distinct from what is said (Wang, 2011). According to Grice (1975), the

related theory describes the relationship between what is said and what is meant in a case that the conventional meaning is associated with the sentence ('what is said') and is not equivalent with the intention of speakers' communication and intended effects on the audience ('what is meant'). It is how it meets with issues that there are meaning and intention beyond what is simply said or involve in the communication such speakers' intention does not appear on his words but another side of meaning. Therefore, there is more than what a speaker says or writes that should be accounted for as a real intended meaning of the speaker or writer (Nanda, 2015). Thus, Coulthard and Johnson (2007) and Aziz (2015) believed that pragmatic studies and pragmatic meanings could cause legal action.

According to Mustafa (2010), Grice introduced two kinds of implicature, the first one is conversational implicature, and the second one is conventional implicature. The earlier arises when the producer of an utterance violates the four maxims. The later occurs from the conventional meaning of words and the discourse they happen in. Aglina (2018) contended that conversational maxims imply meaning during conversation and are known to conversational implicature, but the "co-operation" between speakers while using maxim is called cooperative principles. In conversation, the speaker and hearer need to cooperate in communicating smoothly. Therefore, there is a need for cooperative principles, which is discussed for the first time by Grice in his lecture entitled "Logical and Conversation." According to Grice (1975, in Yule, 1996), "cooperative principles make your conversational contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." Huang (2009, cited in Jingjie, 2016) stated that the cooperative principle in the exchange of conversation makes sure that the right amount of information is provided, and the conversation is made in a truthful, relevant, and perspicuous manner. Thus, the researcher in this study believed that cooperative principles would help find the truth of the murder of Jamal Khashoggi in the consulate. The cooperative principles include four maxims: the maxim of quality, the maxim of quantity, the maxim of relation, and the maxim of manner. Yule (1996) pointed out the maxims, such as the following:

a. the maxim of quantity:

- 1) Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purpose of the exchange).
- 2) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

b. the maxim of quality:

Try to make your true contribution.

- 1) Do not say what you believe to be false.

- 2) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
- c. the maxim of relation:
 - Be relevant.
- d. the maxim of manner:
 - Be perspicuous.
 - 1) Avoid obscurity of expression.
 - 2) Avoid ambiguity.
 - 3) Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
 - 4) Be orderly

The Context of the Murder Case

Jamal Khashoggi is a Saudi citizen who was a prominent journalist and often criticizing the Saudi government (Haltiwanger, 2018). He was an adviser to a senior official in the Saudi government and worked for the top news outlets in the country and was seen as close to the ruling elite in Saudi Arabia. Last year, he had a falling-out with the government over Saudi's prince Mohammad Bin Salman because of controversial tactics as he has worked to consolidate his power. Indeed, he has not been seen since the 2nd of October, 2018 while he entered to Saudi's consulate in Turkey. Based on the online broadcasting Media, he has been killed by Saudi's royal family. Now, the legal procedure is going on. This research focused on the forensic linguistic analysis of Jamal Khashoggi's murder reflected through the national and international online media to determine the truth and help the prosecutions.

METHODS

This research is a descriptive study, and the data is analyzed qualitatively. The design employed in this research is a case study, and content analysis is used to analyze the data based on the qualitative content analysis of Mayring (2000). Based on this framework, Mayring (2000) exemplified materials such as interview transcripts, focus groups, observational studies, document analysis, and secondary analysis. Thus, this study includes transcripts of video recorded tape as document analysis and also interviews. The researcher used Grice's conversational implicatures (1975) and interpreted the data based on Coulthard and Johnson's language in evidence (2007). Further, the framework of the study is developed based on cooperative principles of Grice (1975); based on this framework, QI=stands for Quality, Qn=stands for Quantity, R=stands for relevance, and M=stands for Manner.

The research is a case study investigating the murder of Jamal Khashoggi in Turkey based on online broadcasting Media such as Sabah Daily Newspaper, The New York Times (NYK), Al-Jazeera, and BBC (British Broadcasting Corporation). The data is already published in the Media by CIA agents of USA, Turkish police and authorities, and other investigators. The data includes the exposed recorded tapes of Jamal Khashoggi and the accused people inside the consulate, interviews and press conferences of Khadija Changiz, the fiancée of Jamal Khashoggi who is demanding justice, and Adel al Jubeir’s statements about the murder of Jamal Khashoggi-the foreign minister of Saudi Arabia as a representative of the Saudi Arabian Kingdom in this study. To transcribe the data, the researcher used software called MAXQDA, version 2018. This version is the new generation of software that presents seven new innovative analysis tools, including Paraphrasing, Twitter statistics, smart coding, group comparison, code configuration, survey response, Maxmaps, and Transcriptions. Besides, the researcher asked someone a native speaker of Turkish and a specialist to re-transcript the videos related to the Turkish language. These people could help the researcher to understand the data better.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Interpretation of Implicatures as a Language in Evidence Applied in the Report about the Murder of Jamal Khashoggi

To analyze the data, the researcher applied Grice’s conversational implicature (1975) and interpreted the data based on the theory of language in evidence (Coulthard & Johnson, 2007). Based on the findings of the study, generally, the speakers failed to observe the maxims to have a cooperative conversation, and in particular, they flouted and violated the maxims to convey their intended thought to the hearer. Much details are provided about the outcome of the study in the table below:

Table 1. The findings of cooperative principles of the study

No	Utterer	Observance of maxims				Non-observance of Maxims																Total maxim				
		Ql	Qn	R	M	Flouting				Violating				Opting out				Infringing								
						Ql	Qn	R	M	Ql	Qn	R	M	Ql	Qn	R	M	Ql	Qn	R	M					
1	Recorded tape of Jamal Khashoggi		1	1	1																				3	
2	Khadija Changiz		7	3	1																					11
3	Adel al Jubier					2	2		2	1																7
Overall total of non-observance of maxims																										21

As shown in the table above, the recorded tapes of Jamal Khashoggi's conversation with accused people were included in the non-observance of maxims. For instance, he has flouted the maxim of quality for one time. He has flouted the maxim of quantity and manner, one time, respectively. In opposite, there is not violating the maxims the same as Adel al Jubeir did. Thus, Thomas (1995) stated that flouting a maxim is when a speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim in which he has no intention of deceiving or misleading (p. 65). So, the outcome of the recorded tape of Jamal Khashoggi is similar to Khadija Changiz. Khadija Changiz also has not cooperated well in the conversation. She has flouted the maxims not violated. Based on the results of the analysis, she has flouted the maxims for 11 times, which was included seven (7) times flouting the maxim of quantity and three (3) times the maxim of relevance and once (1) maxim of manner; but, the third party based on the analysis, Adel al Jubeir has violated the maxims in opposite to other parties. Violating maxims occurs when the speaker will be liable to mislead the hearer (Grice, 1989). Hence, Adel al Jubeir violated the maxims of quantity two times, quality, and manner each of them two times and violated the maxim of relevance only two times. Further, Adel al Jubeir has once opted out the maxim of quality. As a result, violating the maxim of quantity is more than others in this study. Thus, it is in line with Tajabadi et al. (2014), who investigated the Grice's cooperative maxims in oral arguments; their study revealed that the maxim of quantity is mostly violated; because the participants in the court were providing more information than required. Hence, they believed that legal language seems to be over informative and overcrowded and presented awkwardly. Thus, Tajabadi et al. (2014) contended that the contribution of involved parties is more than required due to explaining about the situation, telling a story, saving face, and blamed others guilty. In the following, it is discussed in details:

1. Implicatures Applied in the Recorded Tape of Jamal Khashoggi

Based on the revealed recorded tape of Jamal Khashoggi and other people in the consulate, they have flouted the maxims of quality, quantity, and manner once, respectively. In the following is discussed in details:

1.1 Flouting of the maxims

Flouting a maxim is when a speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim in which he has no intention of deceiving or misleading (Thomas, 1995, p. 65). Therefore, the flouting of a maxim includes all kinds of maxims, including quality, quantity, manner, and relation. Further, these maxims are flouted in the recorded tape of Jamal Khashoggi. Examples are discussed below:

1.1.1 Flouting the maxims of quantity in the recorded tapes of Jamal Khashoggi

The utterance below showed the flouting of the maxim of quantity. According to Grice (1989), this maxim is related to the quantity of the information provided (p. 26).

[1.1] **Accused 1:** *I know how to cut well*

Accused 2: *Why?*

Accused 3: *Because he is a forensic expert. He is a senior military guy.*

Regarding the utterances above, the contribution should be as informative as required, and more information than required is flouting the maxims. Therefore, the utterance *because he is a forensic expert. He is a senior military guy*, is an answer to the question *why?* The first sentence of the statement is quite informative and enough to answer the question, but in the second sentence, the speaker has flouted the maxim. *He* has given more information than required, which is not important.

1.1.2 Flouting the maxims of relation in the recorded tapes of Jamal Khashoggi

[1.2] **Jamal Khashoggi:** *I'm suffocating ... Take this bag off my head, I'm claustrophobic.*

Accused: *Put your air phones in and listen to music like me, when I do this job, I listen to music.*

Based on the above statement, *put your air phones in and listen to music like me, when I do this job, I listen to music*, the speaker has flouted the maxim of relation; this is because the speaker's utterance is not relevant to the hearer speech. The reason is that the accused man did not cooperate with the speaker; he stated something irrelevant. Maxim of the relation or relevance emphasizes on the importance of having answers in relevance to the topic being discussed (Ceballos & Sosas, 2018, p. 25). Thus, the speaker said to him to *'put your air phones and listen to music ...'* while he is doing the same. That means the speaker changed the topic using the irrelevance topic related to his partner of the conversation (Levinson, 1983, p. 111). Hence, he flouted the maxim of the relation. Thus, his utterance is not related to the issue. As language evidence and pragmatic meanings, the speaker ignored him, and therefore, his statement is not relevant to Jamal Khashoggi's utterance. This indicated that he is mocking him while doing something. Hence, this utterance employs the implicature of mocking.

1.2.3 Flouting the maxim of manner in the recorded tape of Jamal Khashoggi

In the conversation below, the answer to the question that *Releases my arm! What do you think you are doing*, the speaker answered, *'Traitor! You will be brought to account!'*

[1.3] **Jamal Khashoggi:** *"Release my arm! What do you think you are doing?"*

Accused: *"Traitor! You will be brought to account!"*

Jamal Khashoggi: *"You can't do that; People are waiting outside."*

Based on the above data [1.3], the answer to the question is not clear and did not provide the right answer to the question, and hence, it indicates an ambiguous language (Grice, 1989). The hearer may know what the speaker means because it seems known to him from his next sentence, *you can't do that. People are waiting outside*. That means he can do something, and he is afraid to not happen to him, and thus he continues to affirm that people are waiting for him outside. In last, as a result, he has flouted the maxim of the manner because the answer is not clear to the question. According to Grice (1989), the maxim of manner means speakers should avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), and be orderly (p. 27). Thus, as language evidence, according to Coulthard and Johnson (2007), He has not said the exact word, and on the other side, the implicature employed ambiguity. That means he had a plan to do something with Jamal Khashoggi.

2. Implicatures Applied in the Khadija Changiz Utterances

Khadija Changiz also has not cooperated well in the conversation with the hearer. Based on the result of the analysis, she has flouted the maxim of quantity and maxim of relevance.

2.1 Flouting of the maxims resulted emphasizing on the event by providing more information than required for several times:

The conversation below is between Khadija Changiz and the Reporter:

[2.1] Reporter: What did he say to you before he went in for the appointment? A second appointment. You were outside with him.

Khadija: *He did not tell me anything.* He went straight in. We had not discussed any possibility of having a problem, nor did we talked about whom to contact if something bad happened to him. Not at all.

The question *what did he say to you before he went in for the appointment*, is answered correctly by the hearer in the statement *He did not tell me anything*, but this was not enough to the speaker so, therefore, she has given more information than required which was not essential, but it is related. Thus, she has flouted the maxim of quantity. It is because she has been over informative (Grice, 1989, p. 26). Flouting the maxim of quantity is due to the speaker, which gives more or less information than the situation requires. According to the above statement, she gave more information because she believed the situation required it. She talked about the whole story of what happened on that day while Jamal Khashoggi was leaving for the consulate, and she talked about the unwanted coming events too. Thus, she has provided more information than required. She stated several sentences repeatedly. That means she emphasized that related issue.

In the following statement, Khadija Changiz did not cooperate well with the speaker:

[2.2] **Reporter:** and then you went to the consulate front door. What happened then?

Khadija: The wave bursting, which made me anxious was my sister's message saying that the Saudi consulate would close at three-thirty. I started running towards the entrance. Then I told the consulate security guide that Jamal was still inside and he did not come out yet. The man who a Turkish security official was told me he did not know much about it, but he told me if the consulate was now closed everyone would have been out already.

Based on the data [2.2], the first statement of the question, *the wave bursting which made me anxious was my sister's message saying that the Saudi consulate would close at three-thirty*, is not related to the question's answer; hence, the speaker flouted the maxim of relation. The reason is that Khadija Changiz did not cooperate with the speaker; she stated something irrelevant. Maxim of the relation or relevance emphasizes on the importance of having answers in relevance to the topic being discussed (Ceballos & Sosas, 2018, p. 25). Furthermore, the statements to answer *what happened then while she went to the consulate front door?* is entirely related to the question and answered as much as needed. Hence, that means she has observed the maxim of relation.

3. *Implicatures applied in Adel al Jubeir's utterances*

Adel al Jubier has failed to observe the maxims and violated the maxims of quantity, quality, and manner and also the maxim of relation. In addition, he has even opted out the maxim.

3.1 *Violating of the maxims showed denying the case, misleading the hearer, saving face.*

[3.1] **Reporter:** You're Excellency; this is a top-down society. Explain to us how the crown prince could not know about something like this because people close to him did.

Adel al Jubeir: you have people, and people were dismissed that should have known or should have revealed what they knew or should have prevented this or should have made sure that the authorizations were very clear and the authorities were very clear the. This was an unfortunate accident, and it was a crime and those who committed it will be brought to justice. Our investigation is ongoing. We have asked Turkey to provide us with evidence. We're still waiting for some of the evidence. We're asking other countries if they have any evidence to provide it to our court system so they can help them with the trials that are taking place.

According to the above statement, to answer the question, *how the crown prince could not know about something like this because people close to him did*, Adel al Jubeir responded that *you have people. People were dismissed that should have known or should have revealed what they knew or should have prevented this or should have made sure that the authorizations were very clear and the authorities were very clear*. Based on his answer, Adel al Jubeir violated the

maxim of quality. He misled the hearer to something lie. His sentence seemed non-sense; he said something false and unrelated to the discussed topic. Thus, he has violated the maxim of quality.

Further, based on the above utterance that *'this was an unfortunate accident and it was a crime and those who committed it will be brought to justice....'*, this utterance is relevant to the question. However, Al Jubeir violated the maxim of the quantity. He could say that it was an unfortunate accident that happened, but on the opposite, he has given more information than required. He has provided more information on something which is not important. As some of his utterances are not relevant to the question, for instance, *'We have asked Turkey to provide us with evidence. We're still waiting for some of the evidence. We're asking other countries if they have any evidence to provide it to our court system so they can help them with the trials that are taking place.'* These sentences are a kind of misleading the hearer to some other issues which are not important. Hence, he did not cooperate well in conversation with the opposite side. He used to hide something to save the face of the Saudi Arabia government. Thus, he has violated the maxim of quantity, quality, and relevance. According to Grice (1975, p. 45), a speaker even does multiple violations for lying purposes. Therefore, Adel al Jubeir violated to hide, save face, and lied to have such implicature.

[3.2] Reporter: Your Excellency thank you so much for joining us. I want to kick off by asking you about the comments that we've heard over the last 24 hours from President Trump. He said maybe the crown prince knew and maybe he didn't about the murder of Jamal Khashoggi and either way Saudi Arabia has his support. How do you feel about getting that kind of praise and support from the president?

Adel al Jubier: "Well it's. We have made it very clear that Saudi Arabia's a government is not involved in this, 100 circumference is not important to us at all. We have made it very clear that this was an operation that was that went wrong where people exceeded their authorities did something they're not supposed to do. We have made it very clear that we're investigating that those who committed this crime will be brought to justice and that procedures will be reviewed in order to make sure it doesn't happen again and this is exactly what we're doing."

According to Grice (1975), people intend to tell untruth and break the cooperative principles while communicating and doing multiple violations due to several reasons, for instance, by hiding the truth, saving face, feeling jealous, satisfying, convincing and making happy the hearer and avoiding hurting the hearer. Hence, based on the statement above, Adel al Jubier violated the maxims of cooperative principles in the related conversation with the hearer. The question is, *how do you feel about getting that kind of praise and support from the president?* The question is to know his feelings, but his answer referred to deny the case of murder. He just affirmed it with *'well, it is'* which means he may hide the truth to save the face

of Saudi's government. Hence, he has stated that *We have made it very clear that Saudi Arabia is a government is not involved in this*. He denied the crime committed by Saudi Arabia in this sentence. However, he may know this is false because, in another sentence, he has accepted the crime done by officials of Saudi Arabia. *We have made it very clear that this was an operation that was that went wrong where people exceeded their authorities did something they are not supposed to do*. He intended to mislead the hearer to something different. In the last sentence of his statement, he, while accepting the case of murder and crime, has given hope to bring justice and to commit not to happen again.

In the following to the above statements, Adel al Jubeir violated the maxims of manner two times. The utterances are presented below:

[3.3] Reporter: A lot of people have heard that audio. Why did they say that they won't give it to you?

Adel al Jubeir: *"I don't know you should ask them*. The other issue that we have is we've said to the Turkish friends if you have any more evidence, *please provide it*. And so if there has been any delay in providing evidence, it's the other way around. We have sent an investigative team to Turkey who had spent several weeks there in order to work with our Turkish friends, and our public prosecutor sent three official documents requesting information from Turkey specific information. We still are waiting for the answers.

Furthermore, the speaker in response to the question *'the other issue that we have is we've said to the Turkish friends if you have any more evidence, please provide it...*, According to Grice (1989, p. 27), the speaker has violated the maxim of manner, because he used ambiguous language, in other words, he is not brief and orderly. The utterances did not mean to answer the question but used to mislead the hearer. In last, the speaker at the same time opting out the maxim and violated the maxim of manner. First, he did not want to cooperate with the hearer, and the second did not avoid the ambiguities.

3.2 Opting out the maxims showed rejecting the co-operation with the speaker.

Adel al Jubeir has violated opting out once, and it is discussed below:

[3.4] Reporter: A lot of people have heard that audio. Why did they say that they won't give it to you?

Adel al Jubeir: *"I don't know you should ask them*. The other issue that we have is we've said to the Turkish friends if you have any more evidence, *please provide it*. And so if there has been any delay in providing evidence, it is the other way around. We have sent an investigative team to Turkey who had spent several weeks there in order to work with our Turkish friends, and our public prosecutor sent three official documents requesting information from Turkey specific information. We still are waiting for the answers.

Based on the statement, to answer the question, *why did they say that they will not give it to you*, Adel al Jubeir did not cooperate with the speaker. According to Grice (1975, p.71), when the speaker seems unwilling to cooperate in the way the maxim requires, he/she opts out the maxim. In this case, in the statement above, he answered the question with *I do not know you should ask them*. He has opted out the maxim. Hence, Thomas (1995) believed that opting out occurs in public life when the speaker cannot reply due to legal or ethical reasons in a normal way. Hence, he refused to answer the question. He may know some reasons behind the answering to the question, or he may hide something.

As a result of the discussions above, the recorded tapes of Jamal Khashoggi's with the accused men includes the observance and non-observance of the maxims. The two speakers talking with each other, and failed to observe the maxims, showed misleading each other. In addition to these, recorded tapes are highlighted as ambiguous language. The accused people knew what they were doing, and it was a preplanned action. Therefore, their utterances are not being brief, using obscure language, and using ambiguities language (Thomas, 1995, p. 65).

On the other hand, Khadija Changiz has not cooperated well in the conversation. Khadija Changiz tried to expand more detailed information and emphasized the murder while insisting that Jamal Khashoggi is innocent; hence, she has asked for justice. According to Vrij et al. (2016), truthful stories included more details of information than a deceptive story. That means Khadija Changiz was telling the truth about the murder of Jamal Khashoggi. In contrast, Adel al Jubeir has violated the maxims to fulfill his intentions, such as saving face, lying, and denying the murder of Saudi citizens. He tried to skip the co-operation with the speaker; he has hidden the truth to save the face of Saudi's government. He rejected the crime committed by Saudi Arabia, though he knew that it is false. Later, he has accepted the crime is committed by Saudi Arabia; and, he has given hope to bring justice and not to happen again in the future. In last, the result of this study is in line with Tajabadi et al. (2014), who has investigated Grice's cooperative maxims in oral arguments. Their study revealed that the maxim of quantity is mostly violated because the participants in the court are providing more information than required. Hence, they believed that legal language seems to be over informative and overcrowded and presented awkwardly. Thus, Tajabadi et al. (2014) contended that the contribution of involved parties is more than required due to explaining the situation, telling a story, saving face, and blamed others guilty. Including this, Ceballos and Sosas' (2018) findings showed that the violation of maxims is unostentatious, quiet, and non-observance of a maxim of conversation. They stated that message witness in trial courts intends to convey a misleading

that resulted in the questioning of attorney and leads to further court discussion and lengthy drawn cross-examination.

In last, according to Coulthard and Johnson (2007) and Aziz (2015), pragmatic meanings in any kind of discourse, written or spoken, and conversation have the potential to cause the legal actions. Hence, the murder of Jamal Khashoggi inside the consulate of Saudi Arabia in Turkey, based on the pragmatic meanings provided above, proved 'true.' Thus, the criminals should be arrested, prosecuted until justice should be served.

CONCLUSION

This study attempted to discover the truth and valid information about the murder of Jamal Khashoggi inside the consulate of Saudi Arabia in Turkey. Thus, the exposed recorded tapes of Jamal Khashoggi's with the accused men failed to observe the maxims; hence, recorded tapes are highlighted as ambiguous. On the other side, Khadija Changiz has emphasized on the truth of the case by providing detailed information, while at the same time, constantly demanding justice for the victim. In opposite, Saudi Arabia denied the murder several times, misleading the hearer, saving face and denying the truth, and then in last, accepted the criminal acts and committing to serve justice. Thus, with the help of this study and pragmatic meanings, judgment controversies are solved, the accusations are prosecuted, and justice is served to Jamal Khashoggi.

REFERENCE

- Aglina, E.F. (2018). A study of conversation implicature used in Twilight movie 2008. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 23(7). www.iosrjournals.org
- Ariani, M.G. Sajedi, F. & Sajedi, M. (2014). Forensic linguistics: a brief overview of the key elements. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 158, 222-225.
- Aziz, E. A. (2015). *Pedoman kajian linguistik forensic: Kementerian pendidikan dan kebudayaan Republik Indonesia*. Retrieved by internet on 23 April 2020, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319206942_PEDOMAN_KAJIAN_LINGUIS_TIK_FORENSIK_edisi_REVISI
- Basra, S.M. & Thoyyibah, L. (2017). A speech act analysis of teacher talk in an EFL classroom. *International Journal of Education*, 10(1), 73-81. Retrieved from: <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/208960/>
- Ceballos, C.T. & Sosas, R.V. (2018). On court proceedings: A forensic linguistic analysis on maxim violation. *Journal of Nusantara Studies*, 3(02), 17-31. DOI: 10.24200/jonus.vol3iss2pp17-31
- Coulthard, M. (2005). Some forensic application of description linguistics. *Verdas*, 9(01), 9-28.

- Coulthard, M. & Johnson, A. (2007). *An introduction to forensic linguistics: Language in evidence*. Routledge: USA.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard University Press. Available at: <https://msu.edu/~orourk51/800-Phil/Handouts/Readings/Phil%20Lang/Grice-Logic&Conversation-WJL-1989.pdf>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. Available at: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lis/studypacks/Grice-Logic.pdf>
- [Haltiwanger](#), J. (2018). *Here's everything we know about the troubling disappearance of Saudi journalist Jamal Khashoggi*, Business Insider Singapore. Retrieved from the internet on the 26th of December 2018. <https://www.businessinsider.sg/who-is-jamal-khashoggi-turkey-accuses-saudi-arabia-of-murdering-reporter-2018-10/?r=US&IR=T>
- Leonard, R.A. Ford, J.E.R & Christensen, T.K. (2017). Forensic linguistic: applying the science of linguistic to issues of the law. *Hofstra Law review*, 45(3), 881-897. Retrieved from: <https://scholarlycommons.law.hofstra.edu/hlr/vol45/iss3/11>
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Luo, X. and Gao, J. (2011). On pragmatic failures in second language learning. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(3), 283-286. DOI: 10.4304/tpls.1.3.283-286
- Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative content analysis. *Forum Qualitative Social Research*, 1(2).
- McMenamin, G.R. (2002) *Forensic linguistics: Advances in forensic stylistics*. CRC Press: New York
- Momeni, N. (2012). 'Fraud in judicial system' as a language crime: Forensic linguistic approach. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(6), 1263-1269. DOI: 10.4304/tpls.2.6.1263-1269
- Mustafa, M.S. (2010). The interpretation of implicature: A comparative study between implicature in linguistics and journalism. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(1), 35-43. Retrieved from: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2859505>
- Nanda, D.S. (2015). Implicature in John Green's the fault of our stars. *JEELS*, 2(1), 44-61. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v2i1.43>
- Neito, V.G. et al. (2008) Exploring the state of the art software for forensic authorship identification. *International Journal of English Studies*, 8(1), 1-28. Retrieved from: <https://revistas.um.es/ijes/article/view/49071>
- Nordquist, R. (2019). What is forensic linguistics? *Thought Co.* <https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-forensic-linguistics-1690868> retrieved by internet on 2/6/ 2020.
- Nordin, M.Z.F. (2016). Forensic linguistics and the detecting of deviant teaching in Malaysia. *The European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*.
- Oktoma, E & Mardiyono, S. (2013). The analysis of presupposition in the short stories of Silvester Goridus Sukur. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 2(1), 73-83. Retrieved from: <https://www.journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/ERJEE/article/view/94>
- Olsson, J. (2008). *Forensic linguistics*. Continuum International Publishing Group, London SEI 7NX.
- Ramezani, F. Sani, A.K. & Moghadam, K. (2016). Forensic linguistics in the light of Crime investigation. *Pertanika J. Soc. Sci.& Hum.* 24(1): 375-384. Retrieved from:

[http://www.pertanika.upm.edu.my/Pertanika%20PAPERS/JSSH%20Vol.%2024%20\(1\)%20Mar.%202016/21%20JSSH-1246-2015.pdf](http://www.pertanika.upm.edu.my/Pertanika%20PAPERS/JSSH%20Vol.%2024%20(1)%20Mar.%202016/21%20JSSH-1246-2015.pdf)

- Sudjana, E.T.S., and Fitri, N. (2013). Kurt Cobain's suicide note case: Forensic linguistic profiling analysis. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociological Theory*, 6(4). 217-227. Retrieved from: <https://ijcst.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/ijcst/article/viewFile/37943/34410>
- Sumaljag, M.V. (2018). A forensic linguistic analysis of police reports. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 23(1).
- Shuy, R.W. (2007). *Language in the American Courtroom, Language and Linguistics Compass 1/1-2*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Tajabadi, A. Dowlatabadi, H. & Mehri, E. (2014). Grice's cooperative maxims in oral arguments: The case of dispute settlement councils in Iran. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1859 – 1865. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.616
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. London.
- Udina, N. (2016). Forensic linguistics implication for legal education: creating the e-textbook on language and law. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Science*, 237, 1337-1340. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2017.02.219
- Vrij, A. Leal, S. & Fisher, R.P. (2018). Verbal deception and the model statement as a lie detection tool. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 9, 492. DOI: 10.3389/fpsy.2018.00492
- Wang, J. (2016). A new political and communication agenda for political discourse analysis: Critical reflections on critical discourse analysis and political discourse analysis. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 2766-2784. Retrieved from: <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/3847>
- Waskita, D. (2014). Transitivity in a telephone conversation in a Bribery Case in Indonesia: a forensic linguistic study, *Journal Sosioteknologi*, 13(2), 91-100. DOI: 10.5614%2Fsostek.itbj.2014.13.2.3
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press. New York.