

VIOLATION OF MAXIMS IN “KNIVES OUT” MOVIE

THESIS



BY:

AULIA DEWI PUSPITAWATI

REG. NUMBER: A73217061

**ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES
UIN SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA**

2021

DECLARATION

I am the undersigned below:

Name : Aulia Dewi Puspitawati

NIM : A73217061

Department : English

Faculty : Arts and Humanities

University : UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya

Truly state that the thesis I wrote is really my original work, and not a plagiarism/fabrication in part or in whole.

If in the future it is proven that this thesis results from plagiarism/fabrication, either in part or in full, then I am willing to accept sanctions for such actions accordance with the applicable provisions.

Sidoarjo, March 17th 2021

Who make the statement



Aulia Dewi Puspitawati

APPROVAL SHEET

VIOLATION OF MAXIMS IN “KNIVES OUT” MOVIE

by

Aulia Dewi Puspitawati

Reg. Number: A73217061

Approved to be examined by the Board of Examiners, English Department,
Faculty of Arts and Humanities, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya

Surabaya, 17 Maret 2021
Thesis Advisor



Dr. H. Mohammad Kurjum, M. Ag
NIP. 196909251994031002

Acknowledged by:

The Head of English Department



Dr. Wahyu Kusumajanti, M.Hum
NIP. 197002051999032002

EXAMINER SHEET

This thesis has been approved and accepted by the Board of Examiners, English Department, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya on April 7th 2021

The Board of Examiners are:

Examiner 1



Dr. H. Mohammad Kurjum, M. Ag
NIP. 196909251994031002

Examiner 2



Dr. A. Dzoul Milal, M.Pd
NIP. 196005152000031002

Examiner 3



Suhandoko, M.Pd
NIP. 198905282018011002

Examiner 4



Raudlotul Jannah, M.App.Ling
NIP. 197810062005012004

Acknowledged by:
The Dean of Faculty of Arts and Humanities
UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya



Agus Aditoni, M.Ag
NIP. 196210021992031001



KEMENTERIAN AGAMA
UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA
PERPUSTAKAAN

Jl. Jend. A. Yani 117 Surabaya 60237 Telp. 031-8431972 Fax. 031-8413300
E-Mail: perpus@uinsby.ac.id

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN PERSETUJUAN PUBLIKASI
KARYA ILMIAH UNTUK KEPENTINGAN AKADEMIS

Sebagai sivitas akademika UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, yang bertanda tangan di bawah ini, saya:

Nama : Aulia Dewi Puspitawati
NIM : A73217061
Fakultas/Jurusan : Adab dan Humaniora / Sastra Inggris
E-mail address : auliadewi816@gmail.com

Demi pengembangan ilmu pengetahuan, menyetujui untuk memberikan kepada Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Hak Bebas Royalti Non-Eksklusif atas karya ilmiah :

☒ Skripsi ☐ Tesis ☐ Desertasi ☐ Lain-lain (.....)

yang berjudul :

VIOLATION OF MAXIMS IN "KNIVES OUT" MOVIE

beserta perangkat yang diperlukan (bila ada). Dengan Hak Bebas Royalti Non-Eksklusif ini Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya berhak menyimpan, mengalih-media/format-kan, mengelolanya dalam bentuk pangkalan data (database), mendistribusikannya, dan menampilkan/mempublikasikannya di Internet atau media lain secara **fulltext** untuk kepentingan akademis tanpa perlu meminta ijin dari saya selama tetap mencantumkan nama saya sebagai penulis/pencipta dan atau penerbit yang bersangkutan.

Saya bersedia untuk menanggung secara pribadi, tanpa melibatkan pihak Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, segala bentuk tuntutan hukum yang timbul atas pelanggaran Hak Cipta dalam karya ilmiah saya ini.

Demikian pernyataan ini yang saya buat dengan sebenarnya.

Surabaya, 8 JUNI 2021

Penulis

(AULIA DEWI PUSPITAWATI)
nama terang dan tanda tangan

ABSTRACT

Puspitawati, A.D. (2021). *Violation of Maxim in “Knives Out” Movie*. English Department, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. Advisor: Dr. Mohammad Kurjum, M.Ag.

Keywords: maxim violation, context of situation, Knives Out movie

This thesis aims to analyze the types of violation of maxims used by the main characters and its context of situation that affect the main characters in violating the maxims in “Knives Out” movie. The researcher uses Gricean theory. In this study, the data is the utterances from Benoit Blanc and Ransom Drysdale.

The method of this study was descriptive qualitative method. The way the researcher collected the data was by downloading both the “Knives Out” movie and its movie script from a website. The researcher gave code to the utterances which contained violation of maxims. Then the researcher classified the utterances based on the type of the four maxims and explained the context of situation which affected the characters in violating the maxim.

Based on the result of the study, the researcher finds 20 utterances uttered by the main characters that violate the four maxims, those are 4 utterances of violation of maxim of quantity by giving more information when the main character tries to reveal the case, 5 utterances of violation of maxim of quality by giving sarcastic statement when the main character feels resentful to other character because of her innocence, 9 utterances of violation of maxim of relevance by giving unrelated answer and hiding the truth when the character wants to dig the information, and 2 utterances of violation of maxim of manner by giving exaggerating and ambiguous answer when the characters feel confuse about the suspect and gave more description about the suspect of the case. In this study, violation of maxim of relevance is the most violated maxim than others.

ABSTRAK

Puspitawati, A.D. (2021). Pelanggaran Maksim dalam film “Knives Out”. English Department, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. Advisor: Dr. Mohammad Kurjum, M.Ag.

Kata Kunci: pelanggaran maksim, konteks situasi, film Knives Out

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisa jenis-jenis pelanggaran maksim yang digunakan oleh Benoit Blanc dan Ransom Drysdale serta situasi yang memengaruhi mereka ketika melanggar maksim dalam film “Knives Out”. Penulis menggunakan teori dari Grice. Di penelitian ini, data yang digunakan adalah ucapan-ucapan dari Benoit Blanc dan Ransom Drysdale.

Metode dalam penelitian ini adalah metode deskriptif kualitatif. Peneliti mengumpulkan data dengan cara mengunduh film “Knives Out” beserta skrip film dari sebuah website. Peneliti memberikan kode terhadap ucapan-ucapan yang mengandung pelanggaran maksim. Kemudian, peneliti mengelompokkan ucapan-ucapan tersebut ke dalam 4 tipe pelanggaran maksim dan menjelaskan konteks situasi yang memengaruhi para pemeran utama dalam melanggar maksim.

Berdasarkan hasil dari penelitian ini, penulis menemukan 20 ucapan dari Benoit Blanc dan Ransom Drysdale yang melanggar empat maksim, yaitu 4 ucapan yang melanggar maksim kuantitas dengan memberikan informasi yang berlebihan ketika Benoit Blanc mencoba untuk mengungkapkan kasusnya, 5 ucapan yang melanggar maksim kualitas dengan memberikan sindiran ketika Blanc merasa kesal dengan kepolosan pemain lain, 9 ucapan yang melanggar maksim hubungan dengan memberikan jawaban yang tidak sesuai dengan topic pembicaraan dan menyembunyikan kebenaran ketika pemain ingin menggali informasi tentang kasusnya, dan 2 ucapan yang melanggar maksim cara dengan memberikan pernyataan yang lebih-lebihkan dan ambigu ketika pemain merasa kebingungan mengenai pelaku dan untuk memberikan gambaran pelaku kejahatan dari kasus tersebut. Dalam penelitian ini, pelanggaran maksim hubungan adalah pelanggaran maksim yang paling tinggi daripada pelanggaran maksim yang lain.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Inside Cover	i
Approval Sheet	ii
Examiner's Sheet	iii
Declaration	iv
Acknowledgement	v
Abstract.....	vi
Abstrak.....	vii
Table of Content	viii
List of Tables	x
List of Figures	xi
 CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	 1
1.1 Background of Study	1
1.2 Statement of Problem	5
1.3 Significance of Study	5
1.4 Scope and Limitation	6
1.5 Definitions of Key Terms	6
 CHAPTER II REVIEW OF LITERATURE	 8
2.1 Implicature	8
2.2 Cooperative Principle	9
2.2.1 Maxim of Quantity.....	9
2.2.2 Maxim of Quality.....	10
2.2.3 Maxim of Relevance	10
2.2.4 Maxim of Manner.....	10
2.3 Maxim Violation	11
2.3.1 Violation of Maxim of Quantity.....	11
2.3.2 Violation of Maxim of Quality.....	12
2.3.3 Violation of Maxim of Relevance.....	12
2.3.4 Violation of Maxim of Manner	13
2.4 Context	14
2.5 “Knives Out” Movie	15

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents background of the study, statement of problems, significance of study, scope and limitation, and definition of key terms.

1.1 Background of Study

Communication is a verbal action of a process called sending-receiving messages. Communication aims to share the information with others. By communicating with others, people will have a chance to share new ideas, information, and knowledge. The form of communication is a conversation. Clark and Clark (1977, p. 25) stated that there are three elements in a conversation, those are a speaker, a listener, and a certain language. The listener is expected to understand the information uttered by the speaker. Between the speaker and the listener should be cooperative so that the message in the conversation can be delivered successfully. It can be said that the goal of communication is when the participants in a conversation have the same view.

The application of cooperative principles can lead the people in a success conversation. When people utter clearly and avoid ambiguity, it can be said that they reach the goal of communication. A communication happens when the participants can understand the meaning of the utterances. Therefore, in order to understand the utterances' meaning, the participants should observe the context, such as the listener, the situation during the conversation happens, and the topic of a conversation (Fromkin et.al, 2003, p.208).

The second previous study was conducted by Wijaksana (2016). His study was entitled The Violation Maxim Used in Television Program. In conducting this research, the researcher used Grice theory and Cho and Lake theory. The researcher found nineteen utterances which contained maxim violation. This research proved that violation of maxim was still understandable for the listener to catch the meaning. Besides, although the speakers violated the maxim, the speakers had strategies to repair the maxim so the discussion was more attractive and interactive.

The next researchers who have conducted a study about violation of maxim are Alfina and Subiyanto (2016). This study was entitled The Maxim Violation on Mata Najwa Talk Show ‘Selebriti Pengganda Simpati’. The data of this research were taken from the utterances from Mata Najwa talk show which

However, many studies on violation of maxim (Muhassin, 2019; Wijaksana, 2016; Suartana, Ramendra, & Juniarta, (2018); Alfina & Subiyanto, (2016) have focused on the use of violation of maxim using Gricean theory in different data sources, such as TV program, talk show, and student examination. But, as far as the researcher knows, none of the previous researchers analyze the violation of maxim and the context of situation theory whereas context of situation have influences which make the subject violates maxim. Then, the present researcher intends to examine about violation of maxim and also the context of situation when the conversation occurs. In addition, the researcher uses movie as the data source of this research, it is “Knives Out” movie.

Ransom Drysdale and Benoit Blanc are two appropriate characters to be analyzed in this research since they have their own way to solve their problem.

Benoit Blanc has a unique way to reveal the case. He starts the investigation by interviewing every person in Thrombey family, including Marta, Harlan's nurse. After interviewing them, he continues to investigate around the house which is possible to find the evidence. During the investigation, he is really careful about everything. For example, he finds the mud which cannot be seen by other detectives along the corridor to Harlan's room. Besides, he always puts jokes wherever he is. Then, Ransom Drysdale is an ignorant and ridiculing man. Also, he is cunning in making a plan to cover his mistakes. He acts like he is the victim of that incident. His personalities make him interesting to be analyzed in maxim violation. These are the reasons for the researcher in analyzing these main characters.

1.2 Statement of Problem

Based on background of study above, the researcher writes the following statement:

1. What are the violations of maxims found in “Knives Out” movie?
2. In what context does the violation of maxim occur between the main characters?

1.3 Significance of the Study

In this research, the researcher hopes that the result of this research can give significance to the readers. Theoretically, the result of this research can be beneficial to increase knowledge in Pragmatics area especially about cooperative

1. Violation of Maxim: a condition when the speaker does not fulfill the rule of a certain maxim
2. Conversational maxim: the rules in a conversation where the people must contribute in the conversation by giving informative answer, stating the fact, not ambiguous answer, and relevant.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter shows the theories which are relevant with the topic of the study, such as implicature, cooperative principle, maxim violation, and context of situation.

2.1 Implicature

One of a study of conversational structure is implicature. Levinson (1983, p. 97) states that the notion of implicature provides some explicit account of how it is possible to mean more than what actually said. It means that some meaning of utterance can be beyond the literal meaning. Although the meaning of it beyond the literal meaning, it is still possible to be interpreted by the hearer. According to Grundy (as cited in Bedraoui, 2012) implicature has its meaning which is conveyed indirectly, but it conveys through hints. Although there is hint in an utterance, the hearer still can catch the meaning of it.

Implicature studies about the way in understanding the implied meaning. There are two kinds of implicature, the first one is conventional implicature and the second one is conversational implicature. According to Yule (1996, p. 45), conventional implicature does not happen in a conversation and does not depend on the context for interpretation. In the other hand, Yule (1996, p. 40) states that conversational implicature is needed when the speaker talks with some additional meanings. Furthermore, conversational implicature is divided into two, generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational

2.2 Cooperative Principle

2.2.1 Maxim of Quantity

The rule of this maxim is informative. It means that the speaker requires in making contribution as informative as possible. When a person gives the information than it is required, it can be concluded that she/he violated maxim of quantity. Besides, if the speaker gives too little information, the speaker will fail

2.2.2 Maxim of Quality

2.2.3 Maxim of Relevance

2.2.4 Maxim of Manner

[illegible]

According to Paul Grice (2002, p.40), violation of maxim is a condition when people collide the maxims. People usually apply implicature in their conversation to delude the listeners which cause misunderstanding between the speakers and the listeners. Because of violating the maxim, the listeners will get wrong information. It can be concluded that the speakers fail to deliver their message to the listeners.

2.3.1 Violation of Maxim of Quantity

Violation of maxim of quantity is a condition when the speakers only provide little information to the listeners. It is because the speakers want to make misunderstanding toward the listeners. According to Grice (1975, p.45), violation of maxim of quantity has the criteria, such as uninformative speaker, the speaker repeats certain words, talks too much, and the speaker is not to the point. Here is the example of violation of maxim of quantity.

A: Does your dog bite?

B: No

A: (bends down to stroke it and gets bitten) Ow! You said your dog does not bite!

B: That is not my dog

(Cutting, 2002, p.40)

By seeing the example, B is violating the maxim of quantity because B realizes that the dog meant by A is the dog beside A, not the dog belongs to B at home. The violation happens since B does not give enough information to A which cause the dog bites A.

2.3.2 Violation of Maxim of Quality

Different from violation of maxim of quantity which provides little information, violation of maxim of quality provides the wrong information. The characteristic from violation of maxim of quality is when the speakers refuse or lie to give the true information to the listeners, change the information, and the speaker states sarcastic or ironic statement. It can be seen in the conversation from Cutting (2002, p. 40) below.

A: How much did that new dress cost, darling?

B: (see the tag-50 pounds, but says..) thirty-five pounds

It happens when the speaker gives an unsuitable answer to the topic of the conversation. B knows that the price of the new dress is 50 pounds, but B gives the wrong information to A by saying 35 pounds. Therefore, B is violating the maxim of quality since B does not give true information to A.

2.3.3 Violation of Maxim of Relevance

Violation of maxim of relevance means that the participant gives a response which is not relevant to the topic of a conversation. Besides that, the participant

2.4 Context

In pragmatics, context is one of the elements which is very important because it is useful for the language user about how to use the language. It means that context in a conversation can bring impact to the speaker. Levinson (1983, p.24) states that in Pragmatics, the study of context is needed since Pragmatics itself is a study about the context of role plays in utterance. Nunan (1993, p.7) states a context of situation refers to a particular situation. He also states about non-linguistics context, such as below:

a. Non Linguistics Context

Non linguistics context means that a context in which the discourse takes place. Non linguistics context is divided into six parts. First is the communicative event, for examples jokes, lecture, conversation, story, and greeting. Second is the topic which means that the content of a conversation. Third is the purpose of the event which is about the intended meaning of an utterance. Fourth is the setting which refers to time and place. And the last is the participant in the conversation which includes the speaker and the hearer.

Meanwhile, according to Yule (1996, p.21), context is one of the part of linguistics which refers to the phrase that is used. Also, the context and the physical environment are easily to know because it has a powerful impact in interpreting the expressions.

In addition, according to Mey (1993), context is a dynamic concept which agrees with the environment around and toward the utterance, it can give a deeper meaning. It means that the participants can interact each other during the

communication happens and the interaction of linguistic expression is understood in a conversation.

By the definitions above, it is concluded that context is about the physical and social surroundings in which both the speaker and the hearer can interpret the meaning of the utterance so it can avoid from misunderstanding. There are several points that must be paid attention in context, such as the communicative event, the topic of the conversation, the participant, the intended meaning of the utterance, the setting, and the background knowledge.

2.5 “Knives Out” Movie

“Knives Out” is 2019 movie which was directed and written by Rian Johnson. This movie was released for the first time on international film festival in Toronto then released in America. Many movie critics give compliments for this movie since the plot is delightful and every character has a strong influence in the movie. “Knives Out” movie elaborates three kinds of genre, those are mystery, drama, and comedy. The plot of the movie is begun when Harlan Thrombey, a mystery novel writer, was killed mysteriously in his room after his birthday party. His family tries to reveal the cause and the murderer by calling the cops. Besides, an ungoverned detective, named Benoit Blanc, also handles this case since he got an anonymous letter to investigate this case. But, during the investigation, all his plans are always ruined by Ransdom Drysdale, Harlans’s grandson. He is really cunning in covering his mistakes. At the same time, he also tries to be humble and funny man so people will not suspect at him. At the end of the story, after

This chapter presents the method in analyzing the data, research approach, data collection, and data analysis of the study.

In analyzing maxim violation in the movie, the researcher applied a descriptive qualitative method. According to Creswell (1988, p.15), a qualitative method is a research method that involves the collection, analysis, and interpretation of non-numerical data. It is used to explore and understand the meaning and experiences of individuals or groups. Qualitative research is often used to explore complex phenomena that cannot be fully understood through quantitative methods alone. It allows researchers to gain a deeper understanding of the underlying reasons and motivations behind human behavior and experiences. Qualitative research is often used in fields such as psychology, sociology, anthropology, and education. It involves a variety of data collection methods, including interviews, focus groups, and observations. The data is then analyzed and interpreted to identify themes and patterns. Qualitative research is often used to generate hypotheses and to explore new areas of research. It is a valuable tool for understanding the human experience and for developing theories and models of human behavior.

This study concerned on finding and describing the violation of the social norms and the im and context of situation which was used in “Knives Out” Movie

Data Collection

In this part, the researcher explained about how the researcher data in this study, such as data and data source, research instrument

3.2.1 Data and Data Source

The source of the data that was used by the researcher to develop this research was a movie produced by Rian Johnson which is entitled Knives Out. The researcher focused on each utterance in the form of words, phrases, and sentences uttered by the main characters in the movie as the data. The subjects of this research were Benoit Blanc and Ransom Drysdale. Benoit Blanc and Ransom Drysdale were the major characters who had influence in developing the plot.

Benoit Blanc is an ungoverned detective which was hired by anonymous. He is ordered to reveal a murder case of Harlan Thrombey, a mystery novel writer. He works as a team with the cops to reveal this case. Since this murder case happens in Thrombey's house, so Mr. Blanc suspects all the member of Thrombey family, includes Marta, Harlan's nurse. He investigates all of them and around the house to find the evidence of the murder. But, during the investigation, all his plans are always ruined by Ransom Drysdale, Harlan's grandson. He is really cunning in covering his mistakes. At the same time, he also tries to be humble and funny man so people will not suspect at him. The ways Blanc reveals the case are intelligence, full of carefulness, but relax make him found the cause and the murderer of Harlan Thrombey. The ways Blanc reveals the murder case and Ransom Drysdale tries to hide the truth make the plot interesting. Those things made Benoit Blanc and Ransom Drysdale were chosen as the subjects of this research.

3.2.2 Research Instrument

In this research, the instrument was the researcher herself. In descriptive qualitative research, the main instrument is human instrument. The researcher became the research instrument because some activities related to this research, such as collecting, analyzing, and making conclusion were done by the researcher.

3.2.3 Techniques of Data Collection

To collect the data, the researcher did some steps, such as:

1. The researcher watched “Knives Out” movie in order to understand about the plot, the characters, and the situation.
2. Then, the researcher downloaded the transcription of the movie which could ease the researcher in analyzing the data. It was taken from <https://www.rian-johnson.com/screenplays>
3. The researcher read the moviescript while watching the movie.
4. The researcher highlighted the main characters’ utterances which contained violation of maxim in the transcription.

3.3 Data Analysis

After collecting the data, there were some steps which were done to analyze the data by the researcher, such as:

1. The researcher identified the utterances which contain violation of maxim by giving code. In order to ease the researcher in classifying the

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the researcher presents findings and discussion of the analysis according to the two statements of problem, those are the types of maxim violation used by the characters and the context of situation which affect the characters in violating the maxim in “Knives Out” movie.

4.1 Findings

This section concerns on two points, those are the violation of maxim from the characters' utterances and the context of situation which influence the characters in violating the maxim.

4.1.1 Types of Violation of Maxim in the Conversation of Benoit Blanc and Ransom Drysdale

The researcher found 20 utterances that violated maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner which were done by Benoit Blanc and Ransom Drysdale in “Knives Out” movie. There were 4 utterances of violation of maxim of quantity, 5 utterances of violation of maxim of quality, 9 utterances of violation of maxim of relevance, and 2 utterances of violation of maxim of manner.

4.1.1.1 Violation of Maxim of Quantity

The researcher found 4 utterances that were indicated as violating the maxim of quantity. The indicated utterances can be categorized into violation of maxim of quantity because it had the rules of violation of maxim of quantity, such as when the speaker talks too short or too much, the speaker repeats certain words, and the utterance is not to the point.

Data 1

Trooper Wagner : An envelope? That worked?

Blanc : *An envelope of cash. So somebody suspects foul play, but goes through this ha cha dance of hiring me, of staying anonymous. Why? It makes no damn sense. Compels me though. Walk me through everyone's whereabouts at the time of death.*

From the conversation above, Blanc has answered Wagner's question on "a cash of envelope? That worked?". However, Blanc's respond is more than it is required by saying "An envelope of cash. So somebody suspects foul play, but goes through this ha cha dance of hiring me, of staying anonymous. Why? It makes no damn sense. Compels me though. Walk me through everyone's whereabouts at the time of death." From that utterance, Blanc wants to explain the motive of that anonymous of hiring Blanc as the investigator of Thrombey's death to Trooper Wagner and Lieutenant Elliott. Whereas the question dropped by Trooper Wagner is only about the envelope from that anonymous.

The answer responded by Blanc in that conversation is categorized as violation of maxim of quantity since Blanc's answer is more than asked by Trooper Wagner. According to Grice (1975, p.45), the speaker violates the maxim of quantity when he/she give respond more than it is required.

Based on the conversation above, Blanc's utterance in responding Lieutenant Elliott's question is too long. It makes Lieutenant Elliott and Marta confuse about that. Instead of telling the truth of the case directly, Blanc explains too much information to Marta and Lieutenant Elliott to give a description indirectly that Marta is not the suspect of the case. Therefore, Blanc's utterance toward Lieutenant Elliott's question before is categorized into violation of maxim of quantity.

Data 4

Marta : Is this about what Greatnana told you? She saw me that night, she mistook me for Ransom

Blanc : We'll get to that. In the meanwhile, Mr. Hugh Ransom Drysdale, you might tell us why you hired me?

Ransom : Why I hired you?

Blanc : You're right, let's back up. To the night of the party. Your argument with Harlan. What were the overheard words by the Nazi child masturbating in the bathroom - "my will" and "I'm warning you." You and Harlan were "drama mamas," you shared a love of twisting the knife into one another. I don't believe he would have slipped it in halfway - no, I submit that Harlan told you everything.

Blanc's response toward Ransom's question intends to make everyone in the room understand that Blanc tries to open the accused of the case. He explains a lot, the detail of the accident and states that Ransom already knew the will as the main point. As the result, Blanc violates the maxim of quantity since his response towards Ransom's question before is too much and complicated.

4.1.1.2 Violation of Maxim of Quality

There are five utterances that are categorized as violating the maxim of quality. They are categorized as violation of maxim of quality because they break

respond is categorized as violated maxim of quality because he does not want to be asked questions by the cops and he says something whereas he knows that it is false.

Data 7

Ransom : Hey, Frannie, how about a glass of cold milk?

Meg : Hey asshole. Not her name, not her job.

Ransom : *Meg, how's the SJW degree coming?*

Seeing from the conversation above, Ransom underestimate on Meg's warning. He mocks on Meg's warning sarcastically, saying that Meg has an ability in defending Fran. He does that because Fran is just a household assistant, and he is the family member of Thrombey, so he deserves a service. He ignores Meg's warning, and denounces her sarcastically. Therefore, Ransom's response towards Meg's statement is categorized as violation of maxim of quality since he mocks Meg sarcastically to have a degree of protector.

Data 8

Ransom: Marta I'm sorry. I told them everything, I figured it was all up. I'm sorry.

Marta : It's alright Ransom, I'm glad you did.

Blanc : Not exactly everything though.

Marta : Is this about what Greatnana told you? She saw me that night, she mistook me for Ransom

Blanc : We'll get to that. In the meanwhile, Mr. Hugh Ransom Drysdale, you might tell us all why you hired me.

Ransom: *Why I hired you?*

Based on the conversation above, Ransom tries to change the truth to everyone by giving Blanc other question. Ransom thinks that the question can make Blanc dizzy and avoid him to become suspect from other detectives so the truth will not be opened. In the end of the movie, as Blanc's suspect, it is a fact

that Ransom hired him to investigate Harlan's death. Therefore, Ransom violates the maxim of quality since his question changes the truth so he will not go to the jail.

Data 9

Ransom : Fran's alive?

Blanc : Oh yes (to Marta). Fran, who will confirm this fairy story or something close to it. (to Ransom) And will send you to jail.

In the conversation, Blanc's respond toward Ransom's question, "*Fran's alive?*" seems normal. But, after knowing the situation, Blanc actually changes the truth. He knows that the effect of Fran's accident can kill her. He does that because when Blanc explains the truth, Ransom denies it and says that Blanc is lying. So, in order to get Ransom's confession about his crime, Blanc tells a lie.

Therefore, between Ransom and Blanc's conversation, Blanc violates the maxim of quality because based on Gricean theory (1975, p.45), one of the criteria of violating this maxim is giving the wrong information. It is done by Blanc in order to make Ransom confess one of his crime, that is kill Fran to keep his secret.

4.1.1.3 Violation of Maxim of Relevance

In this type of maxim violation, the researcher finds 9 utterances that are included in violating the maxim of relevance. The utterances can be categorized into maxim violation of relevance because they have the rules of maxim violation of relevance, such as when the speaker changes the topic of the conversation in sudden and the speaker hides something behind or hides a fact.

Data 10

Blanc : Take a seat please. And you're paid a flat rate for how many hours a week?

Marta : Um.. well I started at 15, and then he.. He needed more help.

Blanc : Medical help?

Marta : He needed a friend

Blanc : *Does having a kind heart make you a good nurse?*

Lieutenant Elliott : All right Blanc, I mean, this is...

Blanc's utterance to Marta is not the topic of the question in investigation. He asks it because he is amazed on Marta's kind heart in accompanying Harlan as the personal nurse. He does not state directly about what he wants to say in investigation. On the contrary, he asks question which is not related to the investigation. Thus, Blanc's utterance is categorized as violation of maxim of relation because his response to Marta's utterance is not related and out of the topic of the conversation.

Data 11

Marta : This family, I should help them, right?
Blanc : *I have my own opinion. But I have feeling you'll follow your heart.*

Blanc responds on her question calmly. He says that he has his own opinion for Marta whether to help Thrombey's family or not. But, Blanc also thinks that Marta will do her will based on her feeling. Blanc's statement means that Marta will keep helping Thrombey's family although Blanc suggests her to not helping them.

According to the conversation, Blanc does not answer Marta's question directly. Blanc does that because he opines that Marta has her own mind to decide something justly. He asserts Marta that what she does is true. He states his own

opinion rather than answer Marta's question clearly. As the result, Blanc's statement on answering Marta's question is categorized into violation of maxim of relevance since his response on Marta's question is not related to the Marta's question.

Data 12

Marta: Uh.. yes. It is something I've had since I was a kid. It's a physical thing that I just the thought of lying..
Yeah, it makes me puke.

Blanc : Really? Is Richard having an affair?

Marta : Richard? An affair?

Blanc : A yes or no will do

Marta : Mmm.. No.

The conversation tells that Marta explains when she starts that reaction when she was kid by saying, *“Uh.. yes. It is something I’ve had since I was a kid. It’s a physical thing that I just the thought of lying.. Yeah, it makes me puke.”* As detective, Blanc wants to use this to dig more information to Marta deeper. Then, his careful respond influences Marta’s reaction. He says , *“Really? Is Richard having an affair?”* Marta cannot avoid the question. So she answers the question hesitantly by saying, *“Mmm.. No.”*. Not for long time, Marta pukes. Trooper Wagner and Lieutenant Eliott cannot believe that it is true. Seeing the conversation and the situation, Blanc’s respond toward Marta’s confession about her habit implies two things, Blanc is curious about the fact of Marta’s habit or he wants to make sure that his assumption about Richard’s affair is true so he asks it deliberately.

In addition, Blanc's respond is not related to Marta's statement. It can be seen that Marta explains her habit to Blanc, but Blanc responds it by giving other

herself. But, Blanc responds is not expected by Marta. He says, “*Tomorrow at eight*”.

According to the conversation, Blanc's response to Marta's question is not related at all. Blanc says that to convince Marta to join him during the investigation and proves his statement before that the truth will be revealed. So, he states the time of his investigation in the next day rather than answer Marta's question. As the result, Blanc violates the maxim of relevance since because his response to Marta is unmatched with the topic of the conversation.

Data 15

Marta : You gonna say something?

Ransom : *I always thought I was the only one that could beat him at Go.*

Based on the conversation above, Ransom's utterance is not relevant with the topic of their conversation. He does that because he is surprised on the fact of the case and wants to hide the truth from Marta. Therefore, Ransom violates the maxim of relevance since his response is not matched with the topic of the conversation.

Data 16

Marta : You regret helping me yet?

Ransom : *I regret not taking the Beemer*

The intention of Ransom's respond is trying to make Marta calm because Marta is really surprised and drives in a rush after Blanc looks at them. Also, Ransom's response can imply other meaning, that is he tries to throw a joke to Marta that her car is really slow to escape from the police and the detectives. Ransom knows that Marta is really panic, but he gives unmatched respond to

Marta. Ransom's response is categorized in violation of maxim of relation because Ransom throws unrelated response toward Marta's question.

Data 17

Blanc : Yes, you did, yes, he did, yes, you are. But.. but, I spoke in the car about the hole at the center of this donut. And what you and Harlan did that fateful night seems at first glance to fill that hole perfectly. A donut hole in a donut's hole. But we must look little closer. And when we do, we see the donut hole has a hole in its center. It is not a donut hole, but a smaller donut with its own hole and our donut is not whole at all!

Lieutenant Elliott : Blanc, look, I understand it is amusing for you but-

Blanc : *Why. Was. I. Hired? Why would someone hired me?*

Lieutenant Elliott : Someone fishing for a crime to reverse the will, Blanc. Come on

Blanc : All right, yeah. We do have that.

Ransom tries to hide result in front of the people in the library because he does not want his crime exposed and goes to the jail. So he shouts that Marta is the suspect on Harlan's death because Marta confessed before to the detectives that the medicine for Harlan was switched accidentally. As the result, Ransom violates the maxim of relevance since his response implies that he wants to hide the truth from others.

4.1.1.4 Maxim Violation of Manner

In this type of maxim violation, the researcher finds two data. They are categorized as maxim violation of manner because the speaker exaggerates something, uses ambiguous language and slang to people but they cannot understand the meaning.

Data 19

Linda : Mr. Blanc, I know who you are. I read your profile in the *New Yorker*. I found it delightful. I just buried my 85-year-old father who committed suicide. Why are you here?

Blanc : I am here at the behest of a client.

Linda : Who?

Blanc : *I cannot say, but let me assure you this: my presence will be ornamental, a respectful, quiet, passive observer of the truth.*

Based on the conversation, Blanc's respond towards Linda' question is exaggerating. It happens because at the first time, before Blanc introduces himself, Linda is already doubt about his presence. So, to make her believe that his presence will be needed to solve the case, Blanc exaggerates his respond without mentioning his client. As the result, Blanc's response toward Linda's

question violates the maxim of manner since his respond is exaggerating from Linda's expected answer from him.

Data 20

Blanc : I anticipate the terminus of Gravity's Rainbow

Marta :Gravity's Rainbow?

Blanc :It's a novel.

Marta : Yeah I know. I haven't read it though.

Blanc : Neither have I. Nobody has. But I like the title. It describes the path of a projectile, determined by natural law. Voila, my method. I observe the facts without biases of the head or heart, I determine the arc's path, stroll leisurely to its terminus, and the truth falls at my feet.

Blanc wants Marta know his method in investigating this case. To make Marta understands about his method and to assure Marta that the death of Harlan will be revealed, Blanc depicts his method with the title of a novel, Gravity's Rainbow. Based on the conversation, Blanc violates the maxim of manner because his ambiguous response towards Marta's statement.

4.1.2 The Context of Situation that Affect Benoit Blanc and Ransom

Drysdale in Violating the Maxim

In this point, the researcher focuses on the explanation of the situation that causes the main characters, Benoit Blanc and Ransom Drysdale, violate the maxim.

4.1.2.1 Context of Situation in Violation of Maxim of Quantity

Data 1

Trooper Wagner : An envelope? That worked?

Blanc : *An envelope of cash. So somebody suspects foul play, but goes through this ha cha dance of hiring me, of staying anonymous. Why? It makes no damn sense. Compels me*

inheritance. Their topic of conversation is about Blanc who rejects Marta's statement that she murdered Harlan. Blanc depicts the case through the term 'donut holes' which means that lots of accidents behind the murder of Harlan. Meanwhile, an accident when Marta gives wrong doses to Harlan becomes the main point of this case. The intention Blanc uses that term is to explain the criminal's method in running the plan and makes Marta as the criminal of the case through her failure. Blanc tries to make Marta realize that Harlan's murder is not because of her mistake.

Data 3

Lieutenant Elliott : What if someone in the family had observed Marta doing something suspicious?

Blanc : But they would have had no reason to not speak up. No. The answer is not so simple.

Now with the entire solution in my field of view, the arc of this case is a tragedy of errors. And Marta, it will not be easy for you to hear. But there is at least one truly guilty party behind it all, guilty in the true sense of acting with malice, and committing a heinous crime with selfish intent.

The conversation above occurs in the library in Thrombey's house after Marta announced to accept the inheritance from Harlan. The topic of their conversation is that the case of Harlan can be called as a tragedy of errors according to Blanc's view. He states that because the plan of the criminal is not running well. The intention from Blanc's utterance is to state that the criminal of the case is not Marta, Harlan's personal nurse. There is a person who becomes the criminal of the case and Blanc concludes that the motive of the case is caused by a malice.

Data 4

Marta : Is this about what Greatnana told you? She saw me that night, she mistook me for Ransom

Blanc : We'll get to that. In the meanwhile, Mr. Hugh Ransom Drysdale, you might tell us why you hired me?

Ransom : Why I hired you?

Blanc : You're right, let's back up. To the night of the party. Your argument with Harlan. What were the overheard words by the Nazi child masturbating in the bathroom - "my will" and "I'm warning you." You and Harlan were "drama mamas," you shared a love of twisting the knife into one another. I don't believe he would have slipped it in halfway - no, I submit that Harlan told you everything.

The conversation between Ransom and Blanc happens in the library of Thrombey's house. Trooper Wagner takes Ransom to the library as Blanc requested before he explores the case. The topic of the conversation above is Blanc indirectly suspects Ransom as the accused of the case. It is proven when Blanc asks to Ransom, "*why you hired me?*". Getting that question from Blanc makes Ransom confuse. Then, Blanc explains the plot before Harlan murdered. The intention Blanc explains the accident is to reveal the criminal of the case. It can be seen from the utterance when Blanc tells that Harlan revealed his will to Ransom which makes Blanc restate about "*I'm warning you*" in which it was stated by Ransom to Harlan.

4.1.2.2 Context of Situation in Violation of Maxim of Quality

Data 5

Marta : I've never been to a will reading.

Blanc : *Oh well... You think it'll be like a game show. But think of community theatre production of a tax return.*

Marta : So, what are we looking for?

Blanc : Anything suspicious or out of the ordinary. You'll know when you see it.

The dialogue happens between Marta and Blanc. They are in the backyard of Thrombey's house after looking for footprints in the path behind the house. They talk about a will reading that will be held at 10.00 am. After Marta said that she never comes to a will reading, Blanc responds by saying *"Oh well... You think it'll be like a game show. But think of community theatre production of a tax return."* The intention when Blanc gives that response sarcastically is to inform Marta that a will reading is kind of a salary for Thrombey family members since Harlan is wealthy.

Data 6

Leutenant Eliott : We just wanna ask a few questions
Ransom : (nods arrogantly, then leave the police officers)
Trooper Wagner : Excuse me. Sir? We're officers of the law!
Ransom : *You gonna run me in? I don't feel like talking. I'm distraught.*

The conversation happens between Lieutenant Eliott, Ransom, and Trooper Wagner which takes place in the Thrombey's terrace. The conversation is about asking Ransom to do investigation with the police officers. Ransom becomes the last family member who gets question for investigation because he did not come when all the family members were in investigation with Blanc and police officers. After Lieutenant Eliott states his purpose, Ransom just nods and leaves them. He also states that he is afraid to be investigated by the police officers. By stating that statement, Ransom intends to avoid to be investigated so he is save from the accusation as the criminal of the case.

Data 7

Ransom : Hey, Frannie, how about a glass of cold milk?

Meg : Hey asshole. Not her name, not her job.

Ransom : *Meg, how's the SJW degree coming?*

The conversation above occurs in the living room of Thrombey's house at 10.00 am by Ransom and Meg. It talks about Ransom teases Meg with her SJW degree. Ransom asks Fran, a household assistant, to take him a glass of milk but Meg is annoyed and says that he is impolite by emphasizing Fran's position. It is responded by Ransom sarcastically by stating Meg's SJW degree. The intention of Ransom states that because he satirizes Meg as if Fran has the same position with them.

Data 8

Ransom: Marta I'm sorry. I told them everything, I figured it was all up. I'm sorry.

Marta : It's alright Ransom, I'm glad you did.

Blanc : Not exactly everything though.

Marta : Is this about what Greatnana told you? She saw me that night, she mistook me for Ransom

Blanc : We'll get to that. In the meanwhile, Mr. Hugh Ransom Drysdale, you might tell us all why you hired me.

Ransom: *Why I hired you?*

The conversation above takes place in the library of Thrombey's house. Trooper Wagner takes Ransom to the library after Blanc asks him. Marta looks surprised that Ransom is in the library. Ransom also thinks that he is asked to come in the library as the witness over Marta regarding Harlan's death. So, he admitted that he confessed everything to the detective which can lead Marta to the jail. Marta looks alright because she thinks that she caused Harlan's death after giving the wrong medicine doses.

Data 9

Blanc :Oh yes (to Marta). Fran, who will confirm this fairy story or something close to it. (to Ransom) And will send you to jail.

4.1.2.3 Context of Situation in Violation of Maxim of Relevance

Blanc : Take a seat please. And you're paid a flat rate for how many hours a week?

Blanc : Medical help?

[illegible]

Data 12

Marta: Uh.. yes. It is something I've had since I was a kid. It's a physical thing that I just the thought of lying..

Yeah, it makes me puke.

Blanc : Really? Is Richard having an affair?

Marta : Richard? An affair?

Blanc : A yes or no will do

Marta : Mmm.. No.

The conversation between Marta and Blanc occurs in the afternoon at the backyard of Thrombey's house. Blanc is investigating Marta to find the prove of the case of Harlan. In addition, Marta confesses that she will puke if she tells lies. After knowing the condition, Blanc asnwers by asking Richard is having affair or not. The purpose of Blanc says that is to dig information and to find the prove which becomes the motive of the case. In addition, he ensures that Marta's habit, she is puke when she tells lie, is true.

Data 13

Marta : I'm just going to go get some Scope

Blanc : Miss Cabrera, was Harlan planning on cutting off Joni's allowance?

Marta : I...

Lieutenant Eliott : Ok don't answer that if you're going to puke. Please.

Blanc : Meg said Harlan pays the school directly, Joni says he sends the money to her.

Both were true, she was pocketing the double payment, Harlan found out and cut her off without a cent. Yes? No?

In this conversation, Marta and Blanc are still in the investigation. But, Marta wants to take scope after she pukes because she tells a lie about Richard's affair. In this conversation, Blanc asks again about Joni's allowance. Joni is Harlan's daughter-in-law who receives allowance from Harlan for the study of her daughter, Meg. Blanc intends to ask that to find out the prove which can be the

Ransom has just known that his plan to make Marta as the accused of the case is mess. He says that he cannot beat Harlan at playing Go means that Harlan is smarter than he thinks in this case. But, Ransom will not confess it in front of Marta. So, the intended meaning when Ransom says that is to hide the truth by giving parable.

Data 16

Marta : You regret helping me yet?

Ransom : *I regret not taking the Beemer*

The conversation occurs in the morning. Marta and Ransom come to the laboratory where Harlan had his blood work before autopsy. But, they do not park their car too close with the laboratory because the police officers may suspect them as the accused of that burnt laboratory. Their conversation happens when Blanc knows them around the laboratory and they try to escape. While they escape from Blanc, Marta asks Ransom whether he regrets to help her or not. Then, Ransom responds that he regrets not taking his Porsche because Marta's car is not as fast as his Porsche. Although Ransom's utterances seems a joke, but it implies that he is afraid to be caught by the cops. It happens because he is the criminal who burnt the laboratory.

Data 17

Blanc : Yes, you did, yes, he did, yes, you are. But.. but, I spoke in the car about the hole at the center of this donut. And what you and Harlan did that fateful night seems at first glance to fill that hole perfectly. A donut hole in a donut's hole. But we must look little closer. And when we do, we see the donut hole has a hole in its center. It is not a donut hole, but a smaller donut with its own hole and our donut is not whole at all!

Lieutenant Eliott : Blanc, look, I understand it is amusing for you but-

Blanc : *Why. Was. I. Hired? Why would someone hired me?*

Lieutenant Eliott : Someone fishing for a crime to reverse the will, Blanc.
Come on

The conversation occurs in the library of Thrombey's house. They are talking about the reason Blanc was hired and the motive behind the death of Harlan. Lieutenant Eliott looks so annoyed with Blanc's explanation that the case of Harlan's death is not so simple. He thinks that this case is just a common suicide case with the motive to wrest inheritance from Harlan but Blanc makes it complicated and confusing.

To break the Lieutenant Eliott's doubt, Blanc emphasizes why he was hired anonymously. Besides, he also emphasizes it in order to explore that this case is too complicated both in the side of the plan of the crime and also in the side of hiring Blanc as the detective.

Data 18

Blanc : And we are not finished untangling it. Not yet. Marta, when Greatnana spotted you climbing down the trellis, she said ‘Ransom? Are you back again already?’ ‘cause earlier that night, Greatnana said ‘you’re back?’

Ransom : Come on, Marta. This is stooped with the two o's. you don't have a shred of evidence, you're just spinning a fairy tale.

Blanc : Not a shred no, just as we have no real proof of Marta's mixing up the vials so it's your word against -

Ransom : *You have her confession!*
Blanc : All right, yeah. We do have that.

The conversation takes place in the library of Thrombey's house. That conversation is about Blanc and Ransom have little debate because Blanc explores the accident behind the death of Harlan Thrombey to Marta, Lieutenant Eliott, and

maxim with various ways, such as by giving irrelevant response and unmatched utterances from the topic of conversation. The characters do that since they are influenced by several situation. For example, Ransom Drysdale violates this maxim because he hides the truth to manipulate the police officers and the detective so he will not be the criminal of the case. In the meanwhile, Blanc violates the maxim in order to dig more information, to find the prove of the case, and to hide the truth.

. The second position is violation of maxim of quality where the characters violate the maxim by throwing wrong information and sarcastic statement. By applying those ways, Blanc hopes that the criminal of the case confesses his criminal.

In the third position, there is violation of maxim of quantity which is the most violated by the characters. It happens because the characters want to tell much information than it is required and talk too short in order to reveal the suspect of the case. Moreover, violation of maxim of manner is the least violated maxim in this movie. The researcher found that character gives exaggerating and ambiguous answer while he is talking because he wants to explain the method used in revealing the case.

This study is supported by the research finding of Alfina & Subiyanto (2016). Their study stated that violation of maxim of relevance was dominant than others. From Alfina & Subiyanto's study (2016), the utterances that are uttered by the interlocutors prefer to leave their utterances to others. It aims that the interlocutor wants to show politeness and to keep the good image for other guests.

Furthermore, Blanc and Ransom Drysdale violate the maxim in different way. Mostly, Blanc violates the maxim when he does his investigation. For example in data 13, Blanc knows that Marta will take some scope after she puked, but he violates the maxim of relevance in order to dig more information about the truth of Harlan's family member. Also, when Blanc finds the criminal, he violates the maxim, by giving wrong information, to make the criminal confesses his crime unconsciously. In contrast, Ransom Drysdale violates the maxim in order to cover his crime because he is the real criminal of the case. one of the example, it is shown in data 15 when Marta shares her worry about her family to Ransom, but Ransom responds her by talking about Go Board, in which it is not relevant with their topic of conversation.

During the conversation happens, both the speaker and the listener must be careful in choosing the right diction and the situation. Not all people have the same background knowledge which means that some people are perhaps confuse

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

5.1 Conclusion

The characters violated the maxim in various ways and situations. They had tendency to violate the maxim of quantity by giving too much information than it is needed when the character felt confuse to explain the motive behind the case so the hearer gave much information. Whereas, in violation of maxim of relevance, the utterances that were uttered by the characters were not matched with the utterances before. They violated that maxim when they were curious about unclear information. Moreover, the characters violated maxim of quality by giving sarcastic statement and untrue statement when they were resentful to others so they threw sarcastic statement and provoked other character to reveal the

5.2 Suggestion

Based on the result of the research above, the researcher would like to propose to the next researcher who wants to analyze the same field. The next researcher can analyze the violation of maxim with various aspects and objects of research, such as comic, talk show, short movies, etc. Besides, the next researcher can relate it with other branches of linguistics in order to enrich the analysis.

<https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/movie?q=movie>