

**AN ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING MAXIMS USED BY ELIZABETH IN
AUSTEN'S PRIDE AND PREJUDICE THE MOVIE**

THESIS

Submitted as Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Sarjana Degree of
English Department Faculty of Humanities UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya



By:

Putri Istighfarina Hadi Fajrina

Reg. Number: A83210126

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

FACULTY OF LETTERS AND HUMANITIES

STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA

2014

DECLARATION

This thesis contains materials which have been accepted for the award of Sarjana degree of English Department Faculty of Humanities UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, and to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by other person except where due reference is made in the text of the thesis.

Surabaya, July 2th, 2014

Writer,



(Putri Istighfarina Hadi Fajrina)

A83210126

Approved to be examined

Surabaya, June 10th 2014


Thesis advisor



Dr. A. Dzo'ulMilal, M.Pd.
NIP. 196005152000031002

Acknowledged by

Head of English Department



Endratno Pili Swasono, M.Pd.
NIP. 197106072003121001

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF LETTERS AND HUMANITIES
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA
2014

This thesis has been approved and accepted by the board of examiners of English
Department, faculty of Letters and Humanities, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

Surabaya, 7th July 2014

Dean

A purple circular stamp of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya is overlaid on a handwritten signature. The stamp contains the text 'KEMENTERIAN AGAMA', 'FAKULTAS ADAB DAN HUMANIAH', 'SURABAYA', and 'UIN SUNAN AMPEL'.

Dr. H. Imam Ghozali, M.A
NIP. 196002121990031002

The Board of Examiners

Head of Examination

A handwritten signature in black ink.


Dr. A. Dzo'ul Milal, M.Pd.
NIP. 196005152000031002

Secretary

A handwritten signature in black ink.

Abdulloh Ubet, M. Ag
NIP. 196605071997031003

Examiner I

A handwritten signature in black ink.

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

Examiner II

A handwritten signature in black ink.

Endratno Pilih Swasono, M.Pd.
NIP. 197106072003121001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Inside Cover Page	i
Inside Title Page	ii
Declaration Page	iii
Motto	iv
Dedication Page	v
Thesis Advisor's Approval Page	vi
Thesis Examiners' Approval Page	vii
Acknowledgement	viii
Table of Contents	x
Abstract	xiii
Intisari	xiv

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Statement of Problems	9
1.3 Objectives of the Study	9
1.4 Significance of the Study	9
1.5 Scope and Limitation	10
1.6 Definition of Key Terms	13

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Pragmatics	8
2.2 Implicature	9
2.3 Grice's Cooperative Principle	9
2.3.1 Maxim of Quantity.....	10
2.3.2 Maxim of Quality.....	11
2.3.3 Maxim of Relation	12
2.3.4 Maxim of Manner	12
2.4 Flouting Maxims	
2.4.1 Flouting Maxim of Quantity	14
2.4.2 Flouting Maxim of Quality	15
2.4.3 Flouting Maxim of Relation.....	16
2.4.4 Flouting Maxim of Manner.....	16
2.5 Presupposition	17
2.6 Context	18
2.7 Previous Study	18
2.7.1 The Study of Kirana.....	19
2.7.2 The Study of Prastyaning.....	20

CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Approach.....	22
3.2 Data Source.....	22
3.3 Data	23
3.4 Technique of Data Collection.....	23
3.5 Research Instrument	23
3.6 Technique of Data Analysis.....	24

CHAPTER IV FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Findings 25

 4.1.1 Maxims flouted by Elizabeth..... 25

 4.1.2 The aims Elizabeth flouted the maxims..... 25

 4.1.3 The context Elizabeth flouted the maxims..... 26

4.2 Discussion 26

CHAPTER V CONCLUSION 48

REFERENCES..... 50

APPENDICES 53

ABSTRACT

Fajrina, P.I.H. 2014. *An Analysis of Flouting Maxims used by Elizabeth in Austen's Pride and Prejudice the Movie*. English Department, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, State Islamic University Sunan Ampel Surabaya. Advisor: Dr. A. Dzo'ul Milal, M. Pd.

Key Terms : Grice's Cooperative Principle, Flouting Maxims, Pride and Prejudice, Elizabeth Bennet.

Language is a system to transfer and inform something through a communication. A good communication can avoid misunderstanding between the hearer and speaker. To make the communication be cooperative there is a theory named cooperative principle which it was introduced by Grice (1975). Cooperative principle has strong relation with the 'four rules' in communication, those are maxims. Maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner make the speaker transfer the information clearer to the hearer. Those four rules can make the conversation run well.

Flout is one of the theories that can break the maxims which will be used by the researcher to analyze this movie. The researcher analyzes the utterances spoken and flouted by Elizabeth. She is second daughter of Mr. Bennet and Mrs. Bennet, the main character in this movie. The researcher will take the words, sentences, utterances, or expressions produced by the main character, Elizabeth. Also, to add deeper explanation, the researcher included some utterances produced by other character in a dialog related to Elizabeth. It was used to build or create the context that the utterances flouted by Elizabeth spoken in this movie.

Pride and prejudice the movie was directed by Joe Wright (2005) which is adapted from Austen's novel *Pride and Prejudice*. In the end of this research conclude that Elizabeth flouted all the maxims; maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relevant, and maxim of manner. In this movie, Elizabeth described as a girl who has good humor tasted, lovely, brave and have a personal unique. Those are why the researcher put her as the object in this research.

INTISARI

Fajrina, P.I.H. 2014. *An Analysis of Flouting Maxims used by Elizabeth in Austen's Pride and Prejudice the Movie*. English Department, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, State Islamic University Sunan Ampel Surabaya. Advisor: Dr. A. Dzo'ul Milal, M. Pd.

Key Terms : Grice's Cooperative Principle, Flouting Maxims, Pride and Prejudice, Elizabeth Bennet.

Bahasa adalah suatu sistem untuk mentransfer dan menginformasikan sesuatu dalam berkomunikasi. Komunikasi yang bagus adalah komunikasi yang dapat menghindari sesuatu yang menyebabkan salah paham antara pendengar dan pembicara. Untuk menjadikan komunikasi menjadi komunikasi kooperatif ada sebuah teori yakni *cooperative principle* yang diperkenalkan oleh Grice (1975). *Cooperative Principle* mempunyai hubungan yang erat dengan “empat aturan” dalam berkomunikasi, yakni maxim. Maxim kuantitas, maxim kualitas, maxim hubungan, dan maxim cara/sikap dapat membuat pembicara mentransfer informasi lebih jelas kepada pendengar. Empat aturan tersebut membuat komunikasi berjalan dengan baik.

Flout adalah salah satu teori yang dapat merusak maxim yang akan digunakan penulis untuk menganalisis film ini. Penulis menganalisis perkataan/ucapan yang diucapkan dan yang mengandung *flout* oleh Elizabeth. Dia adalah putri kedua dari Tn. Bennet dan Ny. Bennet, pemeran utama di film ini. Penulis akan mengambil kata-kata, kalimat, ucapan, dan ekspresi yang dicontohkan oleh pemeran utama, Elizabeth. Dan juga untuk memberi penjelasan mendalam, penulis memasukan ucapan-ucapan yang diucapkan oleh karakter lain yang berdialog dengan Elizabeth. Hal tersebut bertujuan untuk membangun konteks kalimat yang telah di *flout* Elizabeth di dalam film ini.

Pride and Prejudice adalah sebuah film yang disutradarai oleh Joe Wright (2005) yang diadaptasi dari novel Jane Austen *Pride and Prejudice*. Di akhir penelitian ini telah disimpulkan bahwasanya Elizabeth mem-*flout* semua maxim; maxim kuantitas, maxim kualitas, maxim hubungan, dan maxim cara/sikap. Di dalam film ini Elizabeth Bennet digambarkan sebagai seorang gadis yang mempunyai selera humor yang bagus, penyayang, pemberani dan pribadi yang unik. Hal tersebut merupakan alasan kenapa penulis menjadikan Elizabeth sebagai objek dalam penelitian ini.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the researcher explains about background of the study, problems of the study, objectives of the study, significance of the study, scope and limitation and the definition of the key terms.

1.1 Background of the Study

Language is a system to transfer and inform something through a communication. People usually use language to inform, to express their idea, and to build up their social relationship; so that language is important thing for human being to maintain their life. Saussure's (1974) theory can prove the statement above, he states that "language is a system of signs that express ideas, and is therefore comparable to a system of writing, the alphabet of deaf-mutes, symbolic rites, polite formulas, military signals, etc." (p. 16). Additionally that language is the most important tool for us to communicate with other people, whether in writing, gesturing, or speaking. Furthermore, Charles (2003) states that "humans communicate not just through language but through other means such as gesture, art, dress, and music" (p. 3). In the daily interaction, people need language as they tool to have a good communication. A good communication can avoid misunderstanding between the hearer and speaker. To make the communication be cooperative there is a theory named cooperative principle which it was introduced by Grice (1975), as stated by Grundy (2000) in his book that "Grice argued that speakers intends to be cooperative when they talk. One way of being cooperative

is for a speaker is to give as much information as is expected" (p. 73). According to Levinson (1983), "cooperative principle is a set of general rules to describe how participants 'cooperate' in conversation to achieve smooth and efficient interaction" (p. 101).

Cooperative principle has strong relation with the 'four rules' in communication, those are maxims. Maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relevant, and maxim of manner make the speaker transfer the information clearer to the hearer. Those four rules can make the conversation run well.

Obviously, it is impossible for people to obey those 'four rules' when they do the conversation. People may break the maxim when do the interaction. There are some possibilities for people to break the maxim; first, maybe the speaker needs to add too much information to the hearer to make it clearer. Second, perhaps the speaker wants to inside a humor in their conversation. Third, breaking the maxims is also appreciated in language as it may be found in the poems, music lyrics, novel or dialogue in the movie. Movie is the data chosen for this research because movie is the most complicated one that uses all of the elements of communication to transfer the message of the story to the audiences or hearers. *Flout* is one of the theories that can break the maxims which will be used by the researcher to analyze this movie.

The researcher analyzes the utterances spoken and flouted by Elizabeth. She is the main character in the movie *Pride and Prejudice*. *Pride and prejudice* the movie was directed by Joe Wright (2005) which is adapted from Austen's novel

Pride and Prejudice. The object of this study is chosen because of many reasons. First, the researcher is curious with the utterances flouted by the main character and it will be an interesting topic to discuss. It is because the main character will give many effects to the audiences. Second, the utterances spoken by the main character may contain 'language style' that can break the maxims, such as hyperbole, metaphor, irony and banter.

From that phenomenon, it strengthens the researcher in conducting the study of flouting maxims used in the movie "Pride and Prejudice". Here the researcher carries out a research entitled "an analysis of flouting maxims used by Elizabeth in Austen's pride and prejudice the movie".



1.2 Statement of Problems

In the study of flouting maxims used by Elizabeth in Austen's *Pride and*

Prejudice movie, the researcher has three problems to answer as follows:

1. How the maxims are flouted by Elizabeth in the Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* movie?
2. What are the aims of flouting maxims performed by Elizabeth in the *Pride and Prejudice* movie?
3. What context does Elizabeth flout the maxims in the *Pride and Prejudice* movie?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The writer's objectives of this study are to answer the problems that appear in this research as follows:

1. To describe types of maxims flouted by Elizabeth in the *Pride and Prejudice* movie.
2. To reveal the aims of flouting maxims performed by Elizabeth in the *Pride and Prejudice* movie.
3. To describe the contexts of flouting maxims used by Elizabeth in the *Pride and Prejudice* movie.

1.4 Significance of the study

The significances of the study are to give contributions in pragmatics study especially conversational implicature. The finding of the study is expected to be references or alternative information about how to apply pragmatics study especially in how to analyze flouting maxims in the movie. The result of this study is expected to give exploration and deeper understanding toward flouting maxims in the movie. This study is also expected to be a reference and alternative information for other researchers in conducting research in this area. In other words, the researcher hopes the result of this study can enrich the knowledge and add the new example object that can be analyzed by flouting the maxims; so the other researcher can easily do the research. Furthermore, the researcher hopes that this study can raise the reader's knowledge and understanding in predicting the conversation that delivers the meaning when doing communication and it will

successfully transform to the receiver. The research is also expected to arouse curiosity and interest in other linguists and students of linguistics to make further research on this kind of study.

1.5 Scope and Limitation

This study focuses on Elizabeth Bennet, the main character in Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*. The researcher will analyze the conversations flouted by Elizabeth in that movie. The study is restricted to the utterances spoken by Elizabeth. Deeper understanding context will be taken in the dialog from the other characters who did the conversation with Elizabeth.

The reason why the researcher takes a movie is because movie takes place as an important media which can give influences directly toward the audiences because visualization will be easier to remember. The utterances spoken by the character in this movie can affect the audiences whether it will deliver bad or good messages to the audiences, especially if the utterances are spoken by the main character. The main character is the most important part of the story. The main character can give many influences for the readers or audiences because of the position in that story. Thus, to make it successfully deliver the messages to the audiences the researcher uses the theory of *implicature* in doing the research.

Actually, there are two kinds of *implicature*. Those are conventional *implicature* and conversational *implicature*. The difference of both of them is that the conventional *implicature* does not obey the cooperative principle but conversational *implicature* does. It is supported by Grice that, Grice (1975)

divides *implicature* into two types, conventional *implicature* and conversational *implicature*. First, conventional *implicature* is determined by the conventional meaning of the words used. Second, conversational “*implicature*” is the theory how people use the language. It is a theory how people communicate to others. Conversational “*implicature*” is something that deals with cooperative principle or maxims (Brown and Yule, 1983, p. 31).

Related with cooperative principle, it is also talking about maxims, and something that can break the maxims. Flout is one of the things that can be broken the maxims, and it will be used to analyze the utterances produced by Elizabeth in this movie.

1.6 Definition of Key Terms

In order to avoid any misunderstanding of the terms and to make them clearer, the researcher would like to give certain definition of key terms used in this study. The key terms are provides as follows:

1. **Flouting**, is a particularly silent way of getting an addressee to draw an inference and hence recover an *implicature*. (Grundy , 2000:78).
2. **“Implicature”** is the term which describes that there is another or hidden meaning in the messages delivered by the conversant. According to Grice, “*implicature*” is what speaker can imply, suggest, or mean as distinct from the speaker literally say (Grice, 1975: 45)
3. **Cooperative principle** a notion formalized by Grice in which people try to be cooperative when they talk (Grundy, 2000:273). It means that, there is a rule when the speakers convey the language and

listeners receive the message. They do the conversation and both of them are exchanging messages.

4. **Elizabeth** is the main character in the *Pride and Prejudice* movie that is used by the researcher to be analyzed in her research. She is the second daughter of Mr. Bennet in the Austen's *Pride and prejudice*.
5. **Pride and Prejudice** is a 2005 British romance film directed by Joe Wright and based on Jane Austen's novel. The film describes five sisters from an English family of landed gentry as they deal with issues of marriage, morality and misconceptions.
6. **Jane Austen** is an author of *Pride and Prejudice* novel.
7. **Context** the situation that gives rise to a discourse and it is within the discourse (Nunan, 1993, p. 6). It means that, that term can explain deeper understanding to support the atmosphere that happens when do the interaction.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL BASES

In this chapter, the researcher discusses Grice's theory of conversational maxims. Then, the writer also gives explanation of the ways the flouting of maxims. Also, previous studies are intended to make the comparison between this research and the others. In this part of the thesis, the researcher will explain the framework of the analysis which will help the researcher to answer the research problems.

2.1 Pragmatics

There are some linguists' interpretations about pragmatics but basically they have same idea that pragmatics is the study of language used in communication and the associated usage principles. According to Grundy (2000), pragmatics is about explaining how we produce and understand the language which is used in communication everyday but apparently rather peculiar uses of language (p. 3).

The researcher uses this theory of pragmatics in order to know the way of communication. Leech (1983) considers pragmatics as a study of discussing the speaker meaning linking with discourse situation. He also adds that pragmatics is a study of linguistic communication according to conversational principles (p. 187). As stated above, the researcher begins to put Leech's theory of pragmatics because it has relation with conversational principle.

2.2 “*Implicature*”

The concept of “*implicature*” is firstly introduced by Grice. Grice was an English philosopher who was best known for his contributions to the theory of meaning and communication. Grice made a distinction between what is said by speaker of a verbal utterance and what is implicated. Based on Grice, “*implicature*” is an inferred meaning, typically with a different logical form from the original utterance. “*Implicature*” is something implied and meant from what is said (Grundy, 2000, p. 273).

This also has a relation, the term “*implicature*” is used by Grice to account for what speaker can imply, suggest, or meant as distinct from the speaker literally say. Here, Grice states that there are two kinds of “*implicature*”:

1. Conventional “*implicature*” which is determined the conventional meaning of the words used.
2. Conversational “*implicature*” which is derived from a general principle of conversational plus a number of maxims which speakers will normally obey.

Hence, the general principle is also known as the cooperative principle which Grice presents in the following term: “make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (1975, p. 45).

2.3 Grice’s Cooperative Principle

Grice (1989) advises cooperative principle which makes the conversational contribution is in the right size and agrees with the accepted purpose of the

conversation a speaker is connected to. Grice states that cooperative principle “make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (p. 26). It means that a speaker needs to be as informative as it requires based on the context of the conversation so that the communication will be successful.

To make the principle acceptable, Grice (1989) generates the principles into four conversational categories or maxims that will result in accordance with cooperative principle (p. 26). The categories are:

2.3.1 Maxim of Quantity

- a. Make your contribution as informative as it is required
- b. Do not make your contribution more informative than it is required

Those mean that maxim of quantity suggests speakers to be brief. It proposes a speaker to contribute as informative as a required and not to contribute too much or too little information than is required. Black (2006) added that “this maxim requires that we offer the appropriate amount information” (p. 29).

Example:

Jack: where is the nearest mosque?

John: it is in front of the post office.

Jack asks John the nearest mosque. John understands that the nearest mosque from the place they are talking is in front of the post office. It fulfills

the maxim of quantity. It is because John's answer is informative and explicit that the mosque is near with the place where the conversation is taken.

2.3.2 Maxim of Quality

- a. Do not say what you believe to be false
- b. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence

Those mean maxim of quality suggests speakers to be true. It proposes a speaker to say what he believes to be true and not to say something with less evidence. Black (2006) adds that "this maxim has to do with the truth of falsity of an utterance" (p. 30).

Example:

Tommy puts his jacket on the sofa then, he goes to the bathroom. Rio outs from his room and looking for the jacket because he wants to go out. Rio found the jacket on the sofa and takes it. After Rio went home, Tommy asks him.

Tommy: where is my jacket?

Rio: I take it.

Rio really takes the jacket, so it completes the maxim of quality because Rio does and he tells the truth.

2.3.3 Maxim of relevance

- a. Be relevant

Maxim of relevance proposes speakers to be relevant. A speaker has to say something related to the topic.

Example:

Jane: how was the scenery?

Rose: it was amazing.

The conversation above is clear enough, between the answer and the question is relevant, and it fulfills the maxim of relevance.

2.3.4 Maxim of Manner

- a. Avoid obscurity of expression
- b. Avoid ambiguity
- c. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)
- d. Be orderly

Maxim of manner suggests speakers to be clear. It means that a speaker needs to say briefly, orderly, and avoid obscurity and ambiguity. Black (2006) stated that "this maxim refers not to what is said, but to how it is expressed" (p. 30).

Example:

Marry: what the day is today?

Robby: it is Wednesday.

Marry: what the date is today?

Robby: it is 25th.

The conversation is clear without the appearance of misunderstanding. It was perfectly brief and well ordered.

Those all how maxims work in cooperative principle, after understanding it all, the researcher lets to know the connection between the cooperative principle and maxims, and also conversational *implicature*. According to Grice (1989; p.30):

“A participant in a talk exchange may fail to fulfill a maxim in various ways, which include the following:

1. He may quietly and unostentatiously *violate* a maxim; if so, in some cases he will be liable to mislead.
2. He may *opt out* from the operation both of the maxim and of cooperative principle; he may say indicate, or allow it to become plain that he is unwilling to cooperate in the way the maxim require.
3. He may face by *a clash*, he may be unable, for example: to fulfill the maxim of quantity without the second maxim of quality.
4. He may *flout* a maxim; that is, he may blatantly fail to fulfill it.”

Those all are about the relation to each other. The last number will be explained in the next point and it will also become the main focus to make this

research runs well.

2.4 Flouting Maxim

A flout occurs when a speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim, not with any intention of deceiving or misleading, but because s/he wants the hearer to look for the meaning which is different from, or in addition to, the expressed meaning. It takes place when individuals deliberately cease to apply the maxims to persuade their listeners to infer the hidden meaning behind the utterances; that is, the speakers employ “*implicature*” (S. C. Levinson, 1983, p. 104).

Grundy (2000) states in his book that flouting is a particularly silent way of getting an addressee to draw an inference and hence recover an “*implicature*”. (p. 78). It is also said by Cutting (2002) that flouting the maxims is when the speakers appear not to follow the maxims but expect hearers to appreciate the meaning implied (p. 37). Cutting (2002) determined flouting of maxims as follows:

2.4.1 Flouting quantity

Cutting (2002) stated that “the speaker who flouts the maxim quantity sees to give too little or too much information (p. 37). It means that the speaker may give information not as it requires. Here, Cutting gives his example:

A: well, how do I look?

B: your shoes are nice....

B’s answer is not giving all the information that A needs in order to fully appreciate what is being said. B does not say that the sweet-shirt and jeans do not look nice, but B knows A will understand that implication, because A asks about his whole appearance and only gets told about part of it.

The example above is clear enough show that the conversation flouts the maxim of quality because the information that needs is too little, B’s answer is not complete yet, but A can catch the meaning implied.

Another example gave by Grice (1983), he says that a flouting of the maxim of quantity are provided by utterances of patent tautologies like:

Women are women.

War is war.

Grice's opinions about these examples are totally non-informative, and so, at that level, cannot but infringe the maxim of quantity in any conversational context. *"An infringement of the first maxim of quantity. "Do not give more information than is required", on the assumption that the existence of such a maxim should be admitted."* (p. 34).

2.4.2 Flouting quality

Cutting (2002) defines the speaker who flouts the maxim of quality may do it several ways:

1. They may quite simply say something that obviously does not represent what they think.
2. The speaker may flout the maxim by using the hyperbole, metaphor, irony, and banter.

digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id

Cutting gives an example of it on his book that speaker may flout maxim by exaggerating as in the hyperbole "I could eat a horse". That sentence has another meaning that may the speakers are dying of hunger. (p. 37)

Another example gave by Grice (1983) in metaphor "you are cream in my coffee" means that it is intending the hearer to reach the metaphor interpreted "you are my pride and joy". Those examples above clearly explain that those are break the maxim of quality by interprets the utterances spoken. (p. 34)

2.4.3 Flouting relation

Cutting (2002) If the speaker flouts the maxim of relation, they expect that the hearers will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say, and make connection between their utterance and preceding one (s) (p. 39). Here the example on his book:

Heckler : We expected a better play

Coward : I expected better manners.

(Sherrin, 1995:29)

Cutting uses Gricean analysis as he says that the second seems irrelevant to the first. The Heckler in the audience is talking about the play and Coward's comment is about manners. However, Coward intends the Heckler to infer that he expected better manner than booing a shouting about his play. The Heckler will have understood.

2.4.4 Flouting manner

According to Cutting (2002), those who flout the maxim of manner may appear to be obscure. (p. 39). Here, the example:

A: where are you off to?

B: I was thinking of going out to get some of that funny white stuff for somebody

A: ok, but don't be log-dinner's nearly ready

Cutting (2002) analyzes that B speaks in an ambiguous way, saying "that funny white stuff" and "somebody" because he is avoiding saying "ice-cream" and

‘Michelle’ so that his little daughter does not become excited and ask for the ice cream before her meal. Sometimes writers play with words to heighten the ambiguity. (p.39).

2.5 Presupposition

Brown and Yule (1983) states in their book that:

“Stalnaker (1978: 321) stated that presupposition are what is taken by the speaker to be the common ground of participants in the conversation.”

Here, Brown and Yule notice from that quotation that the indicated source of presupposition is the speaker (p. 29).

In Seed (1995), Sperber and Wilson argue that presupposition is not an independent phenomenon but one of a series of effects produced when the speaker employs syntactic structure and intonation to show the hearer how the current sentence fits to the previous background (p. 109).

digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id

Lyons (1977) states that, “most of the definitions of presupposition to be found in the recent literature take the presupposition of an utterance to be a set of propositions. An alternative view is that they are the conditions that must be satisfied before the utterance can be used felicitously to perform its function as a statement, a question, a promise, a request, etc. (cf. Fillmore, 1971b)” (p. 604). It is also strengthened with Cooper’s (1974) opinion, he states that “the condition that counts as presuppositions are all ontological, in fact they have to do, not necessarily with existence, but with whatever kind of ontological satisfaction is appropriate to the entity, state-of-affairs, event, process, in question” (p. 605).

2.6 Context

People cannot judge what they say without knowing the condition when they are doing the communication. It might appear different meaning between what is spoken and the utterance itself. People can also know if it has relation with the context when they are doing the communication. Nunan (1993, p. 6) defines context as a situation that gives rise to a discourse and it is within the discourse. So, different occasion means different context.

There are two types of context based on Nunan's perspective. Those are linguistics context and non-linguistics context. Linguistics context is "the language that surrounds or accompanies the piece of discourse under analysis" (Nunan, 1993, p. 8). Non-linguistics context is several aspects involved in the conversation: the type of communicative event, the topic, the purpose of the event, the setting (location, time of day, season of year and physical situation), the participants, the relation between them, the background knowledge and the assumptions in the conversation.

2.7 Previous Studies

On this study, there are several researchers have done in the same area with the researcher of this paper. However, the focus of this research is different. The same studies are such as a research has done by Kirana (2008) with comic strips analysis and Prastyaning (2011) with talk show as the object.

2.7.1 The study of Kirana (2008)

Kirana's study used the Grice's cooperative principle theory to analyze her research entitled "Humor Resulting from the Flouting of Conversational Maxims in Piled Higher and Deeper (PHD) Comic Strips". Comic strips as a part of comic development have been a great part of the history of modern literature. The researcher wants from this study is to reveal how the flouting of maxims produced by the utterances in PHD comic strips. Her research also wants to reveal how the flouting of the maxims can create the humorous effect in PHD strips.

In this research Kirana conducted the study by using descriptive-qualitative approach to describe discourse used in comic strips. And it deals with the utterances spoken by the characters in PHD comic strips that create humorous effect.

In her research, she had two statements of the problems. First, what maxims were flouted in PHD comic strips. In her result, she stated that the flouting of one or more of the four maxims carries a variety of pragmatic meanings. The quantity maxim can be flouted as to create prolixity, to mark a sense of occasion or respect, or to be rude. The quality maxim can be violated to mark the use of figure of speech in one's utterances. The flouting of the maxim of relevance can be used to signal embarrassment or to show a desire to change the subject. The violation of the maxim of manner can be used to establish solidarity or humor (Cook, 1989:31).

Second, which maxim is flouted the most to create humor according to the order of occurrence in PHD comic strips. The result of this statement of the problem is the violation of the maxim of manners. She said that maxim of manner dominates the total flouting. It is usually used frequently by the character in order to make fun of others, to hide fact, and to establish solidarity or humor.

2.7.2 The study of Prastyaning (2011)

On the other hand, it is different in Prastyaning's study. She is also applying Grice's cooperative principle theory on her research entitle "The Study of Flouting Maxim of Grice's Cooperative principle in *Online* Talk Show (Broadcasted on January 20th and February 23rd, 2010)". Talk show is one of the television programs which are categorized as soft news, discussing about particular problem but it does not always deliver immediately. Soft news is the interesting and important information which is delivered in-depth by the host (Morrisan, 2008:28).

Her thesis also used descriptive-qualitative approach as like as Kirana's did. Here, she has two statements of the problems. First, what maxim is frequently flouted by the conversant in their talk exchanges in *On-line* talk show broadcasted on January 20th and February 23rd, 2010. And her result is that the most frequently maxim flouted is maxim of relation with the amount of 47% or twenty five times from the whole maxims.

Second, the statement is why the maxim frequently is flouted by the conversant in their talk exchanges in *On-line* talk show broadcasted on January

digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id

20th and February 23rd, 2010. Her result stated that maxim of relation relates how we said something. She said that it means we have to stay on the topic that we are talking about. Based on her analysis, flouting maxim of relation is not only produced by the guests but also the host. As we know that the host is someone very dominant in the program. The guests and the host flout the maxim of relation because they do not want to respond to the questions. Also, they want to create a humorous situation, give further information, and make a testing.

digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

This research method discussed the method that the researcher used in this study. The researcher explained the general process in collecting and analyzing the data. It consisted of research approach, data source, data, data collection, research instruments, and data analysis.

3.1 Research Approach

The researcher concerned with descriptive qualitative approach in her research. It focused on the conversation between the main character, Elizabeth and the characters who did the dialogue with her in the *Pride and Prejudice* movie which deal with utterances related to the flouting of maxims. In addition, this research focused on how finding how the contexts is created meaning.

digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id

The researcher identified and analyzed the rules of cooperative principle based on Grice's theory and explained the implied meaning or "*implicatures*" within the utterances conveyed by Elizabeth in the *Pride and Prejudice* movie.

3.2 Data Source

The data source was taken from *Pride and Prejudice* movie. It is of course supported by watching the movie. This movie was directed by Joe Wright and produced in 23 November 2005 in USA.

3.3 Data

The data of this study were the words, sentences, utterances, or expressions produced by the main character, Elizabeth. Also, to add deeper explanation, the researcher included some utterances produced by other character in a dialog related to Elizabeth. It was used to build or create the context that the utterances flouted by Elizabeth spoken in this movie. The researcher took dialogs in *Pride and Prejudice* movie that involves Elizabeth as the field to collect the data.

3.4 Technique of Data Collection

The data was collected through observation and transcribing data. The researcher got the data from the movie. It was downloaded from the internet because the writer found difficulties in finding the DVD. The researcher also downloaded the movie's script to enrich the data in this research. Because the main data was taken from the video, the researcher observed the video by watching it several times to understand the language phenomenon properly. After doing observations, the researcher matched it with the script in order to select the data as many as possible containing "cooperative principles". After that, the researcher arranged the data appearing from that movie.

3.5 Research Instrument

The main research instrument of this study is the researcher herself, who collected the data and analyzed the conversation in *Pride and Prejudice*. It is related to the flouting of maxims in the conversation used by Elizabeth in this movie.



3.6 Technique of Data Analysis

In analyzing the data the researcher did several activities:

1. Selecting and identifying the utterances spoken by Elizabeth that containing of flouting maxim. In this step, after collecting the data then the researcher selected them based on the research problems.
2. Then, the researcher identified the data based on Grice's theory of cooperative principle especially about the types of maxims used. After the types are identified, the researcher analyzed and interpreted the data found deeper in order to get the broad explanation about the types of maxims are flouted.
3. Next, to find out the finding from the data, the researcher discussed the whole data in order to get conclusion of the phenomenon based on the research problems. Then, determining why the main character flouted the conversational maxims based on the contexts.

CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The focus of this study is to know how the maxims are flouted by Elizabeth, what the aims and what the context that made Elizabeth flout the maxims in the *Pride and Prejudice* the movie. The main purpose of this chapter is to answer the questions presented in Chapter I.

In this discussion, the data were taken from the utterances spoken by Elizabeth and the characters who had a conversation with her. The researcher took the data only the utterances that contain flouting maxim. Here the data:

4.1 Findings

4.1.1 Maxims flouted by Elizabeth

Elizabeth is a second daughter from Mr. Bennet and Mrs. Bennet. She is love a joke. This study analyzed the utterances spoken by Elizabeth. In this study Elizabeth flouted the four maxims; maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner.

4.1.2 The aims Elizabeth flouted the maxims

The aims Elizabeth flouted the maxims because of many reasons; first, the speaker needs to add too much information to the hearer to make it clearer. Second, the speaker wants to inside a humor in their conversation. Third, breaking the maxims is also appreciated in language as it may be found in the poems, music lyrics, novel or dialogue in the movie. Those all

because of the speaker wants to make the conversation alive and more interesting to do.

4.1.3 The context Elizabeth flouted the maxims

The context does Elizabeth flout the maxims were in variation, such as; in a party, when Elizabeth has debate something with Mr. Darcy or the other character, when Elizabeth in anger. Those all clearly explain in the discussion bellow.

4.2 Discussion

Data 1

Lizzie : Kitty, what have I told you about listening at the door?

Kitty : There's a Mr. Bingley arrived from the North.

The conversation above was the interaction built between Lizzie and Kitty. Lizzie asked a question to Kitty "*Kitty, what have I told you about listening at the door?*" which meant that Lizzie forbid Kitty to do that bad attitude. But there, Kitty did not give the right answer to Lizzie. She ignored it with irrelevant answer to Lizzie's question. "*There's a Mr. Bingley arrived from the North.*" Was not the right answer that Lizzie wants. Kitty gave the answer by avoiding Lizzie's question and she changed it with interesting news that there was a handsome man comes from the north.

The criterion of conversation above included to the third of flouting maxim, flouting of relevance. That explained when the speakers and the hearers break the maxim of relevance. It meant that they had irrelevant conversation. Thus, flouting maxim of relevance clearly appeared in this conversation.

Statements above strengthened with the atmosphere there. It was very crowded with the issues of Mr. Bingley coming to this country. Mrs. Bennet who had five daughters was worrying about her daughter's marriage, and when Mrs. Bennet and Mr. Bennet had a secret discussion their daughters tried to listen to them from outside of the room.

Data 2

Lizzie : Which of the painted peacocks is our Mr. Bingley?
Charlotte : He's on the right. On the left is his sister.

In this conversation, there are two kinds of flouting maxim. First flouting maxim was produced by Lizzie. She said that "*Which of the **painted peacocks** is our Mr. Bingley?*". Painted peacock belonged to the Mr. Bingley. It was an effort to create a metaphor statement. And metaphor include to the one that breaks the maxim of quality. According to Cutting (2002), the speaker may flout the maxim by using the hyperbole, metaphor, irony, and banter. (p. 37).

Second flouting maxim was created by Charlotte. She answered that "*He's on the right. On the left is his sister.*" It was not as it was required. Lizzie's question was just "*Which of the **painted peacocks** is our Mr. Bingley?*".

Meanwhile, Charlotte's answer was too much. She also explained that "*On the left is his sister*" and it made the maxim of quantity was flouted in this conversation.

The conversations were strengthened by deeply understanding the context of it. It has been in a party to celebrate Mr. Bingley's coming to the county. Mr. Bennet family comes join to this party because of the curiosity to the handsome and rich man, Mr. Bingley. Mrs. Bennet is the one who excited to introduce the old daughter to the Mr. Bingley, Jane. When Mr. Bingley comes, Lizzie was with her close friend Charlotte. She asked that question, then.

Data 3

- Lizzie : The library at Netherfield, I've heard, is one of the finest.
- Mr. Bingley : It fills me with guilt. I'm not a good reader. I prefer being out of doors. Oh, I mean, I can read, of course. And I'm not suggesting you can't read out of doors.

The conversation above happened between Lizzie and Mr. Bingley. Lizzie said "*The library at Netherfield, I've heard, is one of the finest.*". There, Lizzie implied something that "is that true the library at Netherfield is finest one?" to Mr. Bingley. Then, the answer should be "yes" or "no". That was the maxim of quantity worked. Here, Mr. Bingley did not give that kinds of answer, he said "*It fills me with guilt. I'm not a good reader. I prefer being out of doors. Oh, I mean, I can read, of course. And I'm not suggesting you can't read out of doors.*". Mr. Bingley's answer actually did not make Lizzie's question clear. He added too much information about the library. Thus, this conversation between Lizzie and Mr. Bingley was flouted in the maxim of quantity.

The context of this conversation happened when Lizzie with her sister Jane (who fell in love with Mr. Bingley) came to have a little conversation to Mr. Bingley. There, Mr. Bingley seemed like nervous in front of Jane. It was because Mr. Bingley had the same feeling with Jane. Thus, when Mr. Bingley gave the answer, he did not focus on what Lizzie's asked about.

Data 4

Charlotte	: Count your blessings, Lizzie. If he liked you, you'd have to talk to him.
Lizzie	: Precisely. I wouldn't dance with him for all of Derbyshire, let alone the miserable half.

That was when Lizzie and Charlotte were conversing. Charlotte said *"Count your blessings, Lizzie. If he liked you, you'd have to talk to him."* Here, Charlotte trusted that Mr. Darcy began falling in love with Lizzie but he was still shy. Then, Lizzie answered *"Precisely. I wouldn't dance with him for all of Derbyshire, let alone the miserable half."* Here, Lizzie wanted to make Mr. Darcy alone along the party. Between Charlotte and Lizzie, there was an irrelevant conversation. Other side, Charlotte trusted him to fall in love with Lizzie, but Lizzie wanted to leave him alone. This conversation was clear enough that Lizzie flouted the maxim of relevance.

Lizzie and Charlotte were in the faraway place from the others. Then, they were not deliberate of hearing what Mr. Bingley and Mr. Darcy talked about. Mr.

Bingley admitted his love to Jane (Lizzie's sister) to Mr. Darcy, and Mr. Darcy told that he hated Lizzie's behavior. It made Lizzie want to leave him alone.

Data 5

Lizzie : I wonder who discovered the power of poetry in driving away love.

Mr. Darcy : I thought poetry was the food of love.

The conversation between Lizzie and Mr. Darcy contained the metaphor aspect. First, the utterance spoken by Lizzie was "*I wonder who discovered the power of poetry in driving away love*". It meant that poetry was the important part in love. Second, Mr. Darcy said that "*I thought poetry was the food of love*". It meant, poetry was the energy to create love. According to Cutting (2002), The speaker may flout the maxim by using the hyperbole, metaphor, irony, and banter.

digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id
(p. 37). Thus, this conversation clearly flouted the maxim of quality.

Their conversing seemed like in a big fight about their perception. So, they did that conversation. The place where the conversation has taken was in the party when Mr. Bingley came to the country.

Data 6

Lizzie : Of a fine, stout love. But if it is only a vague inclination, one poor sonnet will kill it.

Mr. Darcy : So, what do you recommend to encourage affection?

Lizzie : Dancing. Even if one's partner is barely tolerable.

There were two kinds of flouting maxim here. First utterance spoken by Lizzie contained metaphor “*one poor sonnet will kill it.*” It must be there something implied. It may clearly flout the maxim of quality. Then, the second utterance was also spoken by Lizzie. Lizzie’s answer was not relevant with Mr. Darcy’s question. Lizzie’s answer implied something that annoyed her after her invitation of dancing to Mr. Darcy rejected her in the previous conversation. Here was the conversation:

Lizzie : Do you dance, Mr Darcy?

Mr. Darcy : Not if I can help it.

So, it was clear that Lizzie Flouts the maxim of relevance.

This conversation happened in the first party of this movie.

Data 7

Jane : Do you really believe he liked me?

Lizzie : He danced with you most of the night, and stared at you the rest. I give you leave to like him. You've liked many stupider. You're a great deal too apt to like people in general. All the world is good in your eyes.

The conversation was between Lizzie and Jane. Jane asked to Lizzie, “*Do you really believe he liked me?*”. Jane needed to make sure that Mr. Bingley had the same feeling with her. Here, Lizzie should say “yes” or “no” but she did not. According to Grice (1989), you should make your contribution as informative as is required and do not make your contribution more informative than is required. (p. 26). But Lizzie did, she gave contribution more informative than is required.

She said that *"He danced with you most of the night, and stared at you the rest. I give you leave to like him. You've liked many stupider. You're a great deal too apt to like people in general. All the world is good in your eyes."* Of course, it was strengthened by answering Jane's question but it broke the maxim of quantity. Thus, the conversation flouted the maxim of quantity.

Here, Lizzie tried to ensure Jane to her feeling to Mr. Bingley. Lizzie did not want Jane to give up easily of her love with him. Thus, she gave those informations to Jane. The conversation was taken where they were going to sleep.

Data 8

Mrs. Bennet : you'd think our girls look forward to a grand inheritance. When you die, which may be very soon, they will be left without a roof over their head nor a penny to their name.

Lizzie : Mama Please, it's ten in the morning.

This conversation was between Lizzie and her mother (Mrs. Bennet). Mrs. Bingley said *"you'd think our girls look forward to a grand inheritance. When you die, which may be very soon, they will be left without a roof over their head nor a penny to their name."* to his husband Mr. Bennet. But he did answer nothing. Then, Lizzie spoke *"Mama Please, it's ten in the morning."* It implied something to not make a noise in the morning. It made her calm down. Here, of course the utterance spoken by Lizzie was clearly irrelevant. Her mother worried of her daughter fortune, but Lizzie worried of the situation that morning. This

conversation flouted the maxim of relevance. It had no relevance with the conversation before. Thus, the flout appears, flouting the maxim of relevance.

Mrs. Bennet worried in the morning when they were breakfast; Lizzie who felt uncomfortable with her mother's worry said that kind of utterance to her mother. Then, after that the breakfast runs well as usual.

Data 9

Jane : I feel such a terrible imposition. They're being so kind to me.
Lizzie : I don't know who is more pleased at your being here, Mama or Mr. Bingley.

Both of girls are having a conversation. Jane said that *"I feel such a terrible imposition. They're being so kind to me."* She said like that because she got rain and sick because of it. Then Lizzie said, *"I don't know who is more pleased at your being here, Mama or Mr. Bingley."* Here, Lizzie implied that "who was lucky here, her mother or Mr. Bingley." Those conversations clearly showed that between Jane and Lizzie did not have relevant conversing, but both of them have already known what they were talking about. Thus, if the conversation had irrelevant meant that maxim of relevance was broken. So, flouting the maxim of relevance appeared here.

Jane got rain when she came to the diner invitation of Mr. Bingley. So, she got sick and Mr. Bingley took care of it in his home. Then, Lizzie made it a joke by saying *"I don't know who is more pleased at your being here, Mama or Mr."*

Bingley. " Because the way Jane got rain was Mrs. Bennet's plan to get Mr. Bingley treat of Jane.

Data 10

Lizzie : Thank you for tending to my sister so diligently. She's in far better comfort than at home.

Mr. Bingley : It's a pleasure. I mean, it's not a pleasure that she's ill. Of course, not. It's a pleasure that she's here, being ill.

The conversation happened when Lizzie was in the room where Jane was rescued. Lizzie said *"Thank you for tending to my sister so diligently. She's in far better comfort than at home."* To Mr. Bingley who came to join. Then, he said *"It's a pleasure. I mean, it's not a pleasure that she's ill. Of course, not. It's a pleasure that she's here, being ill."* From this conversation, Mr. Bingley flouted the maxim of quality. According to Cutting (2002) that they may quite simply say something that obviously does not represent what they think. (p. 39). Here, Cutting's statements made clear that what Mr. Bingley said was flouted the maxim of quality.

This conversation was the second when Mr. Bingley was nervous in front of Jane. It seemed from his spoken *"It's a pleasure. I mean, it's not a pleasure that she's ill. Of course, not. It's a pleasure that she's here, being ill."* Then, they were all laughed.

Data 11

Mr. Darcy : I do not know more than half a dozen women that are truly accomplished.

Caroline : Nor I.

Lizzie : Goodness, you must comprehend a great deal in the idea.

Mr. Darcy : I do.

The conversations above were between Mr. Darcy, Caroline, and Lizzie. There, Mr. Darcy said *"I do not know more than half a dozen women that are truly accomplished."* The utterances produced by Mr. Darcy contains of hyperbole *"I do not know more than **half a dozen women** that are truly accomplished."*. "Half a dozen" commonly used for counting the things, but here it belonged to women. Because the utterances spoken by Mr. Darcy contain a hyperbole, it breaks the maxim of quality. These conversations fulfilled the flouting maxim of quality.

Mr. Darcy was the man who could easily have conversing with the people who has never met before. So, he judged himself that he did not know more than a half a dozen women. There, Lizzie was very poorly him.

Data 12

Mr. Bingley : And how are you? Miss Elizabeth? Are you looking for someone?

Lizzie : No, not at all, I was just admiring the general splendor.

The conversation happened between Mr. Bingley and Lizzie. There, Mr. Bingley asked a question to Lizzie that *"And how are you? Miss Elizabeth? Are you looking for someone?"*. Then, she answered *"No, not at all, I was just admiring the general splendor."* From the conversation above, Mr. Bingley tried to greeting Lizzie and her sister Jane. But there, Lizzie did not paid attention at him and she ignored the first question from Mr. Bingley. She did not answer the first question. It meant that Lizzie gave too little information to the Mr. Bingley. According to Cutting (2002), he states that *"the speaker who flouts the maxim quantity sees to give too little or too much information (p. 37)*. Because it too little information, Lizzie breaks the maxim of quantity. It was clear enough to show the flouting of the maxim of quantity in this conversation.

The conversation was taken in the second party in this movie. Lizzie and Jane come to this party and met Mr. Bingley and his sister Caroline. There, Mr. Bingley tried to greeting Lizzie and Jane, Jane was fine. Then, he asked to Lizzie that question. When Mr. Bingley asked a question she was looking for someone and did not paid attention to Mr. Bingley question. But, the conversation run well after that.

Data 13

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| Lizzie | : Did I agree to dance with Mr. Darcy? |
| Charlotte | : I dare say you will find him amiable. |
| Lizzie | : It would be most inconvenient since I've sworn to loathe him for all eternity. |

The conversation above built between Lizzie and Charlotte. There, Lizzie tried to ensure herself with a question to Charlotte that *"Did I agree to dance with Mr. Darcy?"*. There, Charlotte's answer was *"I dare say you will find him amiable."*. Lizzie asked about her agreement of Mr. Darcy invitation, but Charlotte's answer was about Mr. Darcy's amiable. Between Lizzie's question and Charlotte's answer was not relevance each other. Charlotte's say was not answer Lizzie's question, but both of them understood what they were talking about. Because they have irrelevance conversation, meant that they were breaking the maxim of relevance and it meant that flouting maxim of relevance appeared in this conversation.

This conversation happen after Mr. Darcy offered himself to have the next dance with Lizzie. She said "you may" to Mr. Darcy with her flat face and just gone away after gave Mr. Darcy an answer. In a long way Lizzie hold her laughed to Mr. Darcy and have a conversation with Charlotte in another place till the dance timing was coming. She was dancing with Mr. Darcy.

Data 14

Lizzie	: Charlotte!
Charlotte	: My dear Lizzie. I've come here to tell you the news. Mr. Collins and I are... engaged.
Lizzie	: Engaged?
Charlotte	: Yes.
Lizzie	: To be married?

Charlotte : What other kind of engaged is there? For heaven's sake, Lizzie, don't look at me like that. I should be as happy with him as any other.

Lizzie : But he's ridiculous.

Charlotte : Oh, hush. Not all of us can afford to be romantic. I've been offered a comfortable home and protection. There's a lot to be thankful for. I'm 27 years old. I've no money and no prospects. I'm already a burden to my parents. And I'm frightened. So don't judge me, Lizzie. Don't you dare judge me.

The conversation above was between Lizzie and Charlotte. In the last conversation Lizzie gave her statement that *"But he's ridiculous."* It implied that why Charlotte must be with him? He was strange. But then, Charlotte tried to explain to Lizzie that she have reasons why did it. She said that *"Oh, hush. Not all of us can afford to be romantic. I've been offered a comfortable home and protection. There's a lot to be thankful for. I'm 27 years old. I've no money and no prospects. I'm already a burden to my parents. And I'm frightened. So don't judge me, Lizzie. Don't you dare judge me."* Here, Charlotte's explanation just to inform she must do that. But then, in this conversation Charlotte gave too much information to Lizzie to make it clear. But it is not the information that requires as the maxim of quantity. Too much information makes the conversation flouts the maxim of quantity.

The conversation happened when Charlotte came into Lizzie's house. There, Charlotte gave the information that she was engaged.

Data 15

- Lady Catherine : Your younger sisters, are they out in society?
- Lizzie : Yes, ma'am, all.
- Lady Catherine : All? What, all five out at once? That's very odd. And you second. The younger ones out before the elders are married? Your youngest sisters must be very young.
- Lizzie : Yes, my youngest is now 16. But it would be hard on younger sisters not to have their amusement because the elder is still unmarried. It would hardly encourage sisterly affection.
- Lady Catherine : Upon my word, you give your opinion very decidedly for so young a person. Pray, what is your age?
- Lizzie : With three younger sisters grown up, you can hardly expect me to own to it.

The conversation above asking and question happened between Lady Catherine and Lizzie. What happened above, the conversation flouts the maxim of manner. The conversation is not brief as like what maxim of manner did. Both of them are have extra-large conversation. Lady Catherine did it because of her curiosity to Lizzie because of her impolite moral.

The conversation happened when they were breakfast in Lady Catherine's house, with Mr. Darcy, Mr. Collins, Charlotte, Diana and Fitzwilliam.

Data 16

- Fitzwilliam : What was my friend like in Hertfordshire?
- Lizzie : You really care to know? Prepare yourself for something very dreadful. The first time I saw him, he danced with nobody, though

gentlemen were scarce and there was more than one lady without a partner.

The conversation above was between Fitzwilliam and Lizzie. At that conversation, Fitzwilliam asked “*What was my friend like in Hertfordshire?*”. He just wanted to know how his friend was, Mr. Darcy. Then, Lizzie gave her answer “*You really care to know? Prepare yourself for something very dreadful. The first time I saw him, he danced with nobody, though gentlemen were scarce and there was more than one lady without a partner.*”. This scene also has the same flout that is flouting the maxim of manner. Here, Lizzie is not give the answer briefly. She makes it larger. Thus, flouting of manner appears here

Fitzwilliam was the close friend of Mr. Darcy. He met Lizzie in Lady Catherine’s house. He asked that question when Lizzie played her piano for Lady Catherine. Then, He asked it when Mr. Darcy and Lizzie have a little conversation.

Data 17

Lizzie	: Mr. Darcy. Please, do be seated. Mr. and Mrs. Collins have gone to the village.
Mr. Darcy	: This is a charming house. I believe my aunt did a great deal to it when Mr. Collins first arrived.

The conversation above was between Lizzie and Mr. Darcy. There, it was contained two kinds of flouting maxim. First, spoken by Lizzie “*Mr. Darcy,*

Please, do be seated. Mr. and Mrs. Collins have gone to the village.", the utterance was breaking the maxim of quantity. She gave an information too much to Mr. Darcy. Then, the second comes because of Mr. Darcy's response *"This is a charming house. I believe my aunt did a great deal to it when Mr. Collins first arrived."* is not relevant with Lizzie's spoken about. And it of course flouted the maxim of relevance. According to Cutting (2002) if the speaker flouts the maxim of relation, they expect that the hearers will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say, and make connection between their utterance and preceding one (s) (p. 39).

In this scene, Mr. Darcy suddenly comes to Mr. Collin's house, but there was only Lizzie. Lizzie surprised with Mr. Darcy coming. Then, both of them were having a strange conversation. After that, Mr. Darcy left Lizzie with nothing except "good bye".

Data 18

Charlotte : What on earth have you done to poor Mr. Darcy?
Lizzie : I have no idea.

In this scene, Charlotte asked *"What on earth have you done to poor Mr. Darcy?"* to Lizzie. Then, Lizzie answered was *"I have no idea."*. Here, Lizzie implies that she do not know what was just happen. Then, she just gave that answer. It cannot make the question answer clearly. It needs more information. It

meant that here Lizzie flouted the maxim of quantity which suggest the speaker to be informative as it requires.

Here, the conversation above has relation with the previous dialog (data 17). The conversation happened when Mr. Darcy suddenly came out with nothing to say when Charlotte coming home. Charlotte and Lizzie were speechless for a minute on what just happened, and then Charlotte asked to Lizzie that question.

Data 19

Charlotte : Lizzie. Are you all right?

Lizzie : I hardly know.

In this scene, the conversation was between Charlotte and Lizzie. Charlotte said "*Lizzie. Are you all right?*", to know what happened to Lizzie. Lizzie's answer was "*I hardly know.*" Here, clearly they were having irrelevant conversation. Charlotte still cannot catch what does Lizzie talked about. She just told Charlotte "*I hardly know.*" Surely known this conversation was flouting the maxim of relevance. It was because between Charlotte and Lizzie was not having a relevance conversation.

These conversations clearly understand with knowing the situation of this conversation. Here, Mr. Darcy comes and gives a letter for Lizzie, and he put it in a window then he just out away. Lizzie realized Mr. Darcy coming after she heard the sound of the door close hardly. Lizzie read the letter and she got in speechless with no word and then Charlotte comes and asked her what just happened.

Data 20

Mr. Darcy : Miss Elizabeth.
 Lizzie : I thought you were in London.
 Mr. Darcy : No. No, I'm not. No.
 Lizzie : We would not have come...
 Mr. Darcy : I came back a day early...
 Lizzie : I'm with my aunt and uncle.

The conversation above was between Lizzie and Mr. Darcy. There, they were appearing obscurity. Ambiguity is must avoid by the speaker to create maxim of manner. But here, they flouted it. According to Cutting (2002) those who flout the maxim of manner may appear to be obscure. (p. 39). It clear enough explained that this conversation flouted the maxim of manner.

The conversation took place in Mr. Darcy house, Lizzie did not know Mr. Darcy was at his home. So, when Mr. Darcy got her there, they seemed like have a strange conversation.

Data 21

Mr. Darcy : And are you having a pleasant trip?
 Lizzie : Very pleasant. Tomorrow we go to Matlock.
 Mr. Darcy : Tomorrow? Are you staying at Lambton?
 Lizzie : Yes, at the Rose and Crown.
 Mr. Darcy : Yes.
 Lizzie : **I'm so sorry to intrude. They said the house was open for visitors. I had no idea.**

Mr. Darcy : May I see you back to the village?

Lizzie : No. I'm very fond of walking.

Mr. Darcy : Yes. Yes, I know.

Lizzie : Goodbye, Mr. Darcy.

In this scene, the conversations happened between Lizzie and Mr. Darcy. There, Lizzie admits something that *"I'm so sorry to intrude. They said the house was open for visitors. I had no idea."*, to Mr. Darcy. She felt sorry on him. But he ignored her admit and offered her to get back to the village, *"May I see you back to the village?"*. For a minute, the conversation between Lizzie and Mr. Darcy was irrelevant. It was clear enough, just like what Cutting (2002) stated that those who flout the maxim of manner may appear to be obscure. (p. 39). Thus, this conversation flouts the maxim of relevance.

It happened in the Mr. Darcy's house. After they met each other they were having that conversation. Lizzie left him after that.

Data 22

Lizzie : Are you well, Mr. Darcy?

Mr. Darcy : Quite well, thank you.

Lizzie : I hope the weather stays fine for your sport.

Mr. Darcy : I return to town tomorrow.

Lizzie : So soon?

Between Lizzie and Mr. Darcy were having irrelevant conversations there. It shows when Lizzie said "*I hope the weather stays for your sport*" it should be answer by Mr. Darcy with "yes I will", but he did not. Mr. Darcy ignores it and gives her information that he will return to town tomorrow "*I return to town tomorrow*", and it has not relevance with the conversation before. Thus, this conversation flouts the maxim of relevance. According to Cutting (2002) If the speaker flouts the maxim of relation, they expect that the hearers will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say, and make connection between their utterance and preceding one (s) (p. 39).

The conversation happened when Mr. Darcy accompanies her friend Mr. Bingley to go to Jane's house. And then, there where did they meet.

Data 23

Jane	: I'm sorry he came with Mr. Darcy.
Lizzie	: Don't say that.
Jane	: Why ever not?
Lizzie	: Jane. I've been so blind.

In this scene, the conversation built between Jane and Lizzie. Showed in the dialog above, the utterance spoken by Lizzie implied another meaning. When Lizzie said "*Jane. I've been so blind.*" She implied that she is in love with Mr. Darcy. And she just realized it. This utterance flouted the maxim of quality. "*I've been so blind.*" was exaggerated or include to hyperbole. According to Cutting

(2002) The speaker may flout the maxim by using the hyperbole, metaphor, irony, and banter. (p. 37).

The conversation happened when Mr. Darcy accompanying her close friend Mr. Bingley to propose her love to Jane. But, there Lizzie just realized that she was also love Mr. Darcy. Lizzie cannot showed her feeling to Mr. Darcy to Jane along the time till she decided to share it with Jane in the day Mr. Darcy accompanying Mr. Bingley.

Data 24

Lizzie : I couldn't sleep.

Mr. Darcy : Nor I. My aunt...

Lizzie : Yes, she was here.

In this scene the conversation was between Lizzie and Mr. Darcy. The utterance gave by Mr. Darcy is not deliver complete yet, he just said "*Nor I. My aunt...*". But, Lizzie can catch what does Mr. Darcy meant. There, the spoken produced by Mr. Darcy flouted the maxim of quantity. It was because the information needed to add other information to make it clear, and it was also this conversation did not obey the rule of cooperative principle, maxim of quantity.

This conversation happened in the morning after Lady Catherine (Mr. Darcy's aunt) came to Lizzie's house. Mr. Darcy felt sorry about his aunt's impolite warning to Lizzie. Then, they did conversation.

Data 25

Mr. Darcy : You must know. Surely you must know it was all for you. You are too generous to trifle with me. You spoke with my aunt last night and it has taught me to hope as I'd scarcely allowed myself before. If your feelings are still what they were last April, tell me so at once. My affections and wishes have not changed. But one word from you will silence me forever. If, however, your feelings have changed.....I would have to tell you, you have bewitched me, body and soul, and I love... I love... I love you. I never wish to be parted from you from this day on.

Lizzie : Well, then. Your hands are cold.

In this conversation was between Lizzie and Mr. Darcy. Here, Flouting of maxim was the maxim of manner. The information given by Mr. Darcy is not briefly enough. He tries to ensure Lizzie about his feeling on her. Thus, clearly flouts the maxim of manner.

This scene, Mr. Darcy proposes his true feeling to the Lizzie for the second time, after rejected before. And then, Lizzie was also allowing him to be hers.

Those all the data that the researcher chose to be analyze. These analyze has already answered the statement of the problems that Elizabeth flouted all of the maxims in this research. Maxim of quality, maxim of relevance and maxim of manner when do the conversation.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This research was taken *Pride and Prejudice* the movie as the object of the study. This movie was directed by Joe Wright (2005) and the movie adapted from Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* novel. Elizabeth is the main character used in this research.

After obtaining and analyzing the data in the previous chapter, the researcher presents the conclusion at the last part of this paper. The conclusion is drawn based on the formulated research question. First, the main character (Elizabeth Bennet) of "Pride and Prejudice" movie flouted the maxims when she broke the utterances in delivering her opinion with other character by using the utterances. These analyze has already answered the statement of the problems that

Elizabeth flouted all of the maxims in this research. Maxim of quality, maxim of relevance and maxim of manner when do the conversation. Second, the aimed Elizabeth flouts the maxims to clearer the information and to make a humor conversation.

According to the findings of this research, the researcher suggested that the findings will be additional references in the field of pragmatics. It was also recommended that the next researchers can use the Grice's maxims to conduct the research on the other areas. Here, the researcher was also realized that this research has not complete yet. The data used in this research was limited for Elizabeth, thus the researcher suggests to enlarge more data when analyze it in

digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id

order to make it clearer. In addition, the researcher also suggests to the next researchers to use other relevance theory to explore different topics in the same area of the research.

digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id

REFERENCES

Brown, G. & George Yule. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University.

Cutting, Joan. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse a resource book for student*. London & New York: Routledge.

Grice, P. (1991). *Studies in the way of words*. London: Harvard University.

Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics second edition*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kirana, Satria Andy. (2008). *Humor resulting from the flouting of conversational maxims in piled higher and deeper (PHD) comic strips*. Unpublished Undergraduate Thesis A thesis. Surabaya. Airlangga University.

Leech, Geoffrey N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London & New York: Longman.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Meyer, Charles F. (2009). *Introducing English Linguistics*. Cambridge University.

Prastyaning, M. H. Sinta. (2011). *The study of flouting maxim of Grice's cooperative principle in Online talk show (broadcasted on January 20th and February 23rd, 2010)*. Unpublished Undergraduate Thesis. Surabaya. Airlangga University.

Saeed, John I. (2003). *Semantics second edition*. Blackweel publishing.

digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id

Sperber, D. & Deirdre Wilson. (1995). *Relevance communication and cognition*
second edition. UK: Blackwell publishers.

digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id

digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id digilib.uinsa.ac.id