
Investigating Types of Maxims Flouted in “Enola Holmes” Movie

Putri Melania 1¹⁾, Mhd. Johan 2²⁾

¹Universitas Putera Batam
pb181210035@upbatam.ac.id
²Univeritas Putera Batam
Mhd.Johan@puterabatam.ac.id

Received: 6th May 2022 | Revised: 19th July 2022 | Accepted: 8th December 2022
Email Correspondence: pb181210035@upbatam.ac.id

Abstract

This research was done with the aim of investigating the flouting maxims types in characters' utterances. The movie with the title “Enola Holmes” was taken as the data source for this research. The utterances that showed the flouting maxims phenomena were used as the data to be analyzed by researchers. In conducting this research, the researchers took the theory of Grice (1975) to analyze the flouting maxims utterances. Besides, the data were collected through the use of the observational method and non-participatory technique. The collected data then were analyzed by using the pragmatic identity method and pragmatic competence- in equalizing technique. The results discovered there were 16 data of flouting maxims in the movie. 1 data of flouting maxim of manner, 3 data of flouting maxim of quantity, 9 data of flouting maxim of relation, and 3 data of flouting maxim of quality were found in characters' utterances. The most dominant maxim flouted in the utterances was flouting maxim of relation. It is because when communicating, the characters of the Enola Holmes movie respond irrelevantly to the topic being discussed.

Keywords: *Flouting Maxims, Gricean theory, pragmatics*

1. INTRODUCTION

Communication is truly inseparable from human life. It is also impossible for both parties, namely the speaker and hearer to establish effective communication without having them to be cooperative. In other words, communicating without involving good cooperation from the speaker and hearer will ruin the communication. Good communication is only possible to be done if the speaker and hearer attempt to be cooperative and try to make their contribution appropriate in the conversation (Birner, 2013). It indicates that good cooperation is the foremost thing that needs to be concerned. The contribution of the speaker and hearer should not be contradicted as it should have them to be conversationally cooperative. Without any doubt, the hearer of conversation cannot always obey Gricean's cooperative principle. The disobeying of maxims indeed will present in communication because of different situation

of communication (Hamidah et al., 2022). This means that communication partners cannot always act cooperatively according to the cooperative principle.

The principle relates to four maxims that should not be violated in order to establish good communication. Language users do not always show a good contribution in communication as people commonly ignore the cooperative principle (Op.Sunggu & Afriana, 2020). This shows that following all cooperative principles in order to have effective communication is necessary. The flouting maxim is found whenever a hearer as a communication partner does not appear to be cooperative. Grice (1975) said there are maxim of manner, maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, and maxim of relation as types of maxims. Birner (2013) mentioned that flouting maxim is quite the same as maxim violation, but the violation in flouting maxim is more blatant which makes the interlocutor is hoped to be aware of the violation. This defines the maxim flouting done by a hearer is intentionally made by a hearer to make the speaker notices the violation.

The phenomenon of flouting maxim appears when a hearer does not follow the four cooperative principles during the communication. This is done by hearer that breaks the maxims for the sake of implying unstated meaning and then encourages the speaker of the previous utterance to explore the meaning that is not directly stated by the hearer. Grice (1975) declared that flouting maxims are done when the speaker is found to be failing to follow the cooperative principle. This infers that the phenomena of flouting maxim are caused by the hearer that disobeys of the principles. Grice (1975) said there are four maxims that can appear as flouting maxims, namely flouting maxim of relation, quality, manner, and quantity.

The irrelevance of answer is the thing that leads to flout the maxim of relation. Grice (1975) said that the utterance that a hearer says should have the relation with the previous utterance stated by speaker. This type is done whenever a hearer does not give the relevant answer in accord with the question given by the speaker (Birner, 2013). In short, this flouting appears if the hearer gives an irrelevant answer to the speaker. The relation of the utterance can help the hearer to avoid the flouting maxim of relation because the utterance said by the hearer relates to the speaker's utterance. One of the utterances is taken from Florentina and Ambalegin (2022)'s research as follows. The speaker named Belle talked by saying "You know Shakespeare?" which got an answer from Beast as the hearer that showed the flouting maxim of relation. The utterance is "**I had an expensive education**" and it shows the character flouted the maxim of relation.

The phenomena that relate to flouting maxim of quality have the characteristics of not being sincere. Gricean theory believes that utterance said by a hearer should be in accordance with reality. In other words, a hearer should not convey utterance that the hearer totally has no evidence of thing that is being said. Grice (1975) agreed that the hearer of communication is hoped to be truthful according to what has happened in real life. By giving the truth to the speaker, it means that the hearer does not lie or hide something from the speaker of the conversation. Therefore, a hearer should not say utterance that is not considered as fact and unavailable of evidence in order to avoid doing the flouting of this maxim. One of the utterances was found in Hamani and Puluhulawa (2019)'s research as follow. In the data of their research, Shifu as the speaker uttered "We have to do something. We can't just let him march on the valley..." The utterance then got a response from a hearer named Ooogway as the character said "**Your mind is like this water, my friend. When it is agitated, it becomes difficult to see. But if you allow it to settle, the answer becomes clear.**" The utterance points out that the flouting maxim of quality.

For flouting maxim of manner, it needs the hearer to utter an utterance that is unambiguous and clear. Grice (1975) declared that a hearer that response the utterance said by the speaker should produce the clear and unambiguous utterance, so the communication is found to be cooperative. It defines that this flouting is done by a hearer that does not avoid obscurity of ambiguity and the hearer also does not appear to produce an utterance in order and brief way. Following is the example taken from Wahyudi, Yusuf, and Lestari (2020)'s research. Teacher as the speaker firstly said "Past tense will become?" Then, students as hearer answered by saying "**Past ten...se**". Answer from the hearer relates the phenomenon of flouting maxim and it specifically indicates the speaker flouted the maxim of manner.

The flouting maxim of quantity phenomena can be found in utterances that have too much information of less than it is needed. The need of the information depends on the speaker context in which the speaker and hear are talking. Grice (1975) argued that this flouting is done when the hearer does not contribute as required and too informative more than it is required. To avoid flouting this maxim, a hearer should not say too much or give less information to the speaker as the response of the previous utterance. An example of this type was found in the research of Helmie and Gunawan (2019). Buzz as the speaker conveyed "Ladies and gentlemen of the jury... I'd like to apologize for whatever displeasure.. I might have caused of you." and it got Kevin as hearer to say "**What?**". This phenomenon describes that the character flouted the maxim of quantity as there has no any enough information provided.

Being part of society, it enables people to notice the existence of flouting maxim phenomena in communication. It unarguably appears in daily conversation in which speaker and hearer involves. As the

present researchers discovered, the phenomenon of flouting maxim appeared in the YouTube channel of Ellen Talk Show with the title “Will Smith’s Full Interview”. The video was published on May 25th, 2019 and had movie casts of Aladdin movie as the guests. Following is the conversation.

Ellen : “So, she asked for it?”

Will Smith : **“She.. Yes. And I was like aw baby for real? cause you don’t have to do that, you know? and she was like anything you want. I was like I want you to go skydiving with me. and she was like how is that what you want for your birthday?”**

In the conversation above, Ellen featured as speaker and Will Smith as the hearer. They were in the studio of the talk show. The speaker firstly ensured whether the hearer’s wife asked before jumping out. The hearer straightforwardly answered that the hearer’s wife did it, but the hearer did not only answer by saying whether she asked. The hearer explained more information than it was required. The information added by the hearer is actually unnecessary to be explained because the speaker only wanted to know. The utterance shows that the hearer attempted to be more contributive than he should have been. As believed by Grice (1975), flouting maxim of quantity is done when the hearer does not contribute as required and too informative more than it is required. It proves that the pragmatics phenomenon that appears in the utterance is flouting maxim of quantity.

Besides the phenomenon above, the researchers also found the phenomena of flouting maxim in utterances produced by characters. In movie entitled “Enola Holmes” there showed lots of flouting maxim phenomena. The flouting maxim done by the characters were found in the different types. One of the conversations that involve the phenomenon is as displayed below.

Tewkesbury : “What are you doing here?”

Enola : **“Why, if you're passionate about flowers, would you come to London?”**

This dialogue existed at the minutes of 1:11:29. From the dialogue above it could be seen that when Tewkesbury asked why Enola was here, Enola did not answer and instead asked Tewkesbury why he had gone to London. It could be seen that Enola did not give an answer according to the topic discussed by Tewkesbury, so that Enola's utterance was included in the flouting maxim of relation.

The researchers found other flouting maxims research. The research conducted by Florentina and Ambalegin (2022) aimed at finding out maxims flouted in characters’ utterances. The movie with the title “Beauty and the Beast” was taken as the data source. The theory used in their research was the theory proposed by (Grice, 1975). The findings revealed that all types of flouting maxims were done by

characters in the movie. The flouting maxim of quality and quantity were found to be the dominant types because the characters tended to disobey the maxim of quality and quantity rather than two other types.

Hamidah, Arifin, and Ariani (2022) revealed the flouting of maxims in movie characters' utterances. The movie "The Help" was chosen to be the data source of their research. In analyzing data, Grice (1975)'s cooperative principle theory was applied to be the theory of analyzing data. The researchers found 32 occurrences of flouting maxims in utterances produced by "The Help" movie characters. Flouting in the maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner appeared in their utterances. The characters of the movie commonly flouted the maxim of quality to other characters.

Present researchers and previous researchers conducted research that had similarities and differences. The similarities were in the object and applied theory. The object of the present and previous research was flouting maxim that was examined by using Grice (1975)'s theory. The research differed in the data source because this research took "Enola Holmes" movie as the movie that has not been taken by other flouting maxims research. In short, this present was conducted with the aim of analyzing four types maxims flouted in "Enola Holmes" movie.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

In this research, descriptive qualitative research was conducted to be the research design. It was designed according to descriptive qualitative because this research analyzed phenomena of society. Also, it was analyzed in descriptive way by using words and there were no symbols included. According to Creswell (2013), qualitative is used to analyze the phenomena found in society. This research observed the movie by watching it and the researchers did not appear in the movie. Because of this, the observational method with the non-participatory technique by Sudaryanto (2015) were used. Steps of data collection were done by the researchers in order to get data. The steps are watching the movie for the first time, re-watching the movie and looking for the phenomena, and lastly, the researchers typed the utterances that had the phenomena.

In analyzing the collected data, the researchers took pragmatic identity method and pragmatic competence- in equalizing technique. It used the method because the researchers analyzed by finding out the elements of pragmatics. Then, the technique was used because the researchers analyzed the data by equalizing data and the theory of flouting maxims. For the steps, the researchers revealed the context of utterances that the researchers had typed. Secondly, the data were analyzed by using the pragmatic

competence- in equalizing technique which is by equalizing it. In the last step, the analysis found out the flouting maxim types in utterances of characters in “Enola Holmes” movie.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Findings

This present research found that there were 16 data that showed the phenomena of flouting maxims. The result of flouting maxim of relation was 9 data, 3 data were found in flouting maxim of quality, 1 data of flouting maxim of manner, and flouting maxim quantity consisted of 3 data.

Table 1. Flouting Maxims Types in Enola Holmes Movie

No	Types of flouting maxims	Frequency
1.	Flouting maxim of relation	9
2.	Flouting maxim of quality	3
3.	Flouting maxim of manner	1
4.	Flouting maxim of quantity	3
Total data		16

3.2 Discussion

Data 1

Mycroft : “**What the...**” (Mycroft sighs)
Mycroft : “**Oh, dear God, look at the house.**”
Enola : “Isn't it wonderful?” (00:06:47)

This conversation appeared at the minutes of 00:06:47. The data above showed that Mycroft's utterances were included in the flouting maxim of Manner. This could be seen from Mycroft who did not say clearly what he thought about the house. He thought the house looked terrible, but Enola thought it looked amazing. Mycroft's ambiguous utterances caused Enola to misunderstand, as she thought that Mycroft had the same response as her. That was why Mycroft's utterances were included in the flouting maxim of manner.

Data 2

Mycroft : “Her bed hasn't been made.”
Sherlock : “**Hmm. Chrysanthemums.**”

-
- Mycroft : “Clothes haven't been put away.”
Sherlock : “**And laurustinus, and Queen Anne's lace.**”
Mycroft : “Enough with the bally flowers, Sherlock.” (00:08:01)

This conversation existed at the minutes of 00:08:01. From the data above, it could be seen that Mycroft and Sherlock were in their mother's room. They were looking for traces of their missing mother. Mycroft watched and said how the condition of their mother's room was, but Sherlock gave irrelevant responses in which he talked about the flowers in his mother's room. So, it could be concluded that Sherlock's utterances were included in the flouting maxim of relation.

Data 3

- Mycroft : “And for Enola, a music teacher, a dance instructor, a governess.”
Sherlock : “Enola, you at least had a governess?”
Enola : “**She wouldn't like you in here. This is her private space.**” (00:09:20)

The conversation above appeared at the minutes of 00:09:20. The data above showed that Enola's utterances were included in the flouting maxim of relation. This could be seen when Sherlock asked if Enola had a nanny. However, instead of saying yes or no, Enola said that Sherlock and Mycroft should not enter their mother's room. Enola did not answer according to the topic discussed by Sherlock, so that her utterances were included in the flouting maxim of relation.

Data 4

- Elona : “Hips are simply a function of legs, aren't they? What need have they of amplification?”
Miss Harrison : “**Aren't you the clever little tongue?**” (00:13:03)

This conversation existed at the minutes of 00:13:03. From the data above it could be seen that Enola's hips were being measured for her uniform. Enola did not like the uniform, that was why Enola asked why she needed amplification in her hips. But, instead of answering Enola's question with a relevant response, Miss Harrison said that Enola had a clever little tongue. Even though Miss Harrison's utterance was irrelevant, her utterance had an implicit meaning in which she quipped Enola for talking a lot. Therefore, Miss Harrison's utterance was included in the flouting maxim of relation.

Data 5

- Sherlock : “.... **We could never persuade you to put any trousers on. Your bottom was always bare.**”
Enola : “Thank you. If you could now forget them all.” (00:16:09)

This conversation existed at the minutes of 00:16:09. From the conversation above, it could be seen that Sherlock told how Enola was when she was little. However, he gave Enola too much information where he said that in the past Enola's bottom was always naked. His exaggerated words made Enola feel embarrassed and uncomfortable because she was a woman and it was not appropriate for her brother to say such things. Therefore, Sherlock's utterances were included in the flouting maxim of quantity.

Data 6

- Tewkesbury : "Hello."
Enola : "Please get out of this carriage."
Tewkesbury : **"I can't. I'm in hiding. Bit of a to-do. Bribed a porter to put me in this and get me on board."**
Enola : "Very daring. Get out of this carriage right now." (00:23:37)

The dialogue above appeared at the minutes of 00:23:37. From the dialogue above, it could be seen that Tewkesbury's utterances were included in the flouting maxim of quantity. This happened because Tewkesbury provided Enola with excessive information. Enola did not need any information about how Tewkesbury got onto the train, but Tewkesbury explained how he got into the train to her. Tewkesbury gave too much information, which made Enola sneer at him.

Data 7

- Enola : "You do make an awful lot of noise, don't you?"
Tewkesbury : **"Well, it turns out, being thrown off a train hurts considerably more than you might think. And I've lost a button."** (00:28:48)

The dialogue above appeared at the minutes of 00:28:48. From the dialogue above it could be seen that Tewkesbury and Enola just jumped out of the train. When they jumped out of the train Tewkesbury screamed very loudly. Enola then quipped Tewkesbury for being so noisy. However, Tewkesbury gave a response that was irrelevant to the topic discussed by Enola in which he said that falling from the train was more painful than Enola thought. Tewkesbury also said he was missing a button on his shirt. Therefore, Tewkesbury's utterances that were irrelevant were included in the flouting maxim of relation.

Data 8

- Mrs. Lane : "Enola is special. She has such a good heart. She's even left money on my bedside table."
Sherlock : "Money?"
Mrs. Lane : **"You've already abandoned her once, sir. I'm asking that you don't abandon her again."** (00:29:41)

This conversation existed at the minutes of 00:29:41. From the conversation above, it could be seen that Mrs. Lane's utterances were included in the flouting maxim of relation. This could be seen when Sherlock said, "Money?" However, instead of explaining about the money given by Enola, Mrs. Lane instead said that Sherlock better not leave Enola again. Mrs. Lane gave an irrelevant response, because he didn't want to discuss further about the money Enola gave him. That was why Mrs. Lane's utterances were included in the flouting maxim of relation.

Data 9

- Tewkesbury : "Look, I believe our recent brush with death deserves me at least a name."
Enola : "Enola Holmes."
Tewkesbury : "Holmes... Like Sherlock?"
Enola : "**And I am undercover, so forget I told you that piece of information.**"
Tewkesbury : "Undercover working for him?" (00:30:17)

This conversation existed at the minutes of 00:30:17. From the conversation above, it could be seen that Tewkesbury asked what Enola's name was. Then, Enola said her full name was Enola Holmes. Enola's last name made Tewkesbury confused because her last name was the same as Sherlock Holmes's. Therefore, Tewkesbury asked for an explanation whether Enola was of the same family as Sherlock Holmes. However, Enola gave an answer that was irrelevant to what Tewkesbury was asking. Enola should have just answered yes or no, so that Tewkesbury would not be confused. Therefore, Enola's utterance was included in the flouting maxim of relation.

Data 10

- Tewkesbury : "Why were they going to send you to the finishing school?"
Enola : "**In the morning, we'll have to move fast. The bowler hat man will be hot on your tail.**" (00:33:48)

The dialogue above appeared at the minutes of 00:33:48. From the conversation above, it could be seen that Tewkesbury was asking Enola why her brother enrolled her in Finishing School. However, Enola gave an irrelevant answer in which she said that it was best to move quickly in the morning. Enola gave an irrelevant answer because he did not want to discuss the topic any further. Thus, Enola's irrelevant utterances were included in the flouting maxim of relation.

Data 11

- Tewkesbury : "Oh, so this is where we part?"
Enola : "It is."
Tewkesbury : "Then, thank you, Enola Holmes, for helping me here."
Enola : "**You were supposed to have forgotten that name.**"

Tewkesbury : “Then you'll have to find another.” (00:34:50)

This conversation appeared at the minutes of 00:34:50. From the conversation above, it could be seen that Enola's utterance was included in the flouting maxim of relation. This could be seen when Tewkesbury thanked Enola for saving his life. However, Enola gave a response that was irrelevant to the topic discussed by Tewkesbury in which she said that Tewkesbury should quickly forget her name. Therefore, Enola's irrelevant response was included in the flouting maxim of relation.

Data 12

Mycroft : “You haven't given our name in the search for her.”

Sherlock : “Of course not. I don't want anyone knowing our business any more than you do.”

Mycroft : “...**they will find that stupid little girl and bring her back to us. Reform God help us. If there's one thing this country doesn't need, it's more uneducated voters. England is going to pot.**” (00:37:54)

The dialogue above appeared at the minutes of 00:37:54. From the dialogue above it could be seen that Mycroft said something wrong and had no proof. Mycroft said something wrong where he said that Enola was a stupid girl, in fact Enola was a genius girl. Mycroft also said the country did not need underperforming voters, he did not have any evidence for his words. From this explanation, it could be concluded that Mycroft's utterances which were clearly wrong and had no evidence were included in the flouting maxim of quality.

Data 13

Enola : “Now, where might I find a lodging house? I'll pay handsomely for good value. Is this really good value?”

Miss Gregory : “**Oh, best value you'll find. You're lucky you found me.**” (00:39:56)

This conversation existed at the minutes of 00:39:56. From the conversation above it could be seen that Enola asked Miss Gregory a good lodging house. Enola did not care how much it cost, the important thing was that she got a very good lodging house. Miss Gregory then showed Enola the lodging house. Enola again asked Miss Gregory if the inn was any good, then Miss Gregory said the inn was the best. After arriving at the lodging house, Enola was forced to smile when she saw the small, dusty and messy old room. It could be concluded that Miss Gregory said something that was clearly wrong. Therefore, Miss Gregory's words are included in the flouting maxim of quality.

Data 14

Enola : “I just need to find her.”

Edith : “What makes you think that she wants to be found? Eudoria's been hiding all her life. If she wants to stay hidden, she will. And besides, she has work to do.”

Enola : "What work?"
Edith : "**I cannot say.**" (00:43:44)

This dialogue existed at the minutes of 00:43:44. From the conversation above it could be seen that Edith told Enola that Eudoria might not want to be found because she had a job. Then, Enola asked what kind of work Eudoria did, but Edith said that she could not tell Enola about her mother's work. From this explanation it could be concluded that Edith provided less information than what Enola needed. Therefore, Edith's utterance was included in the flouting maxim of quantity.

Data 15

Sherlock : "Do you have any sense as to where my mother is?"
Edith : "**How did you find me?**" (01:01:34)

This dialogue existed at the minutes of 01:01:34. From the dialogue above, it could be seen that Edith did not want to tell Sherlock Holmes where Eudoria was, so she immediately changed the subject. So, it could be concluded that Edith's utterance which was not relevant to the topic being discussed by Sherlock was included in the flouting maxim of relation.

Data 16

Tewkesbury's grandma : "What did you say your name was?"
Enola : "May. May Beatrice Posy."
Tewkesbury's grandma : "And how old are you, Miss Posy?"
Enola : "**Twenty-two.**"(01:08:50)

This conversation appeared at the minutes of 01:08:50. From the conversation above, it could be seen that when Tewkesbury's grandma asked again about Enola's name, Enola replied that her name was May Beatrice Posy. Then, when Tewkesbury's grandma asked her about her age, Enola replied that she was twenty-two. Enola said things that were clearly wrong because her name was Enola Holmes and she was actually sixteen years old. Enola's utterances which were clearly wrong were included in the flouting maxim of quality.

4. CONCLUSION

This study identified the types of flouting maxims using Grice's theory (1975). The researchers found that all of Grice's maxims had been flouted by the actors with a total of 16 data. There were 9 data of flouting maxim of relation, 3 data of flouting maxim of quality, 3 data of flouting maxim of quantity, and one data for maxim of manner. Flouting maxim of relation had the most data because the characters in the "Enola Holmes" movie provided answers that were not relevant to the topics discussed. Even though the

characters in this movie flouted all the maxims, the audience could still enjoy the film. Even with the flouting maxims, the plot of the movie became much more interesting.

REFERENCES

- Birner, B. J. (2013). *Introduction to pragmatics*. Wiley Blackwell.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design choosing among five approaches*. Sage Publications.
- Florentina, S., & Ambalegin, A. (2022). Flouting maxims in “Beauty and the Beast” movie. *EScience Humanity Journal*, 2(1), 35–46. <https://doi.org/10.37296/esci.v2i1.23>
- Grice, P. H. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. Academic Press.
- Hamani, T., & Puluhalawa, Y. (2019). Pragmatics analysis of maxim flouting done by the main characters in Kungfu Panda movie by Jonathan Aibel & Glenn Berger. *British (Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra Inggris)*, 8(1), 16. <https://doi.org/10.31314/british.8.1.16-26.2019>
- Hamidah, N., Arifin, M. B., & Ariani, S. (2022). Analysis of flouting of conversational maxims by characters in The Help movie. *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, Dan Budaya*, 6(1), 80–93. <http://e-journals.unmul.ac.id/index.php/JBSSB/article/view/5100/pdf>
- Helmie, J., & Gunawan, N. L. (2019). An analysis of flouting maxims in conversation speaking of the main character in the movie of “Home Alone 2 Lost in New York” by John Hughes. *Jurnal JOEPALLT: Jurnal of English Pedagogy, Linguistics, Literature, and Teaching*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.35194/jj.v7i1.537>
- Op.Sunggu, E. J., & Afriana, A. (2020). Flouting maxims in “Wonder Woman“ movie. *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal*, 4(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.31539/leea.v4i1.1394>
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan aneka teknik analisis bahasa*. Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Wahyudi, A., Yusuf, S., & Lestari, Z. W. (2020). Maxim’s flouting: An analysis of classroom interaction. *JEET*, 219–231. <https://ejournal.unib.ac.id/index.php/JEET/article/view/10842/5629>