

## MAXIM VIOLATIONS ON “THE LION IN WINTER” MOVIE

Anastasia Juwita Ningsih<sup>1</sup>, Ambalegin<sup>2</sup>

University Putera Batam, Indonesia

Email: <sup>1</sup> [Pb181210026@upbatam.ac.id](mailto:Pb181210026@upbatam.ac.id), <sup>2</sup> [Ambalegin@puterabatam.ac.id](mailto:Ambalegin@puterabatam.ac.id)

---

### Abstract

---

#### Keywords:

*maxim, maxim  
violation, pragmatic*

This research to determine the maxim that violated in the movie “The Lion in Winter”. Maxim violation was a pragmatics notion that refers to breaking the rules of cooperation in a dialogue. This statement appeared in the background of problem. The characters in the movie were chosen as the data source that has a high probability of violating the maxims. This study used Grice (1989) theory to analyse the types of maxim violation. The method in this research applied the descriptive qualitative method from Creswell (2009). Then, the researchers used the non-participatory technique because the researchers did not include in the event. The pragmatic identity from Sudaryanto (2015) was included to analyse the data. In addition, this research found four type of maxim violation from the data source. Those were seven data in maxim of quantity, three data in maxim of quality, four data in maxim of relation and four data in maxim of manner. This research identified the types of violation maxim by using Grice’s theory. It could be seen that the maxim affected in conversation from The Lion in Winter Movie. This research was helpful in avoiding misconceptions between the speaker and the interlocutor when transmitting the information.

#### Kata Kunci:

*Maksim, Pelanggaran  
Maksim, Pragmatik*

#### Abstrak

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menentukan maksim yang dilanggar pada filem “*The Lion in Winter*”. Pelanggaran maksim adalah gagasan yang pragmatis yang mengacu pada pelanggaran aturan kerjasama dalam dialog. Pernyataan ini muncul di latar belakang masalah. Karakter yang di pilih dalam filem tersebut adalah sebagai sumber data yang memiliki probabilitas tinggi mengenai pelanggaran maksim. Penelitian ini menggunakan teori Grice (1989) untuk menganalisa tipe-tipe dari pelanggaran maksim. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif dari Creswell (2009). Kemudian, para peneliti menggunakan teknik non-partisipasi karena para peneliti tidak termasuk di dalam peristiwa tersebut. Identitas pragmatic dari Sudaryanto (2015) telah dimasukkan untuk menganalisis data. Sebagai tambahan, penelitian ini menemukan empat jenis tipe pelanggaran maksim dari sumber data. Mereka adalah tujuh data dari pelanggaran maksim kuantitas, tiga data dari maksim kualitas, empat data dari maksim relasi dan empat data dari maksim cara. Penelitian ini mengidentifikasi jenis pelanggaran maxim dengan menggunakan teori Grice. Tampak bahwa maxim mempengaruhi percakapan filem “*The Lion in Winter*”. Penelitian ini sangat membantu untuk menghindari kesalahpahaman antara si pembicara dan lawan bicara sewaktu menyampaikan informasi tersebut.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The existence of maxim The existence of maxim according to Grice in Anggryani & Ghozali (2011), when the speakers refrain from applying his maxims, the speakers were “liable to mislead” their counterparts in conversation. It can be seen from a phenomenon in whatsapp’s chat with foreign. The foreign stated “*Btw...* it’s an off day for you isn’t it?” then the respondent replied “**Yes, you right**”. From the statement above, it showed how the respondent answered the statement. Then, based on the phenomenon, the respondent violated the maxim of quantity since the right answer was ‘yes it is. You’re right’. Adriani et al., (2013) claimed that the cooperative theory would help to prevent misunderstandings. It's because the cooperative concept was made up from a set of conversational maxims that were used to help participants in a discussion collaborated and communicated their understanding.

The other existence of maxim can be seen in the conversation that occurred in the minute 00:04:26 especially at the beginning of *The Lion in Winter* Movie.

Henry II : “He'll make an excellent king. He'll be prepared. That's how it works.  
(as he watches John practice) Come on, my kid!”

Alais : “**Have you discovered religion, Henry?**” I inquire. **Will you glance down from your throne to see who's on your throne?**”

Henry II : “Before I die, I need to know. There is a mythology about a monarch named Lear who. I have a lot in common with you.”

From the conversation above, there was a mistake that occurred in the conversation. The speaker wanted to tell the interlocutor about someone who was the last child would be the next king when the king died. However, interlocutor didn’t agree with him as someone would be replaced the king. Then, the interlocutor violated the quantity of maxim that might not be said too much.

There were several previous studies regarding to this research. First previous study was Fatmawati (2015) that found the maxim flouting. The aim of this study was to look at how the maxim was flouted in the film *12 Years a Slave*. This research used Grice’s theory and this research was a qualitative-quantitative study. The data source came from Solomon Northup's maxim-flouting utterances. According to the findings, (1) Northup involved in four forms of maxim flouting: number, quality, relevance, and

manner. (2) Northup used five maxim flouting strategies: tautology, overstatement, understatement, metaphor, and irony. (3) Solomon's conflicting reasons were based on four factors.

Second previous study was from Hidayati (2013) that found violated maxims in *Malam Minggu Miko*. In this research, the researcher used the theory from Grice. The research used a qualitative method to analyse the data. The processes included classifying the violations of maxims found in the data. Then, how often each of the four maxims was violated and determined whether there was a most commonly violated maxim. The results suggest that the violation of the relation maxim, that was discovered 13 times and occurred more frequently than the other.

From the previous studies above, there was a similarity and the difference compare with this research. The similarity was those previous studies used the theory from Grice, which used in this research. Then the difference was the data source that used in this research was *The Lion in Winter* Movie that different from those previous studies. This data source is the historical movie from United Kingdom in 1968. It tells about the royal family is in a state of political and personal upheaval. The reason of the researchers selected this movie as data source because this movie has high probability about maxim violations. Furthermore, the researchers explored violation and flouting of maxim, which included of maxim quantity, quality, relation, and manner.

## **1.1 Maxim Violation**

Maxim violation was a pragmatics notion that refers to breaking the rules of cooperation in a dialogue. According to Grice (1989), violate a maxim avoid the listener from seeking encourages their utterances at face value. Underlined from Grice's, when the speakers refrain from applying his maxims, the speakers were "liable to mislead" their counterparts in conversation (Anggryani & Ghozali, 2011).

### **1.1.1 Maxim of quantity**

Maxim of quantity is proportional to the amount of information provided. Sub-maxims: make your contribution as informative as it needs to be, but not more information than it needs to be. Example:

A: "Does your dog bite?"

B: “No”

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

B: “**That is not my dog.**” (Cutting, 2000, p.40)

#### 1.1.2 Maxim of quality

Maxim of quality is the truth-value of the speech. Sub-maxims: don't say anything you know to be false, and don't say anything for which you don't have enough evidence. Example:

Mother: “Did you study all day long?”

Son who has been playing all day long: “**Yes, I’ve been studying till know!**” (Khosravizadeh & Sadehvandi, 2011)

#### 1.1.3 Maxim of relation

Maxim of relation is concerned with the correlation of one utterance with other utterances. Be relevant at a sub-maxim. Example:

A: “What do you eat, John?”

J: “Oh, it is spaghetti.”

A: “It looks delicious. Could I taste some?”

J: “**Your shirt is really nice.**” (Andy, A & Ambalegin, 2019)

#### 1.1.4 Maxim of manner

Maxim of manner is a phrase the method the utterances were created. Sub-maxim: be clear, prevent ambiguity, keep it short, and keep things in order. Example:

Chad: “Hungry?”

Chad: “*C’mon* Dylan. You and me, it’s magic.”

Dylan: “**It’s a mistake, a horrible, horrible mistake.**”

Chad: “Then how come we keep getting back together? It’s fate.” (Adriani et al., 2013).

## **METHOD**

This research applied the descriptive qualitative method from Creswell (2009), including textual and contextual information. The information was gathered by using the observational method from Sudaryanto (2015). The data source that taken from the movie "The Lion in Winter" that did not involve the researchers in the event. Then the researchers used the non-participatory in collecting the data. The technique began by (1) watched the movie, (2) read the script and marking the theoretically significant utterances while watching, and (3) summarized the context of the chosen utterances while watching the movie in the second time. On the other hand, the data was examined by using the Pragmatic Identity method and analysed by using the matching method (Sudaryanto, 2015).

## **FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

### ***Findings***

This research found eighteen utterances of maxim violations from "The Lion in Winter" movie. These utterances were specified in terms of types of maxim. Those were seven maxims of quantity, three maxims of quality, four maxims of relevance, and four maxims of manner.

**Table 1. Maxim Violations found in The Lion in Winter Movie**

No	Types of Maxim Violations	Total
1	Maxim Quantity	7
2	Maxim Quality	3
3	Maxim Relevance	4
4	Maxim Manner	4
<b>Total of Utterances</b>		<b>18</b>

### *Discussions*

#### **A. Maxim Quantity**

##### Data 1

Alais : "I'm going to lose you, Henry, aren't I?"

Henry II : **"Alais, in my time I've known... contessas, milkmaids, courtesans...and novices, whores, gypsies, jades... and little boys, but nowhere in God's Western world have I found anyone to love but you."**

This scene occurred in minute 0:05:03 when the speaker and hearer sat together at hills when showed the speaker's youngest child exercised swordfight. In speaker's statement, it showed speaker violated the maxim quantity as the speaker gave too much information that hearer needed. In point of view, the speaker wanted to talk with hearer that the speaker loved the hearer.

##### Data 2

Alais : **"What if I didn't follow orders just once, Henry?"**

Henry II : "It's going to be a day in the jungle. I'll never last if I start growling now."

Alais : "You'll make it. Nothing can bring you down because you're like the Stonehenge rocks."

From the conversation above, in the minute 0:11:50, especially in the palace at Chinon, the speaker and hearer talked to each other. The speaker violated the maxim of quantity as the speaker didn't give clear information. In that point, the speaker doubted about the speaker could not be always beside the hearer. Someday, the speaker would leave and betrayed the hearer.

##### Data 3

Alais : "How much trouble might I cause if I determined to be trouble, Henry?"

Henry II : **"Not a lot."**

This conversation occurred in the minute 0:12:17. In this scene, the speaker violated the maxim of quantity. The speaker didn't give the contribution as informative as it needed to be. The speaker made the hearer confused because the speaker didn't say

anything besides ‘not much’. It might be better if the speaker give clear information as the hearer needed like ‘I trust you. You would not do like that because you love me’ or ‘you could not do anything because you have no rights, and I have no problem with what you’ve done to me’.

Data 4

Alais : **“I might be able to reveal your plans to others.”**

Henry II : “You have no idea  
what they are.”

There was a mistake that occurred in the conversation above in the minute 0:12:37 the speaker violated the maxim of quantity as the speaker didn’t give clear information. Speaker didn’t give any option to hearer. Basically, the speaker didn’t think in another angle and the speaker didn’t know about who would be the speaker’s enemies. The interlocutor’s wife and the speaker’s brother would be the biggest enemies in that time. That was why the interlocutor refused the speaker opinion.

Data 5

Alais : “I know you intend to deprive Richard of his inheritance.”

Henry II : **“Eleanor feels the same way. She is aware that young Henry is no longer alive. I haven't named an heir to the young king, who died in the summer. She understands that I want John on the throne, and she understands that I want Richard. We are completely open about it.”**

In the minute 0:12:39 the speaker violated the maxim of quantity because the speaker gave too much information. This occasion occurred when the speaker told to interlocutor about the speaker argued with the speaker’s wife and the speaker not agreed if the oldest son would sit to the throne and replace the speaker as a new king. Otherwise, the speaker’s wife wanted the oldest son to be the next king and the speaker preferred Johnny as the youngest son to Richard as the oldest son.

Data 6

- Alais : “All I care about is not losing you. Can't you keep me hidden? Isn't it possible for me to simply vanish?”
- Henry II : “You know you're not going to be able to do it. Phillip, your younger brother, is now King of France, and he demands your wedding or your dowry back. It was solely for your dowry that I took you. **You were seven at the time... Two large knees and two big eyes are all there is to it. How was I supposed to know?**”

From the conversation above, there was a mistake that occurred in the conversation in the minute 0:13:03 the speaker violated the maxim of quantity as the speaker gave too much information that the hearer didn't need to be. The speaker should not talk the unnecessary things. It might be better if the speaker said to the interlocutor ‘we don't need to hide and we have to face it up all of these problems’.

Data 7

- Alais : “What's the deal with John? John is completely uninterested in you.”
- Henry II : “We adore each other.”
- Alais : “**None of them cares about you.**”

This scene in the minute 0:15:06 the speaker not agreed with the interlocutor decision. It caused of the speaker thought Johnny as the youngest son still childish and it was not right time for him to be the next king. The speaker also violated the maxim of quantity because the speaker didn't give contribution it as informative as it needed to be. The speaker talked without any prove to show the interlocutor that she was right.

## **B. Maxim Quality**

Data 1

- Alais : “**If I'm married to your son, I can't be your mistress.**”
- Henry II : “Why can't you do it? Johnny isn't bothered.”
- Alais : “Your Johnny irritates me.”

From the conversation above, it occurred in the minute 0:12:40 when the speaker violated the maxim of quality because the speaker didn't give the truth reason. The speaker refused as the speaker couldn't be the interlocutor mistress if the speaker

married with the oldest son. In fact, the oldest son was a gay but the interlocutor didn't know about it. Also, the interlocutor didn't like the oldest son it didn't matter if the oldest young gay or not.

Data 2

Henry II : "He's a good young man."

Alais : **"He has acne and stinks like dung."**

Henry II : "He's only sixteen years old! He can't seem to get rid of the pimples."

This conversation was particular of the previous conversation in the minute 0:12:44, the speaker violated the maxim of quality as the speaker said anything that speaker didn't know and the speaker had not enough evidence to say the truth. There was occurred implied meaning as the speaker meant Johnny was not the right candidate to be the next king as Johnny still young. The speaker also insulted the youngest son as it showed 'he smells of compost'. It meant Johnny's body smelled like a *poop*. The interlocutor tried to convince speaker that Johnny was a good choice to be a next king. The reason why the interlocutor choose Johnny for the next king because the interlocutor trusted and loved Johnny that would not betrayed the interlocutor someday.

Data 3

John : **"What matters is that I am my father's favourite."**

Richard : "You don't know me, Johnny, so take my word for it: I'm a steadfast soldier, a sporadic poet, and I'll be king."

This scene occurred in the minute 0:15:33 when the speaker argued over with the interlocutor that who would sit on the throne and be the next king. In this occasion, the speaker violated the maxim of quality as the speaker didn't have enough evidence why the speaker's father chosen the speaker to be the next king. It might be better if the speaker gave any prove to supported the speaker's statement in order to make the interlocutor envious.

### C. Maxim Relevance

Data 1

Henry II : “We fight because of this? Tell me they're all vying for the title. That prince, I'll tell you, is a weakling. They're the kind of sons I desire because they can snap at me and scheme. All my life, I've been snapping and plotting. There's no other way to be a king when still alive and fifty.”

Alais : “**I'll put up a fight for you.**”

The conversation above occurred in the minute 0:14:20 when the speaker violated the maxim of relevance because the speaker didn't answer coherence and relevant with what the interlocutor did say. This scene related to the previous data as the interlocutor fought with the children. That was why the speaker supported and chosen the speaker side.

Data 2

Alais : “How's your queen doing?”

Henry II : “I suppose he's deteriorating. **Don't be envious of the gorgon, please. I don't think she's one of my favourite things. How many of your friends have spouses that enslave their wives? For the past ten years, I haven't kept the great bitch in the keep due to a strong attachment.**”

In this occasion occurred in the minute 0:05:35 when the speaker violated the maxim of relevance. The interlocutor asked about the speaker's wife but the speaker answered not relevance. It might be better if the speaker would say the wife was good or the wife was not good. In the speaker statement also it related to insult someone as the speaker said the wife ‘decaying’. However, the speaker judged the wife with hatred speech. It was not good in domestic when the speaker build a family. It showed the family was not in good relation among the members in that family.

Data 3

Marshal : “What if the queen declines?”

Henry II : **“Eleanor? This is something she wouldn't trade for anything.”**

This scene occurred in the minute 0:06:10 when the speaker asked the interlocutor to invite the wife for joining Christmas court at Chinon. There was not only the speaker's wife but the speaker invited Philip as the king of France which was the mistress's brother. The speaker also asked the interlocutor to tell the speaker's children. In this occasion, the speaker violated the maxim of relevance as the answer didn't coherence with what the interlocutor asked for. It might be better if the speaker said 'she wouldn't refuse to celebrate the Christmas.

Data 4

Henry II : “On this Christmas, Alais, I have all the enemies I need in these rooms.”

Alais : “You have a lot more than you realize.”

Henry II : **“Are you one of them? Is it true that my willow has transformed into poison oak?”**

The conversation above occurred in the minute 0:12:15 when the speaker violated the maxim of relevance because speaker didn't answer coherence and relevant what the interlocutor did say. The speaker said to the interlocutor with the implied meaning. The speaker meant the interlocutor would betray the speaker someday. In the interlocutor statement included the symbolic sign as the interlocutor would betray the speaker soon.

#### **D. Maxim Manner**

Data 1

Marshal : **“Geoffrey?**

**Geoffrey... Geoffrey!”**

Geoffrey : “Father is interested seeing me.”

In this occasion, it occurred in the minute 0:10:01 when the interlocutor as the second Henry's king child watched a war and it happened at the shore in Brittany. This scene showed when the speaker wanted to tell the interlocutor to celebrate Christmas court at Chinon with the interlocutor mother's and Philip as the king of France to join

with the event. However, the speaker violated the maxim of manner as the speaker didn't give clear information to interlocutor. Luckily, the interlocutor knew what the speaker wanted to tell the interlocutor. It also the interlocutor was right for guessing what speaker wanted to tell with the interlocutor.

Data 2

Alais : "What if I didn't follow orders for once, Henry?"

Henry II : "**It'll be a jungle of a day.** I'll never last if I start growling right now."

Alais : "You're going to make it. Nothing can knock you down like the stones at Stonehenge."

This scene occurred in the minute 0:11:52 in the palace at Chinon, the interlocutor and the speaker were talked to each other. The speaker violated the maxim of manner as the answer was ambiguity and it didn't clear enough. However, in that statement the speaker had implied meaning. It might be better if the speaker told 'It would be hard to face the day. And there seemed like a jungle that had many challenges to trough the life.'

Data 3

Alais : "Eleanor, as well."

Henry II : "**My lovely wife, the new Medusa?**"

In this occasion it occurred in the minute 0:05:30 when the interlocutor asked about the speaker's wife but the speaker answered with violated the maxim manner. The speaker answered without clear information and the meaning still ambiguity. The speaker said the new Medusa as the speaker's good wife. Meanwhile, Medusa was famous with her bad aura and power. It meant the speaker's wife had a bad characteristic. In point, the speaker judged the wife with bad aura and power also. However, the speaker said the wife as a good woman. This showed the speaker had unstable opinion.

Data 4

Geoffrey : “She still desires for you to be king?”

Richard : “**We aren't as nice as we once were.**”

The conversation above occurred in the minute 0:15:28 when King Henry’s children gathered in the palace at Chinon. The speaker and hearer talked about mother would come to celebrate Christmas. The interlocutor as the second child asked the speaker as the oldest son. The speaker answered with violated the maxim of manner because there was ambiguity meaning. It could be mother changed the mind and asked Johnny to be the next king or mother kept the decision to choose the oldest son as the next king.

## **CONCLUSION**

This research identified the types of violation maxim by using Grice’s theory. It could be seen that the maxim affected in conversation from *The Lion in Winter* Movie. It found that all of Grice’s maxims had been violated by the actors. There were several findings consist of seven maxims of quantity, three maxims of quality, four maxims of relevance, and four maxims of manner. The maxim of quality was the maxim that was less violated. It was critical to understand the violating of maxims by examining the study's findings and conclusions. This was helpful in avoiding misconceptions between the speaker and the interlocutor when transmitting information. Speakers and interlocutor should decrease the usage of violating maxims and made the information understandable by understanding how to employ cooperative principles. Interlocutors were also supposed to be able to detect the hidden meaning that the speaker was attempting to express in this study. There were various areas of the analysis in this study that still needed to be developed. As a result, the researchers suggested that a different object be used and that a future study can be conducted using a different theory. The knowledge gained from this study can be applied by future researchers who want to analyse the same subject to generate a better result.

## REFERENCES

- Adriani, K. G. ., Hamzah, H., & & Havid, A. (2013). *Comparison of the Maxim Violation Found in Action and Drama Movies*. 69–78. <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/ell/article/view/900>
- Andy, A & Ambalegin, A. (2019). Maxims Violation on “Night at the Museum” Movie. *Basis*, 6, 215–224.
- Anggryani, M., & Ghozali, I. (2011). Violations of Maxim Analysis of Cooperative Principle in Maleficent Movie. *Pragmatic*, 122–123.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (Third edit). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Cutting, J. (2000). *Pragmatic and Discourse a Resource Book* (P. Stockwell (ed.)). Routledge.
- Fatmawati, S. N. K. (2015). *A Pragmatic Analysis of Maxim Flouting Performed by Solomon Northup in 12 Years a Slave Movie*. Yogyakarta State University.
- Grice, P. (1989). Grice Logic and Conversation. In *Library of Congress Cataloging*. Harvard University Press.
- Hidayati, F. (2013). *An Analysis of the Violation of Maxims In Malam Minggu Miko Situation Comedy. 2003*, 35–40.
- Khosravizadeh, P., & Sadehvandi, N. (2011). *Some Instances of Violation and Flouting of the Maxim of Quantity by the Main Characters ( Barry & Tim ) in Dinner for Schmucks*. 26, 122–127.
- Sudaryanto. (2015a). Method dan Teknik Analisis Bahasa. In *Method dan Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Duta Wacana University Press.
- Sudaryanto. (2015b). *Metode dan aneka teknik analisis bahasa*. Duta Wacana University Press.