

FLOUTING MAXIM OF QUANTITY AND RELEVANCE IN THE NOVEL *OF MICE AND MEN* BY J. E. STEINBECK

Okty Nurfitasari

STKIP PGRI Ponorogo

oktynurfitasari@yahoo.co.id

Abstrak: Penggunaan bahasa memegang peranan penting dalam komunikasi, karena dengan bahasa makna baik eksplisit maupun implisit dapat tersampaikan. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mencari tabu jenis pelanggaran maksim kuantitas dan relevansi dalam novel "Of Mice and Men" karya John Ernest Steinbeck. Metode yang digunakan adalah deskriptif kualitatif. Dalam menganalisis data, peneliti mengkategorikan, menganalisis, mendeskripsikan, dan menginterpretasikan data secara induktif. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa jumlah pelanggaran maksim kuantitas lebih banyak (50 data) dari pada maksim relevansi (40 data). Para tokoh dalam novel ini melakukan pelanggaran maksim kuantitas dengan cara mengungkapkan pernyataan yang berlebihan dari apa yang diinginkan oleh lawan bicara, sedangkan untuk pelanggaran maksim relevansi, para tokoh mengungkapkan pernyataan yang tidak sesuai dengan topik percakapan. Maksud dari para tokoh dalam melakukan pelanggaran tersebut berimplikasi terhadap latarbelakang penulisan novel ini, sehingga mempengaruhi gaya percakapannya. Jadi dapat disimpulkan bahwa gaya percakapan para tokoh menunjukkan nilai moral yang terkandung dalam novel.

Kata kunci: Pelanggaran, Maksim Kuantitas dan Relevansi, Novel "Of Mice and Men"

Abstract: Human should have good interaction to each other. The use of language holds the important role in doing communication. In using language, there is explicit and implicit meaning. Pragmatics studies the implicit meaning of language; it is Grice's Cooperative Principle. This study focuses on the flouting maxim of quantity and relevance in the novel "Of Mice and Men" by John Ernest Steinbeck. The writer uses descriptive qualitative research. In the data analysis, the writer categorizes, analyzes, describes, and interprets the data inductively. The result of the study showed that the data of flouting maxim of quantity were numbered than the maxim of relevance. There were 50 data founded; 40 maxim of Quantity and 10 maxim of relevance. The characters of the novel did the flouting maxim of quantity by using wordy statement than was required in dominantly, while in flouting maxim of relevance, they used the opposite topic of the conversation. The intentions of the speakers were related with the background of writing the novel. It influenced toward the way to get communication between the characters in this novel. So it was concluded that the way of characters' communication in the novel supported to the moral value of the novel.

Keywords: Flouting, Quantity and Relevance Maxim, "Of Mice and Men" Novel

INTRODUCTION

Human is the part of social community. Good interaction is the key for being good social human, so that, if they do good interaction, the communication will be run effectively. Good communication also reduces the misunderstanding. In addition, the use of language takes the important

role in communication. By doing so, language is as the media of sharing information and language is the effective media in communication for expressing idea to support the information shared.

Related to the form of language in communication, there are two kinds of language. They are spoken and written language. Spoken

language is used in drama, film, talk show, interviews' dialogue, and others. The written language is used in the poem, novel, short story, article, and others. Both of written and spoken language have the meaning from the information shared.

Then, based on the meaning of language itself, there are explicit meaning and implicit meaning. Explicit meaning is the meaning that is on the text or utterances, while implicit meaning is the speaker's meaning which is out of the text. Related with the speaker's meaning, there is a branch of linguistic that studies about speaker's meaning. It is pragmatics.

Pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said (Yule, 1996:3). It is related with the flow of communication happened in the daily life. The communication is done by the speaker and listener in order to share the information. In fact, there is different perspective about what the speaker wants and the listener accepted. It is because of what speaker want to share the information is more that is said. As stated by Davis, speaker meaning is determined by the intentions of the individual speaker (1998). So, there must be a good cooperation between speakers and listener to get the purposed communication.

For more understanding about the implicit meaning of the utterance, human needs to learn implicatures. Yule states that implicatures is an additional conveyed meaning (1996:35). In other words, implicatures is used on the speech event when the speakers may explain their intention or meant, but it is different with what is said. As in the conversation below imply the conversation implicatures.

According to Yule, we have assumed that speakers and listeners involved in conversation are generally cooperating with each other (1996:36). To analyze the implicatures, then the appropriate theory immersed, called as Cooperative Principle, proposed by Grice (1975: 26-30). He postulated a general principle of cooperation and four "maxims" specifying how to be cooperative. It is common knowledge, he asserted, that people generally follow these rules for efficient communication (Davis, 1998: 11).

Cooperative principle describes about how people interact with one another. There are four sub-principles or called as maxim. Specifically, Grice divided into four maxims, they are maxim of quantity, quality, relevance and manner. Furthermore, he emphasized that the use of maxims is important to recognize unstated assumption in conversations. If those maxims used in conversation, it can go on smoothly. So, the speakers are expected to be able to obey the four maxims required. But in fact, there are some kinds of failing to observe the maxims, such as flouting, violating, and opting out the maxim. If the speakers fail to observe the required maxims, perhaps they imply the hidden meaning, which called as implicature.

According to Grice, implicatures means implying (1989:24-25. It comes from the verb 'implicate'. Implicatures as the process of understanding about the *implicatum* of a speaker's utterance. In line with Grice, Ward and Horn defines implicatures as a component of speaker meaning that constitutes an aspect of what is meant in a speaker's utterance without being part of what is said (2014:3). It means that actually what the speaker's intention is different with what the speaker said. So, it can be said that implicatures is much closely dealt with context.

The concept of implicatures is the essential thing in pragmatic. Implicatures is a paradigmatic example of nature and power of pragmatic explanations of linguistic phenomena. It gives the pragmatic interpretations that can be able to pass through and pierce through the boundaries of structural linguistic. The concept of implicatures is being able to give the functional explanation significantly toward the linguistic facts (Levinson, 1995:97-98).

Implicatures is divided into two; they are conventional implicatures and conversational implicatures. Conventional implicatures does not have to occur in conversation, and they do not depend on special context for their interpretation, while the conversational implicatures is the process of interpreting the meaning based on the situation and context. Grice calls the

conversational implicatures as a certain subclass of nonconventional implicatures (1989:26).

The theory of cooperative principles is based on the assumption of how people make conversation. Grice considers that a good conversation must fulfill the conversational goal. Grice defines four basic maxims of conversation as guidelines of the effective co-operative use language, and called by Cooperative Principle. It arranges what must be arranged in utterance for having fluent conversation. This principle is the guide for people to do effective communication.

Cooperative Principle contributes about what is required by the accepted purpose of the conversation (Davis, 1998:11). According to Leech, people need CP (Cooperative Principle) to help to account for the relation between sense and force (1983:83). Specifically, maxim of quantity characterized by the information given is informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange), and never give the information more than is required. While the maxim of relation requires the relevant response to keep communication runs (Grice, 1989:26-27)

To get the effective communication, the language users must observe the Cooperative Principle. It is called non-observing maxim. Grice explains the various ways of people in failing the maxims. The one who flouts the maxim, that is, he may blatantly fail to fulfill it (Grice, 1989:30). A speaker flouts the maxim of quantity by blatantly giving either more or less information than the situation demands. A speaker flouts the maxim of relevance when, his/her utterance does not have any relation with the previous one (Alvaro, 2011:37-38). Furthermore Boulkroune (2009) states that, actually the flouting of maxim is not to mislead the hearer, but also to ask the hearer for finding the meaning of utterance inside. Grundy believes that, whenever a maxim is flouted there must be an implicatures to save the utterance from simply appearing to be a faulty contribution to a conversation (2000:76). Finally, Grundy also summarizes that flouting a maxim is a particularly salient way of getting an addressee to draw an inference and hence recover an implicatures (2000:78).

This study are intended to describe (i) maxim of quantity and relevance flouted in the novel "Of Mice and Men" by John Ernest Steinbeck, and (ii) the implied meanings within the flouted utterances.

METHOD

The study uses descriptive qualitative approach. The object of this study is a form of literary work, it is novel. The novel that is chosen as the object in this study entitled "Of Mice and Men" written by John Ernest Steinbeck on 1937. The data in this study are taken from the conversations on "Of Mice and Men" novel. So, the data are in the form of utterances which involves flouting maxim of quantity and relevance in the "Of Mice and Men" novel. In case of collecting data technique, the study uses study documentary, done by reading the novel intensively and identifying the utterances which contained the flouting. Then the data analyzed by using descriptive analysis, consisting of these steps; identifying, collecting, and analyzing the data inductively.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

After identifying the utterances within the novel, the researcher tabulated the findings in the following table.

Table 3.1: The Data of Flouting Maxims

No.	Flouting Maxim	Amount of Data
1.	Quantity	40
2.	Relevance	10
	Total	50

There were 50 data of flouting maxims, in case of flouting the quantity maxim there were 40 data, while flouting the relevance maxim were only found 10 data.

Discussion

The data presented were 3 data that represented of each rule of flouting maxim quantity; they are the more and less informative utterance than was

required but still in topic and the more informative utterance that added with other topic.

Datum 1

"Why ain't you wanted?" Lennie asked.

"Cause I'm black. They play cards in there, but I can't play because I'm black. They say I stink. Well, I tell you, you all of you stink to me."

Lennie did some strange things, and the one of it was entering Crooks's room without permission. Crook was very angry about it. Actually, Lennie wanted to see his puppy. Then he knew that the light was on, so he entered to the room. Then Crook said that he did not like his coming. He also made a noise about his friends who went to the bunk house without him. Then Lennie asked to him about the reason why he did not go ("Why ain't you wanted?"). Then crook said that the reason was about his bad physical performance ("*Cause I'm black. They play cards in there, but I can't play because I'm black. They say I stink. Well, I tell you, you all of you stink to me.*").

Crook's answer flouted the maxim of quantity because he told much to Lennie that actually his point of answer was altruistically ("*Cause I'm black. They play cards in there, but I can't play because I'm black...*"). He wanted to say that he did not have enough confident toward his friends because they always neglected him ("*... They say I stink. Well, I tell you, you all of you stink to me.*"). He said black several times. He was better to answer that he did not have enough confidents because of his physical performance.

The implicatures was that the Crook was unconfident and had altruistically character. He hated himself because of bad performance. He wanted Lennie knew about it.

Datum 2

Lennie got up on his knees. "You ain'tgonna leave me, are ya, George? I know you ain't."

George came stiffly near and sat down beside him. "No."

This was in the last of story. Because of Curley's wife so aggressive, it made Lennie killed her. In addition, George wanted to save Lennie by catching up him to the edge of Salinas River. In

there, Lennie revealed his regret. He told to himself and also recalled his experience with George. He also met with Aunt Clara's in his imagination. Aunt Clara blamed Lennie that had already made George's life troubled. Then not long after his reflection, George came. Lennie received with open arm. He said ("You ain'tgonna leave me, are ya, George? I know you ain't."). Then George only answered ("No. ").

George had flouted the maxim of quantity, because his answer was very short. Lennie asked George for the clear answer and made them believe that George will not leave him lonely. It was better to George for adding his answer by saying "No, I ain'tgonna leave you".

The implicatures was that George is in the anger feeling. He did not imagine that his best friend had killed Curley's wife. George felt confusing and also anxiety about the condition.

Datum 3

"What kind of a guy is the boss?" George asked.

"Well, he's a pretty nice fella. Gets pretty mad sometimes, but he's pretty nice. Tell ya what - know what he done Christmas? Brang a gallon of whiskey right in here and say "Drink hearty boys. Christmas comes but once a year."

The place was still in the new room of George and Lennie. George asked about the Boss of the ranch to Candy ("What kind of a guy is the boss?"). He wanted to know about the owner of the ranch. Then Candy answered about all the Boss's activity and favorites ("*Well, he's a pretty nice fella. Gets pretty mad sometimes, but he's pretty nice. Tell ya what - know what he done Christmas? Brang a gallon of whiskey right in here and say "Drink hearty boys. Christmas comes but once a year."*").

Candy flouted the maxim of quantity, because his answer consisted of much information than what George want. He told about his custom when Christmast (*Tell ya what - know what he done Christmas? Brang a gallon of whiskey right in here and say "Drink hearty boys. Christmas comes but once a year."*). George did not want about that information. It was better if Candy answered, "Well, he's a pretty nice fella. Gets pretty mad sometimes".It was enough for explaining the general characters of the boss.

Candy's intention was to make George and Lennie knew about the boss more. So, they understood how to act in front of him when they had meeting.

Datum 4

George unslung his bindle and dropped it gently on the bank. "I ain't sure it's good water," he said. "Looks kinda scummy." Lennie dabbed his big paw in the water and wiggled his fingers so the water arose in little splashes; rings widened across the pool to the other side and came back again. Lennie watched them go. "Look, George. Look what I done."

At the first story of the novel, George warned Lennie to drink the water of the Salinas River. George believed that the water was not good water ("I ain't sure it's good water,"). He also proved about the bad performance of the water ("Looks kinda scummy?").

While the responds of Lennie flouted the maxim of relevance, because he did not respond the George warning. But he showed his action to George. It was true if Lennie answered his agree or disagreement, "No, I like it".

The implied meaning of Lennie's answer was that Lennie wanted to catch George's attention. He wanted George knew his clever act.

Datum 5

Lennie watched her, fascinated. George said, "If I see him, I'll pass the word you were looking for him." She smiled archly and twitched her body. "Nobody can't blame a person for lookin'," she said. There were footsteps behind her, going by. She turned her head. "Hi, Slim," she said.

Curley's wife entered to the room and looked for her husband, Curley. She asked to Candy and also all people there. She also asked to George and George promised to give information to Curley if she looked for him ("If I see him, I'll pass the word you was looking for him?").

But her answer flouted the maxim of relevance because she answered in irrelevance with the matter of speaking ("Nobody can't blame a person for lookin"). It was true if she answered, "Thank you".

The implicatures was that she did not have the real intention to look for Curley. She only wanted to catch all workers' attention.

Datum 6

Suddenly Lennie's eyes centered and grew quiet, and mad. He stood up and walked dangerously toward Crooks. "Who hurt George?" he demanded. Crooks saw the danger as it approached him. He edged back on his bunk to get out of the way. "I was just supposin'," he said. "George ain't hurt. He's all right. He'll be back all right."

In the situation when Lennie and George did not in the same workplace. Lennie was very miss George. He cared him and worried about his safety. Then Crook gave the add possibility of George and it made Lennie more worried ("Who hurt George?").

Crook's answer flouted the maxim of relevance because he did not answer Lennie question. Lennie's questions asked about the certain answer. "Who" question needed the 'name' answer, but Crook answered about the George's condition.

The implicatures was that Crook wanted to make Lennie worried about George. Besides, he also wanted to catch Lennie's attention.

CONCLUSION

Based on the finding, there are 50 data found, 40 data of flouting maxim Quantity and 10 data of flouting maxim Relevance. The flouting maxim of quantity is numbered than the flouting maxim of relevance. The characters do the flouting of maxim Quantity by using wordy statement than is required in dominantly, while in flouting of maxim Relevance, the characters use the opposite topic of the conversation. Then the intention of the speaker is related with the theme of the novel, it is loneliness. Through flouting the maxim of quantity and relevance, they want to catch the attention of their addressee.

REFERENCES

Alvaro, R. N. 2011. *The Role of Conversational Maxims, Implicature, and Presupposition in the Creation of*

Humor: An Analysis of Wood Allen's Anything Else. New York: UCM

- Boulkroune, K. 2009. *Flouting Grice's Maxims*. Algeria: Mentouri University Constantine.
- Davis, W. A. 1998. *Implicature: Intention, Convention, and Principle in the Failure of Grice's Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, P. 1989. *Studies in the Way of Words*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Grundy, P. 2000. *Doing Pragmatics (2nd edition)*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leech, G. N. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Limited.
- Levison, S. C. 1995. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steinbeck, J. E. 1937. *Of Mice and Men*. New York: Longman Group Limited.
- Ward, L. R. 2004. *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. London: Blacwll Publishing.
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Oxford University Press.