

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides an overview of related theories which are presented into two parts. The first part presents the conversational of maxim flouting. And the second part presents the literature of film “*Before Midnight*” Movie.

2.1 Studies in Flouting of Conversational Maxim

The Flouting of Conversational maxims is one of the important part of Pragmatics that proposed by The British Philosopher, H. Paul Grice, which also known as Conversational maxim flouting. Pragmatics could be seen as a approach attempting for looking certain question about meaning, in particular the relation between what speakers mean when they uttered them (Allot, 2010:1). Conversational maxim flouting is the study that concern the most with the term implicature to refer to what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean, as an attempt at revealing actual meaning from what the speaker literally says (Brown and Yule, 1983).

As Thomas (1995) stated that when one “blatantly fail to observe one or several maxims at the level what is said, with the deliberate intention of generating implicature”, she/he tends to ‘flouting’ a maxim, either semantically or pragmatically (Mey, 2005: 77). In consonance with the explanation, the ability to understanding flouting maxim could gain the awareness of the implicature into

spoken discourse, which often includes speakers' hidden intention and implication under the words and expressions uttered verbally (Yuanita, 2011).

Flouting a maxim used by people who in conversation deliberately disobey Grice's cooperative principle with the intention that the listener recognized the hidden meaning of their certain utterance has some purpose as they commit flouting a maxim, it is acknowledge as flouting conversational maxim (Cutting 2002: 37). The flouting of maxims 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).

As Grice (1975:47) stated, "*Make your contribution such is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose of the talk exchange in which you are engaged*", cooperative principle holds people to be cooperate to each other in conversation. When one uttered something and their interlocutor willing to contribute something in line to respond, that respond is intended as a effort to follow the cooperative principle in order to produce an effective communication which the utterance can be intrepret accordingly later on (Trask, 2007: 57-58). However in many circumstances, people do not follow purposefully and blatantly violate a maxim. The reason is that people want to convey an implicit message of their utterances, but it still rests on the principle of cooperative.

Grice argued to sense the flouting maxims, "*to explain how we can get others to understand the things that we mean but do not say outright, and he needs the maxims and their foundation of rational and cooperative conversation*

to build a convincing explanation” (Robinson, 2006:166). Therefore, Grice (1975) elaborated his principle into four pragmatics sub-principles or ‘maxims’ to analyze implied meaning or implicature in conversation as follows; first, maxim of quantity. It is when the speaker suggested to give their contribution as informative as it is required for the purpose of the exchange information and not to share more or less information on than its needed in order to prevent the misunderstanding in conversation. Second, maxim of quality. It is when the speaker suggested to give their contribution to be true and they are asked to say something for which have adequate evidence. Third, maxim of manner. It is when the speaker suggested to give their contribution to be perspicuous to avoid their utterance to not be obscure, ambiguous and disorderly. Fourth, maxim of relation. It is when the speaker suggested to give their contribution to be relevant in exchanging information. (Mey, 2005:72). However, as in flouting maxim, the speaker intended to generate the implicature that resulted their utterance cannot be comprehend easily by the hearer. It is because the speaker exploits the maxims and aim to put in a message implied their utterance. Therefore, the speaker intentionally break those maxim that have mention before in order that their interlocutor to discover another meaning implied they just uttered in conversation. (Grice, p.49)

According to Agus Purwanto (2008) in his thesis titled *“The Flouting of Conversational Maxims by The Main Characters in Titanic Movie”*, people frequently flout the maxim in order to achieve certain purposes. There are two main reasons, first is verbal humor. Usually happened when the speaker need to

create humor situation in conversation by using irony, banter, and sarcasm to respond the interaction (Donerus, 2005). Second, particular individual's social status. Usually happened when the speaker need to respond the conversation by showing their personality or character, for instance the way they talk actively, over actively, untruly or in mysterious way. And these personality as well as character could be caused by social background of the particular persons.

Grice (1975) stated that there are four flouting maxim such as, flouting maxim quality, flouting maxim quantity, flouting maxim manner, and flouting maxim relation. Grice's flouting maxim is chosen as the tools of the study because it is the substantial action which deal the most issue about implicature (Thomas, 1995: 64)

2.1.1 Maxim Quantity Flouting

The participant in conversation who deliberately disobey the maxim of quantity is classified as flouting maxim quantity. Maxim of quantity is where one tries to contribute as informative as one possibly could, and gives much as information as is needed and do not make the contribution more informative than is required (Grice 1975:46). Maxim of quantity represent the information which is being shared in conversation should be expressed as required neither less nor more. Hence, the participant who commit maxim quantity flouting tend to deliver less or too much information than expected in a conversation. This is an example of flouting maxim quantity, taken from "*Conversational Maxim Flouting in TV Series 'How I Met Your Mother' season six*" (2012) by Rani Setiawati.

Marshall: Hey, Randy. Uh, you want a beer?

Randy: **Oh, no, thank you. I brew my own. At the risk of bargging, my Hazelnut Pilsner won fourth prize at the Weehawken Retirement Home Clam Bake and Wheelchair Maintenance Picnic.**

Marshall asked Randy as if he want a beer or not. Though Randy answered the questioned by saying a no, however he added more embellish explanation about his own beer which won a prize. Randy's utterance are considered as maxim flouting because he deliver too much of information than it is required.

2.1.2 Maxim Quality Flouting

The participant in conversation who deliberately disobey the maxim of quality is classified as flouting maxim quality. Maxim of quality is where one tries to be truthful, and does not give information that is false or that is not supported by evidence (Grice p.45). Hence, maxim quality flouting happened when their contribution is not true and they say something for which lacks adequate evidence. This is an example of flouting maxim quality, taken from "*Analysis on Flouting Maxims Found in Kung Fu Panda Movie Script Written by Jonathan Aibel and Glenn Berger*" (2011) by Yuanita Damayanti.

Mr. Ping: What were you doing up there? All that noise.

Po: **Oh, nothing. Just had a crazy dream.**

Here, Po answered that he just had a crazy dream, which there was no adequate evidence to explain that a dream can produce such a noise, because

based on the conversation in this movie he just did not want to make his father got angry.

2.1.3 Maxim Manner Flouting

The participant in conversation who deliberately disobey the maxim of manner is classified as flouting maxim manner. Maxim of manner is where one tries to be as clear, as brief and as orderly as one possibly can in what one say, and where the speaker avoids obscurity and ambiguity (Grice, p. 46). Hence, maxim manner flouting happened when their contribution is not perspicuous it may be obscure, ambiguous and disorderly. Frequently, the participant in conversation who commit in using maxim manner flouting as cover up something. This following example cited from “*Conversational Maxim Flouting in TV Series ‘How I Met Your Mother’ season six*” (2012) by Rani Setiawati.

Zoey: Hi

Ted: Hi

Zoey: Ted, this is my husband.

Ted: **Yeah, old stuff’s great.**

This conversation above taking place when Ted and Zoey meet in a party. Zoey introduced her husband to Ted, instead of welcoming with a proper and warm respond, Ted replied with an ambiguous statements. Ted implied that Zoey’s husband is really old, which also implied that the old someone is the prosper his life will be. Therefore, Ted added “great” to emphasize his actual meaning in the end of his statement to make Zoey felt uncomfortable about the

words he just said. For disobeying the maxim of manner, Ted considered to commit one of this maxim.

2.1.4 Maxim Relation Flouting

The participant in conversation who deliberately disobeys the maxim of relation is classified as flouting maxim relation. Maxim of relation is where one tries to be relevant, and saying utterances that are pertinent to the discussion. (Grice, p. 46) Hence, maxim relation flouting happened when their contribution is irrelevant due to the current discussion or conversation. This is an example of flouting maxim quality, taken from Universiteit Gent (<http://www.english.ugent.be/node/90>)

A: Where did I leave the keys?

B : The car's on the drive.

Based on the conversation above, speaker B flouts the maxim of relation by not providing the information that was asked, instead saying something which appears to be about something else (the whereabouts of the car). On the assumption that B intends her contribution to be irrelevant as an answer to A's question allows speaker A to infer from speaker B's turn that B implies that A no longer needs to look for the car keys.

2.2 Meaning and Context

According to Levinson (1983), Thomas (1995), and Yule (1996), A study in Pragmatics focuses more on how we achieve meaning in particular context, by taking into account things like how, where and when something is said, who says it, what the relationship is between the speaker and hearer, and how we make sense of ambiguous uses of language (Baker and Ellece, 2011:100). In line with the explanation by the linguistic experts, therefore this study which is investigating the flouting maxim used in “*Before Midnight*” Movie is also taking charge in analyzing its implied meaning in context using Grice’s cooperating principle (1975).

In analyzing implied meaning of flouting maxim, in movie, the detail of the scene seen as the substantial matter to be required as the context in it. The role of the context as Sperber and Wilson (1995) noted “as the set of premise that used to interpret an utterance”. In consistent with the previous explanation, Levinson (1983) stated that the meaning of a sentence can be regarded as a function from a context (including time, place, and possible world) into a proposition, where a proposition is a function from a possible world into a truth value aspects along meaning also involve the interaction between an expression’s context of utterance and the interpretation of elements within that expression. Since this study analyzed the implied meaning in movie, there will be many meanings that can be found in certain conversation. Hence, context is used to limit the potential of implied meaning that will appear in each conversation.

In order to interpret the implied meaning, general linguistic element in context which is known as the deictic expression is required in this case. The deixis or indexical seeks to characterize the properties of shifters, indexical, or token-reflexives, expressions like “I”, “you”, “here”, “there”, “now”, “then”, “hereby” and words with tense aspect markers whose meanings are constant but whose referents vary with the speaker, hearer, time and place of utterance, style or register, or purpose of utterance (Levinson 1983: 2) These element are necessary in comprehend the meaning.

By the reason that this study is analyzing the implied meaning of flouting maxim in movie, describing the scene as a context in seen as the substantial to clear up the exact meaning behind the utterance. Scene is “a subdivision of an act in a dramatic presentation in which the setting is fixed and the time continuous (<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/scene>, 2009).

2.3 Study of Movie

A film is also called a movie or motion picture. It is a text just as a play, a poem, or a novel (Caldwell, 2011:1). Films are designed to have effects on viewers, that aimed to give viewers experiences that they could not get from other media telling fictional stories, recording actual events, animating objects or pictures, and experimenting with pure form (Bordwell & Thompson, 2008:28).

Film results in a story unfolding according to the possibilities and constraints of the medium “in order to achieve specific time-bound effects on a perceiver” (Bordwell 1985: 6). Various levels of perception and cognition, many

of them rooted in convention, are related to a logic of combination which determines the basic qualities of film narration. This paves the way for two approaches which should be tried in fruitful competition. Either the complexity of paradigms can be reduced to a model of abstraction which makes it possible to compare narrative processes in literature and in film without paying too much heed to medial specificities, or there must be an attempt to analyze the multiple forms of interplay that stem from the double vantage points of seeing and being seen, sight and sound, light and shadow, spatial and temporal elements, moving images and movement within the images.

2.3.1 Before Midnight Movie

Before Midnight is the third movie in Richard Linklater's series about returning to the story of the legend couple, Jesse and Celine every nine years played by Hawke and Julie Delpy. The fact that movie sequels rarely work, trilogies even less so. However, the exception belongs to Richard Linklater's three-peat: "Before Sunrise" (1994), "Before Sunset" (2004), and now, "Before Midnight". According to IMDb that was reported on Roger and Ebert by Pablo (2013) this Linklater's series is the top 10 narrative movie in the last 2013. Moreover, as cited from <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt2209418/>, "*Before Midnight*" also reach some awards such as; Women Film Critics Circle (Screenwriting Award), 39th Los Angeles Film Critics Association Awards (Best

Screenplay), 17th Hollywood Film Awards (Screenwriter(s) of the Year), 2013 Boston Online Film Critics Association Awards (Ten Best Films of the Year).

Everything in the movie feels incredibly rich, real and unscripted when it's actually anything but the director and two stars co-wrote. Also, this being their third time around, Delpy and Hawke are so beyond comfortable together as a couple. Linklater's camera is simply there to capture their electric chemistry, giving the film a consistent vibrancy.

Linklater introduced the audience to the couple when they were 23 years old and had smooth and youthful faces full of dreams and hopes; it returned to find them slightly older and wiser at 32. In "Before Midnight," they're 41 surprisingly become a couple with twins. They have wrinkles and seem tired and worried about their relationship. As it happens in every relationship that's endured for years, Celine and Jesse have accumulated countless shared memories, hurts and fights. And all of it seems to be circling the major issue that Jesse wants to spend more time with his son and Celine is scared of what that could mean for the two of them.

Before Midnight is about nine years after the conclusion of Before Sunset, Jesse and Celine live in Paris as a couple, parents to twin girls conceived when they got together. Jesse is also struggling to maintain his relationship with his teenage son, Henry/Hank, who lives in Chicago with Jesse's ex-wife and who, after spending the summer with Jesse and Celine on a Greek island, is being dropped off at the airport to fly home. Jesse has continued to find success as a novelist, while Celine is at a career crossroads, considering a job in government.

As the camera pulls back from the driver's seat, the audience can infer that Jesse and Celine have twin daughters.

2.3.2 Plot

Before Midnight is Richard Linklater's third installment in the love story of Jesse, an American writer, and Celine, an intelligent French beauty. Before Midnight is a thought-provoking film that captures an authentic essence of a long-term relationship. How the film portrays the female protagonist as caddy and selfish while simultaneously portraying her as a feminist champion, struggling against the issues that many women face in the contemporary world is the main reason the writer choose this film to study further.

In the first film, Before Sunrise, the two characters meet in their early twenties while traveling across Europe on a train. After getting off together in Vienna, they spend the night walking around the city, philosophizing, and falling in love. They leave each other, making a plan to meet the following year. In the second film, Before Sunset, set nine years later, Celine and Jesse meet again. Celine had flaked out on their rendezvous due to a family emergency and he had married and had a child. Jesse had also written a book about their night together so, when he comes to Paris for a book reading, Celine shows up. After another long walk and conversation, their romance is inevitably rekindled.

Nine years after the conclusion of *Before Sunset*, Jesse (Hawke) and Céline (Delpy) are in an established partnership and have twin girls conceived when they got together for the second time. Jesse is also struggling to maintain his relationship with his teenage son, Henry or Hank, who lives in Chicago with Jesse's ex-wife and who, after spending the summer with Jesse and Céline on the Greek Peloponnese peninsula, is being dropped off at the airport to fly home. Jesse has continued to find success as a novelist, while Céline is at a career crossroads, considering a job with the French government.

After dropping off Hank at the airport, the couple discuss their worries about Hank having a healthy childhood and Céline deciding what to do with her career, before returning to the house of their Greek friend, Patrick. Over dinner they discuss ideas about love and life, and the other people staying with them buy Jesse and Céline a hotel room for that night so they can have some time alone. While walking to the hotel, the couple reminisce about how they met and how their lives have changed since then. When they arrive at the hotel, however, the two have a vicious argument, as both of them pour out their fears about a present and future together.

After a tense argument with Jesse, Céline eventually storms out of the hotel room, telling Jesse she doesn't think she loves him no longer before sitting in the hotel's outdoor restaurant alone. Jesse joins her and playfully tries to explain to her how things can be different from tonight. Céline initially finds Jesse's attempts far from being a grown man, saying that their fantasies will never match

the imperfect reality their relationship constantly goes through. Jesse then claims his love to her, saying that he loves her unconditionally and he is not sure what else Celine could want from a relationship. Céline then all of sudden resumes Jesse's joke and the two seem to make up.

2.3.3 Characters

- Celine Wallace:

Julie Delpy plays the wife, Celine Wallace. She is a passionate, and icon of feminism in everything she does and she says. Celine is at a career crossroads, considering a job in government. In this movie, Celine captured as a forties woman who has fleshy arms, big hips, thick thighs, and a bit of a stomach. In *Before Midnight*, Celine's feminism pushes her to behave in ways we've not seen her do before in the two past "Before trilogy" movie (*Before Sunset* and *Before Sunrise*) —she seems much more hostile and much less empathetic toward Jesse even though he has supported her values and her career throughout their nine-year relationship.

- Jesse Wallace:

Ethan Hawke, plays the husband, Jesse Wallace. After choosing to stay in Paris with Celine, Jesse has continued to find success as a novelist as he used to do back then. Jesse is torn over the messy divorce that keeps him

from his son. In this movie, Jesse captured as a forties man who's age shows in his drawn face, his lined forehead, and the countless wrinkles around his eyes and mouth.

The main characters—Celine (played by Julie Delpy) and Jesse (played by Ethan Hawke)—are in their forties raising two kids together, so this movie revolves around the kind of issues such people embrace in real life: how to be good parents, how to balance the needs of their careers, how to keep the spark alive in their relationship, and how to deal with the aging process.

2.3.4 Settings

The third chapter of Linklater's legend love story finds Jesse and Celine staying with a writer friend of Jesse, Sir Patrick Leigh Fermor, who made his dreamy home in the hills above Kalamitsi Bay in the southern Peloponnese. Much of the filming took place in and around Kardamili on the Mani peninsula. This old man serving as their host is only referred to as Patrick (played by Walter Lassally), but like Jesse, this Patrick is also a writer and has invited Jesse and Celine to stay with him and others for a summer-long writer's retreat.

Also the setting taken place in Dioskouroi Taverna, with its tables set under the pine trees, was a favourite hang-out of Fermor and, more recently, Jesse and his fellow writers who come here for fresh fish and spectacular sunset views

across the bay. Fermor's house had plenty beautiful scene to offer, such as a lush and amazing outdoor garden.

In the opening scene, Jesse drops off his 13-year-old son, Henry, at the Kalamata Airport after visiting from Chicago for the summer. He have to send back his only son who now lived with his ex wife, who frequently giving hard times to Jesse's new life with Celine and intentionally making inconvenience situation for Jesse and Henry maintaining their long distance relationship as a father and son.

Some scenes were also shot at Pylos, which is famous for the archaeological ruins of the Mycenaean Palace of Nestor. However the setting only seen in passing in the movie as Jesse decide to keep driving his car although the twins, who unfortunately falling asleep in the backseat, dying to see the ruins. Passed over, there is Koroni, a tiny port village with its romantic and dramatic yet overlooked by a Venetian castle also been shot in the movie.

After dinner with Fermor and the fellow writers, Jesse and Celine go for a walk that begins with them leaving the house with a view of Methoni Castle, which continues with them walking the grounds to Foneas Beach, near Kardamyli. From here they walk down toward the waterfront and sit down at the pier as the sun begins to set. Before heading to their hotel, Costa Navarino Luxury Resort, Celine and Jesse sit by the water in Kardamyli and look out over the Messenian Gulf as the sun sets in the distance somewhere in Kardamyli port.

Costa Navarino luxury resort in Messenia is the place where Jesse and Celine escape to a smart seafront hotel for the night. This is the place where the room scene happened which resulted Jesse and Celine have their tense long argument. After the tense long argument, Celine was upset and go back to Foneas Beach in Kardamyli to be alone while later on Jesse come in attempting to make the situation better by playing some jokes but Celine is playing cold heart saying his attempt childish, which coming to the scene where Jesse giving a remark that he love her unconditionally and he just want to make everthing better between both of them instead of walking away from the issue, then Céline suddenly resumes Jesse's joke and the two seem to reconcile.

2.4 Theoretical Framework

In this study, the writer will analyze the flouting maxim in “Before Midnight” movie script using the Gricean Maxim Theory of Cooperative Principle proposed by Paul Grice. As for the writer’s explanation of the theory on the literature review, the key term to raise the implied meaning in this study is the maxim flouting which proposed by Paul Grice’s cooperative principle (1975). The criteria of the flouting maxim that may draw implied meaning are developed based on cooperative principle by Grice (1975). The cooperative principle of Grice is maxim of quality, quantity, manner and relation.

Due to the definition of the flouting maxim, some theory from linguists like Grice, Thomas, Cutting are mentioned in this study. In general, they

explained about the flouting maxim that Grice proposed previously. Thomas (1995: 65) stated “flouts of maxim occur when a speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim at the level what is said, with the deliberate intention of generating implicature”. Based on Grice’s cooperative principles (1975) there are four categories in flouting maxims. They are flouting maxim quality, flouting maxim quantity, flouting maxim relation, flouting maxim manner.

This study analyzed the flouting maxim in “Before Midnight” Movie. Moreover, this study investigated about the types of the conversational maxim flout for instance flouting maxim quality, flouting maxim quantity, flouting maxim relation, flouting maxim manner. The implied meaning which is generated from its flouting is also analyzed in this study.