

## The Flouting of the Gricean Maxims in the Movies *Insidious* and *Insidious 2*

Melinda Kurniati\*, Sharifah Hanidar  
Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

\*Email: kurniati.elinda@gmail.com

---

### A B S T R A C T

The research attempts to examine the flouting of the Gricean maxims in two horror movies *Insidious* and *Insidious 2*. It also aims to investigate the functions of the flouting that the characters made when speaking to other characters. Qualitative and quantitative methods were used to analyze the data. The results show that in *Insidious*, the characters flout all the maxims with 23 cases of flouting: 3 cases of the flouting of the maxim of quality (13.1%), 9 cases of the flouting of the maxim of quantity (39.1%), 6 cases of the flouting of the maxim of relation (26.1%), and 5 cases of the flouting of the maxim of manner (21.7%). Whereas the characters in *Insidious 2* only flout two maxims, the maxim of quantity and relation with 7 cases of floutings: 3 cases of the flouting of the maxim of quantity (42.8%), and 4 cases of the flouting of the maxim of relation (57.2%). The results indicate that characters in *Insidious* and *Insidious 2* flout the maxims for a number of reasons, the main reasons being to avoid making the main characters upset, provide comprehensive explanations, convince the hearer, and criticize someone's action.

**Keywords:** *Cooperative Principle, Flouting, Maxims, Functions, Horror Movies.*

---

### INTRODUCTION

Communication is one important element that cannot be separated from people living in a community or society. As long as humans exist, languages exist; in short they are inseparable. Communication is also about how people deliver their thoughts, their assumptions, their messages, their purposes and their feelings.

Effective communication, according to Grice (1975), can be achieved when a speaker makes a contribution as required by the hearer. He adds that a conversation is successful if the participants obey the four maxims of the Cooperative Principle: the maxim of quality, the maxim of quantity, the maxim of relation, and the maxim of manner (p. 45). The maxim of quality requires the speaker to tell the truth because a lying or untruthful statement will disrupt communication and lead to a misunderstanding. The maxim of quantity requires the speaker to

provide information that is required by the hearer. The information should not be too much or too little than is required. The possibility that may occur if the speaker gives too little information is that the hearer is unsatisfied by the information provided. On the other hand, if the speaker gives too much information than is required s/he will risk making the hearer bored (p. 35). The maxim of relation requires the speaker to provide an answer relevant to the topic of conversation. The maxim of manner requires the speaker to speak orderly and clearly in order to avoid ambiguity and confusion.

Yet in reality some people tend to flout the maxims deliberately due to several factors such as avoiding offending people, creating a sense of humor, saving face, and criticizing something or someone. Occasionally some listeners do not understand what the speaker means and thus misinterpret what the speaker says.

Nowadays, in the era of globalization, many people channel their thoughts through arts and other media, one of which is movies. Movies have been popular among all ages. Perrine (1998) believes that the success of a movie is seen from the number of audience. He further explains that commercial filmmakers are always compelled to produce movies that correspond to the audience's demand which decides the story patterns, character types, and other conventions of new movies. All these share repetition from the previous popular movies and create innovation to satisfy the audience's desire (p. 22).

Grant (2007, p. 1) affirms that most popular movies are entirely set up according to genre categories—science fiction, horror, thriller, pornography, romantic comedy, and so forth. The genres are categorized based on the story content, the mood, the target audience, and the setting of time.

In this research, two horror movies were selected as the data sources. While Blake and Bailey (2013, p. 31) define horror movies as movies whose stories contain spirits which haunt people, Kawin (2012, p. 2) maintains that horror movies evoke fear which deals with evil and the goal is to revolt and frighten the audience. The characters in a horror movie are placed in a stressful and frightening situation, which cannot be separated from paranormal activities. People who are placed in that situation should be straightforward, honest and clear in delivering information to other characters in order not to mislead them and cause misunderstanding about what is really going on. It is interesting to investigate why the characters in horror movies choose to flout the Gricean maxims.

Two American supernatural horror movies entitled *Insidious* (2010) and its sequel *Insidious 2* (2013) were selected for analysis. The scripts of the movies were written by Leigh Whannell. The story tells about a boy, Dalton, who has the ability of leaving his physical body and traveling in the astral world. He has traveled too far to the place inhabited by the tortured souls of the dead. He is caught and trapped by the Demon in the astral world. Elise, a paranormal, suggests that Josh, his

father, who has the same ability as Dalton to bring his soul back.

*Insidious* was chosen because it was the most profitable movie in 2011, while *Insidious 2* was chosen because it is the sequel and the ending of *Insidious*. Furthermore both movies include supernatural beings and activities which evoke fear and stressful situations for the characters.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

### Context

Based on Cutting's (2002, p. 3) categorization, there are three types of context: situational context, background knowledge context, and co-textual context.

#### *Situational context*

Situational context is when the speaker and the hearer share the same situation around them (p. 5).

#### *Background Knowledge context*

Background Knowledge Context is what the speaker and the hearer know about each other and the world (p. 5).

#### *Co-Textual Context*

Co-textual context is what the speaker and the hearer know about what they have been saying (p. 5).

### Implicature

According to Levinson (1983, p. 97), implicature is when the speaker's utterance has an implicit meaning behind what is literally said or expressed. Implicature contributes to the comprehension of the meaning of a conversation. Below is an example from Levinson (1983, p. 97).

(1) A : Can you tell me the time?

B : Well, the milkman has come.

Levinson (1983, p. 98) paraphrases the previous example as follows:

A: Do you have the ability to tell me the time of the present moment, as standardly indicated on a watch, and if so please do tell me.

B: No I don't know the exact time of the present moment, but I can provide some

information from which you may be able to deduce the approximate time, namely the milkman has come.

In the previous dialogue, B does not know the exact time of the present moment. B gives little information which leaves the hearer unsatisfied. However B still tries to obey the Cooperative Principle by giving A a clue that the present time can be indicated by the arrival of the milkman.

### Cooperative Principle

Grice introduced the concept of Cooperative Principle in 1975. He argues that people need to cooperate with each other while exchanging their verbal information in communication. Grice (1975) states that people will have a successful conversation if they fulfill the Cooperative Principle that is realized by four maxims of conversation. Grice (1975) formulates four ways for effective communication, which can be summarized as follows:

***The Maxim of Quantity.*** Do not say too much or too little

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required.
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Following Grice, Cutting (2002) states that in obeying the maxim of quantity, the speaker should provide information that is required by the hearer. It should not be too much or too little than is required. The possibility that may occur if the speaker gives too little information is that the hearer is unsatisfied by the information provided. On the other hand, if the speaker gives too much information than is required will risk boredom for the hearer (p. 35).

***The Maxim of Quality.*** Be truthful

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

The maxim of quality requires the speaker to tell the truth. A lying or untruthful statement will disrupt the communication and lead to a misunderstanding.

***The Maxim of Relation.*** Be relevant with the topic discussed.

1. Be relevant with the topic the speaker intent.

The maxim of relation requires the speaker to provide answers relevant to the topic.

***The Maxim of Manner.***

1. Be perspicuous
2. Avoid obscurity of expression.
3. Avoid ambiguity.
4. Be brief.
5. Be orderly

The maxim of manner requires the speaker to speak orderly and clearly in order to avoid ambiguity and confusion.

Even though Grice (1975) has formulated four ways to effective communication, yet it is still possible for them to be broken. He points out several ways people may fail to fulfill the Cooperative Principle, i.e., opting out, clashing, violating, and flouting (p. 49).

1. Opting Out

Opting out occurs when the speaker chooses not to obey the maxims and shows unwillingness to do so. For example,

- (2) I cannot say more; my lips are sealed (p. 49).

2. Clashing

Clashing occurs when the speaker fails to fulfill the maxim of quantity (“be as informative as is required”) without violating the maxim of quality (“have adequate evidence for what you say”) (p. 49).

3. Violation

Violation is defined as “the unostentatious or ‘quiet’ non-observance of a maxim. A speaker who violates a maxim “will be liable to mislead” (p. 49). This takes place when the speaker intentionally decides not to apply certain maxims in their conversations to cause misunderstanding on the hearer or to achieve some other purpose. The following is an example of conversation that shows the violation of the maxim of quantity (Cutting, 2002, p. 40):

- (3) [The setting: A (a guest) wants to be nicer and friendlier. He smiles to B (a receptionist) and says hello politely. A dog comes and stands beside him. Then A asks B:]

A : Does your dog bite?

B : No

A : (bends down to stroke it and gets bitten)

Ow! You said your dog does not bite!

B : That is not my dog.

B is actually not lying when he says that his dog at home does not bite. But in this case B has violated the maxim of quantity by giving less information than is required by the hearer. He knows that A is talking about the dog beside B and not B's dog at home. As a result B has misled A.

### Flouting the Maxims

As Grice (1975, p. 49) states, when a speaker flouts a maxim; he may BLANTALY fail to fulfill it. Unlike violating a maxim where a speaker tends to mislead and cause the hearer to misunderstand, maxim flouting takes place when the speaker deliberately decides not to obey the Cooperative Principle so that the hearer will infer the hidden meaning behind the utterance that is literally spoken by the speaker.

Cutting (2002) categorizes maxim flouting into four types of flouts:

#### *Flouting of the Quantity Maxim*

It occurs when the speaker gives too little or too much information. Below is an example from Cutting (2002, p. 36)

- (4) Peter : Well, how do I look?

Mary : Your shoes are nice.

In this case Mary has flouted the maxim of quantity by giving information less than required. Peter asks her about his whole appearance, but Mary only refers to his shoes. She does not say directly that the shirt or his jeans look nice, which means that she is not impressed with the rest of what he is wearing. To avoid offending Peter, Mary decides not to obey the maxim of quantity. Thus Peter is forced to infer the hidden meaning of Mary's utterance.

#### *Flouting of the Quality Maxim*

Cutting (2002, p. 37) states that in flouting the maxim of quality the speaker may simply say something that obviously does not represent what they think. In this case the speaker speaks sarcastically with the intention that the hearer will get the implicit meaning of what the speaker says. This occurs when the speaker says something which needs to be perceived as blatantly untrue. Cutting (2002, p. 38) proposes several ways people may flout the maxim of quality by using hyperbole, metaphor, irony, banter, and sarcasm.

##### a. Hyperbole

A speaker uses hyperbole when s/he deliberately chooses to exaggerate something better or worse than it is, and is often used to create humor. Below is an example from Cutting (2002, p. 37)

- (5) Lynn : Yes I'm starving too.

Martin : Hurry up girl

Lynn : Oh dear, stop eating rubbish. You won't eat any dinner.

"Starving" in this context is an exaggeration. The speaker would not expect the hearer to think that she is suffering of hunger or dying of hunger; however the hearer would simply assume that the speaker is very hungry.

##### b. Metaphor

Lakoff and Johnson (1980, p. 5) say that "The essence of metaphor is to understand and experience one kind of thing in terms of another." A speaker uses metaphor to describe the analogy between two different things. Cutting (2002, 38) provides the following example of metaphor: "My house is a refrigerator in January," which implies that the house is so cold in January. Because a refrigerator is associated with cold, so the speaker uses the word "refrigerator" to describe the temperature of the house (p. 38).

##### c. Irony

Cutting (2002, p. 38) states that irony is a way of being offensive (mock-politeness). The speaker makes a positive statement to imply a negative one. "If you only knew how much I love being woken up at 4 am by the fire alarm" shows

sarcasm and the hearer is expected to understand that it means the opposite (p. 38).

d. Banter

Banter is the contrary of irony. The speaker makes a negative statement to imply a positive one. “You’re nasty, mean, and stingy. How can you only give me one kiss?” is actually intended to express friendship and not to hurt the hearer (Cutting, 2002, p. 38).

d. Sarcasm

Sarcasm is a form of irony that is not friendly. It is usually used to hurt the hearer, as in “This is a lovely undercooked egg you’ve given me here, as usual. Yum!” The speaker intends to criticize something in an impolite way (Cutting, 2002, p. 38).

### ***Flouting the Maxim of Relation***

Flouting the maxim of relation occurs when the speaker deliberately gives a response that is irrelevant to the topic that is being discussed. Cutting (2002) says that the speaker who flouts the maxim of relation expects the hearer to understand the meaning behind the unsaid utterance and make connection between what is being discussed. Below is an example from (Cutting, 2002, p. 39).

- (6) Heckler: We expected a better play.  
Coward: I expected better manners.

Heckler refers to the play, but Coward irreverently replies by referring to manners. Even though Coward does not seem to cooperate in replying to the statement, Heckler still understands that Coward finds him and the other players play rudely and offensively. Heckler assumes that Coward indirectly asks them to improve their attitude in playing.

### ***Flouting the Maxim of Manner***

Flouting maxim of manner occurs when the speaker deliberately fails to observe the maxim by not being brief, or using obscure words. An example of flouting maxim of manner is a dialogue between a husband and a wife as follows (Cutting, 2002, p. 38):

- (7) A: Where are you off to?

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

A: Ok, but don’t be long – dinner’s nearly ready.

B speaks in an ambiguous way, mentioning “funny white stuff” and “somebody”, because he is trying to avoid saying “ice cream” and “Michelle”, so that his little daughter does not get excited and asks for the ice cream before her meal.

## **METHODS**

The research was conducted by using qualitative and quantitative methods. The object of investigation focused on the utterances made by the characters in *Insidious* and *Insidious 2* that contain the flouting of the maxims.

The data were collected from the selected films, *Insidious* and *Insidious 2*. In order to understand the utterances better, the subtitle was downloaded from [www.subscene.com](http://www.subscene.com) on November 1, 2015 and was used to help identify the utterances of the characters which flout the maxims. Thereafter the flouting of the maxims were classified and analyzed based on the theoretical concept proposed by Grice (1975). As stated by Grice (1975, p. 49), when a speaker flouts the maxims, he blatantly does not obey the maxims.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Table 1. The frequency and distribution of maxim flouting in the movies

Maxim Flouting	Number	%
Quality	3	10
Quantity	12	40
Relation	10	33
Manner	5	17
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>

This section presents and discusses the findings of the data analysis, which is the flouting of the conversational maxims in two horror movies: *Insidious* and its sequel *Insidious 2*. The table above summarizes the results. The table shows that a total of 30 occurrences of maxim flouting were found. Out of these 30 occurrences,

most (77%) were found in the movie *Insidious* and the remaining (23%) in the movie *Insidious 2*. The much more frequent occurrences of maxim flouting in the movie *Insidious* might be attributable to the fact that in *Insidious* the main characters lack the knowledge of supernatural beings and activities which make the characters who already understand them choose to flout the maxims in delivering the information in order to deliver the information sufficiently without causing the main characters to be upset.

The table above also shows that the most frequently flouted maxim was the maxim of quantity (40%), followed by the maxims of relation (33%), manner (17%) and quality (10%). The flouting of each of the maxim is discussed in detail below.

### The Flouting of the Quality Maxim

Flouting the maxim of quality occurs when the speaker's utterance does not represent the reality or when the speaker deliberately says something which is untrue. In this case the speaker may use sarcastic words to deliver the implicit meaning to the hearer.

(8) [00:15:46 - 00:16:03] (from *Insidious*)

It is in the middle of the night. Renai flops down onto the bed beside Josh. They are discussing about Dalton, who has just fallen from the ladder in the attic when he tries to explore the attic alone.

**Josh:** So were you putting boxes away upstairs?

**Renai:** Don't, Josh.

**Josh:** I just hate feeling helpless. Sorry. I'll figure out a way to lock the door tomorrow.

**Renai:** Good. It's dangerous, you know. *Maybe we should just put him on a child leash.*

**Josh:** *I'll stop at the pet store tomorrow.*

In this scene both Renai and Josh flout the maxim of quality. When Renai states that Dalton should be put on a child leash, it does not literally mean that she will do it because Dalton is eight years old. Her utterance conveys that Dalton

should always be watched because it will be dangerous to let him play alone and go up to the attic. Josh also flouts the maxim of quality when he replies jokingly by saying he would buy a child leash in the pet store. He uses banter as he decides to make a negative statement to imply the positive one in expressing his care towards his son.

Renai flouts the maxim of quality to criticize Dalton's character, which is energetic and needs a distinctive treatment. Josh also flouts the maxim of quality intended to convey his agreement with his wife's statement that their child, Dalton should always be under control.

(9) [00:18:22 - 00:18:42] (from *Insidious*)

Renai and Josh are getting ready for breakfast. However, Dalton has not come down yet. Renai, who is preparing breakfast asks Josh, her husband to wake him up.

**Renai:** Can you go wake up Dalton, Josh?

**Josh:** Yeah.

In Dalton's bed room.

**Josh:** Hey, Mr. Sleepy-pants. Get up. Hey, Sleepypants. *You'd better get out of that bed or your mother's gonna kill us both.*

Josh tries to wake Dalton up by saying that "You'd better get out of that bed or your mother's gonna kill us both." This indicates that he flouts the maxim of quality. In this case he uses hyperbole to exaggerate his statement. Renai will not truly kill both Josh and Dalton just because Dalton does not wake up. However, it has the implicit meaning which emphasizes that Renai might get angry if Dalton does not wake up, and is late for school.

Josh decides to flout the maxim of quality by exaggerating to create humor considering that Dalton is still a little boy and also to make him get up immediately.

### The Flouting of the Quantity Maxim

The characters who are already aware of the existence of supernatural beings and activities flout the maxim of quantity by providing shorter utterances to avoid making the characters upset and expect that they will be able to infer from the

explanation provided. Flouting the maxim of quantity is also mostly used to provide comprehensive information about the incident by giving more information than is required to relate the incident and its effects.

(10) [00:34:15 - 00:34:50] (from *Insidious*)

Renai questions Josh about the house. She can sense that there is supernatural activity going on in it. She finds a bloody hand print on Dalton's bed, she hears voices over the baby monitor when no one is in Cali's room. Renai believes that supernatural beings are haunting them, but Josh does not believe her.

**Josh:** You think our house is haunted?

**Renai:** I don't think it. I know it. *Things move around in here by themselves. I walk into the kitchen at night to get a drink, I can feel eyes on me. I can't be in there alone anymore. I need you. But you're never here. Where are you?*

**Josh:** I told you. I was grading tests.

Josh does not believe that supernatural beings are haunting their family. In replying to Josh's question, Renai flouts the maxim of quantity by giving information more than required. She gives evidences to support her argument that their house is not safe, and unseen beings are watching them. She also shares her current feelings of the situation they are facing in order that Josh realizes that they are now in an emergency situation that needs to be resolved.

Renai decides to flout the maxim of quantity in order to convince Josh that supernatural beings do exist and are haunting them.

(11) [00:50:41 - 00:51:13] (from *Insidious*)

Elise, the paranormal, sends both her assistants, Specs and Tucks to monitor Josh's house. They have to collect the facts of the negative energies from Josh's house to help Elise know what is happening in the house.

**Specs :** We took Trifield and EMF readings of the whole house, all the wiring, alarm clocks, radios, toasters, IV,

record player, fuse box, nothing went off the charts except for the...

**Elise:** And the previous home?

**Specs:** Tucker hadn't monitored that yet. *You know what? Don't even sweat it. I'll make myself available. I'll get on that this afternoon.*

**Tucks:** Yeah, but I'll have to come, too, because who's going to operate the equipment?

**Specs:** Well, strictly, I could do it without...

**Tucks:** Yeah, but I need to oversee...

**Specs:** Yeah, but it's not...

**Elise:** That's fine, gentlemen. I don't think bad wiring is the problem here.

In this case Specs has flouted maxim of quantity by giving more information than is required. When Elise asks about the previous house, Specs has answered the question by saying that it has not been monitored yet. He flouts the maxim of quantity because he feels bad for being irresponsible.

By flouting the maxim of quantity Specs intends to show Elise that he will be responsible for the monitoring. It also has the implicit meaning that he will provide her with the information that afternoon.

(12) [00:13:33 - 00:13:36] (from *Insidious 2*)

In the movie, *Insidious*, Josh's real soul has been trapped in the spirit realm after he tries to bring Dalton back. A spirit, named Parker possessed Josh's physical body. At the end of *Insidious*, Parker uses Josh's body to kill Elise, a paranormal, who tries to chase him away several years ago. In this scene Renai is being questioned by a detective about Elise's death. He questions Renai about the photograph that was taken by Elise before she died. The detective tells her that Josh's fingerprints match those found at the scene, and that her husband is suspected as the murderer.

**Renai:** One morning, Dalton just wouldn't wake up. We took him to the best doctors we could find, but none of

them had any idea. Eventually, we just took him home, still in his coma. Then things started happening around the house. Unexplained things. I got so freaked out, we moved. But they kept happening.

**Sendal:** And you believe that there was some sort of supernatural force at work? When did you hire the services of the deceased Elise Rainier?

**Renai:** When we ran out of places to go.

**Sendal:** It says in your statement, Mrs. Lambert, that last night, at approximately 10:00 p.m., Elise put your husband into a state of hypnosis. She did this as part of a ritual that she believed would allow him to "project his unconscious into a..." Uh... I'm sorry, I can't read my own handwriting. "...Into a spirit realm, where he could locate your son "and bring him back to consciousness." Now, did you really believe that would help?

**Renai:** I had to. *Whatever she did, it worked. Dalton woke up.*

It is seen in the dialogue that Renai flouts the maxim of quantity by giving additional information about the condition of Dalton after she hired Elise. The detective does not question her about the condition of her son, but only inquires her trust in Elise. Renai can only say that it worked, however she also adds the information about the result of the service. She uses 'had to' to emphasize that what she experienced is unbelievable. Even though it all makes no sense and is unacceptable, yet she sees that Elise manages to bring her son back to consciousness.

She flouts the maxim of quantity because she wants the detective to believe in what happened to her family.

(13) [00:15:26 - 00:15:35] (from *Insidious 2*)

Renai is still being under a series of questions by the detective related with Elise's death.

**Sendal:** Did you believe him?

**Renai:** He's my husband.

**Sendal:** That's not what I asked.

**Renai:** Yes, I believed him. *My husband isn't capable of killing anybody.*

From the conversation above, it can be seen that Renai flouts the maxim of quantity by giving more information than is required by the hearer. Renai's answer "Yes, I believed him" is a sufficient reply to the detective's question. She does not need to give additional information about her husband's personality which is not capable of killing someone.

Renai does not believe that Josh is capable of murdering anyone. However, the fact shows that he is the last person to be in the same room as Elise before she was found dead. Renai is certain that Josh is not capable of killing Elise, a paranormal whom they entirely rely on. Therefore, she decides to flout the maxim of quantity by giving the detective a testimony of her husband's personality in order to convince him that Josh is not a murderer.

### The Flouting of the Relation Maxim

Flouting the maxim of relation occurs when the speaker responds to the hearer by deliberately not giving a relevant response to the topic that is being discussed. Cutting (2002, p. 37) asserts that the speaker that flouts the maxim of relation expects the hearer to understand the meaning behind the utterance.

(14) [00:05:44 - 00:06:00] (from *Insidious*)

The scene is in the beginning of the movie when Renai wakes up, goes downstairs, reaches for some books in a moving box and puts them on the shelf. She sits alone in the living room while thumbing a photo album. Dalton suddenly approaches her.

**Dalton:** Mom?

**Renai:** Hey, sweetie. What are you doing up? Come here.



**Dalton:** I don't like my room.

**Renai:** No? That's okay. You know, you're still getting used to it.

**Dalton:** I can't sleep either.

In this case Dalton deliberately flouts the maxim of relation in response to her mother's advice that he will be accustomed to sleeping in his bed room. When Dalton says that "he cannot sleep either" conveys a refusal to his mother's advice.

By flouting the maxim of relation in replying to his mother's statement that he is still getting used to sleeping in his room intends to express his unwillingness to sleep in the room and convey a request to move him to another room.

(15) [00:54:09 - 00:55:26] (from *Insidious*)

Everyone is in the living room after Elise scans Dalton's room and finds out that other entities are trying to possess Dalton's physical body. She figures out that Dalton is not in a comma, but he is doing an astral projection and gets lost in the spirit realm. She holds a meeting in the living room. Josh and Renai are struggling to comprehend the whole situation.

**Elise:** Your son isn't in a coma. Falling off a ladder had nothing to do with this. His physical body's here. But his spiritual body is not. And the reason these disturbances, they followed you to a new home, is because it's not the house that's haunted. It's your son.

**Renai:** I don't understand.

**Elise:** Have you ever heard of astral projection?

**Renai:** Yes. It's out of body experience or something?

**Elise:** *I like to call them travelers. You see, these are people with the ability to leave their physical body and to travel to different places in astral form. Now, Dalton, he is a very accomplished astral projector. He's been doing it in his sleep for a long*

*time. He has been since he was very young. And he's unafraid because he thinks they're dreams. And it's that very lack of fear that has led him to travel too far. And to become lost.*

Elise obviously flouts the maxim of relation, when Renai tries to confirm her statement about astral projection. Instead of saying "yes it is true", Elise gives a long and indirect explanation about astral projection. She decides to flout the maxim of relation because she knows that Renai and Josh are not familiar with and even has limited knowledge of astral projection and supernatural beings. Besides that Elise also associates her previous statement about astral projection and Dalton's condition, so that Renai will comprehend it easily.

She chooses to flout the maxim of relation by not answering Renai's question, but instead explaining it in a different way to avoid making Renai and Josh upset. Because Renai and Josh only know that Dalton lapses into a comma because of an illness.

(16) [00:15:35 - 00:16:11] (from *Insidious 2*)

Renai is still being questioned by the detective related to Elise's death.

**Sendal:** This is a photo Elise took seconds before she was killed. Can you tell me who that is in this picture?

**Renai:** *There were a lot of strange things happening in our house. I saw apparitions, lots of them.*

**Sendal:** Are you telling me that this is a photograph of a ghost? Listen, I'm not interested in ghosts, Mrs. Lambert. I'm interested in the living people who create them. Elise has marks on her neck that were put there by human hands. I'll let you know if forensics matches those marks to your husband.

Renai explicitly flouts the maxim of relation. She does not answer Sendal's question about the identity of the person in the picture that was taken by Elise before she died. Instead of telling him the identity of the person, Renai

recounts all the strange experiences that occur in her house. Although the detective does not get the answer he expects, he can infer that the one in the picture is not a human but an apparition.

She chooses to flout the maxim of relation by recounting her horrible experiences to make the detective believe in the incident related with the apparitions haunting her family.

(17) [00:33:17-00:33:54] (from *Insidious 2*)

Specs and Tucks visit Elise's house and discover the video tape of little Josh when Elise initially performs her service on him several years ago. While reviewing it, they find the adult Josh standing behind little Josh. They decide to inform it to Lorraine, Josh's mother.

**Specs:** Do you remember the first time Elise visited your house to talk to Josh when he was a boy?

**Lorraine:** No. I did a lot to try to forget that part of my life, until recently. All right.

**Tuck:** Well, Elise hypnotized him, asked him a series of questions. I digitized the actual footage taken from the night. I cropped and lightened the image.

**Specs:** Lorraine, is that Josh? (*Pointing out at the picture of little Josh while he was being hypnotized*)

**Lorraine :** *How is that possible?*

**Specs:** We don't know.

Lorraine flouts the maxim of relation by answering unrelatedly to the topic discussed. When Specs asks Lorraine whether the man standing behind little Josh is the current Josh or not, Lorraine is shocked and does not answer his question. She instead says "how is that possible?" which implies that the standing man is Josh. Although the answer is not what Specs expects, he can infer from Lorraine's question that the man is Josh. It also implies that Lorraine is unable to understand how the adult Josh is able to return to the past.

Lorraine flouts the maxim of relation to express both her agreement and her surprise. This shows the fact that the one in the picture is Josh.

### The Flouting of the Manner Maxim

In *Insidious 1* the characters who are already aware of the existence of supernatural beings decide to flout the maxim of manner to avoid making the main characters upset about the truth of the incidents that befall their family.

(18) [00:31:15 - 00:31:51] (from *Insidious*)

Dalton has fallen into an unexplainable coma for three months. His parents decide to take him from the hospital and nurse him at home. In this scene, a young nurse is checking Dalton's health through several tests to know his recent condition as Renai watches on.

**Renai:** Did he respond to any of the new tests?

**Nurse:** No. No, he didn't. But we have to give it time. I've seen coma patients with a much longer inactivity time suddenly start making noises.

**Renai:** He's not in a coma. They don't know what to call it. They don't know what to do with him, so they've just given up. I feel like the universe is just trying to see how far I'll bend before I break.

**Nurse:** *Well, the universe picked a fight with the wrong chick.*

In the dialogue, above the nurse flouts the maxim of manner by being ambiguous. "Fight" in this context does not mean taking part in a war or battle against an enemy physically using weapons, but it means that the universe wants to see how strong she is. The 'universe' here represents the situation that she is facing, which is Dalton being in a coma for a long period.

The nurse flouts the maxim of manner to cheer Renai up. She indirectly wants to convey that Renai is a strong woman, she is unbreakable and she will manage to pass through the difficult time.

(19) [00:43:18 - 00:43:43] (from *Insidious*)

Josh comes home from work and sees Renai consulting with a priest about her supernatural experiences she experienced lately.

**Priest:** Your faith can help. Trust it, you know. (*Speaking to Renai*)

(*Josh comes into the house.*)

**Josh:** Hello.

**Renai:** Josh.

**Josh:** *This is the first line of a joke, right? A guy comes home to find his wife with a priest.*

**Renai:** This is Liam Martin.

**Priest:** Nice to meet you.

**Renai:** He's actually a very old friend of mine. This is my husband, Josh.

**Josh:** What's going on here?

**Priest:** I should be going.

**Renai:** Thank you.

**Lorraine:** Thank you so much.

Josh obviously flouts the maxim of manner by being obscure in replying to Renai's greeting by saying that the meeting between Renai and the priest is a joke and saying 'a guy and a wife' who refers to himself and Renai. He does not believe in the supernatural beings haunting their house. That is why Josh thinks that Renai is 'insane' to invite a priest to their house. He thinks that Renai's meeting with the priest makes no sense. Josh wants to imply that by calling a priest will not change the situation and that Dalton will not wake up. Because Josh has no knowledge of the supernatural activities going on in their house. He does not believe that the priest is able to help them.

Josh chooses to flout the maxim of manner to criticize his wife who invited a priest to their house to solve their problem.

(20) [00:53:18 - 00:54:00] (from *Insidious*)

After Elise investigates and enters Dalton's room, she finds out that there are demonic spirits watching him closely in order to possess Dalton's physical body. She holds a

meeting in the living room to explain to them about what is happening to them.

**Renai:** Elise, what is that?

**Elise:** *I'm not sure if you're ready to hear this yet, but unfortunately, I can't waste any time easing you into it. I want you to know, this is what I believe, and it may contradict a previous medical diagnosis, but... You called me here, and I'm taking that as an acceptance of my readings. Yes?*

In this context Elise flouts the maxim of manner, when she chooses not to be brief while speaking. She does not tell her truthfully what she sees after her investigation. Instead she provides Renai with convoluted explanation.

She flouts the maxim of manner because she finds the situation is dangerous and extremely dreadful. She does not want to make Renai and Josh upset because the result may disturb them.

## CONCLUSION

The movies *Insidious* and *Insidious 2* contain very different occurrences of maxim flouting. The characters in *Insidious* flout all the maxims: quality, quantity, relation, and manner, in 23 cases of maxim flouting: three (10%) cases of the flouting of the quality maxim, nine (30%) cases of the flouting of the quantity maxim, six (20%) cases of the flouting of the relation maxim, five (17%) cases of the flouting of the manner maxim, whereas the characters in *Insidious 2* only flout two maxims: the maxim of quantity and relation in seven cases: three (10%) cases of the flouting of the quantity maxim, and four (13%) cases of the flouting of the relation maxim.

The characters in *Insidious* flout the maxim of quantity to provide comprehensive information to other characters. The main characters that lack knowledge of the existence of supernatural beings and activities make the character who already understands about the supernatural being explain by giving more information than is required so that the information delivered is complete and sufficient. Flouting the maxim of relation occurs to avoid making the main characters upset. The

paranormal chooses not to tell the point blatantly about the existence of supernatural activities, but choose other words to explain about the incident so that the main characters can infer by themselves without making them upset. Flouting the maxim of manner occurs to criticize someone's action. The main character, Josh, who does not believe in the existence of supernatural activities, speaks obscurely to disparage the paranormal team whom he thinks are trying to con him out of money.

In *Insidious 2* the main character decides to flout the maxim of relation during the investigation between the main character and the detective related to the paranormal's death. The main character is in a difficult situation due to her testimony that will set her husband free or even to jail him. She chooses to recount her experiences in answering the detective's questions. The main character also chooses to flout the maxim of quantity. It happens because the main character has to explain the incident more informatively to convince the detective that supernatural beings do exist and cause the death of the paranormal.

From the findings it can be concluded that the characters who are placed in a frightening and tense situation flout the maxims deliberately because of several factors. Most of the factors are providing comprehensive situation to the hearer about supernatural activities and avoiding making someone upset in telling the truth about the incident.

## REFERENCES

- Blake, M. and Bailey, S. (2013). *Writing The Horror Movie*. USA: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Grant, B. K. (2007). *Film Genre: From Iconography to Ideology*. London: Wallflower Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. In Cole, P& Morgan, J. (eds) *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol 3. New York: Academic Press.
- Kawin, B. F. (2012). *Horror and the Horror Film*. London and New York: Anthem Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Perrine, T. A. (1998). *Film and the Nuclear Age: Representing Cultural Anxiety*. New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc. A Member of the Taylor & Francis Group.
- Wan, J. (Producer). (2010). *Insidious*. FilmDistrict. Los Angeles, California, USA. 102 mins.
- Wan, J. (Producer). (2014). *Insidious 2*. FilmDistrict. Los Angeles, California, USA. 105 mins.