

## Violations of Gricean Maxims in the TV Series *You*

Gledin Maulin, Thomas Joko P. Sembodo\*

English Department, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author: [thomassembodo@ugm.ac.id](mailto:thomassembodo@ugm.ac.id)

### ABSTRACT

This research investigates the violations of Gricean maxims committed by the main characters in the TV series *You* Season 1, especially Joe Goldberg and Guinevere Beck. It focuses on how the two characters violate the maxims and the possible purposes behind each violation. Quantitative and qualitative methods were applied to the data analysis. The results show that 100 maxim violations were found in the first season of the series. The most frequently occurring violation is the violation of the quality maxim with 56 occurrences (56%), followed by the relation maxim (28%) and the manner maxim with (10%). The least occurring violation is the violation of the quantity maxim (6%). Joe Goldberg and Guinevere Beck tend to violate the maxims by being dishonest, saying irrelevant things, giving vague or obscure responses, and providing insufficient or unnecessary information. Several purposes of violations can be identified throughout the data, namely to avoid unwanted responses, avoid suspicion, make certain impressions, deceive, divert, persuade others, and relieve worries.

**Keywords:** *conversational maxims, cooperative principle, purposes, maxim violation.*

### INTRODUCTION

The basic way of communication is a conversation in which people interact through spoken words. The conversation should be a two-way talk between the interlocutors. There is a principle that people need to follow in order to have an effective conversation. This principle is known as the cooperative principle, proposed by Paul Grice, where cooperation between the speaker and the hearer is required to understand the conversation. Grice (1989) stated that people should make the right contribution to the right kind of conversation they are in at the time (p. 45). In observing the cooperative principle, Grice proposes conversational maxims that fundamentally help the hearer understand the meaning and intention of utterances spoken by the speaker.

Although the maxims do help people to understand the speaker's utterances, some people still fail to observe the maxims on many occasions. There are five types of non-observance of the maxims: flouting, violating, infringing, opting out, and suspending. Maxims could be flouted when the speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim but not with an intention to mislead the hearer, but because s/he wants the hearer to look for an implied meaning which is different from the expressed meaning. A maxim could also be violated through the act of disobeying with an intention to mislead the hearer (Thomas, 1995, p. 65).

In order to observe more about the violation of maxims, this study takes an American TV series titled *You* as its research material. This series is based on a thriller novel written by Kepnes (2014) under the

same title, which was then adapted into a series by Berlanti and Gamble in 2018. Television series is chosen mainly because of its ability to show certain characters' personalities, in this case, Joe Goldberg and Guinevere Beck, that is hard to find in real-life situations.

This research is conducted to identify and classify the types of maxims that are violated and to discover the possible purposes of the violation committed by Joe Goldberg and Guinevere Beck in the TV series.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

There have been several studies on the violation of Gricean maxims. Zebua, Rukmini, and Saleh (2017), for example, investigate the violation and flouting of the quantity, quality, relation, and manner maxims by male and female participants in the *Ellen Degeneres* talk show. The results revealed that male participants mostly did the flouting than violating with the quantity maxim dominantly flouted. Based on the analysis, male participants mostly used exaggerated statements in showing their opinion. Meanwhile, the female participants dominantly violated the relation maxim. The female participants tended to avoid talking about something by changing the topic of conversation, and they also did not give good responses to the interlocutor. They conclude that male participants tend to exaggerate responses in order to satisfy the audiences. On the other hand, female participants are usually more careful in giving comments in a talk show.

Another research on the violation of maxims is done by Amianna and Putranti (2017). This research attempts to analyze humorous situations in a situation comedy *How I Met Your Mother Season 2*, episodes 1 to 5 which are created by violating and flouting the conversational maxims as the forms of not observing Grice's cooperative principle. They found 14 violations of the quantity maxim, one violation of the quality maxim, two violations of the relation maxim, and two violations of the manner maxim. The characters violated the maxims because they intentionally mislead and deceive the interlocutors by generating misleading implicatures. Meanwhile, floutings of the conversational maxims,

as seen in the situation comedy, occur because the characters expect the interlocutors to be able to look for the meaning different from, or in addition to, the expressed meaning. The speakers assume that the hearers are able to infer the implied meaning of what is said.

Another study conducted by Ramadhan (2017) investigates the flouting and violation of Grice's maxims in *The Flash* TV Series by the main character. From 40 data, 34 utterances flout the maxims, and six violate the maxims. Most of the flouting occurs when the main character is involved in conversations with people who know about his secret (group A). On the other hand, the violation mainly happens when he is in conversations with people who do not know about his secret (group B). Ramadhan argues that the main character discusses heroic acts and methods to control his power when talking to group A. However, he discusses work and casual topics only when he talks to group B. He also avoids talking about something that could reveal his secret.

Another similar research was done by Affifatusholihah and Setyawan (2016), who examined maxim flouting by Sherlock Holmes and dr. Watson in the TV Series *Sherlock* Season 1. They found that the two characters flouted all of the maxims. They flouted the maxim of relation by saying something irrelevant to the question. They flouted the maxim of quality when they said something to hide the factual truth. Moreover, They flouted the maxim of quantity because they made their contribution less informative than required. They also flouted the maxim of manner when they said something ambiguous and obscure.

Similarly, Annas (2018) investigated the violation of conversational maxims in BBC's *Sherlock* TV Series. He found that the characters tend to violate the maxims by providing insufficient information, being insincere, saying irrelevant things, not being brief, and giving obscure or ambiguous responses. It was also found that they violate the maxims for several purposes: concealing the truth or fact, concealing the identity of themselves or people they know, distracting and changing the topic of conversation, confusing the hearer, and creating a good impression on someone.

The present research also investigates the violation of Grice's cooperative principle by Joe Goldberg and Guinevere Beck in the TV series *You*. Despite the numerous studies on the violation of Grice's conversational maxims, this study focuses on the violation of the maxims by mentally troubled people like Joe Goldberg who has identity disorder and toxic relationship with Guinevere Beck.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

### Cooperative Principle

Grice (1989) stated that people should make the right contribution to the right kind of conversation they are in at the moment of speaking in order to achieve effective communication. Therefore, he proposed four maxims that need to be observed: quantity, quality, relation, and manner. The maxim of quantity requires the participants to make contributions as informative as needed and does not make any contribution more informative than is required. The maxim of quality requires the participants to be genuine and also not to say what they believe to be false and which they lack adequate evidence. The maxim of relation requires the participants to be relevant. The maxim of manner requires the speaker to speak clearly, orderly, and briefly in order to avoid ambiguity and confusion.

Although the four maxims are available to help build effective communication, there is still a possibility that people fail to fulfill the Cooperative Principle by violating, flouting, and infringing the maxims.

### Maxim Non-Observance

#### *Maxim Violation*

As defined by Grice (1989), a maxim violation is the unostentatious or 'quiet' non-observance of a maxim, and a speaker who violates a maxim may lie to mislead the hearer (p. 49). Cutting (2002) also stated that people might violate a maxim when they know that the hearer will not see the truth and will only

understand the surface meaning of the words (p. 40).

#### *Maxim Flouting*

In contrast with maxim violation, maxim flouting can lead the hearer to find an implied meaning. Cutting (2002) states that "when flouting a maxim, the speaker assumes that the hearer knows that their words should not be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning" (p. 37).

### Conversational Implicature

According to Grice (1989), the term "implicature" is used to explain the phenomenon in which a speaker does not say directly what he or she means but rather hints, suggests, or conveys some meanings indirectly (p.58).

### Context

Leech (1983) defines context as any background knowledge shared by a speaker and a hearer which will help the hearer interpret what the speaker means by a given utterance (p. 13). Thus, context enables us to understand a hidden or deeper meaning of a speaker's utterances.

## METHODS

### Data and Data Source

The data sources are the ten episodes in the first season of the TV series *You* on *Netflix* accessed via the writer's account with username *gledinmaulin98*, subtitles provided by the platform, and the TV series' transcript downloaded from the *Subscene* website at <https://subscene.com/subtitles/you-first-season/english/2099334>.

The data of this research are the utterances that are categorized as violations of maxims. Utterances are defined as natural units of speech bounded by breaths or pauses. The utterances containing maxim violations were collected from the subtitles of the ten episodes. Besides utterances, the data also includes the context of each maxim violation, the timestamp, and the characters' names.

## Method of Data Collection

The data were collected through the following steps. For each episode, we watched the series using the English subtitle provided by Netflix. While watching the series, we checked the accuracy of the subtitle from Netflix, and that of the subtitle file by observing whether they matched the dialogues. If some inaccuracies were found while writing down the data, we corrected the subtitles by checking them to the characters' utterances in the series. However, there were no significant differences between Netflix and Subscene subtitles except for several spelling errors. While watching the episodes, we identified any maxim violation. Only maxim violations by Joe Goldberg and Guinevere Beck were collected. If a maxim violation was found, we paused the video and copied the dialogue containing the violation from the subtitle file into a Microsoft Word file. Besides copying the utterances, we also added the characters' names, timestamps, and context. During the identification process, we often rewound the video to make sure that no maxim violation was missed.

## Method of Data Analysis

After all the data were collected, we analyzed them using some procedures as follows. First of all, we sorted the data of maxim violations based on the Gricean maxims that were violated in the conversation: violation of quantity, quality, relation, and manner maxims.

Since the data were taken from ten different episodes, the writer used the data-coding method to classify which episode the dialogue belongs to. These codes were attached next to the timestamps.

Below is an example illustrating the use of the data coding system:

(1) 00:11:50,501 --> 00:11:59,218 Y1

**Context:** *This scene happens after Beck lies that what she buys for Annika is on clearance. Peach, who knows Beck's actual economic condition, scolds Beck for buying an expensive gift. Beck lies again, saying that she has a gift card in order not to make her friend concerned about her economic condition.*

Peach: You make, like, a big gesture that you can't afford because... I'm sorry, you're too nice.

Beck: **It's no big deal. I had, um, a gift card.**

In the example above, 00:11:50,501 --> 00:11:59,218 indicates the timestamp that shows the exact time of the dialogue's appearance on the screen, and Y1 stands for the data-coding method to classify which episode the data were taken from.

Subsequently, the data were calculated using quantitative methods in order to find out both the frequencies of maxim violations and the frequencies of possible purposes committed in the series. The data were presented in the form of tables. Following the table, in explaining the possible purposes behind the violations, we analyzed the data based on pieces of evidence taken from the contexts (situational, background knowledge, and co-textual context), dialogues (including the speaker's way of saying), the hearer's responses, and the interlocutors' gestures and facial expression. The qualitative method was also used in analyzing the possible purposes of each violation.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### The Violations of Gricean Maxims

Maxim violation is a form of non-observance of maxims that happens when people do not follow the cooperative principle and violate it due to certain conditions. People may also have their own intentions and reasons for violating the maxims. The violation itself has several functions, one of which is to deceive the addressee (Thomas, 1995, p. 72).

Based on the identification and the classification of the data found in the ten episodes of the series, 100 violations were found. Table 1 below presents the frequency of maxim violation in the ten episodes.

Table 1. Frequency of maxim violations in *You* TV Series Season 1

Maxim Violations	Token	Percentage
Quantity	6	6
Quality	56	56
Relation	28	28
Manner	10	10
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

The table above shows that out of the 100 maxim violations, violations of the quality maxim are the most frequently found (56%), while the least frequently violated maxim is the (6%).

### ***Violation of Maxim of Quantity***

Maxim of quantity expects the speaker to make a contribution as informative as is required. It will be considered a violation if the speaker gives information more or less than is needed. Below are the examples and explanations of each violation found in the conversation.

(2) 00:37:07,058 --> 00:37:13,481 Y1

**Context:** *This happens inside the taxi that Beck and Joe take to go home. While they are chatting, Joe accidentally mentions her poetry. Beck is taken aback because she has not talked anything about poetry to him. Joe responds by saying that there are many young writers in New York and he also reads a lot of poetry.*

Beck: How'd you know I write poetry?

Joe: **Doesn't every young writer in New York? I mean, I read a lot of poetry.**

In the conversation above, Joe's utterance is regarded as a violation of the maxim of quantity because his response does not exactly answer Beck's question. Instead of giving a complete explanation of how he knows that Beck writes poetry, Joe tells her about other trivial facts about the existence of young writers in New York and how he also reads poetry. It shows that Joe wants to hide the truth by giving unnecessary information.

### ***Violation of Maxim of Quality***

The maxim of quality requires the speaker to give the correct information that has to be supported by solid evidence. If his/her utterance fails to fulfill this requirement, the speaker can be considered violating the maxim. Below is an example of the violation of the quality maxim.

(3) 00:11:34,360 --> 00:11:38,865 Y1

**Context:** *The scene occurs at a restaurant where Beck and her friends celebrate Annika's birthday. Beck gives Annika a McQueen scarf as her birthday gift.*

*After the party ends, Peach asks how much is the gift. Beck is lying that it was on sale and not mentioning its price.*

Peach: A McQueen, Beck? How much was it?

Beck: **It was on clearance.**

The conversation above is considered a violation of the maxim of quality due to Beck not telling the correct information to Peach's question about the actual price of the gift. Instead of answering Peach honestly, Beck intentionally decides to tell a lie to her best friend. Beck does this because she does not want Peach to be concerned about her economic condition. Beck is afraid that Peach would like to help by lending her money if she finds out about how much she spends on the gift.

### ***Violation of Maxim of Relation***

The relation maxim requires the speaker to be relevant when responding to others. A violation happens when the speaker intentionally gives irrelevant information to avoid what they do not want to face. Below is an example of the violation of the relation maxim found in the series.

(4) 00:07:17,979 --> 00:07:23,526 Y6

**Context:** *This scene occurs at the bookstore where Beck gives a surprise visit to see Joe. Beck makes him worried due to her unusual expression. He asks her if she is okay or not. Beck ignores his question and just goes to the point that she is going to accompany Peach in her family's estate in Greenwich, Connecticut.*

Joe: Is everything okay?

Beck: **Listen, I'm going away for a few days.**

From the conversation above, it can be seen that Beck's answer does not connect with Joe's question. Maxim of relation expects the speaker to give relevant information. Thus, Beck's answer is considered a violation due to the information that she gives does not suit with the question. This happens because Beck does not have much time to explain everything. Beck decides to violate it by telling what she wants instead of answering the question straightforwardly.

### *Violation of Maxim of Manner*

The maxim of manner requires the speaker to be perspicuous, brief, and orderly. It can be assumed that a speaker violates the maxim of manner if he/she purposely gives a long and disorganized explanation, obscure references, and ambiguous information. Below is an example of the violation of the manner maxim.

(5) 00:25:43,208 --> 00:25:51,133 Y1

**Context:** *This occurs at Prof. Leahy's office. Beck is submitting her incomplete thesis to him. Prof. Leahy asks where the remaining pages are. Instead of admitting that she has not finished it yet, Beck gives an ambiguous answer because she does not want him to assume that she is lazy or slacking.*

Prof. Leahy: But, Beck, where's the rest? You owe me 20 more pages.

Beck: **I've been, honestly, working every day, and grading papers—**

Beck's utterance here violates the maxim of manner because she does not give the answer briefly. Prof. Leahy's question does not need a long explanation. Beck could just tell him whether the remaining pages are already done or not. However, Beck decides not to answer clearly in order to avoid giving an image that she is lazy or slacking in front of her professor.

### **Possible Purposes of Maxim Violations**

This section discusses the possible purposes behind the violations of the maxim. It aims to help understand the reasons why Joe and Beck decide to violate and not obey the cooperative principle while engaging in a conversation. The possible purposes are acquired by drawing conclusions based on evidence taken from the context, dialogues (including the speaker's way of saying), the hearer's responses, and the interlocutors' gestures and facial expressions. Table 2 below presents the frequency of the possible purposes of maxim violations.

#### *Avoiding Unwanted Response*

The main characters of the TV series *You Season 1*, Joe Goldberg and Guinevere Beck, violate the maxim intentionally in order to avoid specific responses,

particularly the negative ones, from the hearer. There are two important factors that indicate this purpose. First, the speakers hold information which is known to him/her only. It may arouse displeasing responses from the hearer if it is expressed directly by the speakers. Second, the speakers purposely tell the hearer wrong or insufficient information to make sure those unwanted responses do not show up in their conversation. These actions can be executed by violating the maxim of quality and quantity.

Table 2. Frequency of the purposes of maxim violation

Purposes	Token	Percentage
Avoiding unwanted response	5	5
Avoiding suspicion	17	17
Making certain impression	6	6
Deceiving	28	28
Diverting	29	29
Persuading others	4	4
Relieving worries	11	11
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

Five violations by Joe Goldberg and Guinevere Beck are possibly committed to accomplishing this purpose. Below is an example.

(6) 00:04:39,988 --> 00:05:00,675 Y10

**Context:** *This scene occurs in the bookstore basement where Joe locked Beck inside the cage. He does it because she tries to run away after finding out the hidden box in his bathroom ceiling. Beck wants Joe to explain about the box and prove that her suspicion of him is not true. However, he responds by telling her that she does not know what he knows instead.*

Beck: What's in the box? Tell me. Tell me I'm crazy. Tell me you didn't kill Benji. Tell me you didn't kill Peach.

Joe: **If you knew what I knew.**

From the dialogue above, Joe violates the maxim of quantity due to not telling Beck sufficient information. His utterance does not answer Beck's question and may mislead the hearer. Joe purposely gives an inadequate answer because he needs to defend himself from Beck's accusation. He tries to justify whatever his crime is by saying "If you knew what I knew." His answer also does not allow Beck to deduce whether the things inside the box prove

him as Benji and Peach's murderer or not. If Joe admits to Beck's accusation, he is afraid that Beck will not see him as a savior but as a murderer instead. Hence, Joe decides to commit this violation in order to avoid an unwanted response from Beck.

### *Avoiding Suspicion*

Violations of the maxim are often committed when a character in this series is being suspicious. This can be seen from certain conditions set for this purpose: the hearer is interrogating the speaker after knowing his/her strange behavior, and the speaker will get in trouble if the hearer's suspicion is proven to be true. In avoiding suspicion, the speaker would do any method such as not giving the correct information and telling less than what is expected by the hearer. These actions can be carried out by violating the maxims of quality and quantity. Below is an example.

(7) 00:26:25,793 --> 00:26:37,054 Y10

*Context:* this scene occurs near Joe's apartment building. Ross, a private investigator hired by Peach's family, is asking Joe about Beck. After hearing that Joe and Beck are not together anymore, he asks why Joe still goes to Beck's place even though she is not there. Joe realizes that Ross has watched him sneaking into Beck's apartment last night. Joe says that he went there to return the key when actually he scoured her place for evidence that would link him to her disappearance.

Ross: You spend a lot of time at her place when she's out of town?

Joe: **Well, I... I still have a key. No, in fact, I had a key. I returned it last night.**

Based on the conversation above, it can be seen that Joe violates the maxim of quality because he does not want to give Ross the correct information. Joe is in a difficult situation where he has to answer Ross's question due to his status as a private investigator hired by Peach's family. In this case, Joe needs to confuse Ross and mislead him to be on Ross's good side. If Ross finds out the truth that Joe actually went to Beck's apartment to arrange his scheme for Beck's disappearance, he will put Joe on the suspect list. Thus, Joe decides to violate the maxim of quality and get rid of Ross' suspicion of him.

### *Making Certain Impressions*

Joe and Beck possibly commit maxim violations as a means to leave a particular impression on the hearer. In pursuing this purpose, there are several conditions that must be fulfilled: the presence of influences through violations of maxim on the hearer's mind to create a particular image or raise questions about it, and the use of unusual words or phrases uttered by the speaker to give misleading impressions. These conditions can be gained by telling any information which is hard enough to be verified as truth by the hearer and ambiguous response that might mislead the hearer. Thus, the speaker may violate the maxim of quality and manner in pursuing this purpose.

(8) 00:39:25,655 --> 00:39:33,329 Y1

*Context:* As the taxi has reached Beck's apartment, Joe is asking for Beck's number to call her after she replaces her phone. Instead of giving her phone number, Beck tells him that she uses her e-mail often. Her intention is kind of ambiguous. It can be seen as an effort of playing hard to get or a hint that Joe should not wait until she gets a new phone.

Joe: Uh, okay, well. Just maybe give me your number, for when you get a replacement.

Beck: **I'm basically enslaved to e-mail.**

Beck violates the maxim of manner in the conversation above. Joe asks for her phone number, but she intentionally gives rather an ambiguous answer. Beck is kind of worried that Joe might see her as an easy woman if she gives Joe her phone number right away. Her utterance "I'm basically enslaved to e-mail" leaves Joe with a particular impression that Beck is trying to play hard-to-get with him. However, it may also be a hint of allowing Joe to contact her right away without waiting for her to get a new phone. By violating the maxim of manner, Beck can show her interest in Joe subtly without leaving an image of an easy woman.

### *Deceiving*

Joe and Beck violated conversational maxims as a means to deceive the hearer. The word 'deceive' means "To use dishonest or illegal methods to get something or to make people believe that something is true when it is not" (Deceive, n.d.).

This can be indicated by the presence of secret information that the speakers keep to themselves because they want to avoid protest and manipulate the hearers to follow what the speakers say without questioning anything. They are also afraid that it will lead them into trouble if the truth is discovered. Thus, the speakers put an effort so that the hearer does not find out the truth by lying, withholding, or being ambiguous. These actions can be executed by violating the maxim of quality and manner.

(9) 00:05:53,395 --> 00:06:05,615 Y4

*Context: This scene happens at Peach's house. Peach is asking Beck to hang out with her. Beck does not want to tell the truth that she has to go somewhere with Ned, her father, because she lies to everyone that her father is already dead. Thus, she tells Peach that she is going to a writer's retreat instead.*

Peach: That's it. I'm booking a room at the Mandarin Oriental and you're coming with.

Beck: **I would so love to, but I can't. I, um... I am going to a writer's retreat in Rockland.**

The conversation above shows that Beck violates the maxim of quality because she gives wrong information to Peach. Beck is in a situation where she has to decline her friend's offer. However, Beck cannot tell Peach the truth about having an appointment with her father because she has told everyone that he is already dead. Thus, Beck decides to lie that she is going to a writer's retreat and keep her secret to herself only. Beck chooses to violate the maxim of quantity in order to deceive her friend into believing her lie as the truth without questioning anything.

### ***Diverting***

Joe and Beck divert the hearer to change the topic of conversation by committing maxim violations. This can be seen from the presence of two different topics in an ongoing conversation shared by the interlocutors. The presence of two different topics can only be fulfilled when the speakers intentionally tell unrelated answers towards the hearer's utterance due to having their own intention not to share the actual information. This kind of situation violates the maxim of manner. Besides telling irrelevant answers, the speakers can also divert the hearer and redirect

the focus of their conversation by telling unnecessary information, a condition that violates the maxim of quantity.

(10) 00:37:53,855 --> 00:38:00,361 Y6

*Context: This happens at Peach's Greenwich estate. While asking questions to Joe, Peach notices that he is wearing Benji's watch. She then asks him the reason why he is wearing it. Joe cannot tell the truth that he killed Benji and stole his watch. He avoids it by admitting that he was the one who stole her laptop.*

Peach: Why are you wearing Benji's watch?

Joe: **You're right. You're right. I stole your laptop. I found all the files.**

In the dialogue above, Joe violates the maxim of relation because he gives an answer that is irrelevant to the question. He is in a dangerous situation since Peach points a gun to threaten him. She asks why he is wearing a watch that belongs to a missing person. Joe must not admit that he actually murdered Benji or Peach will pull the trigger for real. Thus, he decides to talk about stealing Peach's laptop and seeing all the secret files which prove her obsessive behavior toward her best friend, Beck. Joe chooses to commit this violation because he needs to divert Peach's attention from talking about Benji so he can escape from a difficult situation right away.

### ***Persuading Others***

Maxim violations are committed as a device to persuade the hearer. The word 'persuade' means "To make someone do or believe something by giving them a good reason to do it by talking to that person and making them believe it" (Persuade, n.d.).

This can be indicated by some conditions set for this purpose, such as the speaker who is aiming for something for his/her own good that requires support from the hearer, and the presence of effort through violations of maxim committed by the speaker intended to convince the hearer. The effort may be delivered by telling false or unnecessary information to trick the hearer and lead them into supporting the speaker's ideas. Therefore, the speaker may violate the maxim of quality and quantity in delivering these actions.



(11) 00:10:16,574 --> 00:10:30,547 Y3

**Context:** *This scene occurs in front of the bookstore. Joe cannot go to buy some supplies to dispose of Benji's corpse since he has to open the store. Therefore, he asks Paco for a favor to buy them by lying that he needs those supplies for his secret project.*

Paco: Hey, Joe. You said you needed to talk?

Joe: **I do, yeah. So, here's the thing. I have a secret project I'm working on, but I got to open up the shop. So, I thought you could run some errands for me. I'll give you a little money for books? Just between us.**

Based on the conversation above, it is apparent that Joe violates the maxim of quality because he tells a lie to his neighbor's son, Paco. Joe is in a situation where he cannot leave Benji's corpse in the bookstore's basement anymore, so he needs to dispose of it as soon as possible. To save his time, Joe asks Paco to buy the supplies while he moves the corpse from the basement. Joe persuades Paco by telling him that it is for a secret project and promises to give him money. A little kid like Paco is easily fooled and follows Joe's instructions without knowing that he is actually being taken advantage of.

### ***Relieving Worries***

Maxim violations can also be committed as a device to relieve the worries of others. In identifying these violations, some conditions need to be checked. For example, suppose the speaker is hurt, harmed, or exposed to a dangerous situation that may lead to life-threatening circumstances that the hearer does not know. In that case, the worries expressed by the hearer in the form of questions or statements such as 'are you okay?' or 'you look sick' may result in the speaker giving a false or vague answer. These are the conditions that violate the maxim of quality and manner.

(12) 00:42:06,566 --> 00:42:10,028 Y9

**Context:** *This scene occurs at Joe's apartment. Joe gets worried after seeing her finger is bleeding, Beck assures him that it is just a paper cut. He also notices*

*that Beck is shaking. She says that it is because of the blood. In reality, Beck is shaking as she finds Joe's hidden things in the bathroom ceiling.*

Joe: Beck, you're shaking.

Beck: **I just... I get weird with blood.**

The dialogue above shows that Beck violates the maxim of quality because she gives false information. Joe, as the hearer, is worried about his girlfriend's condition as her whole body is shaking. On the other hand, Beck does not want him to get worried and find out that she is actually in shock after discovering hidden things from the bathroom ceiling. Beck is scared that she will get into trouble if Joe finds out the truth. Hence, Beck lies to him that blood from the paper cut makes her feel weird. She decides to commit this violation to ease off her boyfriend's worries and prevent any possible troubles.

## CONCLUSION

Based on what has been presented previously, this study investigates the violation of Gricean maxims done by Joe Goldberg and Guinevere Beck in *You Season 1*. The first objective is to identify and classify the maxims violated by the two characters. Altogether, 100 maxim violations were found in the series's first season. Most violations were committed to the quality maxim.

The second objective is to find out the purposes of the violation committed by Joe Goldberg and Guinevere Beck. The maxims can be violated as a device to serve various purposes such as avoiding unwanted responses, avoiding suspicion, making certain impressions, deceiving, diverting, persuading others, and relieving worries of the hearer.

This research shows that people still tend not to observe the cooperative principle. As stated by Grice, maxim violation is an unostentatious or 'quiet' non-observance of a maxim and is not meant to be noticed by the hearer. Hence, it creates a sense of illusion that speakers are being cooperative while, in fact, they are not.

## REFERENCES

- Annas, H. R. (2018). *Violation of conversational maxims found in BBC's Sherlock Television Series Season 1, 2, 3, and 4*. (Unpublished undergraduate thesis). Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Affifatusholihah, L. & Setyawan, A. H. (2016). Flouting maxim by Sherlock Holmes and dr. Watson in TV Series of *Sherlock* Season 1. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 2(2), 110-117.
- Amianna, J. N. R. P. & Putranti, A. (2017). Humorous Situations Created by Violations and Floutings of Conversational Maxims in a Situation Comedy Entitled How I Met Your Mother. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 17(1), 97-107.
- Berlanti, G. & Gamble, S. (Creators) (2018). *You* [Video File]. United States: Warner Bros Television Studios. Retrieved from <https://www.netflix.com/watch/80212201?trackId=14277283&tctx=-97%2C-97%2C%2C%2C%2C>.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse a Source: A resource book for students*. Routledge.
- Deceive. (n.d.). In *Cambridge online dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/deceive>.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in The Way of Word*. Harvard University Press.
- Kepnes, C. (2014). *You*. Emily Bestler Books.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman Group Limited.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Persuade. (n.d.). In *Cambridge online dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/persuade>.
- Ramadhan, L. (2017). *Flouting and violating of Grice 's maxims in The Flash series done by the main character*. (Unpublished undergraduate thesis). Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Subscene. *You: First Season*. Warner Horizon Television. Retrieved from <https://subscene.com/subtitles/you-first-season/english/2099334>.
- Thomas, J. A. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Zebua, E., Rukmini, D., Saleh, M. (2017). The violation and flouting of cooperative principles in the Ellen Degeneres Talk Show. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 12(1), 103-113.