

VIOLATING MAXIMS AS THE HUMOROUS SENSE IN THE MOVIE *DEADPOOL* (2016)

R. Agung Satriya Pribadi

English Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya

Email: r.p@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Abstrak

Film *Deadpool* menceritakan kisah superhero yang unik. Dia banyak bicara, kekanak-kanakan, dan konyol. Tapi justru karakternya yang membuat film ini lucu. Namun, ada satu hal yang penting untuk dilihat bahwa karakternya juga menjelaskan mengapa dia selalu melanggar prinsip-prinsip kooperatif dalam kebanyakan percakapan. Dengan demikian, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk melihat maksim-maksim yang dilanggar dalam film *Deadpool* dan bagaimana pelanggaran maksim itu menciptakan kesan humor dalam film *Deadpool*. Dengan menggunakan analisis sosio-pragmatik Gricean, pendekatan obyektif, dokumentasi sebagai teknik pengumpulan data, dan interpretasi deskriptif sebagai teknik analisis, penelitian ini dapat menemukan hasilnya. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa tokoh *Deadpool* melanggar semua maksim, termasuk maksim kualitas, kuantitas, cara, dan relasi. Intinya adalah, dengan melanggar prinsip-prinsip itu, kesan humor dapat dihadirkan karena ada percakapannya justru menjadi berlebihan, konyol, ambigu, dan tidak relevan, yang membuatnya terdengar lucu.

Kata Kunci: *Prinsip Kerja Sama, Maksim, Pelanggaran, Humor, dan Deadpool.*

Abstract

Deadpool movies narrates a unique superhero. He is talkative, childish, and ridiculous. His character makes this movie funny. But, there is one thing important to see that his character also explains why he always violates maxims in the cooperative principle in the most conversation. Thus, this research aims to see maxims that are violated in the movie *Deadpool* and how the violation of maxims creates humorous sense in the movie *Deadpool*. By using Gricean socio-pragmatics analysis, objective approach, documentation as the technique of collecting data, and descriptive interpretation as technique of analysis, this research can find the result. The result shows that *Deadpool* violates all maxims, including quality, quantity, manner, and relation. This is the point, by violating those maxims, the sense of humor can appear because there are conversations which are hyperbolic, ridiculous, ambiguous, and irrelevant that make it sound funny.

Keywords: *Cooperative Principle, Maxims, Violation, Humor, and Deadpool.*

INTRODUCTION

Deadpool is known as an American superhero movie based on the Marvel Comics character of the same name. It tells about Wade Wilson (*Deadpool*) hunting the man who made him mutant with damaged physical appearance, Ajax or Francis. Francis is also the man who has kidnaped Wilson's girlfriend, Vanessa. This conflict becomes the adventure of this antihero. In accomplishing his mission to revenge to Francis and save Vanessa,

Deadpool is supported by Negasonic and Colossus, while Francis is supported by Angel Dust.

However, *Deadpool* does not look like the other superheroes, such as Thor and Iron Man. Thor is calm and Iron Man is intellectual, while *Deadpool* reckless and careless. Moreover, if it is compared to DC Comics' superheroes, such as Batman and Superman, *Deadpool* must be far from their characters. Batman speaks heavily and gently, Superman behaves calmly and manly, while in

contrast, Deadpool is talkative and childish. This talkativeness and childlike are something that make this movie alive in the humorous sense because it is full of jokes.

Joke, based on Cambridge Dictionary, has many definitions. As a noun, it is a person or thing that is very bad or silly. As a verb, it means saying funny things (for example, when someone is joking, he does not really mean what is said). So, joke is funny gesture or speech which is expressed or uttered to make people laugh. Of course, making laugh is the point of joke. Laughs have important position in succeeding the jokes. With that case, in entertainment world, the communication (how someone utters, speaks, and means) is very important.

Deadpool movie uses jokes as one of the major components. Watching Deadpool is like watching a comedian in red tight costume. Comedian is quite different from comic. It is important to clarify that "a comic says funny things, a comedian says things funny" (Bent, 2009: 7). It means that a comic intentionally wants to joke, while comedian makes something usual to be funny. Therefore, in the movie (as gesture and verbal), jokes take an important role because it can make the audiences interested and blended in the movie, even it is superhero movie which is full of violence.

In the Deadpool movie, there are funny gestures (physical) and funny dialogs (language) from the main character Deadpool. It can be classified that the gesture refers to the slapstick style (an improvisation of the comedian to advance the basic plot scenarios so the characters can develop) (Christopher, 2002: 74). So, this style expresses exaggerated and hyperbolic physical actions that makes things funny. It is all what Deadpool acts in the movie, such as waiting for Francis by drawing cartoon, going to save Vanessa by taxi, leaving the guns on taxi, girly-panic-gesturing, and bringing kiddy-pinky bag.

This funny gesture is nothing, if there is no language. It needs (language) jokes. If making humorous sense from gesture is making it hyperbolic, then in verbal communications or

dialogs, the humorous sense can appear from disconnection, ambiguous, unimportance, false-assumption, irrelevance and other thing that expose problems in the communication principle.

The basic principle of communication is the conversation between the speaker and hearer (or the speaker 1 and speaker 2). Between them, there is a system that forms the communication in an interaction. In pragmatics perspective, it is called as cooperative principle. It refers to how people interact each other. Paul Grice said, "make your contribution such as it is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Grice, 1975a: 41-58; Yule, 2006: 130). It means that Grice sees that the principle is proposed as the behavior or norm of common people in conversation. Of course, the cooperative principle function to make effectively communicate. This composition of the communication is called as maxim.

Jeffries and McIntyre define maxims, "encapsulating the assumptions that we prototypically hold when we engage in conversation" (2010: 106). These maxims make the interactions of communication keep in the structure. It makes communication out of order. Speaker and Hearer must unite cooperatively to deliver and receive each other, so the communication can be made in good understanding. It means that the cooperative principle exposes the effective communication in conversation.

Moreover, according to Grice (1975b: 45-46), there are four maxims that should be obeyed by the interlocutors (the Speaker and the Hearer). First, the maxim of quantity. The hearer replies to the speaker by the necessary information or answer, not more not less. Second, the maxim of quality. The hearer replies the speaker by the truth or something with evidence. Third, the maxim of manner. The hearer replies the speaker by saying briefly and orderly but avoiding unimportance and ambiguity. Four, the maxim of relation. The hearer replies the speaker by saying relevantly. Those maxims make the communication clear.

But, in making humorous sense, the maxim should be violated because people need something shocking, surprising, and strange from the conversation. In the comical conversation, one may ask something, but someone else can receive something disconnected, and it makes the humorous sense appears because he does not get the point or he gets the point from something he never expects before. It is what is called as the non-observance of the maxims. It is the interesting one because it exposes how conversations are going mistaken, comical and unconnected.

Conveying more information for the necessary is the non-observance of the maxim quantity. Conveying lies for the evidence is the non-observance of the maxim quality. Conveying ambiguous answer is the non-observance of the maxim manner. Conveying irrelevance answer the non-observance of the maxim relation. If the non-observance of the is put together in communication, especially brought by non-serious superhero like *Deadpool*, then it can be something interesting to analyze because humorous sense sometimes comes from exaggerative (quantity), ambiguous (quality), unimportant (manner), and disconnected (relation) answers or responses. It can pump the laughter.

At this point, *Deadpool*'s speeches become the important part to look at, whether it can keep the cooperation principle in structure (intended meaning), or to mess it up in the non-observance against the maxims. In the movie *Deadpool*, the funny character of *Deadpool* has made this movie interested to analyze, specifically to the side of the impact of the non-observance of the maxims pragmatically.

The problem is, because Wade Wilson's background is not a comedian, he was even a hit man, then it is important to see that Wilson never intends to joke in his speeches, but he usually says something disconnected intentionally. The way he replies and communicates, with dictions and analogies, is what makes him funny. Therefore, in the non-observance of the maxim, there is a term of violating maxim.

Violating maxim refers to a moment when someone is responsible to one's misunderstanding.

A speaker replies by saying something non-observance intentionally to make people think what he says. For example, a mother tells her children, "Mummy's gone on a little holiday because she needs a rest" (Paltridge, 2006: 65). The truth is, the mother is going away to divorce her children's father. The mother lies to her children deliberately to make her children think what she means, and even to mislead her children's understanding that she will separate from their father.

Deadpool often misleads the communication and the way he misleads it mostly makes humorous sense come up. He often says something exaggerative, ambiguous, unimportant, and disconnected just to express what he feels, how he wants to encourage himself, and many things. *Deadpool* is different from the other superhero, therefore, his language is very interesting to be analyzed.

Furthermore, film as the part of modern people's life, can be seen as an important thing. It is not only to entertain, but also to represent how society lives, how people interact, and of course, how people communicate each other. So, in analyzing movie, it needs to see that movie has "visual perception varies less throughout the world than languages do" (Metz, 1991: 64). Visuals in film should be considered as a universal language. In the movie, we can reflect what we do in communication and in *Deadpool* movie, we can imagine how the non-observance of the maxim can make laughter for us. It shows that film and language are connected importantly.

Film as the representation of social life contains a story that is narrated through conversations/dialogs. Richard L. Stromgren and Martin F. Norden said that any kind of verbal narration in film is an "un-cinematic" similarity to literary modes of story-telling (1984: 173). Film delivers the conversations/dialogs among the characters. Film as representation of social life also shows how language is communicated both in verbal way and visual way. So, in film, we can learn that "the task now was not to re-shackle the medium to the spoken word of the talkie" (Cook, 1981: 252). Film simply can be analyzed linguistically as social communication. In *Deadpool*

movie, it can be seen that Deadpool's characters make him unique, the uniqueness is expressed with his talkativeness, and most of his talkativeness is violating maxim that makes humorous sense of this film.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. Implicature, Cooperative Principle, & Maxims

Implicature is a word to define the implicit meaning beyond the semantic meaning in a conversation. It develops an additional level of meaning. There are two kinds of implicatures; conventional and conversational.

Conventional implicatures are words conveying an implicature within sentence. There are four words that can be seen as implicatures in the sentence level: but, even, therefore, and yet (Thomas, 1995: 57). For example, "he has no job, not a bachelor, and single, but far from poor." In this sentence, the word of but has function to explain the contradiction. The implicit meaning is, a single man with no job and bachelor degree is usually poor. Of course, the man is an exception.

Conversational implicatures are uttered words in conversation that have wider meaning than the uttered words (Thomas, 1995: 58). For example, a girl who wants to go to dance party but her friend spills coffee on her gown. The girl responsively says, "Thanks God, that's so fantastic! Every prince will stare at me." In the sentence, there is implicit meaning beyond the uttered words. Of course, the woman really wants to say that she is angry to her friend because she spills the coffee on her gown.

To understand the second case, some people can misunderstand if they do not see the context. The girl says good thing while she means to her anger. The communication must be good if it is structured in a cooperative communication. This cooperative communication refers to cooperative principle.

Cooperative principle, according to Grice, exists in a good communication. Grice stated, "make your contribution such as it is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted

purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Grice, 1975a: 41-58). It means that, if people follow the structure and the context, they can have good communication. He believes that in a conversation, the interlocutors (speaker 1 and speaker 2) reflexively should obey to the conversational maxims (Thomas, 1995: 56).

The cooperative principle explains that anyone who involves in a conversation should operate the systematic condition. If the systematic condition is obeyed, the meaning will not be misled. Set of cultural bound or convention of linguistics rules make a conversation successful. Therefore, cooperative principle can be seen as a communicative condition when people cooperate in conversation (Thomas, 1995: 62). It also makes people interconnected and interacted. For Grice, there are for maxim in the cooperative principle (Thomas, 1995: 63-64)

1. Quantity Maxim; it is when the speaker answers something as informative as is required.
2. Quality Maxim; it is when the speaker answers something true, not more and not even less, of course, by showing the evidence.
3. Manner Maxim; it is when the speaker answers something in brief, orderly, clear.
4. Relation Maxim; it is when the speaker answers something relevant and related to the question.

B. The Non-Observance: Violations

The non-observance means that the maxim rule is not obeyed by the speakers. It exposes that the conversations can be mistaken and unconnected. Grice stated that there are five ways to make the non-observance (Thomas, 1995: 64).

1. Flouting;

It happens when a participant in a conversation ignores the maxims unintentionally and demands the recipient to find out implicit meaning (Thomas, 1995: 65). Flouting a maxim explains that the speakers do not obey the cooperative principle (Cruse, 2000: 360). For example, when a boy asks to his girlfriend, "what food do you want to eat?" The girl replies, "up to you." The girl does not

observe the maxim, she flouts the maxim of manner and makes the boy look for other meaning.

2. Violating;

It happens when a participant in a conversation ignores the maxims intentionally and demands the recipient to find out implicit meaning (Thomas, 1995: 73-74). Violating a maxim comes with the intention to mislead the recipient and it sometimes makes something ridiculous to think up. For example, there is a situation when a man visits a cafeteria and orders Coffee without Milk, but the waiter says, "Sorry sir, the Milk runs out, what if you order Coffee without Cream." The fact is that the man wants to order just Coffee and the waiter also knows it, but the waiter prefers to say something else and unclear. Since the information misleads, it makes questions, enigma, and of course, laughter from anyone hears that stupid conversation. Therefore, violating can pump laughter because it is too funny to understand.

3. Infringement;

It happens in a conversation when the interlocutors (the speaker and the hearer) have no intention to use an implicature. For example, when a native English carpenter speaks to a nonnative English, the Carpenter asks about the type of wood the nonnative English wants for his shelves. The Carpenter says, "I'm not sure what kind of wood you would want to use for the shelves," then the nonnative English replies, "Yes, we want to have wood shelves" (Rost, 2013: 44). Here, the nonnative English does not try to mislead the implicature, but he purely does not understand the question.

4. Opting out;

It occurs when the interlocutors show that they do not want to cooperate in maxim system. Here, someone refuses the truth for untold reasons (for ethical or personal reasons). For example, when someone dials a radio show hosted by Nick Ross: The Caller says "Um, I lived in uh a country where people sometimes need to flee that country," then Nick Ross asks him, "Uh, where was that?" The Caller replies, "It's a country in Asia and I don't want to say anymore." (Thomas, 1995: 75). The Caller does not try to be cooperative for the

situation. He refuses to tell the truth because he does not want to offend.

5. Suspending;

It occurs when the interlocutors have no purpose to fulfill the maxims (Thomas, 1995: 76). For example, when a daughter of a murdered man talks to an officer of the Navajo Tribal police: the daughter asks, "last time you were with that FBI man-asking about the one who got killed (it is a taboo for Navajo to mention the dead-man's name)." Then the Navajo Tribal police replies, "You found out who killed that man?" (Thomas, 1995: 76). Here, the daughter talks implicitly to keep the politeness and respect about the dead-man although she knows the dead-man very well. But, the police man thinks that she does not know the dead-man's name (Thomas, 1995: 77).

Based on those five types of non-observances, the most humorous one is violation, because the intention to mislead the conversation make the context wider and it makes the humor comes in the process of looking the pointlessness. This is what is going to be described in the following part.

C. Making Humorous Sense in Violated Maxims

Humor is an attitude that tends to arouse feelings of joy and trigger laughter. Sense of humor can be from funny things. What makes it funny is the joke. A joke is a way when words are expressed. To express means to communicate it. It is mostly practiced orally or verbally, "as for its being oral," it is true that jokes may appear printed, but when further transferred, there is no obligation to reproduce the text verbatim" (Hetzron, 1991: 65-66). The point is joke is classified as humor delivered either orally or textually. Because making humorous sense needs connection between the speaker (the joker) and the hearer. So, telling (or delivering) a joke is also seen as a cooperative effort (Raskin, 1985: 103). In a conversation analysis, "this telling is composed, as for stories ... the preface, the telling and the response sequences" (Sacks, 1974: 337-353). In making sense humor, the way to tell needs the response from the hearer. Those combine to loosen the point that shapes humorous sense.

In most of films, many genres use joke as part of it. Films use jokes to entertain. In that case, it is known that joke is not simply about telling, speaking, and delivering something to the audience, but also misleading communication that can be the source of the laugh. Misleading or misunderstanding the point can be the source of the laugh because it can show the fool of the speaker and people start asking the pointlessness of their conversation. For some hearers, if they know the meaning behind the misleading, it becomes the laughter. So, the misleading, misunderstanding, and disconnection finally can be a joke. A joke is used to make laugh. Laugh and smile of people is a goal of humor (Ross, 2005: 1).

Humor should relate to specific logic, perception, or emotional experiences of the hearers to make the laughter. If the hearers connect and click to the joke, the humor automatically comes up. How joke is brought makes the sense. If the joke is not brought and delivered humorously, the laughter cannot be produced. No laughter means no humor. If it is not humor, it just telling.

If it is seen shortly and clearly, it explains that humor is not just telling. There is a purpose behind the uttered words. So, if a speaker answers or replies something in a violated maxim, the disconnection can be the sense of the humor because laughter can come in a way something is not straight. It is what explains that violating maxim can make the sense of humor.

ANALYSIS

A. Violated Maxims in the Movie *Deadpool*

As it is generally known, According to Grice, there four maxims in the cooperative principle. *Quantity Maxim*, *Quality Maxim*, *Manner Maxim*, and *Relation Maxim*. However, in the movie *Deadpool*, those maxims are violated and it creates humorous sense. To understand, it can be seen as follows.

Violated Quantity Maxim

Quantity maxim occurs when the second speaker answers something as informative as is required, but if the second speaker answer too much, more than what is asked intentionally, it can

be said that he has violated the maxim. Deadpool usually violates this maxim because he is talkative. Just take a look at this conversation.

Dopinder: Why the fancy red suit, Mr. Pool?

Deadpool: That's because it's Christmas Day, Dopinder. And I'm after someone on my naughty list. I've been waiting one year, three weeks ... six days and ... fourteen minutes to make him fix what he did to me.

(*Deadpool*, 00:04:21,887 - 00:04:36,364)

The conversation occurs in the first part of the movie. Deadpool is actually trying to find out Francis. The problem is, he is set in a taxi. In the taxi, he has conversation with the driver. The driver is Dopinder. During his way, Deadpool and Dopinder talk many things. Dopinder shares his painful experience because her girlfriend is taken by another man. Deadpool himself seems to share his emotion because Vanessa, his girlfriend, is kidnapped by Francis. But, there is something tickling in the conversation, because Deadpool seems to answer Dopinder's questions with so many information.

Based on the conversation, Dopinder asks Deadpool why he has red suit to wear. In this case, Dopinder is characterized as a driver who knows nothing about Deadpool, he seems to value Deadpool just as a passenger. This question is answered by Deadpool by saying that he wears red tight suit because it is Christmas. He also adds that he is looking for someone (Francis) in his list. He adds again by saying that he has been waiting for one year, three weeks, six days, and fourteen minutes. It seems so abundant to answer a question "why red suit?" therefore, it can be said that Deadpool has violated the quantity maxim. He actually should just answer, "because it is Christmas". The implied meaning of this answer (far from meaning his superhero costume) is saying that Christmas is identic with red and that is why he wears red. But the fact, Deadpool talks too much by saying that he is looking for someone that he has been waiting for so long. It is the problem and it is the violated maxim.

Another choice of answering the question "why red suit" can be "because I like red" or "because I am a superhero" and etc. It is all the choice of the answer to answer as informative as it is. If it is answering too much information, it becomes the violation. It is violation because Deadpool knows and understands the answer, but he intentionally says something else to mislead the meaning. So, Dopinder still does not understand that Deadpool is not celebrating Christmas, but he is a superhero who chases the villain, Francis. Dopinder just wants to know why Deadpool wears red suit and quantitatively, Deadpool answers by many things.

Violated Quality Maxim

Quality maxim occurs when the speaker answers something true, not more and not even less, of course, by showing the evidence. Talking about true cannot be far from evidence because only evidence can show the truth. There is one moment that shows problem in this maxim. It can be seen as follows.

Dopinder: That's \$27.50.

Deadpool: I never carry a wallet when I'm working. Ruins the lines of my suit. But, how about a crisp high five?

Dopinder: Okay.

Deadpool: Merry Christmas.

(*Deadpool*, 00:06:09,161 - 00:06:19,087)

After Deadpool stops the taxi, Dopinder says the payment Deadpool should pay. It is \$27.50. The problem, Deadpool says that he does not bring wallet when he is working. He adds by saying that giving five (a toss) can replace the payment. Deadpool actually violates the quality maxim. It is about how Deadpool answer Dopinder by saying yes or no choice. Yes means paying then taxi and No means sorry for having no money. However, Deadpool seems to violate it by saying that he does not bring wallet because he is working. He is Deadpool. He is superhero. He does it a lot and if he does it a lot it means that he never pays. Of course, that is the problem. Deadpool never pays the taxi but he lies by saying he never brings the wallet.

Deadpool in that moment shows that he intentionally says that he does not bring the wallet while he does not want to pay or he has no money. He uses evidence (tight red suit) to convince that he really does not bring wallet while it is just a trick to say that he does not want to pay. If he wants to pay, he does not need to say he never brings wallet in working, working with red tight suit and the wallet can ruin the style. Of course, it is a lie and Deadpool violates it.

Violated Manner Maxim

Manner Maxim occurs when the speaker answers something in brief, orderly, clear. Talking about manner can be related to way, means, style and custom. It means that manner maxim relates to how someone answers the question. Therefore, it refers to brief, orderly, and clear answer. However, Deadpool seems to violate it. It can be seen as follows.

Dopinder: Who brought this twinkly man?

Deadpool: Twinkly, but deadly. My chrome-penised friend back there has agreed to do me this solid. In exchange, I said that I would consider joining his boy band.

(*Deadpool*, 01:18:32,713 - 01:18:44,805)

From the conversation, it can be seen that there is something strange. Dopinder asks Deadpool about someone who has brought tow passengers behind him. Dopinder uses the word of *twinkle* to refer to Colossus. Colossus is one of X-Man members who wants Deadpool to join X-Man. But Deadpool refuses. Colossus is portrayed as a gigantic man. His body is full of metal. It shows that Colossus looks so masculine. In this moment, Deadpool who wants to save Vanessa, asks Colossus and Negasonic to help him to save Vanessa. Previously, Deadpool has met with Colossus and Negasonic and he has been asked to join X-Man, but Deadpool refuses. In this moment, Deadpool asks them a help and Deadpool offers himself to join X-Man. That is the case.

The problem is, in the conversation, Deadpool answers Dopinder's question by saying that Colossus and Negasonic are deadly. Deadpool also says that Colossus is chrome-penised friend. Deadpool also says to Dopinder that he has agreed to consider joining X-Man. However, Deadpool calls X-Man as boy band. Of course, Dopinder does not know the meaning of boy band which X-Man. Deadpool shows that he violates the manner maxim. It is unclear answer. It is not brief. Deadpool can just answer "I do" or "It is me", but Deadpool answers ambiguous answer, especially by saying chrome-penised friend (Colossus) and boy band (X-Man). It is undoubtedly violation in manner maxim.

Violated Relation Maxim

Relation occurs when the speaker answers something relevant and related to the question. Talking about relevant thing means talking about something logical. It should be accepted by the hearer. If someone says something, the answer should be relevant to the question. If it is not, it is not relevant. There is a moment when Deadpool does not obey this maxim.

Al: Upside of being blind: I've never seen you in Crocs.

Deadpool: You mean my big, rubber masturbating shoes?

(*Deadpool*, 01:05:35,018 - 01:05:38,063)

The setting of the conversation is in Deadpool's apartment. It is known that Deadpool lives with Al. Al is an old woman who is blind. But Al is a unique old woman because she has a lot of cocaine and guns. Deadpool seems to be friendly with Al. However, the conversation between Al and Deadpool seems to show problem.

Al says to Deadpool that she never that Deadpool wears crocs. Croc is a kind of sandal made of rubber. It is so surprising to know that Deadpool responds Al by saying that the croc are masturbating shoes. Now it shows the violation. Deadpool really understands that Al is blind, of course he knows that Al cannot know the crocs

Deadpool has. But, Deadpool prefers to respond her by saying that the croc is the masturbating shoes. There is no relevance between croc and masturbating. The rubber shoes and masturbating shoes seem to have connection, but it is too far and even irrelevant with the topic they have. The implied meaning is that Al wants to say to Deadpool that previously, he is not so noisy but recently, he is so noisy. Croc refers to the noisy. Therefore, it can be said that Deadpool has violated the relation maxim by answering the rubber shoe with masturbating shoes which are out of the context.

Violated Maxims as Humorous Sense in the Movie *Deadpool*

After knowing those violated maxims, this part contains the explanation that the violations can have effect to the humorous sense. *Deadpool* movie can be categorized as humorous movie and it can be known from general reviews from many critics. It also can be seen from Deadpool's reactions which are so childish, ridiculous, hyperbolic, and many other strange reactions. These reactions can make laugh, but the violations of the maxims can be also considered having role in creating laughs. If there is laugh, it can be said that there must be humor.

Basically, humor is one form of culture that is universal. Everyone must have a sense of humor. There are people who have high sense of humor and a sense of humor is low. Therefore, it is so segmented. However, far from the taste of people, humor is a characteristic mood. It is something that is funny. It can be ridiculous or amused for those who hear or see it. Humor is not only as an entertainment, but in humor research, it also has its own characteristics or form and function. One form of humor is verbal and nonverbal. Thus, humor cannot be separated from the language function itself.

Besides humor, there is also term that is important to understand in verbal conversation that is so funny. It is joke. There are some types of producing jokes. First is Script Opposition (SO). This includes themes such as real (unreal), actual (non-actual), normal (abnormal), and possible

(impossible). Second is Logical Mechanism (LM). This includes intelligence using faulty logic or false analogies. Third is Situation (SI). This includes the use of property such as objects, activities, instruments to dramatize the story. Four is Target (TA). This includes the actor(s) who become the *butt* of the joke by labelling stereotypes of ethnic groups, professions, etc. Five is Narrative Strategy (NS). This includes narrative format of the joke, such as simple narrative, a dialogue, or a puzzle. Six is Language (LA) This includes all the information necessary for the verbalization of a text (Attardo, 1994: 223).

Because the context of this research is from the violated maxims as humor sense, it means that it is not joke in the real sense, but the joke comes from the violation. The violation is an intentional process of breaking the cooperative principle. This process is the joke itself. The joke that is from violation becomes the humorous sense.

In the movie, gesture and language are in combination to expose it. Thus, in *Deadpool* movie, it can be imagined, how stupid superhero tries to save his girlfriend. Besides his gesture, he also talks something unimportant, ambiguous, hyperbolic, and others. Therefore, the violations of the maxims previously, have very tight relation to the humorous sense. To make it clear, these sub-parts can explain it more.

B. Violations as Humorous Sense

The violation can make humorous sense because it can express something implied with disconnection.

Violated Quantity Maxim as Humorous Sense

Violated quantity maxim occurs when the speaker does not answer something as informative as is required. In the previous part, it is known that *Deadpool* violates quantity maxim when Dopinder asks him about the fancy red suit. To make it clear, it can be reposted again the quotation as below.

Dopinder: Why the fancy red suit, Mr. Pool?

Deadpool: That's because it's Christmas Day, Dopinder. And I'm after someone on my naughty list. I've been waiting one year, three weeks ... six days and ... fourteen minutes to make him fix what he did to me.

(*Deadpool*, 00:04:21,887 - 00:04:36,364)

In the conversation, *Deadpool* violates the conversation by answering uninformative answer as it is required by Dopinder. The question must be about the reason why this moment can be so funny to laugh. It should be remembered that this scene is after *Deadpool* has fights against Francis's armies.

This scene is flashback, it means that it is generally known that *Deadpool* is unusual man. He is superman. He has power. But, something ridiculous is a superman is in a taxi. This is the first point to pump the laugh because it is unusual scene. If it is not trusted, it can be compared to other superhero movies, there is none of them looking for the villain by taxi. Ironman can fly, Batman has gigantic car, and others. Thus, *Deadpool's* scene has been something to make laugh. After conceptualizing the audience's perspective with this ridiculous act, the conversation gives more effect.

Deadpool says that he wears the fancy red suit because he is in the Christmas. There is no tight relation between his super-heroic power with Christmas. The only thing to link it up is just the red color. Christmas is identical with red and *Deadpool* wears red. It does not mean that he is going on Christmas.

The stupid thing is, Dopinder just nods. He looks so sure of what *Deadpool* says about Christmas. It becomes funny scene. Moreover, the Christmas is related to the way he wants to do revenge, finding Francis. The violated quantity maxim becomes the humorous sense in this part.

Deadpool intentionally does not say that his fancy red suit is because he is *Deadpool*, a man with super power, but he prefers to say it as Christmas and wants to do revenge. There is abundant information. The split is in the Christmas (comparing himself to Santa Claus) and the

abundance is looking for Francis. Francis is not the topic Dopinder wants to seek out.

Violated Quality Maxim as Humorous Sense

Violation in quality maxim occurs when the speaker does not answer something true, not more and not even less, of course, by showing the evidence. It has already been known that Deadpool violates the quality maxim by telling the lie. Lie refers to the misdirection to the truth. What is true is told with something else and it becomes violation. To remember the case when Deadpool does violation to quality maxim, it can be seen as follows.

Dopinder: That's \$27.50.

Deadpool: I never carry a wallet when I'm working. Ruins the lines of my suit. But, how about a crisp high five?

Dopinder: Okay.

Deadpool: Merry Christmas.

(*Deadpool*, 00:06:09,161 - 00:06:19,087)

From its story, the conversation is when Deadpool stops the taxi. It can be imagined, a man with super power, in the red tight suit, mask, is going to kill the villain by taxi. When the taxi driver, Dopinder, informs about the cost, Deadpool says that he never brings wallet during working. It sounds so very stupid and it makes people laugh.

It is very simple to understand that a superhero going to kill his villain by a taxi and he does not have money. What Dopinder wants is the payment but Deadpool replies that he does not bring wallet (he cannot pay). Between a poor superman and stupid superhero, there is violation of quality maxim that makes the scene becomes so funny. The stupidity of Deadpool can be reflected from his answer to Dopinder and it can shape the humorous sense. The humorous sense is so very essential to expose in Deadpool's part of speech.

Violated Manner Maxim as Humorous Sense

Violation of manner maxim occurs when the speaker does not answer something in brief, orderly, clear. Looking at the character Deadpool, there is something always there: talkative and ridiculous. The talkativeness can be reflected from

his violation to quantity maxim, but it also occurs to manner maxim. To make it clear, it can be seen again to the case when Deadpool violates manner maxim.

Dopinder: Who brought this twinkly man?

Deadpool: Twinkly, but deadly. My chrome-penis friend back there has agreed to do me this solid. In exchange, I said that I would consider joining his boy band.

(*Deadpool*, 01:18:32,713 - 01:18:44,805)

The conversation occurs when Deadpool asks for a help to Colossus and Negasonic. They are put in the taxi. The condition is something that makes it funny. Colossus is a big guy. His body is full of metal.

It can be imagined, how a gigantic with metallic body inside of a taxi. Dopinder asks Deadpool about those passengers and Deadpool answers it by saying Colossus as chrome-penis friend and calling X-Man as boy band.

Deadpool violates the manner maxim because he intentionally answers while mocking them indirectly. What he mocks is actually violation because it is so ambiguous, for Dopinder especially.

However, for audience, it is totally funny to call Colossus with a name chrome-penis friend. It seems so very hard to imagine a man with chrome penis. Something pervert turns to be something ridiculous. It is a kind of dirty jokes.

Dirty joke is generally known as a joke by using sensual and sexual object as the punchline. It is usually about sexual relation but it is usually said indirectly, but the implied meaning is always about sex. Deadpool should actually just say that Colossus is my friend, but with his ridiculous act and dirty mouth, he calls Colossus with chrome-penis friend.

It is violation to manner maxim but it is also ridiculous to hear. It is funny because it is so hard to imagine a man with metal penis. How can a woman satisfy him? it is just a question and no need to

answer. Just Keep it up in mind and it is the humorous sense.

Violated Relation Maxim as Humorous Sense

Violation of relation maxim occurs when the speaker does not answer something relevant and related to the question. It must be so many for Deadpool to do this. He is very stupid but he is so talkative. His stupidity sometimes makes him violate the relation maxim. It means that he answers something irrelevantly. Just go back to the previous case when Deadpool has conversation with Al.

Al: Upside of being blind: I've never seen you in Crocs.

Deadpool: You mean my big, rubber masturbating shoes?

(*Deadpool*, 01:05:35,018 - 01:05:38,063)

This short conversation has humor sense because there is implied meaning behind what Deadpool says. Al is blind. She is an old woman living with Deadpool. Deadpool has crocs (rubber shoes). Just keep focus on the crocs, there must question about the relation between crocs and masturbation. It sounds so extreme to imagine a one masturbates using crocs.

Crocs itself is a rubber shoe manufacturer from Colorado United States that was first marketed in 2002. In the beginning, Crocs are designed for outdoor activities and sailing. This is because Crocs are made of rubber that is anti-slip and certainly waterproof. It makes it so easy to dry. Of course, it is made as anti-bacteria. Crocs shoes and sandals are very light, soft and comfortable, these shoes are also used for everyday activities. Quickly, Crocs and his imitations spread all over the world.

Deadpool says it intentionally and it violates relation maxim because Al must not expect to hear anything about masturbation. Deadpool violates the relation maxim but what he says is also emerging the humorous sense because it stimulates the audiences' imagination to think the impossibility to masturbate with the crocs.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research questions that have been proposed before, it is assumed that violating maxim can be the part of making humorous sense. To understand it clearly, it can be explained in detail in these following paragraphs.

The first question proposed in this research is about the violated maxims in the movie *Deadpool*. It should be highlighted that *Deadpool* is different from the other superhero movie. It is not about his position as an anti-hero, but it is about his character. He is very ridiculous and what he says is mostly strange, ambiguous, excessive, irrelevant, and many other disconnected responses. Therefore, from the analysis, it is found that the characteristics of *Deadpool* as the main character in the movie makes violations in all maxims, including quality, quantity, manner, and relation.

The second question proposed in this research is about the violated maxims in the first question becomes the source of the humorous sense. Based on the analysis, it can be said so, because the humorous sense is not only gotten from the gesture, but also from the verbal instruments. The violation is known as an intentional process of breaking the cooperative principle. It can be said that violation makes something connected to disconnected to find out the implied meaning. This is the point. The implied meaning is actually making humorous sense because it makes something else to interpret. Therefore, it can be said that that violation to maxims can be the source of humor sense because the conversation becomes a joke for the audience. Far from the funny character of *Deadpool* himself, the conversation which is out of cooperative principle itself can be the humorous sense.

REFERENCES

- Attardo, Salvatore. 1994. *Linguistic Theories of Humor*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bent, Mike. 2009. *The Everything Guide to Comedy Writing: From Stand-Up to Sketch - All You Need to Succeed in The World of Comedy*. New York: Barnes & Noble.
- Blackburn, Simon. 1996. *The Oxford Dictionary of*

- Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Calame, Claude & Peter Michael Burk. 2004. *Masks of Authority: Fiction and Pragmatics in Ancient Greek Poetics*. New York: Cornell University Press
- Christopher, David. 2002. *British Culture: An Introduction*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Coates, Jennifer. 1986. *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language*. London & New York: Pearson Longman.
- Cook, David A. 1981. *A History of Narrative Film*. New York: Norton.
- Cruse, D. Alan. 2000. *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Flick, Uwe, et.al. 2004. *A Companion to Qualitative Research* (trans. Bryan Jenner). London: Sage.
- Grice, Herbert Paul. 1975a. □Logic and conversation□, in Cole, P. & Morgan, J. *Syntax and semantics. 3: Speech acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Grice, Herbert Paul. 1975b. *Studies in the Way of Words*. New York: Academic press.
- Jeffries, Lesley & Daniel McIntyre. 2010. *Stylistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leech, George. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Metz, Christian. 1991. □The Cinema: Language or Language System?□ in *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema* (trans. Michael Taylor). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Paltridge, Brian. 2006. *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. New York: Continuum.
- Raskin, Victor. 1985. *Semantic Mechanisms of Humor*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Roeper, Richard. 2012. *21 Jump Street*, Richard Roeper Online, retrieved from <http://www.richardroeper.com/reviews/21jumpstreet.aspx>, on 9 March 2016, at 9 am.
- Ross, Alison. 2005. *The Language of Humor*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Rost, Michael. 2013. *Teaching and Researching: Listening*. Harlow: Routledge.
- Ruskin, Harry. 1980. *Comedy is a Serious Business*. Washington: Dramatic Publishing.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1974. □An Analysis of the Course of a Joke□s telling in Conversation□ in Bauman, Richard; Sherzer, Joel. *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Savić, Milica. 2014. *Politeness through the Prism of Requests, Apologies and Refusals*. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing Ltd.
- Spector, Benjamin. 2013. *Maxims of Conversation*, Oxford Bibliographies, DOI: 10.1093/OBO/9780199772810-0129, retrieved from <http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199772810/obo-9780199772810-0129.xml>, on 9 March 2016, at 11 am.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen (ed.). 2008. *Culturally Speaking: Culture, Communication and Politeness Theory*. London & New York: Continuum.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen & Jiang, Wenying. 2003. □Explaining Cross-cultural Pragmatic Findings: Moving from Politeness Maxims to Socio-pragmatic Interactional Principles (SIPs)□. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol.35 (No.10-11). pp. 1633-1650. ISSN 0378-2166.
- Stromgren, Richard L. & Martin F. Norden. 1984. *Movies: A Language in Light*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Thomas, Jenny. 1995. *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Harlow: Longman.
- Trosborg, Anna. 1995. *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Boston: de Gruyter Mouton
- Yule, George. 2006. *The Study of Language* (3rd Edition). New York: Cambridge university press.
- Attardo, Salvatore. 1994. *Linguistic Theories of Humor*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bent, Mike. 2009. *The Everything Guide to Comedy Writing: From Stand-Up to Sketch - All You Need to Succeed in The World of Comedy*. New York: Barnes & Noble.