



The Types and Motives of Maxim Infringement in Agatha Christie's Murder on The Orient Express Novel (Pragmatic Approach)

Adhitya Darmawan¹, Nada Humaida Rohmah²

Magistrate of Linguistics, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Sebelas Maret University, Kentingan
Jl. Ir. Sutami No.36, Jebres, Kec. Jebres, Kota Surakarta, Jawa Tengah 57126.

Correspondence Email: adhityadarmawan1998@gmail.com¹, nadahumaidaruns@gmail.com²

Abstract

This study performs a pragmatic analysis on Agatha Christie's "Murder on the Orient Express," focusing on the intentional types and motives behind the Grice's conversational maxims infringement strategies. This research is descriptive qualitative that uses document analysis from the dialogues where the characters strategically infringe the maxims and find the motive(s) behind every infringement. The motives are namely withholding information, providing misleading details, using ambiguity, and creating communicative effects. This research uses domain, taxonomy, componential analysis, and cultural theme as well as inductive technique for the data analysis technique. The results show that there are 118 infringement of the maxims that fulfil the types of all the maxim of quality, quantity, manner, and relevance as well as the motives This research finds out that the story is dominated by the infringement of the maxim of relevance to control information flow which aligns with the novel's purpose as a crime-solving detective novel.

Keywords: *Infringement, maxim, Agatha Christie, pragmatic*

Abstrak

Penelitian ini melakukan analisis pragmatik terhadap novel "Murder on the Orient Express" karya Agatha Christie, dengan fokus pada jenis dan motif yang disengaja di balik strategi pelanggaran maksim percakapan menurut Grice. Penelitian ini bersifat deskriptif kualitatif dengan menggunakan analisis dokumen dari transkrip dialog di mana para tokoh secara strategis melanggar maksim dan menemukan motif di balik setiap pelanggarannya. Motif-motif tersebut adalah menyembunyikan informasi, memberikan detail yang menyesatkan, menggunakan ambiguitas, dan menciptakan efek komunikatif. Penelitian ini menggunakan domain, taksonomi, analisis komponensial, dan tema budaya serta teknik induktif untuk teknik analisis data. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa terdapat 118 pelanggaran maksim yang memenuhi jenis-jenis pelanggaran maksim kualitas, kuantitas, cara, dan relevansi serta motif yang melatarbelakanginya. Penelitian ini menemukan bahwa pelanggaran yang paling sering terjadi adalah pelanggaran maxim relevansi untuk mengendalikan informasi, dimana ini sejalan dengan novel ini sebagai novel bertema detektif

Kata kunci: *Pelanggaran, maksim, Agatha Christie, pragmatik*

Introduction

Within a communication, following specific communication guidelines is essential for the speakers. One of the most common rules is the cooperative principle, a set of crucial guidelines that ensure smooth communication which was proposed by Grice (1975). The cooperative principle creates the framework for effective conversation. Compliance to these rules is crucial to prevent misunderstandings

between speakers and listeners. This often becomes a significant issue in communication when individuals speak solely from their own knowledge without considering the listener's background. The cooperative principle encompasses four fundamental maxims that serve as guiding principles for speakers during a communication namely the maxim of quality, quantity, manner, and relevance. People who are communicating tend to infringe or fail to observe maxims namely: violating, flouting, suspending, opting out, and infringing a maxim.

Within Grice's cooperative principle, the infringement of a maxim involves purposefully violating one of the conversational maxims to convey a specific implied meaning or to achieve a particular goal. For example, once a speaker intentionally provides an ambiguous or irrelevant response in a conversation to create humor or to imply something indirectly, they are committing an infringement of the maxim of relevance. Similarly, intentional exaggeration or providing excessive information for emphasis can be considered as an infringement of the maxim of quantity. Thomas, (2014) argues that infringement happens when the speaker unintentionally breaks the maxims due to language barriers, performance impairment, or cognitive impairment while Grice (1975) states that communicators might infringe maxims strategically to convey implicatures or to manipulate the conversational context for various reasons, including humor, emphasis, lying, or conveying underlying messages indirectly. Therefore, a maxim infringement can indeed occur when a speaker intentionally flouts or violates a conversational maxim.

Grice's conversational maxims, while rooted in everyday communication, can be effectively applied to literary narratives to analyze character development, theme exploration, and narrative structure. However, as (Osunbade & Adeniji, 2014) points out, individuals may not always adhere to these maxims in real-world or fictional contexts, leading to violations and implicatures. In literary narratives, characters may deliberately or unintentionally violate Grice's maxims, revealing their personalities, motivations, and relationships. For example, a character who frequently violates the Maxim of Relevance might be seen as evasive or manipulative.

Furthermore, the author's use of Grice's maxims can contribute to the overall themes and pacing of the story. A sudden violation of a maxim can create suspense or tension, while a consistent adherence to the maxims can create a sense of predictability or reliability. However, it's important to note that the application of Grice's maxims may vary depending on the genre, setting, and the author's specific intentions. In some cases, characters may follow different cultural norms or have unique ways of communicating that don't align with Grice's principles.

There are various motives of maxim infringements which can differ from one to another. Grice (1975) states the four general motives of maxim infringement namely achieving or creating communicative effects, controlling information flow, asserting power or superiority, as well as protecting privacy or information. Creating communicative effects is the common motive of infringement since it can happen for creating a sarcasm, irony, or jokes. Controlling information flow happens when someone consciously decides not to tell the full details of what he or she knows. Asserting power is almost similar to controlling information flow but this is also followed by indirectly implying that the individual owns a dominance over the other one. The last one is protecting privacy which is once again similar to controlling

information flow but this happens only to protect the individual's secret, not other's secrets.

The communication that people do, can possibly happen in both spoken and even in a written form such as in narratives. Narratives come in various forms such as films or novels. Novels are more intriguing since they do not provide any detailed audio descriptions nor the visual ones. Considering how interesting and intriguing a novel's narrative structure and ability to provide sequences of events apart from analyzing the types and motives of maxim infringement, this becomes one of the reasons why this research is conducted. Novels often own their own communicative strategies, transcending the boundaries of conventional conversational norms (Sisakht, 2014). Agatha Christie's renowned work, "*Murder on The Orient Express*", stands as a compelling medium where characters intricately navigate communication, often deviating from the established conversational maxims. This research adapts a pragmatic approach by using the theory from Grice's conversational maxims within Christie's novel, examining these deviations as infringement strategies by the characters in pursuit of specific reasons or motives.

This research focuses only on the maxim infringement in Agatha Christie's Novel *Murder on The Orient Express*. "*Murder on the Orient Express*" is about the famous detective Hercule Poirot as he travels on the luxurious train. When a wealthy passenger is killed, Poirot is drawn into a complex investigation where multiple suspects, each with their own motives, provide conflicting information, leading to a surprising and ingenious resolution that challenges the concept of justice itself. This is the reason why the researcher decides to choose novel since it contains maxim infringement as Poirot suspects each character and so do the other characters. In some cases, Poirot finds the suspects to infringe the maxims as he sometimes knows that they lie. But in some cases, Poirot also infringes the maxims so that the suspects will not see that Poirot already comes up with a conclusion.

Previous studies have discussed and analyzed the infringement of the maxims (Fitriyani et al., 2020; Hanifah, 2013; Mbisike, 2021; Osunbade & Adeniji, 2014; Rohmadi et al., 2019) but those studies did not specifically analyze what the types of the infringement are, what the motives are, and how the patterns of the maxims infringements are. Those previous studies commonly analyse the maxim infringement in humor, entertainment, or when the speakers are not capable of speaking due to several reason without analyzing the deeper understanding on the utterances. This study fills this gap by analyzing the meanings that are implicitly conveyed when the speakers are assumed to be cooperative, but infringe the maxim of quality in conveying their own informative intentions.

Since Infringement through Flouting the maxims can happen for it involves knowingly flouting a maxim in an obvious or exaggerated manner to convey a hidden meaning or create a certain effect. This intentional flouting can lead to infringements that challenge conventional communication norms (H. P. Grice, 1975; P. Grice, 1989). The previous research did not completely analyze the types and motives of maxim infringement in Agatha Christie's *Murder on The Orient Express* nor analyze the infringement patterns, these can be seen as the gaps for this research that makes the researcher decide to conduct a research on the types and motives of the infringement

of the maxims in Agatha Christie's *Murder on The Orient Express* Novel. These gaps then become the focus and the objectives of this research.

Method

This study is a descriptive qualitative research which aims to explore the nature of maxim infringements and their underlying motives in Agatha Christie's *Murder on the Orient Express*. A single case study approach was chosen to delve into the intricacies of the narrative and the characters' communication strategies. The qualitative paradigm was selected due to its ability to provide rich and detailed data, allowing for in-depth analysis of the characters' utterances and their contextual significance. Document analysis was used to examine the text of the novel, focusing on the characters' conversations and their adherence to or violations of Grice's conversational maxims.

As a qualitative research, this research adapts Spradley (2016) ethnographic analysis. The analysis starts from domain, taxonomy, componential, and cultural theme analysis. These methods allow the identification of relevant domains, categorization of data, and taxonomic analysis is done to categorize data based on this research aims. Next, componential analysis is performed to find patterns of behavior which in this case is the characters' communication strategies. Additionally, cultural theme analysis was conducted to explore the broader cultural and historical context of the novel and its influence on the characters' behavior. By incorporating these methodological approaches, this study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the types, motives, and implications of maxim infringements in the context of detective fiction, especially in Agatha Christie's *Murder on The Orient Express*. The analysis focuses into the characters' communication strategies, their underlying motivations, and the ways in which these strategies contribute to the complexity of the narrative.

Result and Discussion

The componential analysis that works as the analysis technique in this research finds that there are currently 118 maxim infringement found in *The Murder on The Orient Express* Novel. Some of the data are found as the maxim of quality infringement (7 data). The next data are the maxim of quantity infringement (3 data), the maxim of relevance infringement (16 data), the maxim of manner infringement (5 data). Most of the data involve the motive of controlling information flow and the rest are creating communicative effects, asserting power and superiority, and protecting privacy or information. The interpretation of the data from the results in componential analysis starts from what maxim infringement that the characters commit throughout the story, what motive that is commonly used by the characters while doing the maxim infringements, and lastly, in order to find the cultural theme, there is a discussion on why the characters choose a certain type of infringement as well as certain motive of

infringement with the goal of this novel itself. The findings can be seen in the following table.

Table 1. The types of maxim infringements and the motives

Infringement of the maxim	Infringement motives				Σ
	Communicative effects	Information Flow	Power and superiority	Privacy & info	
Quality	10	20		12	42
Quantity	3			2	5
Relevance		34	4	10	48
Manner	3	18		2	23
TOTAL	16	72	4	24	118

The Infringement of the Maxim of relevance to control information Flow

This category happens when someone intentionally deviates from the topic or withholds information to manipulate the conversation or steer it in a specific direction. This infringement can serve various motives, such as creating confusion, protecting one's interests, or redirecting attention away from incriminating details. The deliberate manipulation of information by deviating from relevance assists characters in maintaining control, shaping perceptions, or concealing vital clues in the story. This is the dominant category since the story

- (1) Poirot : *Let us hope you will not be snowed up in the Taurus!*
- Lt. Dubose : *That happens?*

The conversation between Poirot and Lt. Dubose is considered as an infringement of the maxim of quantity by the fact that Lt. Dubose does not completely reply Poirot's question but just shortly reply with "*That happens?*" The conversation between Poirot and Lt. Dubose presents an intriguing illustration of a maxim infringement, specifically concerning the maxim of quantity within Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975). The maxim of quantity suggests that speakers should provide the right amount of information required for effective communication while this one lacks it.

Poirot's initial statement, "Let us hope you will not be snowed up in the Taurus!" appears deliberately vague, lacking specificity regarding the potential hazards or occurrences associated with the Taurus Mountains. This ambiguity could be perceived as a departure from the expected norm of quantity in communication, as it fails to provide sufficient details about the risks of being snowed in, an event hinted at but not explicitly elaborated upon. Lt. Dubose's subsequent response, "That happens?" seeks further information or confirmation regarding the likelihood or frequency of such an event. This indicates a perceived lack of adequate information provided by Poirot's earlier statement. Dubose's query can be interpreted as an attempt to elicit more specific details or clarification, aligning with the expectation of the maxim of quantity for a fuller and more informative exchange.

The motive behind Poirot's potentially vague statement could be strategic, involving the control or manipulation of information flow. By withholding specific details about the dangers or occurrences related to being snowed in, Poirot might be intentionally steering the conversation to observe Dubose's reactions or maintain a level of mystery or control over the information being shared. Therefore, this interaction also shows a potential deviation from the maxim of quantity, with Poirot's ambiguous initial statement potentially infringing upon the principle of providing sufficient information for effective communication, alluding to the motive of controlling information flow for strategic or investigation purposes

Within the next data, there are instances where characters intentionally control the flow of information by infringing on the maxim of relevance during conversations.

- (2) McQueen: "*I was in my compartment reading a book.*"
Poirot: "*What book were you reading?*"
McQueen: "*Oh, just something I picked up.*"

In this exchange, Poirot seeks specific information, possibly relevant to the investigation or the character's actions during the incident. However, the character responds evasively, dismissing the book's significance by stating it's "*just something I picked up*". This shows that McQueen tries to directly avoid Poirot's inquiry. This evasion potentially diverts attention away from the critical details about the book he was reading, showing a control of information flow. By offering a vague response, McQueen restricts Poirot's access to potentially relevant information about their activities or mindset at the time of the incident. This manipulation of the conversation subtly hinders the investigation and prevents Poirot from obtaining crucial details that can probably help him in solving the case.

Throughout the story, many more instances of relevance infringement occur as characters strategically try to avoid specific details or evade providing pertinent information. These subtle manipulations contribute to the complexity of the mystery, as characters use evasion or vagueness to control the direction of conversations and shield themselves or others from revealing potentially incriminating information.

This following conversation is the continuation of the investigation between Poirot and McQueen. As this investigation goes any further, the infringement that happens between those two seems to more vibrant.

- (3) Poirot: "*Can you recall the exact time when you heard the noise?*"
McQueen: "*It was late, I think.*"

In this dialogue between Poirot and McQueen, there's a potential infringement of the maxim of relevance. Poirot asks for a precise time when McQueen heard the noise and he also seeks for specific details which is crucial for the investigation. However, McQueen's response lacks the precision necessary to fulfill Poirot's request. By replying with "*It was late, I think,*" McQueen provides vague, improper and imprecise information, deviating from the relevance of Poirot's inquiry.

This lack of specificity regarding the time of the noise might be an attempt by McQueen to control or manipulate the flow of information that he has to give to Poirot. By offering a vague response, McQueen potentially withholds important details, holding Poirot's ability to establish a clear timeline of events and disturbing the progress of the investigation. This deviation from relevance might serve McQueen's intention to obscure or control information relevant to the case that Poirot is working on.

(4) Debenham: "*What is the matter?*" (she asked rather breathlessly in French.) "*Why are we stopping?*"

Poirot: "*It is nothing, Mademoiselle. It is something that has caught fire under the dining-car. Nothing serious. It is put out. They are now repairing the damage. There is no danger, I assure you.*"

(She made a little abrupt gesture, as though she were waving the idea of danger aside as something completely unimportant.)

In this dialogue, there is particularly an infringement of the maxim of relevance or perhaps it is simply just the maxim of quantity without any infringement. Poirot's response seems to adhere to the situation's immediate context, informing the passenger of a minor incident (*a fire under the dining car*) and reassuring her that it's been handled and there is no longer a danger.

The infringement of the maxim of manner to control information flow

The next category in the analysis is the infringement of the maxim of manner with the motive of controlling information flow. This belongs to a condition where an individual does not answer or respond to the previous speaker properly. Unlike maxim of relevance infringement, this category leans more into how someone decides to improperly

(1) Col. Arbuthnot: "*Well, you know, breakfast isn't always a chatty meal.*"
Ms. Debenham: "*I should hope not. But I don't bite.*"

In the dialogue between Colonel Arbuthnot and Ms. Debenham seems to have a potential infringement on the maxim of manner within Grice's Cooperative Principle. The maxim of manner emphasizes clarity, directness, and avoidance of ambiguity in communication.

Colonel Arbuthnot's statement, "*Well, you know, breakfast isn't always a chatty meal,*" lacks explicitness and precision in conveying information regarding the nature of breakfast. The phrase "*isn't always a chatty meal*" introduces ambiguity, failing to provide a clear or specific characterization of breakfast, potentially infringing upon the maxim of manner by lacking clarity and precision in expression.

Ms. Debenham's response, "*I should hope not. But I don't bite*", seemingly responds to Arbuthnot's ambiguous statement with politeness and indirectness. Her reply maintains a level of tact while suggesting that she does not engage in overly talkative behavior during breakfast. This response aligns with the conversation's context and subtly acknowledges Arbuthnot's ambiguous statement without directly addressing its lack of clarity. The potential maxim infringement lies in Arbuthnot's initial statement, which lacks the expected clarity and precision required by the maxim of manner in communication. Debenham's response, although indirect, tactfully navigates the

conversation without overtly pointing out the lack of clarity in Arbuthnot's statement and to maintain the conversational flow while subtly addressing the ambiguity introduced in the dialogue.

(2) Poirot: *"It's so beautiful! I wish—I wish—"*

Arbuthnot: *"Yes?"*

Poirot: *"I wish I could enjoy it!"*

(Arbuthnot did not answer. The square line of his jaw seemed a little sterner and grimmer.)

Arbuthnot: *"I wish to Heaven you were out of all this,"*

Poirot: *"Hush, please. Hush."*

Arbuthnot: *"Oh! it's all right."* (He shot a slightly annoyed glance in Poirot's direction, then he went on) *"But I don't like the idea of her being a governess—at the beck and call of tyrannical mothers and their tiresome brats."*

In the interaction between Poirot and Arbuthnot within, a subtle display of indirect communication appears, resembling the concept of conversational ambiguity and indirectness related to Grice's maxim of manner. Arbuthnot's response to Poirot's expressed wish, *"I wish I could enjoy it,"* is not a direct acknowledgment. Instead, Arbuthnot responds to Poirot with his own wish, *"I wish to Heaven you were out of all this,"* conveying a personal sentiment rather than addressing Poirot's stated desire. This indirect response creates a complexity on the direct meaning of the conversation which can be considered as an infringement of the maxim of manner which emphasizes clarity and directness in communication. Moreover, Arbuthnot's statement about disliking the idea of Poirot being a governess simply shows the indirectness. Rather than openly expressing his concern or disagreement, Arbuthnot indirectly hints at his reluctance, indirectly implying disapproval about Poirot assuming a governess role, which is not the main point of the conversation. These examples of indirectness and perhaps ambiguity in Arbuthnot's responses create several layers of implied meaning, creating a less straightforward exchange in the dialogue between the speaker and the hearer.

In this dialogue, it shows that there is a sign of maxim infringement that will eventually happen as the conversation is progressing.

(3) Ratchett's Associate: *"I didn't see anything unusual that night."*

Poirot: *"Can you provide more details about your activities?"*

Ratchett's Associate: *"I'd rather not talk about it. It's been a stressful journey."*

Ratchett's associate's response to Poirot's request for more details constitutes an obstruction or refusal to provide relevant information. By expressing a reluctance to discuss their activities and citing the journey's stress as a reason, the associate deliberately withholds potentially pertinent details about their actions or observations during the night of the incident. This refusal to engage in conversation about their activities infringes the maxim of relevance and slightly quality. The associate avoids sharing relevant details that could contribute to the investigation by claiming stress or discomfort as a reason for not discussing their actions.

Why this conversation belongs to the infringement of the maxim of relevance is because Poirot's request for more details about the associate's activities directly pertains to the investigation and the events of the night in question. However, the associate's response ("*I'd rather not talk about it. It's been a stressful journey.*") does not address Poirot's query and deflects from providing a relevant information. However, there is an element of infringement on the maxim of quality. The associate's response lacks specificity and detail, failing to offer any substantial information about their activities or observations on the crucial night. Instead, they provide a vague excuse ("stressful journey") without contributing any informative content related to the investigation. Overall, while the primary infringement is on relevance by avoiding the direct inquiry, there's also a lack of quality in the response, as it doesn't provide specific, truthful, or relevant information pertinent to the investigation.

The Infringement of the maxim of quality

In this analysis, the infringement of the maxim of quality occur when characters withhold or manipulate information, providing vague or misleading responses that lack truthfulness or relevance to the investigation. It is almost similar to what maxim of relevance is but this infringement is more into how accurate and truthful the information that a speaker gives. Here are the data that belong to this category.

(1) Poirot: "*Now, Michel, I am going to ask you an important question. Where were you at a quarter past one?*"

Michel: "*I, Monsieur? I was at my little seat at the end—facing up the corridor.*"

Poirot: "*You are sure?*"

Michel: "*Mais oui—at least—I went into the next coach, the Athens coach, to speak to my colleague there. We spoke about the snow. That was at some time soon after one o'clock. I cannot say exactly.*"

This conversation between Poirot and Michel can possibly have a potential slight infringement of the maxim of quality concerning the precision of information provided by Michel. Michel's response about his whereabouts is somewhat approximate when he mentions speaking to his colleague in the Athens coach "*soon after one o'clock,*" without providing an exact time like the detailed minute. This lack of precision can be seen as a minor deviation from the maxim of quality, as it does not offer a specific timeframe.

In the dialogue between Poirot and Michel, while there's a subtle deviation from providing precise details regarding Michel's whereabouts, it's plausible that this lack of specificity aligns with a motive of protecting privacy. Michel's hesitation or imprecision in detailing the exact timing of his interaction with a colleague might stem from a desire to protect personal or potentially sensitive information. It's plausible that his uncertainty or reluctance to pinpoint the exact time of the conversation in the adjacent coach could be to safeguard the nature of his discussions or interactions. As an employee on the train, Michel might feel a sense of confidentiality regarding work-related discussions or topics mentioned during his conversation with the colleague in the Athens coach. His avoidance of providing a precise time could be a conscious

effort to uphold confidentiality and refrain from divulging specific details about the discussion or the colleague involved.

(2) Poirot: *"His bed was already made up?"*

Michel: *"Yes, Monsieur. I had made it up while he was at dinner."*

Poirot: *"What time was all this?" "I could not say exactly, Monsieur. Not later than two o'clock certainly."*

The infringement of the maxim of quality starts from Michel's response that does not have specific or even accurate details regarding the timing of the events. When he was asked about the time he made Ratchett's bed while he dined, Michel could not provide an exact time, stating it was *"Not later than two o'clock certainly."* This response lacks precise temporal information, offering an uncertain estimation rather than a specific or accurate timestamp like *"it was at two past ten, Sir"*. It infringes on the maxim of quality by not providing the level of detail expected in response to a temporal inquiry, leaving the timing ambiguous and imprecise.

Michel's inability to provide an exact time could happen due several motives, mostly linked to an intentional act to obscure information from Poirot. He might act as if he is genuinely struggle to recall precise timings due to the passage of time or the routine nature of the task—making a bed for Ratchett while he dined. Michel's motive here appears suspicious, showing a possibility of being involved in something that is related to what Poirot is interrogating.

The infringement of the maxim of relevance to assert power or superiority

In this category, the phenomena happen when a character tries to assert the dominance, power or superiority that he or she has towards the interlocutor but without directly implying that he or she has the higher power or such.

The first data comes from the dialogues between Ratchett and his employee at the train.

(1) Ratchett: *"I don't care about your excuses. Just get it done."*

Employee: *"Sir, it's going to take time to arrange."*

Ratchett: *"I didn't hire you for excuses. I expect results, not delays."*

The first data in this category is this dialogue, Ratchett's emphasis on the immediate results and disregard for explanations could be analysed as infringing on the maxim of relevance. Ratchett's response does not align with his employee's previous response or irrelevant to the excuse for being unpunctual. Despite the employee's attempt to explain, Ratchett attempts to maintain his authoritative position, demanding compliance and asserting his superiority by dismissing any excuses that do not align with his expectations. This is then followed by the next argument between those two.

(2) Employee: *"Understood, Mr. Ratchett, but there are procedural hurdles we must navigate."*

Ratchett: *"I pay you to handle hurdles, not to present obstacles. I need this completed."*

Employee: *"We'll do our utmost, but these matters require due process."*

Ratchett: *"Due process? I'm not interested in red tape. I make things happen. You should do the same."*

Employee: *"I assure you, we're working diligently to streamline the process, but it's complex, Sir."*

Ratchett: *"Complexity is your problem, not mine. Just make it happen, or find someone who can."*

In this dialogue, Samuel Ratchett once again shows his dominance and desire for immediate action which shows his sense of superiority over the employee. Ratchett's repeated dismissal of the employee's explanations and insistence on quick results could be interpreted as infringing upon the maxim of relevance. Instead of acknowledging the complexities or challenges faced by the employee, Ratchett emphasizes his expectation for immediate action, seemingly disregarding the pertinent information the employee is trying to convey. His repeated emphasis on "making things happen" and lack of interest in procedural hurdles or complexities might be seen as a disregard for relevant information necessary to understand the situation fully. This assertiveness and dismissiveness could reflect Ratchett's desire to assert power and control in the conversation.

The infringement of the maxim of quantity to control information flow

This specific category appears the least in this research. This category belongs to a situation or conversation where a character does not provide sufficient amount of information regarding what the other speaker asks. The data are in the following.

(1) Poirot: *"You almost feel as though you would have been willing to do the good deed yourself?"*

MacQueenL: *"I do. I—"* (He paused, then added rather guiltily), *"Seems I'm kind of incriminating myself."*

Poirot: *"I should be more inclined to suspect you, Mr. MacQueen, if you displayed an inordinate sorrow at your employer's decease."*

MacQueen: *"I don't think I could do that even to save myself from the chair," said MacQueen grimly.* (Then he added) *"If I'm not being unduly curious, just how did you figure this out? Cassetti's identity, I mean."*

The response that MacQueen gives may seem that it does not infringe any maxim of quality but it actually does since MacQueen's response to Poirot's statement, *"Seems I'm kind of incriminating myself,"* can be seen as an infringement of the maxim of quantity. Instead of providing a more elaborate or detailed explanation of his thoughts or actions, MacQueen's response is long yet it remains relatively unclear. This lack of additional information or elaboration in his long reply can be considered an infringement on the maxim of quantity, as it does not offer a fuller explanation or more specific details regarding his feelings or intentions. However, this could also be attributed to MacQueen's cautiousness about self-incrimination, leading to a somewhat reserved response to avoid divulging more information than necessary. In other word, MacQueen's motive is to protect his privacy. This has to be related to what he is going to do in the upcoming scenes.

Discussion

The findings already show whether the characters infringe the maxims or not, which maxims they mostly infringe, and what motives are behind the entire infringement throughout the story of “*The Murder on The Orient Express*” due to several key aspects. First aspect is undoubtedly the novel’s narrative structure itself. Narrative has four main parts of the story that start from orientation to evaluation (Kooiman, 2004). This novel is not just a puzzle to be solved. It is a case of human communication gone awry. Beneath the elegance of train travel and shocking murders, this novel offers an interesting exploration of how Grice's Conversational Maxims are twisted and weaponized, adding more suspicion and intrigue to the narrative. This story showcases the progress of how the main character Poirot attempts to solve the murder case which brings him to encounter several suspects with their own motives behind their alibis. Knowing that the goal of the novel is to find the culprit, Agatha Christie’s skill plays a crucial role here on putting fractions of the complexity by making the characters perform numbers of maxim infringements. This can be considered as Christie’s point of view of the whole story because the writer’s point of view is the most important factor in shaping and delivering unity to the materials of the parts of the story which also determines the relation of the creator with the story, (Fitriyani et al., 2020) and directs readers’ feelings towards characters”

In a murder mystery detective novel like “*Murder on the Orient Express*,” characters' intentional infringement of conversational rules serve a variety of narrative functions that are closely related to the plot's progression itself. Grice's idea of implicature suggests that manipulating these maxims is crucial for creating suspense, mystery, intrigue, character development, and intricate plot points throughout the story. The characters frequently infringe these maxims in order to create alibi, tension and interest (Osunbade & Adeniji, 2014) for the plot or in other words they want to be seen as if they are cooperative while they actually have their own needs and motives (Keenan, 1976; Procknow, 2019). The characters who are considered as suspects add a sense of intricacy and confusion by giving false or partial information. This intentional infringement can possibly happen to gain the readers' interest and motivates them to sort through layers of confusion and deceit in order to witness the truth in the later chapters.

The maxims of relevance emphasizes staying relevant to the topic at hand. In the context of a murder investigation, however, some characters seem more concerned with their own agendas than providing precise information. Some characters sticking to their own activities or agendas to divert attention from the investigation is a prime example. Similarly, Colonel Arbuthnot's stoicism and reluctance on sharing details about his past blocks Poirot's progress. These intentional deviations from this maxim create a sense of frustration (Culpeper et al., 2017; Fitriyani et al., 2020) and heighten the mystery. The infringement of maxims of quality in this novel happens when the characters do not provide precise and correct response (Hanifah, 2013). For instance, MacQueen’s tendency to blur the lines between truth and embellishment through emotional outbursts and melodramatic pronouncements (in chapter 8). This constant questioning of truthfulness confuse the reader on whom to trust.

Furthermore, infringement of the maxims has a big impact on character development. The dishonest actions from their alibis, speech patterns, and purposeful withholding of important details by characters to finally reveal the details about their goals, hidden objectives, and different personalities. These phenomena add to the complex character portrayal that enable readers to enjoy the complexities of each person's patterns of behaviour in a greater detail. In a murder mystery novel, breaking speech conventions on deliberately also helps to create surprising plot twists. Maxim infringements in the plot are made possible by the introduction of contradicting or misleading material through the conversations of the characters. These twists make it difficult for the investigator (and the readers also) to see through multiple layers of false information in order to finally find the truth. Grice's maxims provide a valuable theory for understanding how characters in '*The Murder on the Orient Express*' manipulate language to conceal their motives and mislead others" (Culpeper et al., 2017).

This study examines how characters violate various conversational maxims to achieve their goals. For example, characters may deliberately infringe on the Maxim of Relevance by avoiding direct answers or changing the subject, creating a sense of frustration and hindering Poirot's investigation. Similarly, characters may violate the Maxim of Quality by providing misleading or incomplete information, challenging the reader's trust and creating a sense of uncertainty. Moreover, the infringement of conversational maxims plays a crucial role in character development. By analyzing characters' dishonest actions, speech patterns, and purposeful withholding of information, readers can gain a deeper understanding of their motivations, hidden objectives, and personalities. These complexities contribute to the richness of the narrative and enhance the reader's enjoyment.

Next, the role of maxim infringements in character development and plot progression as characters strive to create alibis is to manipulate perceptions, and protect themselves, they frequently violate Grice's conversational maxims. This intentional infringement can be seen as a form of deception, designed to create a sense of intrigue and challenge the reader's understanding of the events. By withholding information, providing misleading statements, or avoiding direct answers, characters contribute to the complexity of the narrative and the overarching mystery.

Lastly, the infringement of conversational maxims plays a role in building the overarching mystery of the narrative. Conflicting statements or deceptive information spoken by the characters create many complexities due to the infringement (Osunbade & Adeniji, 2014), compelling the detective and the readers to find the truth behind the multiple versions of events or statements presented by the characters. Ultimately, the purpose of the characters infringing the conversational maxims intertwines with finding truth and deception within the novel. This shows how language expressions can be manipulated or used to obscure realities to go deeper into themes that play a role on the complexities of the communication and the interplay between truth and lies in a story of a novel.

Conclusion

The analysis of maxim infringement in Agatha Christie's *Murder on the Orient Express* reveals that characters primarily employ this strategy to control the flow of

information, influencing the direction of the investigation and creating a complex mystery. By providing misleading information, redirecting discussions, or withholding pertinent details, characters attempt to shape perceptions, create confusion, and protect themselves or others involved in the case. This strategic use of conversational maxims adds complexity to the mystery and challenges Poirot's investigation. While characters generally adhere to the Maxim of Quantity, providing necessary and relevant information without excessive details, the occasional infringement of this maxim is strategically employed to avoid overwhelming or distracting readers.

The study's findings have implications for understanding the broader communicative strategies used in detective fiction. The deliberate withholding or misdirection of information is a common technique in this genre, used to create suspense, intrigue, and a sense of mystery. By analyzing the specific ways in which characters manipulate conversations, we can gain valuable insights into the author's craft and the underlying strategies employed to engage readers. Future research could explore the broader context of these communicative strategies, including politeness theory, face-threatening acts, and speech acts. Additionally, a narrative analysis of character development based on the staging of conversations could provide further insights into the effectiveness of these strategies in shaping the reader's experience.

Reference

- Culpeper, J., Haugh, M., & Kádár, D. Z. (Eds.). (2017). *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-37508-7>
- Fitriyani, A., Mujiyanto, J., & Suwandi, S. (2020). The impact of Grice maxims infringement in adventure of Tintin towards communication purposes. *English Education Journal*, 10(3), 266–272.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In *Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). Brill. <https://brill.com/downloadpdf/book/edcoll/9789004368811/BP000003.pdf>
- Grice, P. (1989). *In the way of words*. London: Harward University Press. https://static.aminer.cn/upload/pdf/678/631/1450/53e9b124b7602d9703ba6523_0.pdf
- Hanifah, I. R. (2013). Non-observance of maxims in Facebook conversation (a case study in English Education Department). *Passage*, 1(2), 135–144.
- Keenan, E. O. (1976). The universality of conversational postulates. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 67–80.
- Mbisike, R. C. (2021). A Survey of Infringements of Gricean Maxims in Some Precautionary Inscriptions on Medicine Packets. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 3(2), 160–172.
- Osunbade, N., & Adeniji, A. (2014). Information-based Infringements and Implicit Meanings in Conversations in Select Recent Nigerian Novels. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(5), 1.
- Procknow, G. (2019). The Pedagogy of Saneness: Sane-Centricity in Popular Culture as Pedagogy. *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, 31(1), 4–21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nha3.20237>
- Rohmadi, M., Sudaryanto, M., & Ulya, C. (2019). The Infringement of Maxim and the Perspective of School Teachers toward the News in Mass Media. *INCOLWIS 2019: Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Local Wisdom, INCOLWIS 2019, August 29-30, 2019, Padang, West Sumatera, Indonesia*, 268. [https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=YPv6DwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA268&dq=Rohmadi,+M.,+Sudaryanto,+M.,+%26+Ulya,+C.+\(2019,+August\).+The](https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=YPv6DwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA268&dq=Rohmadi,+M.,+Sudaryanto,+M.,+%26+Ulya,+C.+(2019,+August).+The)

- +Infringement+of+Maxim+and+the+Perspective+of+School+Teachers+toward+the
+News+in+Mass+Media.+In+INCOLWIS+2019:+Proceedings+of+the+2nd+Intern
tional+Conference+on+Local+Wisdom,+INCOLWIS+2019,+August+29-
30,+2019,+Padang,+West+Sumatera,+Indonesia+(p.+268).+European+Alliance+for
+Innovation.&ots=hMexBvtvuE&sig=62mIvi6IxnC9lvCb24GRCzZnCuk
- Spradley, J. P. (2016). *Participant observation*. Waveland Press.
[https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=q7DICwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR3&dq=Spradley,+J.+P.+\(1980\).+Participant+Observation&ots=H0dgO_TS19&sig=-dBWqn_HhyboGEqITMurAS4u4_w](https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=q7DICwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR3&dq=Spradley,+J.+P.+(1980).+Participant+Observation&ots=H0dgO_TS19&sig=-dBWqn_HhyboGEqITMurAS4u4_w)
- Thomas, J. A. (2014). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Routledge.
<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315842011/meaning-interaction-jenny-thomas>