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Abstract
The characters in a drama sometimes say implicitly so that what are said are different from what are meant. This study investigates conversational implicature in a drama script entitled “Sherlock Holmes and the Mystery of the Aquilla” by Sid River. The aim of the study was to find out what conversational maxims flouted to generate conversational implicature in the Sid River’s drama script entitled “Sherlock Holmes and the Mystery of the Aquilla” were. The research design employed in this study was a descriptive qualitative research using Grice’s theory. The results of the study showed that from 35 excerpts, 11 excerpts belonged to observing the maxims, and the other 24 excerpts belonged to non-observance of the maxims, especially flouting the maxims. The number of flouting the maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner respectively were 6, 20, 3, 3. Based on the analysis, it can be concluded that the conversational maxims flouted in this drama script are maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. Moreover, flouting the maxim of Quality mostly occurs while the least occurance is flouting the maxims of Relation and Manner. In other words, the characters in this drama script often say untruthful utterances.
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The characters in a drama sometimes say implicitly so that what are said are different from what are meant. This study investigates conversational implicature in a drama script entitled “Sherlock Holmes and the Mystery of the Aquilla” which is written by Sid River. Moreover, the writer is interested to discover conversational implicature in this drama script since in a drama, the characters usually say indirectly and the story about Sherlock Holmes is quite popular. Furthermore, there are five characters in this drama and the writer would like to investigate the conversational implicature which occurs among the characters and some evidences generating the conversational implicature.

There were several studies about conversational implicature which had ever been conducted. One of them was a study relating conversational implicature and English listening comprehension (Wang, 2011). The aim of this study was to improve listening comprehension by introducing Grice’s conversational implicature theory. The findings showed that by understanding the theory, it could help learners better understood the implicated meanings in English listening. Moreover, another study about comprehension of conversational implicature in an Iranian EFL context also found out that learners with different levels of English proficiency differed significantly in their comprehension of implicatures (Samaie, 2018). The other study related to conversational implicature was carried out by Alduais (2012). The objective of his study was to investigate the fact that the theory of conversational implicature proposed by Austin and later on extended by Grice could be universal and could be applied to all languages of the world, especially an idiolect from the Arabic language (Alduais, 2012). The findings showed that Grice’s theory can be applied to other idiolects of non-standard Arabic. Furthermore, the other study related to conversational implicature was a study which had an objective to discover political implicatures (Dijk, 2005). Here, some speeches by Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar in Spanish were examined. The findings of the study revealed that the implicatures had the function to derogate and attack the opposition in the public sphere.
Different from the previous studies, in this study, the writer would like to discover the conversational implicature in a drama script entitled “Sherlock Holmes and the Mystery of the Aquilla” which is written by Sid River.

The theory of conversational implicature came from Grice in which it was written in the article entitled “Logic and Conversation” (Schadeck, Beltrame, & Mirek, 2013). In accordance to implicature, there are several notions about implicature from different proponents. One of them is that implicature is an additional conveyed meaning (Yule, 1996). It is attained when a speaker intends to communicate more than just what the words mean. Implicature is related to the method by which speakers work out the indirect illocutions of utterance. Furthermore, the term “implicature” is used by Grice to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean, as distinguished from what the speaker literally says (Liu, 2012). Grice also classifies implicature into two kinds: conventional implicature and conversational implicature (Mušafá, 2010). Moreover, Birner & Ward state that conversational implicatures are propositions which a speaker conveys without such explicit commitment (Mayora, 2014). In addition, the process whereby an implicature is generated is referred to flouting a maxim (Black, 2006). This is in line with what Grice says, that is, in conversational implicature, a speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim, not with any intention of deceiving or misleading, but because the speaker wishes to prompt the hearer to look for a meaning which is different from, or in addition to, the expressed meaning (Thomas, 2013). In addition, he terms the process by which it is generated “flouting a maxim”. A flout occurs when a speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim at the level of what is said, with the deliberate intention of generating an implicature. Grice’s notion of conversational implicature requires that speaker meaning be calculable on the basis of sentence meaning, and presumptions about the speaker’s adherence to cooperative principles of conversation and the ability of the hearer to work out the speaker’s meaning (Sedivy, 2007). Furthermore, according to Grice’s implicature inference model, the purpose of conveying certain
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In order to explain the mechanisms by which people interpret conversational implicature, Grice introduces four conversational maxims and the Cooperative Principle (CP). According to Grice, the Cooperative Principle runs as follows: “Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (Thomas, 2013, p. 61-62). Moreover, there are four conversational maxims proposed by Grice. Maxims are principles or unstated assumptions people have during verbal interaction (Kondowe, Ngwira, & Madula, 2014). The four conversational maxims proposed by Grice are maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner (Thomas, 2013, p. 63). In terms of Quantity Maxim, the utterance should be as informative as required and should not be more informative than is required. Maxim of Quality insists the utterance not to lack adequate evidence. In addition, in terms of Relation Maxim, the utterance should be relevant. Moreover, in terms of Manner Maxim, the utterance spoken should be clear, unambiguous, brief and in order.

In line with the definitions of conversational maxims, Grundy also has some notions about them. According to him, maxim quality can be defined as truthful as required (Grundy, 2000). In addition, maxim of relation is fulfilled when the speaker give information that is relevant to the topic proceeding.

Based on the notions about conversational maxims above, it can be said that maxim of quantity deals with the amount of the given information, whether it is quite informative or more informative than is required.
Moreover, maxim of quality is related to whether it is truthful or not. In addition, maxim of relation deals with whether the conveyed information is relevant or not out of the topic. Furthermore, maxim of manner is related to whether the information given is quite clear (unambiguous) or otherwise.

Conversational implicature is generated by flouting a maxim. However, flouting a maxim is just one kind of non-observance of the maxims. The other kinds of non-observance of the maxims are violating a maxim, infringing a maxim, opting out of a maxim, and suspending maxim (Grice in Thomas, 2013).

Based on the background of the study and the literature review, the research question of this study is as follows: What are the conversational maxims flouted to generate conversational implicature in the Sid River’s drama script entitled “Sherlock Holmes and the Mystery of the Aquilla”?

In accordance to the research question above, the objective of the study is, thus, to find out what conversational maxims flouted to generate conversational implicature in the Sid River’s drama script entitled “Sherlock Holmes and the Mystery of the Aquilla” are.

**METHOD**

**Research Design**

The research design used in this study was a descriptive qualitative research. Here, the writer used several interrelated utterances or dialogues in the drama script written by Sid River entitled “Sherlock Holmes and the Mystery of the Aquilla”. The utterances are described and analyzed.

**Data analysis**

In analyzing the data, the writer classified the interrelated dialogues into several excerpts at first. Afterwards, the writer analyzed each excerpt using Grice’s theory about conversational implicature especially about flouting maxims. Here, the writer investigated whether there were maxims which were flouted and the types of maxims flouted. After all of the excerpts were analyzed, the writer presented the results of the analysis or made a
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description of the results of the analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The drama script entitled “Sherlock Holmes and the Mystery of the Aquilla” told about an investigation to seek the lost diamond. The owner of the diamond was Lady Aquilla. The investigation was done by a detective namely Sherlock Holmes helped by his friend, Doctor Watson. In addition, there were five characters. They were Sherlock Holmes, Doctor Watson, Lady Aquilla, Gertrude L’Escargo/ Cook, and Crumpton (the butler). The results of the analysis were presented below.

Findings

In analyzing the drama script, the writer divided it into 35 excerpts. The analysis was done using Grice’s theory about Conversational Implicature. The results of the conversational implicature analysis could be depicted through Table 1.

Table 1. The Number of Observing the Maxims and Non-observance of the Maxims

| Observing the maxims | Non-observance of the maxims | The Number of Flouting the maxims (Non-observance of the Maxims) |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11 excerpts          | 24 excerpts                 | Quantity  | Quality  | Relation | Manner  |
|                      |                             | 6 flouts   | 20 flouts | 3 flouts | 3 flouts |

From Table 1, it could be seen that not all of the excerpts observed the conversational maxims (maxim of Quantity, maxim of Quality, maxim of Relation, and maxim of Manner). Eleven excerpts observed (followed) the maxims while the other 24 excerpts didn’t observe the maxims. In other words, the percentage of the observing the maxims was around 31% while the non-observance of the maxims was 69%. Thus, it could be drawn that most of the excerpts didn’t observe the maxims.
Observing the Maxims

The further details of the excerpts which observed the maxims were explained below.

First Excerpt

Holmes : Get that would you Watson.
Watson : Certainly Holmes (goes to the door, opens it, in bursts a woman in very expensive riding gear, boots and a riding hat perched on top of a large nest-like hairdo) Goodness me!

In this conversation, there was no maxim which was flouted. All of the utterances fulfilled the maxims. For example, Watson followed the maxim of quantity in which he didn’t give more or less information than the situation required. Moreover, dealing with the maxim of relation, Watson didn’t flout the maxim of relation because his response was relevant to the Holmes’ order.

Fifth Excerpt

Lady Aquilla: But my name! And about the diamond.

Holmes : Quite straight forward! You have a ridiculously expensive hairdo covered by an extremely sad hat, and your picture is in tonight’s paper under the headline “Famous Aquilla diamond stolen from Lady Aquilla”. It is this that has brought you in such a fervour and so quickly to 221b Baker St!
Watson : Marvellous! I told you he was a smarty pants! Good show Holmes!

In this excerpt, there was no maxim which was flouted. Holmes’ answer followed the four maxims (quality, quantity, relation, and manner). He answered based on the evidence and it’s truthful. He also didn’t give more or less information. In addition, his answer was relevant to the topic, clear and unambiguous.
Sixth Excerpt
Lady Aquilla: Yes, Yes! Very clever! But can you help me?

Holmes: Lady Aquilla, I would only be too pleased to help you. Let us make our way directly to the scene of the crime! Come Watson, the game is afoot!

In this conversation, there was no maxim which had been flouted. The answer from Holmes was relevant to the question and he didn’t give more or less information.

Eleventh Excerpt
Holmes: And someone, in the meantime, had polished off the diamond!
Watson: (laughs) Oh very good Holmes, very good.

Lady Aquilla: This is a very serious matter Dr Watson. Why that diamond has been handed down from generation to generation of Aquilla’s It was only the other day that I was saying....

There was no maxim which was flouted in this conversation. Watson gave a compliment to Holmes and it was relevant to the Holmes’ utterance. Moreover, what was said by Lady Aquilla was also relevant to the topic.

Thirteenth Excerpt
Holmes: No idiot! On the carpet.
Watson: Goodness me! It’s a footprint in the shape of a boot!

Holmes: Yes! And a strange yellow footprint at that. Notice that it is quite small and more pointed at the front and, if I’m not mistaken, has been repaired at least 3 times in the last year. (leans down and sniffs the footprint) Hmm.

In this conversation, there was no maxim which was flouted. Both Watson and Holmes’ utterances followed the maxims.
Seventeenth Excerpt
Watson : Well Holmes, at least we know one thing.
Holmes : What’s that Watson?
Watson : (smugly) The butler didn’t do it!
Holmes : I’m not so sure Watson.

In this excerpt, there was no maxim which was flouted. Both Watson and Holmes followed the maxims (maxim of quality, quantity, relation, and manner).

Twenty Second Excerpt
Lady Aquilla: (sounding hysterical) Something wrong! We can’t serve that to guests! It looks like it’s been carved with a wood axe! Take it away this instant!
Cook : Yes madam, I’ll remove it directly!

In this conversation, there was no maxim which was flouted since it followed the maxims in cooperative principle.

Twenty Third Excerpt
Holmes : (Leaping up and placing his hand on the meat dish as cookie tries to remove it) Not so fast Cookie! Watson, stand by the door if you please. Perhaps Lady Aquilla, I can shed some light on the matter.
Watson : I wish you would Holmes, it’s rather dark in here!

In this conversation, there was no maxim which was flouted. Both Holmes and Watson followed the maxims.

Twenty Eighth Excerpt
Watson : Goodness me Holmes!
Holmes : Watson, your service revolver!
Garlic Gertie : Ok! Ok! Take me alive! I surrender!

In this conversation, there was no maxim which was flouted. The utterances followed the maxims in cooperative principle.

Twenty Ninth Excerpt
Lady Aquilla: Goodness me Mr Holmes, this is just too much to believe. Are you saying that Cookie here is responsible for the murder of Crumpton and the theft of the diamond?
Holmes : I certainly am Madam.

In this excerpt, there was no maxim which was flouted. The utterances followed the maxims in cooperative principle.

Thirty First Excerpt
Watson : All that remains then Holmes, is for her to tell us where she hid the diamond.
Holmes : Ah Watson, sadly that is the one thing that she cannot tell us. For up until now only one person knew the hiding place of the Aquilla diamond and he, unfortunately, lies dead in the library.

In this conversation, all of the utterances followed the maxims in cooperative principle. Thus, there was no maxim which was flouted.

Non-observance of the maxims

The type of non-observance of the maxims found in this drama script was flouting the maxims. It meant that this drama script contained conversational implicature. From 24 excerpts, there were 32 flouts. The thirty two flouts were classified into four categories. They were as follows:

1. Flouting the maxim of Quantity

The number of flouting the maxim of Quantity was 6 flouts. These flouts occurred when the characters in the drama gave less or more information than the situation required in their conversation. The examples of this kind of flout were shown below.
Third Excerpt
Lady Aquilla: And who might you be Sir!

Holmes : (getting up and turning round) I, Madame, might be Mr Sherlock Holmes. In fact, I definitely was the last time I looked! And you, you are Lady Henrietta Aquilla of Porkington. You have rushed here, directly from riding in the hunt to ask me to recover the famous Aquilla Diamond which was, two days ago, stolen from your country house!

Watson : Goodness me! Jolly good show Holmes!

In this conversation, a maxim of quantity had been flouted in which it was depicted by Holmes’ answer towards Lady Aquilla’s question. Lady Aquilla asked who Holmes was (she didn’t know that the person whom she asked was Holmes). However, Holmes gave more information than what was asked. Beside saying that he was Holmes, he also said something else.

Fourth Excerpt
Lady Aquilla: (astonished) How on earth did you know all that Mr Holmes? I haven’t breathed a word to anyone!

Watson : It’s just a talent that he has. But I’d like to know anyway.

Holmes : Elementary, my dear Watson, elementary. First, the knock on the door. Too loud for a hand, but not for the ornate silver riding crop that her Ladyship is holding. As for coming straight from the hunt, well, leather riding boots, fresh mud, and the unmistakable smell of horse manure, simple really.

In this conversation, a maxim of quantity had been flouted. Holmes gave less information than the situation required. Holmes only addressed Watson (Lady Aquilla wasn’t mentioned) when he answered the question whereas actually the answer was addressed to both Watson and Lady Aquilla.
Tenth Excerpt
Holmes : Lady Aquilla, when was the theft discovered?
Lady Aquilla: At about 4:00pm two days ago. The maid Florence noticed it when she came to polish the silver.

In this conversation, Lady Aquilla had flouted the maxim of quantity. She gave more information than the question required. The question was about when the theft was discovered, but she elaborated her answer by saying “The maid Florence noticed it when she came to polish the silver”.

Fifteenth Excerpt
Watson : Why, yes! What on Earth is it?
Holmes : Garlic Watson! The overpowering smell of fresh garlic! (turns to Lady Aquilla) I would like to speak to the maid if you please.

Lady Aquilla: Certainly. I’ll send for her at once.

In this conversation, Lady Aquilla had flouted the maxim of quantity. She gave more information than the situation demanded. Actually, the answer “certainly” was enough, but then she added “I’ll send for her at once”.

Eighteenth Excerpt
Holmes : Lady Aquilla, all this criminal activity is making me quite hungry. Is there any chance that you could lay on a Roast turkey dinner for us?
Lady Aquilla: Now? But shouldn’t we call the police or something?
Holmes : Just trust me on this one Madam, just trust me.

In this conversation, Lady Aquilla had flouted the maxim of quantity in which she didn’t give answer whether she could serve dinner for Holmes and Watson.
Twenty Fourth Excerpt
Holmes : (Ignoring Watson) Now, Cookie. Could you please tell us all just what exactly, did you use to carve the joint?

Cook : (nervously) Why, a carvin’ knife o’course!

In this excerpt, the cook had flouted the maxim of quantity. She gave more information by adding “why” before she answered “a carvin’ knife o’course”. The required answer was actually only “a carvin’ knife o’course”.

2. Flouting the maxim of Quality

The number flouting the maxim of Quality was 20 flouts. This was the highest among the other kinds of flouts. These flouts occurred when the characters didn’t give truthful information or enough evidence. The examples of this kind of flout were shown below.

Fourth Excerpt
Lady Aquilla: (astonished) How on earth did you know all that Mr Holmes? I haven’t breathed a word to anyone!

Watson : It’s just a talent that he has. But I’d like to know anyway.

Holmes : Elementary, my dear Watson, elementary. First, the knock on the door. Too loud for a hand, but not for the ornate silver riding crop that her Ladyship is holding. As for coming straight from the hunt, well, leather riding boots, fresh mud, and the unmistakable smell of horse manure, simple really.

In this conversation, a maxim of quality had been flouted by Lady Aquilla. Her utterance “I haven’t breathed a word to anyone!” has an untrue meaning or an implied meaning, that was, she hadn’t told to anyone about the case. Another maxim quality which had been flouted was done by Holmes. His word “elementary” didn’t mean “basic”, but “easy”.
Seventh Excerpt
Watson : I thought the game was chess Holmes?
Holmes : (sighs and sounds impatient) Watson, just call me a cab.

In this conversation, both Watson and Holmes had flouted the maxim of quality. There were implied meanings behind their words (“chess” and “cab”).

Ninth Excerpt
Lady Aquilla: This is where the diamond was kept Holmes, in this glass display cabinet.
Watson : Goodness me, it’s been smashed Holmes!
Holmes : (mockingly) Well done Watson, very astute. How on earth did you work that out with all this broken glass in the way!
Watson : (extremely pleased with himself) Well, just a good guess really!

In this conversation, there was a maxim which had been flouted, that was, maxim of quality. In this case, Watson just gave a guess without further evidence (his words were untruthful).

Eighteenth Excerpt
Holmes : Lady Aquilla, all this criminal activity is making me quite hungry. Is there any chance that you could lay on a Roast turkey dinner for us?
Lady Aquilla: Now? But shouldn’t we call the police or something?
Holmes : Just trust me on this one Madam, just trust me.

In this conversation, Holmes flouted the maxim of quality. His utterance “Just trust me on this one Madam, just trust me” contained untruth meaning. There was an implied meaning behind that utterance, that was, they shouldn’t call the police.
Nineteenth Excerpt
Lady Aquilla: I must apologise gentlemen for the very sparse service. The only member of staff that we have left is the cook and I’m afraid that she is best left in the kitchen!

Holmes: Don’t you worry Lady Aquilla. Watson here is an Ex Indian Army man, he won’t mind roughing it for Sunday dinner. Besides, I am most interested to meet Cookie. Ah here is the good lady herself!

In this excerpt, Holmes had flouted the maxim of quality. Here, he accepted Lady Aquilla’s apology but he gave a little bit insinuation. In this case, he gave untrue response.

Twentieth Excerpt
Cook: (sounding old and servile) I’m so sorry it’s a bit late your Ladyship, but has we’re so short staffed down below, I’ve ‘ad to do everything myself, an’ when you get to my age madam you don’t want to be running round a field after a distraught Turkey with a large chopper!

Watson: (jumping up in amazement) You mean the turkey was armed!

Holmes: Sit down Watson! Shall we begin? Allow me to reveal this evenings savoury delights!

In this conversation, the cook had flouted the maxim of quality since she gave untrue words like “you don’t want to be running round a field after a distraught Turkey with a large chopper”. The implied meaning of this utterance might be: It wasn’t easy to serve the dish and if the Lady Aquilla became the cook, she would get difficulty to prepare the dish. Moreover, Holmes also had flouted the maxim of quality in which he gave untrue response. There was an implied meaning behind his words “Allow me to reveal this evenings savoury delights”.
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Twenty First Excerpt
Lady Aquilla: (gasps and stands) Cookie, what on earth happened to the turkey! It looks like it’s been savaged by wild wombats!
Cook: (looking distressed) I... don’t know what you mean madam? I... Is there something wrong?

In this conversation, the cook had flouted the maxim of quality since she didn’t give a truthful response. It seemed that she concealed something.

Twenty Fifth Excerpt
Holmes: Would it be a carving knife similar to... THIS ONE... perchance! (Holmes whips out knife and bangs it on the table.)
Cook: (getting agitated) I... I... suppose so, yes!

A maxim of quality had been flouted here. It was shown by the response from the cook which contained the word “suppose”. By the use of this word, it seemed that she was not sure. In other words, she didn’t give the truthful response.

Twenty Sixth Excerpt
Holmes: (pointing his finger upwards as though a solicitor in court) Impossible! Because this was the very knife used to stab Crumpton, the butler!
Cook: It... It must have been another one, I was mistaken!

In this conversation, the cook had flouted the maxim of quality in which her response was not truthful. It seemed that she concealed something.

Twenty Seventh Excerpt
Holmes: (Still gesturing) Impossible again! Just before dinner your Ladyship, I took the liberty of checking the kitchen for another carving knife, and I found NONE! What do you say to that Cookie! (Holmes walks up to Cook) Or should I say (pulls off her hat and wig) MADAME GERTRUDE L’ESCAGO. Otherwise known... as ‘Garlic Gertie’ of Burgundy!
Garlic Gertie : (French accent) Oh no! I am undone! You’ll never take me alive!

In this conversation, Garlic Gertie (the cook) had flouted the maxim of quality. She gave an untrue response by saying “You’ll never take me alive!” Her utterance had an implied meaning, that was, she was worried if she would be killed.

Thirtieth Excerpt
Lady Aquilla: But how on Earth did you see through it all?
Holmes : Elementary Your Ladyship. You see, the “modus operandi” of Garlic Gertie is known across the whole of Europe! I recognised it and was on to her from the very beginning. The smashed display cabinet; a cook who cannot carve a Sunday joint and who leaves footprints made by spilled custard powder; and of course, that tell tale smell of fresh garlic! It all added up to only one thing, Gertrude L’Escago! A fiendishly clever plot though!
Cook : Yes, and if it hadn’t been for you meddling kids I’d ‘ave gotten away with it!

In this conversation, Holmes and the cook had flouted the maxim of quality. Holmes said a word which had an untrue meaning, that was, “elementary”. Elementary here didn’t mean “basic”, but “easy”. Meanwhile, the cook said an utterance which had an untrue meaning, that was, “if it hadn’t been for you meddling kids I’d ‘ave gotten away with it!”. The implied meaning behind this utterance was that if Holmes didn’t involve in this investigation, she wouldn’t be arrested or she would be free.

Thirty Second Excerpt
Watson : Crumpton! The butler did do it after all!
Lady Aquilla: Surely you must be wrong!
Holmes : I’m not wrong, and please don’t call me Shirley! Crumpton
had the misfortune to see Gertie take the diamond in the first place and thought that he could have it for himself. He stole it from her, hid it quickly but then paid the price when he would not give up the hiding place.

There was a maxim of quality which had been flouted here. Holmes’ utterance “but then paid the price when he would not give up the hiding place” had an untrue meaning. The implied meaning was that when Gertie (the cook) knew that Crumpton had stolen the diamond from her, Crumpton was killed by Gertie.

Thirty Third Excerpt
Lady Aquilla : So what your saying Mr Holmes is that we are still no further on than when we started!
Watson : She’s right Holmes, you can’t deny her that!

In this conversation, both Lady Aquilla and Watson had flouted the maxim of quality. Their utterances contained untrue meanings. The implied meaning of Lady Aquilla’s utterance “we are still no further on than when we started” was that the investigation was useless since the diamond couldn’t be found although they had already known who had stolen it. Moreover, there was an implied meaning behind Watson’s utterance “you can’t deny her that”, that was, what she said was right.

Thirty Fourth Excerpt
Holmes : There is only one thing Watson, that I cannot deny Lady Aquilla, and that . . . is a celebratory drink.
Lady Aquilla : But Mr Holmes, what could there possibly be to celebrate?
Holmes : Only two things, your Ladyship. Firstly, that the great Sherlock Holmes has once again successfully resolved a baffling case and, secondly . . . (Holmes holds up the decanter stopper and slowly hands it to Lady Aquilla as he speaks) . . . the recovery of the . . . beautiful...Aquilla . . . DIAMOND!
In this excerpt, Holmes had flouted the maxim of quality two times. First, when he said “that I cannot deny Lady Aquilla”, there was an implied meaning behind those words, that was, that he agreed with Lady Aquilla. Second, his utterance “the recovery of the .... beautiful...Aquilla... DIAMOND!”, also contained an untrue meaning or an implied meaning, that was, a happiness for Aquilla since the diamond had finally been found.

Thirty Fifth Excerpt

*Watson* : By Jove Holmes, how ever do you do it?

*Holmes* : Ah, Elementary my dear Watson, Elementary!

In this conversation, Holmes had flouted the maxim of quality since he said a word which had an untruthful meaning, that was, when he said “elementary”. Elementary here didn’t mean “basic”, but had an implied meaning, that was, “easy”.

3. Flouting the maxim of Relation

Flouting the maxim of Relation only happened 3 times. These flouts occurred when the utterances from the characters were irrelevant with the topic. The examples of this kind of flout were shown below.

Twelfth Excerpt

*Holmes* : (Holmes walks to the front of the stage) Over here Watson! What do you make of this? (points to something on the floor)

*Watson* : (excitedly) Why, it’s a carpet Holmes!

A maxim of relation had been flouted in this conversation. It was shown by the word “why” said by Watson. This word was irrelevant to the question being asked.
Fourteenth Excerpt
Watson : What is it Holmes, another clue?
Holmes : Can you smell anything Watson? Apart from Lady Aquilla’s boots that is?

A maxim of relation had been flouted here. Watson asked Holmes whether there was another clue, but Holmes’ answer was irrelevant to the question. He preferred to asking a question to Watson instead of answering Watson’s question.

Sixteenth Excerpt
Watson : (urgently) Is he dead Holmes?
Holmes : (sarcastically) I’d say that was a fairly safe bet Watson. Hmm! An interesting weapon.

In this conversation, Holmes had flouted the maxim of relation. Holmes’ answer was irrelevant to the Watson’s question.

4. Flouting the maxim of Manner
The number of flouting the maxim of Manner was 3 flouts. These flouts occurred when the characters in the drama gave unclear, ambiguous, and convoluted utterances. The examples of this kind of flout were shown below.

Second Excerpt
Lady Aquilla: Mr Holmes (addressing Watson) I need to speak with you immediately! It is of the utmost importance!
Watson : Well I never.... Goodness me!
Holmes : (coolly, without turning round) And Mr Sherlock Holmes will speak to you when he decides that he is good and ready!

Here, Lady Aquilla wanted to speak to Holmes, but she addressed Watson since she presumed that the one who was in front of her was Holmes.
In this conversation, Watson had flouted the maxim of manner since he responded unclearly or convoluted. Actually, he could simply say: “I’m not Mr. Holmes” rather than made other utterance that demanded Lady Aquilla implied the meaning behind his words. Furthermore, Holmes had flouted the maxim of manner, too. He gave an ambiguous answer to Lady Aquilla. By his answer, perhaps Lady Aquilla didn’t know exactly which one Mr. Holmes was. Actually, Holmes could simply say: “I am Mr. Holmes”. Moreover, the utterance “And Mr Sherlock Holmes will speak to you when he decides that he is good and ready!” also had another ambiguous meaning, that was, Lady Aquilla wouldn’t know the exact time to speak to Holmes.

Eighth Excerpt
Watson : Righty-ho. You’re a cab Holmes.
Holmes : Doh! You just can’t get the staff nowadays!

In this excerpt, Holmes had flouted the maxim of manner since he didn’t give clear response (he gave an ambiguous response) towards Watson’s utterance. In other words, Watson should guess what was meant by Holmes.

Discussion
The results of the analysis showed that the drama script contained conversational implicature since there was flouting the maxims. It was in line with what was revealed by Grice, that was, in conversational implicature, a speaker blatantly failed to observe a maxim (Thomas, 2013). Moreover, the kinds of flouting the maxims were flouting the maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. Flouting the maxim of Quality got the highest number, that was around 62.5%. Flouting the maxim of Quality mostly occurred because some characters in the drama script liked to say utterances that contained implied meanings (untruthful meanings). These flouts could be exemplified by the insinuation done by a character to another character or by some guesses proving that the characters were not sure with what they said.
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Meanwhile, the lowest number (around 9.375%) belonged to flouting the maxims of Relation and Manner. Flouting the maxims of Relation and Manner rarely occurred because most of the utterances were relevant one another and most of the characters could give clear and unambiguous utterances.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the results of the analysis, it can be concluded that conversational maxims flouted to generate conversational implicature in the Sid River’s drama script entitled “Sherlock Holmes and the Mystery of the Aquilla” are maxims of Quantity, maxim of Quality, maxim of Relation, and maxim of Manner. Moreover, from those four kinds of maxims, flouting the maxim of Quality mostly occurs in the drama script while the least occurrence is flouting the maxims of Relation and Manner. In other words, the characters in this drama script often say untruthful utterances.
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