CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter consists of the analysis of the violation of tact and generosity maxim. The data are divided into four classifications, tact maxim violation, generosity maxim violation, generosity maxim violation with tact maxim, and both generosity maxim and tact maxim violation.

4.1 Tact Maxim Violation

Tact maxim requires oneself to maximize the benefit and minimize the cost for other. If, the rules are not followed by oneself, it is considered as violation of the tact maxim.

Data 1

Speaker: Jay Gatsby. He has Klipspringer works for him.

Listener: Klipspringer. He works for Gatsby as a piano player in Gatsby's residence.

Location: Jay Gatsby's Residence

> When Klipspringer had played THE LOVE NEST. he turned around on the bench and searched unhappily for Gatsby in the gloom.
> *"I'm all out of practice, you see. I told you I couldn't play. I'm all out of*

prac----"
"Don't talk so much, old sport," commanded Gatsby. *"Play!"*
(1923: 123)

Analysis

The speaker, Jay Gatsby, commanded the piano player who works for him to stop talking. In doing so, he uttered "*Don't talk so much, old sport!"* This utterance is categorized as an impositive since its purpose is to make the listener refrain from doing something. Therefore, as it is an impositive utterance, this utterance has fulfilled the criteria of tact or generosity maxim which requires an utterance to be either impositive or commissive.

Before Jay Gatsby uttered this utterance, he had previously asked the listener, Klipspringer, to play the piano for him. Even though Klipspringer insisted that he had not played for a while and only could hardly play, he played the piano anyway. After playing one song, Klipspringer informed Gatsby that he could not play because he was all out of practice. Nevertheless, when Klipspringer was giving his complaint, Gatsby immediately responded to him by saying *"Don't talk so much, old sport!"* Gatsby's respond shows the intention that he wants the listener to stop talking. As a result, his utterance has an intention to make the listener refrain from doing something which is, in this case, to stop talking.

As the intention has been discovered, the implicature of this utterance can also now be discovered. After playing one song, Klipspringer gave a complaint to Gatsby: *"I'm all out of practice, you see. I told you I couldn't play. I'm all out of*

prac----" However, before he could finish his complaint, Gatsby immediately replied *"Don't talk so much, old sport."* From Gatsby's reply, it can be seen that he does not want to listen about the listener's complaint and does not want to know what the listener feels. For that reason, the implicature of this utterance is that the speaker does not have a desire to listen to the listener's objections. In short, the speaker does not intend to give benefits to the listener.

As the speaker intends not to listen to the listener's complaints, he has maximized the cost and minimized the benefits for the listener. The cost is that the listener has to keep playing the piano without his complaints of having difficulty in playing being heard or taken care of. The listener also could not resist as he held no power over Gatsby because the listener worked for him and moreover, the event happened in Gatsby's residence which can be considered as the working place of the listener. This is proven by the action Klipspringer did after Gatsby uttered the utterance, which was continuing playing songs. The benefit that has not been given to the listener is that the listener's desire to stop playing. As a result, this utterance uttered by Gatsby is categorized as tact maxim violation.

Data 2

Speaker: Nick Carraway. He knows who the listener is as they have met previously at Gatsby's residence when the listener was still working for Gatsby.
Listener: Klipspringer. He knows who the speaker is as they have met when he was still working for Gatsby.

Location: Gatsby's residence

> *"The funeral's to-morrow,"* I said. ***"Three o'clock, here at the house. I wish you'd tell anybody who'd be interested."***
> *"Oh, I will,"* he broke out hastily. *"Of course I'm not likely to see anybody, but if I do."*
> (1923: 213)

Analysis

The speaker uttered *"I wish you'd tell anybody who'd be interested (to come to the funeral)"* It means that the speaker hoped the listener to tell people to come to Gatsby's funeral. However, in asking the favor, the speaker uttered the command indirectly. Nonetheless, as the utterance requires the listener to do something, this utterance is categorized as impositive. As a result, this utterance has fulfilled the criteria of tact or generosity maxim which requires an utterance to be either impositive or commissive.

Gatsby has passed away and there was a funeral of him about to be held. The speaker, Nick, was having a phone call with Klipspringer who was Gatsby's private piano player back in the days. Nick informed Klipspringer that the funeral was going to be held on the following day. After informing him, he added *"I wish you'd tell anybody who'd be interested."* It was an indirect request to the listener made by Nick. The result of the action Nick desired was that there would be more people who were interested in attending Gatsby's funeral coming. As a

consequence, the speaker intended to ask a favor to the listener for the goal he desired to fulfill.

As the speaker's intention has been revealed, the implicature of this utterance can also now be discovered. As previously explained, the aim of the action the speaker requested the listener to do was to make more people come to Gatsby's funeral. Therefore, this utterance implicates that the speaker wanted the listener to do something which to tell anybody who would be interested in coming to the funeral so that this funeral of Gatsby would be visited by more guests.

This utterance requires the listener to do an action. The action itself would not benefit the listener for the result of it was not for the listener but for the funeral. Furthermore, this action would only cost the listener as he was required to do something. The speaker, on the other hand, would not get any benefit nor the cost from the result of the action he demands. However, though it would not benefit and just cost him, the listener did not resist the request to do the action. He committed to do it by saying *"I will."* The reason is assumed to be because of previous relationship between the listener and Gatsby. Nevertheless, though it was not resisted, Nick's utterance has violated tact maxim as it would maximize the cost and minimize the benefit for the listener.

Data 3

Speaker: Stella. She is someone who works for Mr. Wolfshiem as his representative. She does not know who Nick is.

Listener: Nick Carraway. A guest in the Mr. Wolfshiem's residence where he is confronted by Stella.

Location: Mr. Wolfshiem's Residence

> *"Please say that Mr. Carraway wants to see him."*
> *"I can't get him back from Chicago, can I?"*
>
> At this moment a voice, unmistakably Wolfshiem's, called *"Stella!"* from the other side of the door.
>
> ***"Leave your name on the desk,"*** she said quickly. *"I'll give it to him when he gets back."*
> *"But I know he's there."*
>
> She took a step toward me and began to slide her hands indignantly up and down her hips.
> (1923: 216)

Analysis

After being asked to do something by Nick, Stella as the speaker asked Nick to do something. She utters *"Leave your name on the desk."* The utterance means that the listener is required to take an action—putting his name on the desk. Therefore, as the utterance requires the listener to do something, this utterance is categorized as impositive. Accordingly, this utterance has fulfilled the criteria of tact or generosity maxim which requires an utterance to be either impositive or commissive.

Nick came to see Mr. Wolfshiem. Stella as the one who showed up was asked by Nick to get Mr. Wolfshiem. Nevertheless, instead of following Nick's

order, she refused and informed Nick that Mr. Wolfshiem was in Chicago even though Nick knew that Mr. Wolfshiem was there. Subsequently, she just asked Nick, which in this case has the role as the listener, to leave his name on the desk informing that it would be given to Mr. Wolfshiem when he returned. Therefore, as she gave a command to the listener, her intention in uttering this utterance is that she wanted the listener to do as she desired in order to obtain something she wanted.

As the intention of the speaker in uttering the utterance has been discovered, the implicature of this utterance can now also be obtained. Stella was hiding Mr. Wolfshiem from Nick even though Nick was aware of it. Stella was called to come inside by somebody who was likely to be Mr. Wolfshiem. She then immediately asked Nick to leave his name on the desk, promising it would be given to Mr. Wolfshiem. As the context of this event occurs, this utterance has the implicature that the speaker wants the listener to follow her command so that the listener will not meet with Mr. Wolfshiem at that very time.

Based on the speaker's intention, the violation occurs in this utterance can now be determined. The speaker intended to not give benefit to the listener as she did not want Nick to meet Mr. Wolfshiem. Then, she gave cost to the listener as she made Nick to take an action which required Nick to write his name and left it on a table. However, the order was not followed by Nick and he mentioned the name Gatsby, who just passed away, which made the speaker changed her mind. So, his relationship with Gatsby made him able to resist the action the speaker intended him to do. Nonetheless, though it was resisted, the utterance uttered by the speaker

violates tact maxim. It is because the speaker has minimized the benefit and maximized the cost of the listener.

4.2 Generosity Maxim Violation

Generosity maxim requires oneself to minimize benefit and maximize cost for himself. Therefore, if the rules are not followed, it will be considered as a violation.

Data 4

Speaker: Daisy Buchanan. She is Nick's cousin, a close friend to Jordan, and a wife to Tom.

Listeners: Nick Carraway, Jordan Baker, and Tom.

Location: Tom and Daisy's residence

> Before I could answer her eyes fastened with an awed expression on her little finger.
> ***"Look (at this finger)!"*** she complained; *"I hurt it."*
> We all looked--the knuckle was black and blue.
> *"You did it, Tom,"* she said accusingly. *"I know you didn't mean to, but you DID do it. That's what I get for marrying a brute of a man, a great, big, hulking physical specimen of a----"*
> (1923: 21)

Analysis

The speaker, Daisy, uttered to the listeners, Nick and Jordan, *"Look (at this finger)!"* It means that she wanted the listeners to do an action—looking at her

bruised finger. As it requires the listeners to do something, this utterance is categorized as impositive. Therefore, this utterance has fulfilled the criteria of tact or generosity maxim which requires an utterance to be either impositive or commissive.

Daisy complained about her bruised finger to the listeners. In doing so, she uttered *"Look (at this finger)!"* This utterance requires the listeners to do something—which is taking a look at her finger. She later explained that it was because of something Tom did. However, there was an intention as to why she brought this up by firstly commanding the listeners to look at her finger. Then, she later added *"I hurt it"* and blamed Tom for it. So, it seems that she wanted the listeners to acknowledge her pain as she felt hurt and the one who caused it. As a result, her intention in uttering this utterance was to make the listeners take an action as she desired.

It has been revealed that Daisy felt hurt and told people to look at her bruised finger. So, the implicature of this utterance can now be identified. She, complaining about her bruised hand, wanted the people to acknowledge her pain and the person who causes the damage. Therefore, the implicature of this utterance is that the speaker wanted the listeners to do something in order for her to fulfill her desired intention which is that the listeners would recognize the pain she is currently having and the person who causes it.

Based on the speaker's intention, the kind of maxim violation of this utterance can now be determined. The speaker demanded the listeners to do

something and the aim of it was to make them aware of her pain. So, in uttering this utterance, she is most likely to demand sympathy from the listeners hence a benefit. In addition, she does not want to keep it to herself which makes her get no cost. Besides only looking at her bruised finger, the listeners did not do anything afterwards nor resisted the request. Nonetheless, the speaker has maximized the benefit and minimized the cost for herself. Thereby, she has violated generosity maxim as it requires the speaker to minimize the benefit and maximize the cost for herself.

4.3 Generosity Maxim Violation with Tact Maxim

The rules of generosity maxim is that oneself should minimize benefit and maximize cost for himself. On the other hand, tact maxim requires oneself to maximize benefit and minimize cost for other. If a speaker uttered an utterance that did not follow the rules of either one of them, it would be considered as violation. However, if one violated generosity maxim but followed tact maxim at the same time, it would benefit both parties, the speaker and listener.

Data 5

Speaker: Tom Buchanan. He is Myrtle's secret affair.
Listener: Myrtle Wilson. She is George's wife and Tom's secret affair.
Location: George Wilson's Residence

> A white ashen dust veiled his dark suit and his pale hair as it veiled everything in the vicinity — except his wife, who moved close to Tom.

> *"I want to see you,"* said Tom intently. ***"(You) get on the next train."***
>
> *"All right."*
>
> *"I'll meet you by the news-stand on the lower level."* She nodded and moved away from him just as George Wilson emerged with two chairs from his office door.
>
> (1923: 38)

Analysis

The speaker that is, in this case, Tom Buchanan asked the listener that is, in this case, Myrtle Wilson to do something. In doing so, he uttered *"get on the next train".* As it requires the listener to do something, the utterance is categorized as impositive. Therefore, this utterance has fulfilled the criteria of tact and generosity maxim which requires an utterance to be either impositive or commissive.

The context surrounding this utterance is that both Tom and Myrtle were married people and they were in secret relationship. In this particular occasion, they met in one circumstance that did not allow them to have time alone for themselves because they met at the place where Myrtle lived which also where her husband lived. Therefore, Tom asked Myrtle to meet him later by saying *"I want to see you, get on the next train."* It indicates that Tom wanted something which is having a meeting with Myrtle afterwards. Therefore, his intention in saying the utterance has now been revealed—he asked something to Myrtle to get what he wants.

From the context above and the intention Tom has, the implicature of the utterance can be obtained. The speaker not only asked the listener to get on the train

for nothing but he also wanted to get something from it. In this case, what the speaker really wanted in uttering the utterance to the listener is that he wanted her to follow his order as he would get benefit from it. Thus, the utterance implicates the speaker wants to meet the listener somewhere later in the attempts to fulfill his desired expectation which has not been known so far.

Based on the intention above, in uttering this utterance, the speaker expects to obtain benefits from it. The benefit itself is that he would get the opportunity to have a meeting with his affair. He also expects no cost as there is no indication of him taking her right away which in other way would make him get more costs if Myrtle's husband was aware of the situation. For that reason, the speaker has maximized the benefits and minimized the cost for himself which is the opposite of the rules in generosity maxim. As a result, this utterance is categorized as a violation of generosity maxim.

However, as the listener would also get benefits if she followed the speaker's order, which was meeting her affair someplace else later, this utterance also follows the rules of tact maxim which requires oneself to maximize benefits for the listener. Despite she had to do something, she agreed to do it without any significant resistance. *"All right"* she agreed and nodded after the speaker gave more instructions of how to meet him. As a result, despite this utterance violate generosity maxim, on the other hand this utterance follow the rules of tact maxim. Therefore, this utterance, based on the context, makes both parties get benefits or it can be said as mutual benefits and moreover there was no significant resistances from the listener.

Data 6

Speaker: Tom Buchanan. He is Myrtle's secret affair.

Listener: Myrtle Wilson. She is Tom's secret affair.

Location: An apartment in the city in which Tom, Myrtle, other peers hold a party.

> Her husband said *"SH!"* and we all looked at the subject again, whereupon Tom Buchanan yawned audibly and got to his feet.
>
> *"You McKees have something to drink,"* he said. ***"Get some more ice and mineral water, Myrtle, before everybody goes to sleep."***
>
> *"I told that boy about the ice."* Myrtle raised her eyebrows in despair at the shiftlessness of the lower orders. *"These people! You have to keep after them all the time."*
>
> (1923: 45)

Analysis

The speaker Tom Buchanan gave a request to the listener Myrtle Wilson to bring him ice and mineral water. In doing so, he uttered "*get some more ice and mineral water, Myrtle, before everybody goes to sleep."* As the purpose of this utterance was to tell the listener to do something, this utterance is categorized as impositive. Consequently, this utterance has fulfilled the criteria of tact or generosity maxim which requires the utterance to be either impositive or commissive.

In the process of the speaker uttering the utterance, the apartment, in which Tom, Myrtle and their peers having a party, was the location where the event occurred. In that place, in which there were more than one person attending, Tom wanted the guests to have something to drink. Specifically, he intended to give McKee's family drinks. To fulfill that desire, he requested his mistress Myrtle to bring ice and mineral water. He uttered *"get some more ice and mineral water, Myrtle, before everybody goes to sleep."* By uttering that, he expected Myrtle to do what she was told. As a result, his intention in uttering the utterance is that he wanted to acquire something benefit from her.

It has been explained that the speaker intended to obtain something from the listener which benefit him. However, after he gave an order to Myrtle, he also added another statement. He added "*before everybody goes to sleep."* So, it means that the ice and mineral water that the speaker asked was intended not only for him or McKee's family but also for everybody attending the party, including the listener. Consequently, the implicature of the impositive utterance has now been discovered. The utterance implicates that the benefits desired by the speaker is for everybody who is attending the party, including himself and the listener.

Based on the intention of the speaker that has been discovered above, it can be understood that the speaker intended to obtain benefits from the listener. Moreover, the speaker expected to get no cost as he did not intend to take the water and ice by himself but instead he ordered other to do it. Subsequently, this utterance is categorized as generosity maxim violation since the speaker has maximized the benefits and minimized the cost for himself. However, since the benefits would not

only be obtained by the speaker but also by the listener, this utterance has fulfilled the rules of tact maxim. Moreover, the listener then told the speaker that she had told a boy to do it. So, there is no any resistance from her. In that way, this utterance is beneficial for both parties.

Data 7

Speaker: Jay Gatsby. By this time, Gatsby has known Nick for some time and can be considered as friends.

Listener: Nick Carraway. By this time, Nick has known Gatsby for some time and can be considered as friends.

Location: Gatsby's residence.

> *"Look here, old sport,"* he broke out surprisingly. *"What's your opinion of me, anyhow?"* A little overwhelmed, I began the generalized evasions which that question deserves.
>
> ***"Well, I'm going to tell you something about my life,"*** he interrupted. *"I don't want you to get a wrong idea of me from all these stories you hear."* So he was aware of the bizarre accusations that flavored conversation in his halls.
>
> *"I'll tell you God's truth."* His right hand suddenly ordered divine retribution to stand by. *"I am the son of some wealthy people in the Middle West--all dead now. I was brought up in America but educated at Oxford, because all my ancestors have been educated there for many years. It is a family tradition."*
> (1923: 85)

Analysis

In this case, the speaker, Jay Gatsby, uttered *"Well, I'm going to tell you something about my life."* It means that he wanted to do something for the listener—Nick Carraway. He wanted to give information to Nick. Therefore, as he willingly committed to do something for the listener, this utterance is categorized as a commissive utterance. As a result, this utterance has fulfilled the criteria of the tact and generosity maxim which requires an utterance to be either impositive or commissive.

The context surrounding this utterance was that the speaker was quite worried with the current situation he was facing. First, he asked about Nick's opinion of him and Nick said he knew him same as other people knew him. Then, it can be seen in the next utterance that states Jay Gatsby was clearly worried. The utterance itself says *"So he (Jay Gatsby) was aware of the bizarre accusations that flavored conversation in his halls."* That is why Jay Gatsby wanted Nick to not have that bizarre accusations of him. As a result, he uttered *"Well, I'm going to tell you something about my life."* That utterance contains a committed action the speaker was willing to do. However, after that, he added *"I don't want you to get a wrong idea of me from all these stories you hear."* It indicates that he intended to get something in return that was he did not want Nick to have wrong accusations of him. Therefore, the intention of him saying the utterance is now clear. He committed to do something good for his listener, giving information. However, he also wanted something in return.

Based on the context explained above, the implicature of the speaker saying the utterance can now be obtained. The speaker indeed wanted to give information to the listener but it is revealed that he also wanted something in return. In this case, the speaker wanted his listener to not have any bad accusations of him. So, it would be beneficial for both parties. In conclusion, the utterance implicates that he was willing to do something for other in order to get benefits for his own which would make the listener to not have that bad accusations of him.

As explained above, the intention of the speaker uttering the utterance has been revealed. He wanted to give information for the listener. Therefore it would be beneficial for the listener as the listener would get benefits from it that is knowing the possibly the true information of Gatsby from Gatsby himself. Moreover, there is no cost that would be taken by the listener from this action. However, as the speaker intended to give benefits to the listener, he also wanted to get benefits from the successful action being done by himself. The benefit he wanted to get from it was that the listener would not have wrong or bad accusations of him after the information being given. In conclusion, the speaker has followed the tact maxim rule, giving benefits to the listener but in doing so he also fouled generosity maxim that requires the speaker to minimize the cost to himself. So, this utterance follows tact maxim rule and violates the generosity maxim in the process. As result, this utterance benefits both parties, the listener and the speaker.

Data 8

Speaker: Nick Carraway. Daisy's cousin.

Listener: Daisy Buchanan. Nick's cousin.

Location: Nick's place.

> I called up Daisy from the office next morning, and invited her to come to tea.
> *"Don't bring Tom,"* I warned her.
> *"What?"*
> ***"Don't bring Tom."***
> *"Who is 'Tom'?"* she asked innocently.
> (1923: 107)

Analysis

Ordered by Gatsby, the speaker Nick Carraway invited the listener Daisy Buchanan to his place for a tea. He then phoned her and said *"Don't bring Tom!"* That is an impositive utterance as its purpose is to make the listener to do something. As a consequence, this utterance has fulfilled the criteria of tact and generosity maxim which requires an utterance to be either impositive or commissive.

The background story to this utterance is that Daisy was married to a man named Tom and on the other hand, Jay Gatsby, who happened to be Daisy's previous boyfriend before she got married to Tom, wanted to meet her. Gatsby then asked Nick to arrange the meeting. Nick knew that if Daisy brought her husband, this meeting would not be good for all parties involved. It was because Daisy was somebody's wife at the time this event occurred. Nick then personally asked Daisy

to not bring Tom. Nick asked *"Don't bring Tom!"* to Daisy. The utterance indicates that he wanted Daisy to do something. And by saying that utterance, he undoubtedly did not want any troubles happened in the meeting. So, his intention in uttering the utterance is now clear—he asked the listener a favor by doing what he told in order for him to get what he intended.

From the intention explained above, the implicature of the utterance can now been identified. The speaker wanted the meeting to proceed without problems. If it did have problems, it would not be good for anybody. Therefore, Nick asked Daisy to not bring her husband to the meeting. As he did that, he wanted to get benefits not only for him, but also for Daisy and Gatsby. The fact that this meeting would have problems if tom was involved was even strengthened by the answer stated by Daisy. She answered *"Who is 'Tom'?"* By that statement, she was clearly aware of the situation and then pretended to not know Tom, her own husband. In conclusion, the utterance uttered by Nick implicates that he wanted himself, Daisy, and Jay Gatsby to get benefits from the action—not bringing Tom to the meeting.

Based on the intention above, the speaker expected to get benefits from the action he desired the listener to do. Thus, it makes the utterance violate the generosity maxim that requires the speaker to minimize the benefit and maximize cost for himself. However, the benefits would not only be given to Nick if the action asked by him to Daisy is undertaken by her but the benefits would also be obtained by Daisy as she would not be facing problem in secretly having meeting with Jay Gatsby. As a result, this utterance also follows the tact maxim rule while violating

the generosity maxim. Thus, if the order was followed by Daisy, both parties would benefit from it.

Data 9

Speaker: Daisy Buchanan.

Listener: Possibly Nick Carraway, Jordan Baker, or Tom Buchanan

Location: A hotel suite in the city.

> The room was large and stifling, and, though it was already four o'clock, opening the windows admitted only a gust of hot shrubbery from the Park. Daisy went to the mirror and stood with her back to us, fixing her hair.
> *"It's a swell suite,"* whispered Jordan respectfully, and everyone laughed.
> ***"Open another window,"*** commanded Daisy, without turning around.
> *"There aren't any more."*
> *"Well, we'd better telephone for an axe----"*
> *"The thing to do is to forget about the heat,"* said Tom impatiently.
> (1923: 163)

Analysis

The speaker, Daisy Buchanan, asked the listeners, anybody who was in the room, to open a window. In doing so, she uttered *"Open another window."* It means that there was an action should be done by the listeners. Hence, this is an impositive utterance. Therefore, this utterance has fulfilled the criteria of tact or generosity maxim which requires an utterance to be either impositive or commissive.

The location in which this event occurred was in a hotel suite in Town. The weather was quite hot and everybody felt the heat even inside the hotel. As a result of the heat, Daisy commanded *"Open another window."* This means that she asked the listeners to do something that she desired. She asked this action to the listener for it could possibly decrease the heat in the room so that she could feel less heat. Thus, by uttering this utterance, she intended to gain something she desired from the action she demanded the listener to do—the benefit.

As the intention has been revealed, the implicature of this utterance can now be obtained. The speaker stated the utterance because she felt that the air was too hot. As a result, she commanded the listener to open the window. The result of this action was that there would be less heat in the room. For that reason, this utterance implicates that the speaker suffered from the heat and that was the reason why she asked the listener to do as she told in order for her to feel less heat in the room.

Based on the speaker's intention explained above, it can be seen the speaker demanded something from the actions she commanded the listener to do. The result of the action she demanded would benefit her as she wanted to feel less heat in the room. Therefore, by uttering this utterance, she has violated the generosity maxim as she has maximized the benefit for herself and minimized the cost as there was no action she did in the attempt of obtaining this benefit. However, even though the listener *replies "There aren't any more"* so that the action Daisy demanded could not be completed, the impositive utterance uttered by Daisy which violates generosity maxim could also give benefits for the listeners. It is because not only Daisy who would feel less heat from the action, but the listeners would also feel so.

Therefore, while violating generosity maxim, this utterance has completed the other maxim, tact, as it would benefit the listeners. In short, this utterance benefits both parties or could be said as mutual benefits.

4.4 Tact and Generosity Maxim Violation

Tact maxim requires oneself to minimize cost and maximize benefit to other. On the other hand, generosity maxim requires oneself to maximize cost and minimize benefit for himself. If a speaker did not follow these rules, the violation had then occurred. Sometimes, an utterance can violate these two maxim at the same time if both maxims have not been followed.

Data 10

Speaker: Nick Carraway. Daisy's cousin.

Listener: Daisy Buchanan. Nick's cousin.

Location: Tom Buchanan's Residence.

> "This Mr. Gatsby you spoke of is my neighbor ——" I said.
> ***"Don't talk. I want to hear what happens."*** –Daisy Buchanan
> (1923: 25)

Analysis

The speaker, Daisy, uttered *"Don't talk."* It means that she wanted the listener, Nick, to stop talking. Hence, this utterance is an impositive utterance since the purpose of this utterance is to make the listener refrain from doing something.

For that reason, this utterance has fulfilled the criteria of tact and generosity maxim that requires an utterance to be either impositive or commissive.

The context surrounding this utterance is that both the speaker and the listener were talking, then while the conversation was in progress, something else happened. When it was Nick's turn to talk, the speaker, Daisy, stopped him by saying *"Don't talk."* Then she added *"I want to hear what happens"* to make it clear what she wanted in uttering the impositive utterance. As a result, her intention as to why she wanted Nick to stop talking has appeared. She wanted to know and focus on the other thing that was currently happening. Thus, she asked the listener to refrain from doing something in order to get what she wanted.

From the context above, the implicature of the utterance can now be obtained. The speaker not only asked the listener to just stop from doing something, she also wanted to get benefits from it. In short, if the listener stopped talking, the speaker would get what she wanted—knowing the other thing that was currently happening while their conversation was in progress. It was also strengthened by the statement she added right after she uttered the impositive utterance—*"I want to know what happens."* In conclusion, this impositive utterance implicates that the speaker did not want to be distracted by the voice of Nick in order to be focused on the other thing that was currently happening.

As explained before, the speaker expected to get benefit by ordering the listener to refrain from doing something. As a result, she has maximized the benefits for herself. Moreover, she stated she did want to miss what happened thus she did

not intend to get cost. These are the opposites of the rule in generosity maxim. Consequently, she has violated generosity maxim. In the process, she also stopped the listener to get benefits from her. Before she uttered the utterance, the listener wanted to obtain information from her. Nick as the listener wanted to know the information about Mr. Gatsby but before he obtained the information, Daisy stopped him. Thus, while Daisy violates the generosity maxim, she also violates the tact maxim as the rule of this maxim requires oneself to maximize the benefits for other. Here, Daisy has maximized the benefits for herself and minimized the benefits for the other. In conclusion, she violates two maxim at the same time, tact and generosity.

Data 11

Speaker: Jordan Baker. She is, at the time the utterance uttered, only an acquaintance to the listener.

Listener: Nick Carraway. He recognizes the speaker from somewhere else, but does not really know her at the time the conversation occurs as Jordan is a quite popular golf player.

Location: Tom Buchanan's residence.

> Her body asserted itself with a restless movement of her knee, and she stood up.
>
> *"Ten o'clock,"* she remarked, apparently finding the time on the ceiling.
>
> *"Time for this good girl to go to bed."*

> *"Jordan's going to play in the tournament to-morrow,"* explained Daisy, *"over at Westchester."*
> *"Oh — you're Jordan Baker."*
>
> I knew now why her face was familiar — its pleasing contemptuous expression had looked out at me from many rotogravure pictures of the sporting life at Asheville and Hot Springs and Palm Beach. I had heard some story of her too, a critical, unpleasant story, but what it was I had forgotten long ago.
>
> "*Good night,"* she said softly. ***"Wake me at eight, won't you?"***
> (1923: 29)

Analysis

Jordan Baker asked Nick Carraway to do something. She uttered "*Wake me at eight, won't you?"* Since its purpose is to make the listener do something, this utterance is categorized impositive. Therefore, as this is an impositive utterance, this utterance has fulfilled the criteria of the tact and generosity maxim which requires an utterance to be either impositive or commissive.

Jordan was going to play golf in a tournament in the morning of the following day. Consequently, she asked a favor to Nick. She asked him to wake her up in the morning at eight o'clock. The reason as to why she asked to be woken up at eight o'clock in the morning could be because she did not want to be late as she would have to be in the tournament at ten o'clock. Therefore, her intention in

uttering this utterance has now been revealed. She asked somebody to do something in order to acquire what she wanted.

From the context and the speaker's intention that have been explained before, the implicature can now be obtained. As Jordan was going to have to play in the golf tournament the following day, she wanted somebody to do her a favor—which was waking her up in the morning so that she would not be late. So, this utterance implicates that Jordan wanted Nick to do what she told as she would get benefits from it if Nick did follow her order. In short, she wanted Nick to do her a favor to fulfill her desired intention which was not waking up late in the next day.

Based on Jordan's intention in uttering the utterance, it is now clear that she expected to acquire benefits in asking a favor to Nick. As a result, she has maximized the benefits for herself in her attempt of asking the listener a favor. Moreover, she did not state that she would try to wake up by herself which made her seems like she expected any cost. Therefore, in uttering this utterance, she has violated the generosity maxim which requires oneself to minimized benefits and maximized cost to self. At the same time, she also maximized the cost for Nick as he would have to do something in the morning in order to fulfill the speaker's desired intention. Consequently, she has also violated another maxim which is tact maxim as she has maximized the cost for the listener and gave no benefit whatsoever. In conclusion, in uttering this utterance, Jordan has violated both tact and generosity maxim at the same time.

Data 12

Speaker: Myrtle Wilson. George's wife.

Listener: George Wilson. Myrtle's husband.

Location: George Wilson's Residence

> Then she wet her lips, and without turning around spoke to her husband in a soft, coarse voice:
> ***"Get some chairs, why don't you, so somebody can sit down."***
> *"Oh, sure,"* agreed Wilson hurriedly, and went toward the little office, mingling immediately with the cement color of the walls.
> (1923: 38)

Analysis

The speaker, Myrtle, uttered to her husband *"Get some chairs, why don't you, so somebody can sit down."* It means that the she wanted her husband to do something for her. As it requires the listener to do something, this utterance is categorized as impositive. For that reaosn, this utterance has fulfilled one criteria of tact or generosity maxim which requires an utterance to be either impositive or commissive.

Before the speaker uttered the utterance, she was having two guests, her affair Tom and his friend Nick. Realizing there were no chairs to sit for her and her guests, she then asked her husband, George Wilson, to get chairs for them to sit on. In doing so, she uttered *"Get some chairs, why don't you, so somebody can sit down."* By stating that, she expected the listener, George, to do what she told.

Therefore, the intention of her in saying that utterance is that she wanted to get something from the listener which were chairs for her and her guests.

As explained before, the speaker wanted to obtain benefits from the listener. In the process of asking her husband to do something, Myrtle as the speaker also stated the reason as to why she asked George to do what she wanted. She added *"so somebody can sit down."* Thus the reason as to why she did that was clear—she wanted her guests and herself to obtain benefits from the listener by having chairs for them to sit on. As a result, that reason is the implicature of the impositive utterance—wanting her and her guests to sit.

Based on the speaker's intention, the maxim violation in this utterance can now be determined. The speaker wanted to obtain benefits from the listener. Moreover, she also did not intend to get any cost as she did not try to get the chairs by herself. So, she has violated the generosity maxim which requires oneself to minimize benefits and maximize cost for herself. In contrast, she has maximized the benefits and minimize cost for herself. Moreover, in the process of violating generosity maxim, she also violated the other maxim, tact. It is because she asked George to get and bring chairs for her and her guests. Even though there was no resistance shown by George, this utterance still give cost to him and does not give benefit whatsoever to him. Therefore, while she maximized benefits for herself, she also maximized the cost of the listener. Her utterance could make the listener do something, in this case, bringing chairs from one place to another. As a result, she has violated the tact maxim. In conclusion, in uttering that utterance, she violates two maxim at the same time—tact and generosity.

Data 13

Speaker: Rosy Rosenthal.

Listeners: His peers, one of them is Mr. Wolfshiem

Location: A restaurant.

> *"The old Metropole,"* brooded Mr. Wolfshiem gloomily. *"Filled with faces dead and gone. Filled with friends gone now forever. I can't forget so long as I live the night they shot Rosy Rosenthal there. It was six of us at the table, and Rosy had eat and drunk a lot all evening. When it was almost morning the waiter came up to him with a funny look and says somebody wants to speak to him outside. 'all right,' says Rosy, and begins to get up, and I pulled him down in his chair.*
>
> *"'Let the bastards come in here if they want you, Rosy, but don't you, so help me, move outside this room.'*
> *"It was four o'clock in the morning then, and if we'd of raised the blinds we'd of seen daylight."*
>
> *"Did he go?"* I asked innocently.
> *"Sure he went."* Mr. Wolfsheim's nose flashed at me indignantly. *"He turned around in the door and says:* ***'Don't let that waiter take away my coffee!'*** *Then he went out on the sidewalk, and they shot him three times in his full belly and drove away."*
> (1923: 92)

Analysis

The speaker, Rosy Rosenthal, was about to leave his table where he sit with his friends. Before he left, he gave a request to his friends to prevent his coffee from

being taken by the waiter. To do so, he uttered *"Don't let that waiter take away my coffee!"* This utterance said by him has a purpose to make listeners take action. Therefore, this utterance is categorized as impositive. Consequently, the criteria of tact or generosity maxim which require an utterance to be either impositive or commissive has been fulfilled.

This event took place in a restaurant where there were waiters working there. Therefore, the speaker, Rosy Rosenthal, was aware that if he left his table, his coffee could be taken away by the waiter who could probably assume that the buyer has finished the coffee. Aware of that, Rosy asked his peers to look after his coffee while he was away. So, he uttered "*Don't let that waiter take away my coffee!"* By uttering that, the speaker expected the listeners to follow his order. From this action, his intention could be now revealed. He intended to make his listeners to do what he desires which was keeping his coffee.

From the explanation above, it can be seen that Rosy expected something from his listeners which benefit him. The benefit that could be taken by the speaker from this event was that he could still have his coffee when he got back. Consequently, as the speaker intended to still have his coffee when he came back, he wanted his listeners to follow his order to keep his coffee as he would get benefits from it. Therefore, the implicature in which why the utterance was uttered is now discovered. This utterance implicates that the speaker wanted to still having his coffee when he returned in which that was a benefit for him.

Based on the speaker's intention, it can be seen that the speaker expected to get benefits from the action that he requested to his peers. Furthermore, he did not have an intention to have his coffee taken thus he did want to get any cost. Therefore, the speaker has maximized the benefits and minimized cost for himself. As a result, he has violated the generosity maxim. However, as the action the speaker desired required the listeners to do something, he also violates the tact maxim. It is because he has maximized cost and minimize the benefits for the listeners. The listeners then would have to do something which was keeping the speaker's coffee from being taken away but they would not get anything in return whatsoever. In short, this utterance uttered by the speaker violates two maxims at the same time.

Data 14

Speaker: Jay Gatsby. He has Klipspringer works for him.

Listener: Klipspringer. He works for Gatsby as a piano player in Gatsby's residence.

Location: Jay Gatsby's Residence

> When Klipspringer had played THE LOVE NEST. he turned around on the bench and searched unhappily for Gatsby in the gloom.
> *"I'm all out of practice, you see. I told you I couldn't play. I'm all out of prac----"*
> *"Don't talk so much, old sport,"* commanded Gatsby. ***"Play!"***
> (1923: 123)

Analysis

The speaker, Jay Gatsby, ordered the listener, Klipspringer, to play the piano. In an attempt to do so, he uttered *"Play!"* This utterance indicates that the listener should take an action. Therefore, this utterance is categorized as impositive. For that reason, this utterance has fulfilled the criteria of tact or generosity maxim which requires an utterance to be either impositive or commissive.

Before he uttered this utterance, Jay Gatsby had asked Klipspringer to play the piano for him but the piano player insisted that he was all out of practice and could only hardly play. Nevertheless, Gatsby also insisted that Klipspringer should just play. After one song being played, the piano player for the second time gave a comment about his own condition—saying that he could not play. However, Gatsby gave an immediate respond *"Don't talk so much, old sport,* ***Play!***" It means that despite the condition, Klipspringer should just continue to play the piano. So, from the context, his intention in uttering this utterance has now been revealed. He intends to ask his listener to do something he desired in order to obtain benefit.

At the time in which this event occurred, Jay Gatsby was accompanied by Daisy Buchanan. This was the only reason why Gatsby asked Klipspringer to play the piano at the first place. Both Gatsby and Daisy did not know what to do, but then Gatsby said *"I know what we'll do, we'll have Klipspringer play the piano."* Subsequently, Gatsby's action could implicate that he wanted to give an impression to Daisy. After Klipspringer complained about his condition, Gatsby insisted that he should just play despite his bad condition. Taken from the context, Gatsby's

utterance implicates that he wanted the listener to do as he told in order for Gatsby to obtain the benefit which was to impressing his guest, Daisy.

Based on the speaker's intention, it has been revealed that the speaker intended to obtain benefits from the action he desired the listener to do. Furthermore, he expected no cost as he insisted the listener to keep playing which made him get what he demanded. Thus, this utterance has violated generosity maxim as he has maximized benefit and minimize cost for himself. At the meantime, the utterance also maximizes cost and minimizes the benefits for the listener since despite the listener express his bad condition, Gatsby still wanted him to play. The listener would not get any benefit from this action, on the other hand, he only received the cost as he needed to keep playing. Therefore, not only generosity maxim, this utterance also violates tact maxim. In conclusion, this utterance has violated two maxims at the same time.

Data 15

Speaker: Mr. Sloane. An acquaintance of Nick.

Listener: Nick Carraway. An acquaintance of Mr. Sloane

Location: Horse Field

> Suddenly Mr. Sloane and the lady walked down the steps and mounted their horses.
> *"Come on,"* said Mr. Sloane to Tom, *"we're late. We've got to go."* And then to me: ***"Tell him we couldn't wait, will you?***"
> (1923: 133)

Analysis

The speaker, Mr. Sloane, uttered *"Tell him we couldn't wait, will you?"* It means that he demanded the listener to do something. For that reason, this utterance is categorized as impositive utterance since its purpose is to make the listener to take action. Accordingly, this utterance has fulfilled the criteria of tact or generosity maxim which requires an utterance to be either impositive or commissive.

Gatsby, Tom, Sloane, and the lady were about to mount horses. However, Gatsby stated that he had not mounted a horse since in a war he had been in years before. Then, he told the other to wait for him for a moment. The other then were waiting for him. Then, as the time went on, Mr. Sloane told Tom that they were already late. He then commanded Nick *"Tell him we couldn't wait, will you?"* By uttering the utterance, it can be seen that Mr. Sloane wanted something from the listener Nick. He wanted Nick to inform Gatsby that they were going to go without him. So, his intention in saying this utterance is that he wanted the listener to do what he wanted in order for him to fulfill his desires.

From the intention explained, the implicature of this utterance can now be obtained. Before Mr. Sloane stated the utterance, he mentioned that he and the other were already late. So, this impositive utterance he uttered had the implication that the speaker wanted to get going as soon as possible and did not want to wait any longer for Gatsby as it was already late for them.

Regarding the maxim violation, this utterance has violated generosity maxim as the speaker intended to obtain benefit which resulted from the action he

demanded. The benefit itself is that he would get going soon and not have to wait for Gatsby any longer. Moreover, there was no action done by the speaker in an attempt to obtain this benefit so that he expected to get no cost in this event. Furthermore, besides violating generosity maxim, this utterance also violates tact maxim as it would cost the listener. The action the speaker demands would make the listener to do a particular thing. Moreover, there is no indication that the listener would get any benefit from this action. In conclusion, this utterance has violated two maxims at the same time, tact and generosity.

Data 16

Speaker: Daisy Buchanan

Listener: Unknown (Possibly the Butler)

Location: Tom Buchanan's Residence

> Tom flung open the door, blocked out its space for a moment with his thick body, and hurried into the room.
> *"Mr. Gatsby!"* He put out his broad, flat hand with well-concealed dislike.
> *"I'm glad to see you, sir. . . . Nick . . . ."*
> ***"Make us a cold drink,"*** cried Daisy.
> As he left the room again she got up and went over to Gatsby and pulled his face down, kissing him on the mouth.
> (1923: 149)

Analysis

The speaker, Daisy Buchanan, uttered to the listener *"make us cold drink."* The utterance means that she wanted the listener to do as she requested. So, since its purpose is to make the listener to do something, this utterance is categorized as impositive. For that reason, this utterance has fulfilled the criteria of tact or generosity maxim which requires an utterance to be either impositive or commissive.

Tom walked into this room where Nick, Daisy, Jordan and Gatsby were present. There, despite his dislike towards Gatsby, Tom greeted Gatsby even though he still showed his dislike. In the process of the greeting which could end up bad, Daisy suddenly uttered *"Make us cold drink".* So, in uttering the utterance, she attempted to escape from an awkward situation that could happen. Therefore, her intention as to why she uttered the utterance was that she wanted the listener to do as she told in order to obtain something she wanted which in fact was not the drink as she uttered but the situation resulted from the action.

As explained before, the speaker uttered this utterance in order to obtain what she wanted which was a benefit for her. She uttered this utterance in the middle of Tom's greeting to Gatsby as a result of her fear of the situation that could end up bad. So, she asked the listener to do something in order to obtain benefit. However, the benefit that she wanted was not from the thing that she requested the listener to bring but the situation resulted from the action. As a result, this utterance does not

implicate that Daisy wanted the drink but it implicates that as Daisy felt the situation was not good, she wanted to escape from it.

Based on the speaker intention, the maxim violation can now be determined. As the speaker intended to obtain benefit from the action she requested, this utterance has violated the generosity maxim. Moreover, she expected to get no cost as she did not intend to just receive that awkward situation. In the process, she also gave a cost to her listener as the listener had to bring water or something to drink for her without giving the listener any benefit whatsoever. Therefore, not only generosity maxim she has violated, but she also has violated tact maxim. In short, this utterance violates two maxims at the same time, tact and generosity.

Data 17

Speaker: Jay Gatsby. By this time, he is a friend of Nick.

Listener: Nick Carraway. By this time, he is a friend of Gatsby.

Location: Gatsby's residence

> I went back to the drawing-room and thought for an instant that they were chance visitors, all these official people who suddenly filled it. But, as they drew back the sheet and looked at Gatsby with unmoved eyes, his protest continued in my brain:
> *"Look here, old sport,* ***you've got to get somebody for me.*** *You've got to try hard. I can't go through this alone."*
> (1923: 209)

Analysis

The speaker, Jay Gatsby, indirectly asked the listener *"You've got to get somebody for me."* It means that the speaker gave a command to the listener to get him somebody to help him. As it requires the listener to do something, this utterance is categorized as impositive. For that reason, this utterance has fulfilled the criteria of tact or generosity maxim which requires an utterance to be either impositive or commissive.

There was a hit and run incident which was done by Daisy Buchanan resulting a death of Myrtle Wilson. Gatsby who was in the passenger seat of a car driven by Daisy, was willing to take a blame for Daisy's action. However, he still needed help from others to get him out of this situation. Therefore, he asked his friend, Nick Carraway, to get him help from somebody. In doing so, he uttered *"You've got to get somebody for me."* As it was an order or a command, the listener was then required to follow the speaker's order. He uttered this utterance for he wanted to get out of this situation. Thus, with this situation occurred, he intended to ask the listener to do as he told in order for him to get the desired intention which was to bring him somebody.

As the intention of the speaker in uttering this utterance has been revealed, the implicature can now also be determined. The speaker intended to ask the listener to get somebody for him. As the speaker was in a bad situation which can be seen from the statement he added later: *"I can't go through this alone,"* and it was even stressed by the statement *"You've got to try hard (to get that somebody),"* the

implicature which is contained in the utterance is that the speaker wanted to be helped by that somebody he had asked the listener to bring. So, this utterance implicates that the speaker wanted the listener to do what he commanded as it would benefit him as the result of the action would be a presence of somebody that could help him.

Based on the speaker's intention, it can be seen that the speaker demanded something from the listener which benefit him. Also, the speaker did not show any intention of having or getting cost from this action as he only asked the listener to do something. Therefore, in uttering this utterance, the speaker has violated generosity maxim which requires the speaker to maximize cost and minimize benefit for himself. Instead, the speaker has minimized the cost and maximized the benefit for himself resulting a generosity maxim violation. Furthermore, in asking this kind a favor, it required the listener to do something which can be considered as cost. In addition, there was no indication that the listener would get any benefit from the action the speaker demanded. Therefore, the speaker has also violated the tact maxim which requires the speaker to maximize the benefit and minimize the cost for the listener. As a result, not only generosity maxim that has been violated, this utterance has also violated the other maxim, tact. In short, this utterance contains two violations at the same time, tact and generosity.

Data 18

Speaker: Stella. She is someone who works for Mr. Wolfshiem as his representative. She does not know who Nick is.

Listener: Nick Carraway. A guest in the Mr. Wolfshiem's residence where he is confronted by Stella.

Location: Mr. Wolfshiem's Residence

> ***"Please say that Mr. Carraway wants to see him."***
> *"I can't get him back from Chicago, can I?"*
>
> At this moment a voice, unmistakably Wolfshiem's, called *"Stella!"* from the other side of the door.
>
> *"Leave your name on the desk,"* she said quickly. *"I'll give it to him when he gets back."*
> *"But I know he's there."*
>
> She took a step toward me and began to slide her hands indignantly up and down her hips.
> (1923: 216)

Analysis

The speaker, Nick Carraway, uttered *"Please say that Mr. Carraway wants to see him."* It means that he commanded the listener to do something. As the utterance required the listener to do something, this utterance is categorized as impositive. Therefore, this utterance has fulfilled the criteria of tact or generosity maxim which requires an utterance to be either impositive or commissive.

Nick Carraway came to Mr. Wolfshiem's residence to meet with him. He then asked someone who was in the residence, a woman named Stella, *"Please say*

that Mr. Carraway wants to see him." As the speaker wanted to meet Mr. Wolfshiem, his intention in uttering this utterance is that he wanted the listener to do as he commanded which would make the speaker obtain the thing he wanted.

As the speaker's intention has been revealed, the implicature of this utterance can now be obtained. The speaker intended to have a meeting with Mr. Wolfshiem. In doing so, he asked Stella to get Mr. Wolshiem for him. Therefore, the implicature of the utterance Nick uttered is that he wanted to meet Mr. Wolfshiem and the listener was asked to fulfill this desire.

Based on the speaker's intention, the participant who would get benefit from the action the speaker demanded was the speaker himself. It is because if the listener did as she was told, Nick would get what he desired—meeting with Mr. Wolfshiem. Moreover, the speaker displayed no indication whatsoever of having been involved of the action he demanded. Consequently, the speaker would not get cost from this. As a result, this utterance is categorized as generosity maxim violation. On the other hand, this utterance would not benefit the listener whatsoever as she would not get anything from it. However, she indeed would get the cost as she would have to find Mr. Wolfshiem in some other places. Therefore, this utterance also violates tact maxim. In short, this utterance violates two maxim at the same time, tact and generosity.