

## CHAPTER 4

### CONCLUSION

Having analysed the data in chapter three, I have found four violations of **the maxim of manner**, three violations of **the maxim of quality**, three violations of **the maxim of relation**, and eight violations of **the maxim of quantity**. These facts show that the most often violated maxim is the maxim of quantity. It means that most people in the court of law tend to hide parts of the truth with the intention to deceive or mislead the hearer for their own benefit. In my opinion, the maxim of quantity is most often violated in the court of law because hiding parts of the truth or adding unnecessary information are the easiest ways to mislead the hearer and get the sympathy of the jury and the judge.

The truth that is partially hidden may be something different from the whole truth. The speaker usually tells parts of the truth that do not endanger his or her position and hide the parts of the truth that may put him or her at a disadvantage. Similarly, the unnecessary information given by the speaker may be something different from the whole truth as well. The speaker may tell the truth which is disadvantageous to him or her, but at the same time he or she also adds some more information that can save his or her position or attack his or her

opponent. In doing so, the speaker is misleading the hearers and is trying to impose their opinion on the hearers.

In the analysis, two maxims are least violated. They are **the maxim of quality** and **the maxim of relation**. In my opinion, the maxim of quality is least violated because the speaker does not tend to lie. The speaker does not tend to lie because the hearers can detect a lie easily, as the jury always pay attention carefully and the lawyers will also be very careful in preventing the speaker from telling lies. The maxim of relation is also least violated because it is more difficult to deceive someone by giving an irrelevant answer. It is easier to deceive someone by violating the other maxims. In a court of law, the speaker has to think instantly in answering the questions, so they will tend to find the easiest way to mislead the hearer.

There are two data in the analysis that violate both **the maxim of quantity** and **the maxim of manner**. In my opinion, the reason why it is the combination of the maxim of quantity and the maxim of manner is that the violation of the maxim of quantity, in which one is giving too much information, makes the utterance longer and not brief. Therefore, it violates the maxim of manner. In my opinion, the maxim of quantity and the maxim of manner are very closely related to each other. It is shown by the relationship between them. The more unnecessary information added in a sentence, the less brief the sentence will be. In other words as the speaker violates the maxim of quantity, he or she also violates the maxim of manner.

The underlying intentions of the violations vary, related to the speaker's role in the court of law. As a defendant, the speaker usually violates the maxim in

order to save himself or herself, by trying to make the jury or the judge sympathetic towards the speaker. As a plaintiff, the speaker usually violates the maxim in order to attack the defendant or merely to defend himself against the Defense Attorney's attacking questions. The ways could vary, from attacking the defendant's good image to just emphasising the defendant's faults. As a witness supporting the defendant, the speaker usually violates the maxim in order to give advantage to the defendant. And as a witness supporting the plaintiff, the speaker violates the maxim in order to give advantage to the side he or she is supporting. He can attack the opponent or merely defend his own side.

Normally, the defendant or the witness supporting the defendant does not violate the maxim in order to attack their opponent, because their role in the court of law makes them subject to the District Attorney's or the Prosecutor's attack. On the other hand, the plaintiff and the witness supporting the plaintiff may violate the maxim in order to attack the opponent because their roles in the court of law make them the ones who are able to attack the opponent. At the same time, the plaintiff and the witness supporting the plaintiff can also violate the maxim in order to defend themselves because quite often the Defense Attorney can turn the situation around and attack them.

After observing the court sessions in Ally McBeal series, I can conclude that in this series seeking justice in the courtroom is merely a matter of someone's success in performing his or her role in the courtroom. The vows made before someone gives their testimonies are not an assurance that he or she will tell the truth. If a defendant succeeds in defending him or herself by misleading or deceiving the hearer, he or she could win although he or she is actually guilty.

Similarly, the plaintiff could win the case although the defendant is not guilty, if the plaintiff could do his or her job well in attacking the defendant by misleading or deceiving the hearers. This, of course, is greatly influenced by the skills of the lawyers. In order to seek the truth and uphold justice, the jury in the courtroom as the hearers, must be able to read the situation very carefully and detect the misleading or deceiving statements, so that they are able to know whether or not the defendant is guilty.

As my analysis only deals with one type of failure in observing a maxim, which is the violation of the maxim, I would like to make a suggestion that anyone who is interested in writing a thesis with a topic similar to mine analyse the other types of failure found in court sessions. The theory has stated that the type of failure in observing a maxim that is most often found in court sessions is the violation of the maxim. It will be worthwhile trying to prove that the type of failure in observing a maxim in a court of law is not necessarily the violation of the maxim, but it could also be the other types of failure.