MAIN CHARACTERS’ PARTICULARIZED CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN THE DUCHESS MOVIE
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ABSTRACT: Particularized conversational implicature is an additional conveyed meaning uttered in a very specific context in communication. The data is taken from original movie script of “The Duchess” movie and analyzed based on Brown and Levinson off-record politeness strategy (1987) by violating Gricean maxims, that are specifically maxim of quality, quantity and relevance. Findings showed that there were 27 utterances containing particularized conversational implicature. Particularized conversational implicature mostly appeared in the climax part and that violated relevance maxim.
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People sometimes use utterance containing implicit meaning to deliver the message in communication. Thomas (1996:1) states that people do not always or even usually say what they mean. Speakers frequently mean something quite different or even just the opposite from what their words actually say. According to Yule (1998: 35) that something is more than just what the words mean, called an implicature.

Implicature is an additional conveyed meaning to hint, suggest or convey some meaning indirectly by means of language, (Thomas (1996: 58). Moreover, politeness principle is also important in trying to explain why people are so often indirect in conveying what they mean or want (Spiers (1998: 31) quoting Leech (1983)). Certain utterances are liable to damage or threaten another person’s face (Thomas, 1996: 169). Off-record politeness strategy is one of politeness strategies in maintaining hearer’s face and the speaker own face to reduce the threats by inviting conversational implicatures.

Conversational implicatures is the basic way to do Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) but be indirect by violating, in some way, the Gricean Maxims of efficient communication, Brown and Levinson (1987: 213). Furthermore, if a speaker wants to do an FTA, but wants to avoid responsibility for doing it, he can do it off record and leave it up to the addressee to decide how to interpret it. Conversational implicatures are often dependent on salient aspects of some particular context. In addition, Brown and Levinson (1987: 212) points out off record refers not simply to formal type of indirection but rather to such linguistic strategies in context. In relation to off-record politeness strategy, Murcia and Olschtain (2000: 11), quoting Halliday (1991: 5) describes context as “the events that are going on around when people speak (and write)”. Context entails the situation within which the communicative interaction takes place.

Brown and Levinson (1987: 213) also states that if a speaker chooses to invite conversational implicature, he must give hearer some hints and hope that the hearers picks up on them and thereby interprets what speaker really means (intends) to say. If the speakers violate relevance maxim, they will automatically: (1) give hints, (2) give association clue and (3) give presupposition. Then, if the
speakers come to violate quantity maxim in their conversational implicature, they tend to: (1) understate, (2) overstate and (3) use tautologies. Lastly, if the speakers violate quality maxim, they may use: (1) contradictions, (2) be ironic, (3) use metaphors and (4) use rhetorical question.

In this research, the researcher is going to discuss particularized conversational implicature used by the two main characters in *The Duchess* movie by analyzing the kinds of maxims they mostly violate. Thus, the researcher is able to draw the speakers’ purposes and functions of violating certain kind of maxim in any different context of conversation. The result of this study is expected to give description about theory of politeness off-record politeness strategy of doing FTA in conversational implicature. This study is significant for lecturers as a reference to teach their students and as a supporting research in English language teaching to give the view how actually particularized conversational implicature are used in conversation and in certain situation which take place in the work of art.

The movie is set at the end of the eighteenth century, 17-year-old Georgiana (Kierra Knightly) has to marry with the much older Duke of Devonshire (Ralph Fiennes) for high personal and family expectations. The Duchess of Devonshire was a celebrated beauty and a socialite who gathered around her a large circle of literary and political figures. She was also an active political campaigner. The Duchess of Devonshire campaigned for the Whigs where The Duke was the main supporter. Unfortunately for Georgiana, the Duke is a man who is far more interested in his dogs than in getting to know his new wife. Georgiana's duty is to be able to bear him a male heir in short order. In the meantime, Georgiana gives birth to two daughters, but fails to provide the Duke with the expected male heir. The Duke continues to have affairs with Bess Foster (Hayley Atwell), Georgiana’s best friend. Their relationship is getting worst when Georgiana meet again with Charles Grey who can make her happy although he has no rank and power like what the Duke has.

The previous study about the conversational implicatures was proposed by Ani (2009) about the flouting of Grice’s conversational maxim done by the characters in the *Crash Movie*. She made a research in flouting all of the four conversational maxims with the result that the maxim of relation as the most frequently flouted maxim.

The characters in the *Crash Movie* flouted the conversational maxim on behalf of generating implicatures (implicit meanings). The meanings of the implicatures they created are varied; they depend on the contexts or the situations under which dialogues happened. The characters in the *Crash Movie* also flouted the conversational maxim by blatantly being off the topics, by giving uninformative remarks, by providing fallacious responses, by showing the vague and obscure responses, and by giving irrelevant responses towards their interlocutor’s questions or remarks.

**METHOD**

The method in this study is descriptive qualitative since it was aimed at describing the characteristics of a phenomenon of particularized conversational implicature seen in the main characters of the movie (Johnson & Christensen, 2004: 347).
The source of data in this research is *The Duchess* movie itself in the form of DVD. The data of this study was in form of direct conversation written in the script, mainly between the two main characters, they are The Duke and The Duchess of Devonshire.

Data collection would be in a form of listing the main characters utterances which contains particularized conversational implicature of the whole scene from the movie starting from the beginning or introduction, pre-climax, climax, anticlimax and ending of the movie.

There are several steps in doing data analysis in this research. The researcher would start by searching for, listing and classifying the data into some stages, they are in the introduction, pre-climax, climax, anticlimax and ending. After that, the researcher compared the data which was gained from the movie script and also the movie DVD to support the movie script since the main characters’ face, gesture and expression were clearly seen in the DVD. Lastly, the researcher made conclusion of the study.

RESULT

The result showed that there were 27 utterances containing particularized conversational implicature uttered by the two main characters of *The Duchess* movie. In the introduction part, there were seven examples of maxim violation in particularized conversational implicature (26%) existed: two examples violating quality maxim, one example violating quantity maxim and four examples violating relevance maxim. Meanwhile, there were four examples of maxim violation (15%) existed in the pre-climax part of the movie. Those four examples totally violated relevance maxim. Then, in the climax part, there were ten examples of maxim violation (37%) existed: three examples violating quantity maxim and seven examples violating relevance maxim. Moreover, in the ant cliimax part, there were five examples of maxim violation (8%) existed: one examples violating quantity maxim and four examples violating relevance maxim. Lastly, in the ending part of the movie there was only one example of maxim violation that was violation of quantity maxim (4%). The decrease of the conversational implicature connoted that the speakers wanted to keep the convenient communication which automatically resulted in convenient relationship and forget all the problems in the climax and also anticlimax part of the movie.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Maxims violating in Particularized Conversational Implicature</th>
<th>Stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MQL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MQN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>26%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6.2 Frequency of Particularized Conversational Implicature seen in *The Duchess* Movie
Researcher found that the most violated maxim in particularized conversational implicature in the introduction of The Duchess movie was relevance maxim where the speakers gave hints to save the speaker’s own positive face from any embarrassment and to protect both speaker and hearer from the inconveniences.

In the introduction part of the movie, the speaker applied particularized conversational implicature (26%) by violating maxim of quality, quantity and relevance. Those functioned as a speaker’s avoidance for the potentially face-damaging interpretation, the addressee opportunity to interpret what the speaker meant without being irritated and losing face and avoidance the potential threat of ordering the hearer around and the hearer got credit for being generous or cooperative.

In pre-climax part of the movie, there was only violation in relevance maxim by giving hints (15%). There was an increase in the amount of violating relevance maxim to minimize the treat by giving hints as a one strategy in off-record politeness strategy to cover up that inconvenient situation. Thus, the shift of violating quality, quantity and relevance maxims in introduction which became only violating relevance maxim in pre-climax part of the movie was caused by the speaker who really concerned to care for his/her own positive image to the hearer to achieve the purpose in communication. In this case, the purpose was to force the hearer to agree with the speaker’s statement without being irritated.

Then, in the climax part, there are ten examples of maxim violation (37%) existed: three examples violating quantity maxim and seven examples violating relevance maxim. The main characters faced the most predicament situation in the climax. The reuse violation of quantity and relevance maxim in the climax connoted that the speaker tried to overcome the inconveniences in their communication by reducing the possibility of damage to hearer’s face or to the speaker’s own face.

There were five utterances containing particularized conversational implicature in the anti-climax part of the movie (8%). The bigger amount of violated maxim was relevance maxims which were done by giving hints functioned to show speaker’s intention to convey the real evidence and emotional feeling for being powerless followed by violating quantity maxim which functioned as speaker’s indirect request. Since the inconvenience between the main characters was trying to be solved in the anticlimax part of the movie, the researcher found less particularized conversational implicature. It means that the intention of employment conversational implicature in reducing the threat which could possibly damage the speaker and hearers’ face has been minimized since the situation and relationship between them is going to be better.

At the end of the movie there was a shifting of violation quantity maxim in the ending. The speaker totally violated in only one quantity maxim (4%) by using understatement. It functioned to show that the speaker really care to the hearer. There had been quite good relationship between the speaker and hearer to keep the good communication and forget the entire inconvenient situation at the end.
DISCUSSION

In this discussion, the researcher discusses particularized conversational implicature that happened in the introduction, pre-climax, climax, anti-climax and ending stages of the movie. The analysis could be seen as follow:

One example of particularized conversational implicature in the introduction which violated relevance maxim was the conversation between DK and GE in the bedroom of Devonshire house at late night. GE found DK was sitting half naked on the bed. Georgiana stopped at a distance and asked DK for the truth about what he had done. She knew that the young maid the Duke was talking to earlier came running out, half naked, carrying her clothes in her arm. As a wife, GE was very curious for knowing what had happened to her husband.

(1)

U 97 GE 1: What is going on?
U 98 DK 2: About what?
Georgiana approaches, unnerved.
U 99 GE: 3: What have you been doing?
U 100 DK 4: Nothing to concern you.
DK= the Duke
GE= Georgiana

In the first line, GE opened up the conversation by asking DK what was going on. But DK answered GE question with irrelevant answer. He just simply asked back to GE without any clear answer in line two (U98) by saying, “About what?” In this context, DK hid the fact meant that nothing happened with him. What GE said in the third line meant that she was still curious and she did not believe at DK’s answer because from her background knowledge she knew that the young maid who was talking to DK earlier came running out, half naked, carrying her clothes in her arm. It must be something. Since DK gave irrelevant answer, he had violated maxim of relevance through his additional conveyed meaning.

Then, GE asked DK for the second time for the truth in U99, but she still accepted irrelevant answer. In the fourth line (U100), DK answered, “Nothing to concern you”. DK utterance implied that there was nothing important to tell. What he had been doing had no significant impact to GE, therefore it was not necessary to force him telling the truth. In this context, DK seem to avoid talking about the topic because it was impossible for him to tell her about what he had done with the maid. The speaker had saved his own positive face and reduced the possibility of damage to the speaker’s own face to protect both speaker and hearer from the inconveniences.

The example of particularized conversational implicature in pre-climax part of the movie was the conversation happened between GE and DK when they sat together in a gigantic dining room of Devonshire house at a very long table eat in silence. After a few moments Burleigh emerged to whisper something into the ear of DK. He understood the message and nodded. DK was going to introduced someone to GE.

(2)

U106 DK 1: Send them in…
U107 GE 2: Are we having company? Is it Fox?
U108 DK 3: Don’t you think this mutton has a funny taste?
This certainly doesn’t taste like normal mutton.

In the first line, the Duke (DK) opened up the conversation by asking Burleigh to send a little three-year-old girl, Charlotte and a nanny to enter the gigantic dining room. Then, in the second line, Georgiana (GE) asked the Duke who the company was actually, whether it was Fox or not. But her question was not answered relevantly by DK. He then gave question to GE in very different topic which was showed in line three when the Duke said, “Don’t you think this mutton has a funny taste?” Then it was continued in the fourth line by saying, “This certainly doesn’t taste like normal mutton. I am sure something is the matter with it.” Those two utterances came up as the answer of GE’s question. The particular background knowledge about the context had to be drawn by GE that how the normal mutton usually tasted. The mutton tasted just like the usual mutton she had ever eaten before. Since there was no problem with the mutton, GE had to assume that there must be something more than what DK said. DK response did not appear on the surface to adhere to relevance.

A simply answer would be ‘Yes’ or ‘No’. In order to make DK’s response relevant, GE had to draw on some assumed knowledge that there was another thing and it was not just Fox. She was Charlotte (DK’s little daughter with his maid) and not Fox. The particularized conversational implicature here showed that it was not Fox and it was not too important for him to answer GE’s question directly because GE would understand it soon. On the other hand, DK would automatically lose his face in front of GE because Charlotte was his daughter with the maid. In this part, the speaker really cares for his/his own positive image to the hearer to achieve the purpose in communication. The purpose was to force the hearer to agree with the speaker’s opinion and decision without being irritated.

The third example was particularized conversational implicature in the climax by violating quantity maxim. GE finally challenged DK, more imploring than angry in the DK’s bedroom. They were still in quarrel. GE was ranging at DK while he patiently heard her out.

What is wrong with me? Why have you never loved me?

I do not claim to be a man of fine sensibility, G.

I have always known what I expect from this marriage and what I am prepared to give.

In the second, third and fourth line of U387, again DK implicitly showed that he actually felt difficult to love GE by admitting himself as a man who was not really sensitive especially about love by saying “I do not claim to be a man of fine sensibility... what I expect ... what I am prepared”. He did not give relevant answer, but GE could make his answer became relevant through background knowledge she had experienced before. DK never talked and gave not much attention to her. GE understood that all he expected in their marriage was the male heir who was prepared to become the next Duke of Devonshire through additional conveyed meaning uttered by DK. The particularized conversational implicature he had given meant DK could not completely love GE as the expression of his
disappointment, since she could not bear the male heir. In fact as a husband, DK could fulfill his obligation. The main characters faced the most predicament situation in the climax. The reuse violation of quantity and relevance maxim in the climax connoted that the speaker tried to overcome the inconveniences in their communication by reducing the possibility of damage to hearer’s face or to the speaker’s own face.

The fourth example appeared in anticlimax part of the movie which happened in the dining room of Devonshire house. GE was distant with no interest in the food in front of her. DK looked up, chewing:

(4)  
U670 DK  1 : What’s the matter, don’t like the chicken?  
2 : I find it really quite decent.  
The table is quiet. Not even Bess can muster a reply. Georgiana looks at him.  
U671 GE  3 : I’m with the child.  
DK= the Duke  
GE= Georgiana

In the last line, GE had made her contribution irrelevant. The implicature here was that the condition that made her so disinterested in the food in front of her was not because of the taste of the food. She wanted to convey that she had been pregnant with Charles Grey. As a result, GE would go away from Devonshire house and stay in another country until the child was born. Charles Grey’s family would take the baby and take care of it. The purpose of inviting particularized conversational implicature by giving hint in her additional conveyed meaning of violating the relevance maxim showed the speaker’s intention to convey the real evidence.

The last example was the particularized conversational implicature in the ending by violating quantity maxim. The conversation took place in the room of Devonshire house in the afternoon. Charlotte looked at GE and DK approached and unusually looked warmly at GE. Their relationship was getting better. DK looked relieved and smiled.

(5)  
U708GE  1 : Who will be there?  
U709 DK  2 : Everybody.  
U710 GE  3 : As you wish.  
The Duke turns back to the window. We see what he sees: Bess is playing with all their children in the garden. It is a mirrored moment from his opening scene where he watched the young people, his thoughts then a mystery…  
The Duke resumes his far away look and says as if from nowhere.  
U711 DK  4 : How wonderful to be that free.  
DK= the Duke  
GE= Georgiana

In line two, DK answered GE’s question indirectly by saying something less than what he actually intended to convey through particularized conversational implicature. The implicature here was that everybody would be there including Charles Grey. To get the intended meaning from DK’s answer, GE had to use her background knowledge of the small gathering that DK had planned for her return. Everybody would be there. Since Charles Grey also was becoming the Prime Minister of Great Britain, GE really assumed that he would also be there. In this
case, DK had violated quantity maxim as a strategy of saving GE’s face in that situation. DK used understatement and made his contribution less informative for GE. Thus, related to going off record by giving understatement, DK could get a credit of being tactful in this context. The decrease of the conversational implicature connotes that the speakers want to keep the convenient communication which automatically results in convenient relationship and forget all the problems in the climax and also anticlimax part of the movie.

The flow of contextual particularized conversational implicature by violating maxim of quality, quantity and relevance in *The Duchess* movie can be seen as follows:

![Figure 3.7 Flow of Particularized Conversational Implicature in The Duchess Movie](image)

MQL= Maxim of Quality  
MQN= Maxim of Quantity  
MR= Maxim of Relevance

From the table of flow of particularized conversational implicature above, the speaker totally violated in only one quantity maxim by using understatement at the end of the movie. It connotes that there had been quite good relationship between the speaker and hearer to keep the good communication. Thus, the problems had been solved and there was no such inconvenient situation at the end.
The concept of conversational implicature uttered by DK and GE as the main characters in *The Duchess* movie in the whole parts movie is that their conversation depends on the aspects of the context that make additional implicatures might be inferred result from particularized conversational implicature. The biggest number of particularized conversational implicature happened in the climax when the characters faced the most difficult problems in their marriage. The findings also showed that the relevance maxims were dominated to be violated in the particularized conversational implicature uttered by the main characters. Association clue and hints can only be understood if the speaker has background knowledge of the context. The speaker let the hearer to interpret what he/she wanted to convey through additional conveyed meaning to minimize the threat by using politeness strategies to produce convenience communication. It supports the interpersonal cooperation that is necessary to get things done in away that maximizes satisfaction in the outcome and minimizes either threat to the self or other in interaction (Spiers, 1998: 29).

**CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

Particularized conversational implicature is one of conversational implicatures that are used by the main characters of *The Duchess* movie. It is one strategy in off-record politeness strategies to do FTA indirectly by violating Gricean maxims, that are specifically maxim of quality, quantity and relevance.

The researcher found 27 utterances containing particularized conversational implicature in introduction, pre-climax, climax, anticlimax and also ending of the movie that can be seen as follows: In the introduction part of the movie, there are 7 particularized conversational implicature violating maxim of quality (28%), quantity (14%) and maxim of relevance (58%). In pre-climax part, there are 4 particularized conversational implicature and the speakers totally violate relevance maxim (100%). Then, in the climax there are 10 particularized conversational implicatures which violate maxim of quantity (30%) and relevance (70%). In the anticlimax, there are 5 particularized conversational implicatures which violate maxim of quantity (20%) and relevance (80%). Lastly, there is only 1 particularized conversational implicature which violates quantity maxim (100%).
It connotes that the more problems faced, there will also increase the number of particularized conversational implicature to reduce any possibility to damage face (minimize the threats).

There are different functions of particularized conversational implicature which violate certain maxims in different stages of the movie. The function of violating quantity maxim in the introduction is as a speaker’s avoidance for the potentially face-damaging interpretation. Speaker gives (non-overtly) the addressee opportunity to interpret what the speaker meant without being irritated and losing face by violating quantity maxim in introduction. The shift of function in violating quantity maxim happens in climax as a speaker’s way to blame the hearer indirectly, a reminder of speaker’s mistake and a way to show the speaker’s authority. While in anti-climax and ending stages, it functions as speaker’s indirect request and also to show that the speaker really cares to the hearer. Lastly, the function of violating relevance maxim in the introduction is to avoid the potential threat of ordering the hearer around. While in the pre-climax and climax parts, it functions to avoid the speaker’s face damaging and reduce face damaging interpretation of being embarrassed. In the ending part of the movie, the violation of relevance maxim in particularized conversational implicature functions to show speaker’s decision and emotional feeling for being powerless.

Regarding to the shift in the occurrence of particularized conversational implicature from the introduction part to the ending part of the movie, it can be concluded that the shift in violation certain kinds of maxims is influenced by different convenience of the situation faced by the main characters in every part of the movie. Therefore, it encourages the main characters to use politeness strategy, especially off-record politeness strategy by violating Gricean maxims to maintain both speaker and the hearer face in communication. It produces more effective communication and keeps the good the harmony between the locutor and interlocutor.

It is suggested that this study can be used as a reference for the teacher to teach their students and to give the view how actually conversational implicature are applied in conversation and in certain situation which take place in the specific context to communicate. Specifically, it will be useful for teaching culture and the ways of speaking. Teaching pragmatic and sociolinguistics should focused on the socio-cultural norms of politeness and appropriateness in performing various type of speech acts, such as requests, apologies, compliments, and complaints. For students of pragmatics may also use this study to understand the relevance of pragmatics and politeness strategies happened and applied in the daily life in movie covering politeness and appropriateness in performing several speeches. For other researchers, it is suggested to develop this study to get understanding about particularized conversational implicature and how it is applied a better in a real life situation.
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