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Abstract
The aims of this study are to find implicature of criticism utterances, maxim, and politeness strategies of the criticizing utterances in Troy and King Arthur movies manuscript. The type of this study is a qualitative study. The data source of this study is Aristocratic movies manuscript. The methods of collecting data are documentation the movies manuscript and observation of the utterances, gathering data criticism utterances, coding the data and finding criticism utterances implied. This study shows the variety of implicatures, cooperative principles, and politeness pattern of criticizing utterances. The implicature of criticism utterances are mocking, contradiction, order, disappointment, forbid, satire, anger, and advice. The second analysis is cooperative principles by Grice. There are maxim of clarify and quantity. The politenesses of strategies are bald on record, positive and negative politeness.
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Introduction
In spoken language, a speaker does not turn out separate the sentences, however s/he tries to adapt to a group of general rules has to create all his/her messages sent. This can be the essence of linguistics (Zor, 2006). Mastering the target language is not solely mastering all the grammatical and structural rules however conjointly of exploit the information of how language is pragmatically used in the target language (Leech, 2014). Therefore, pragmatics is the study of acting as language, doing something with words "eg persuading, rejecting, apologizing (Kasper, 1989). Through pragmatics, people can better understand how language is used and how it is interpreted in a given context. Thus, (Kasper & Röver, 2005) stated that a speaker needs to have the ability to understand and produce socio-pragmatic meaning with pragmalinguistic conventions. In other words, speakers must have the ability to act and be regulated through language. In daily life, everyone gives and takes criticism. There are reasons and greatness why criticism is given. First, people accept criticism for doing wrong or different perspectives with others or are low in society. Second, some people criticize someone because they disagree on something. Criticism is an act of expression caused by disagreement with something or someone and opinions about their poor quality (Oxford, 2003: 102). In other words, this is a statement of rejection. People show their expressions in various ways, criticism can be found indirectly such as anger, resentment, ridicule, satire, etc., and directly to the speaker. Criticism is a way of conveying one's mistakes or commissions so that they can later be corrected. Sometimes people who give criticism consider that they are right so they become arrogant.

This study is related to pragmatic studies, especially the theory of implicature in criticism. People often use expressions of criticism to show dislike or disagreement with opinions or behavior such as in debates, disputes, and in other daily activities. People have many ways of expressing criticism, sometimes it can be shown in a polite or disrespectful way. Therefore, the speaker must know the right way to convey it, and the listener must identify the deep meaning of the utterance. Several researches had been found related to this study. Al-Qaderi (2015) conducted his study focusing on investigating Gricean Theory of Conversational Implicature and its application to the Arabic language. These findings recommended that the Gricean Theory of conversational implications is often applied to Arabic, significantly the Yemeni dialect. The maxim of amount was most often flouted and also the maxims of Relation, Quality and Manner were flouted severally. Farnia and Sattar (2015)
conducted their study focusing on the speech act of criticism among Iranian native speakers of Persian. The overall findings unconcealed that the use of direct ways outnumbered that of indirect ways and mitigating devices. However, one different feature of this data is the politeness achieved through the utilization of mitigation tools. Igwedibia (2018) conducted a study that explored the extent to which maxims could be applied to the recitation of selected Lorde's poetry and ascertained the extent to which Audre Lorde's poetry violated these four maxims. The study showed that the poem of Audre Lorde violates these maxims. According to those studied above, they employ their study using implicature and speech act that are two of pragmatics branch. Those studies were not studied about cooperative principles and politeness in their studies, so that this study tried to fill the gap on previous study.

Cooperative principles is an important aspect in conversation because if these are violated, could lead to misunderstanding. A movie is reflection of real life, so that it also aimed to give knowledge about when a criticism, cooperative principle, and politeness are used in communication to give effect to the listener. However, this study focused on implicature of criticism utterances in “Troy and King Arthur” movies manuscript that is about struggle and idealism like the real life. The phenomena of these movies deal with the criticism utterances since the social strata of aristocratic community (The King, Knight, Emperor, Slaves, Servants, etc) are various. In the manuscript, there are some criticizing utterances with the situational context. Moreover, it also analyzes about maxim or cooperative principles which is violated. In general, this study explored the implicature theory, cooperative principles and politeness by Brown Levinson in “Troy and King Arthur” movies manuscript. In specific, this study aimed to understand how the expression of criticism conveyed in polite, find out the meaning, intension of criticism utterances and know cooperative principles that are often used and violated in conversation.

Literature Review
This study covers implicature, cooperative principles, and politeness. The object of the study is criticism utterances.

1. Implicature
Implicature is one of kinds of pragmatic that study about meaning. Pragmatic is study of relation between meaning and social context. In pragmatic, the meaning deals with the social context and appropriate sentences (Levinson in Leech, 2014). There are some principles of pragmatics, namely deixis, presupposition, entailment, speech act, and implicature, but this study just discuss about implicature. The theory of implicature is attributed to Paul Herbert Grice. The implicature is what speaker implies, suggests, or means as distinct what speaker says (Grice in Levinson, 1983). The implicature as inferences that cannot be made from isolated utterance and shared knowledge between speaker and hearer (Piech, 1999). It can be concluded that the implicature is what explicit meaning is behind the utterances or what is a literary expression uttered. The implicature divided into two types, namely conventional implicature and conversational implicature.

a. Conventional implicature.
Conventional implicatures are meanings not part of the conditions for item truth or expressions that do not originate from super ordinate pragmatic principles such as the proverb, but are connected to certain lexical items (Levinson, 1983). When the speaker use word but between coordinate coordinate clauses that some contras relation e.g. “Denia is poor but happy”. This condition shows the contras condition that poverty is identified with affection and contrast with happiness which identified with wealth. However, Denia’s condition is different and proven that happiness is not always about wealth but it is about comfortable, pleasure, peaceful, etc.

b. Conversational Implicature
This means implicit speech acts, what the speaker said meant implicitly based on the situation, culture, social context, etc. It is utterance in conversation which has meaning behind meaning based on other aspect social (Levinson, 1983). Conversational implicature need cooperative principle, it is usually called maxim to avoid misunderstanding, e.g.

“Mich : Do you want chocolate?”

“Angel : I am diet sugar.”

Both of them need some general knowledge about food especially chocolate and sugar. Chocolate is kind food which contains of sugar. It can make diabetic and fat. This is reason why Angel refuses the offer of chocolate. The implicature meaning of Angel’s utterances is “No”, it shows a refusal.

2. Cooperative Principles

The cooperative principle is used to keep understanding between speaker and listener. It also describes how effective communication in conversation and even works when we are not being cooperative principles. It is called Maxim i.e. the rules of conversation. There are principles of cooperative principles, namely maxims of quantity i.e. be informative and giving as much information as is needed, maxim of quality i.e. be truthful and not giving information that is false, maxim of relation i.e. be relevant and saying something that is pertinent to the discussion, and maxim of manner i.e. be clear, be brief, and avoiding obscurity and ambiguity (Grice in Levinson, 1983).

3. Politeness Strategies

According to Brown and Levinson (2000), politeness is maintaining proper etiquette and speaking properly to a person without offending him or her. In other words, the politeness is one of sociolinguistic studies concerning with human behavior in using the language in social cultural context. It is useful to convey the message so that can be accepted easily. The politeness strategies are developed in order to save the hearer face. Face means to respect that an individual to him and self esteem in public or private situations. People usually avoid wound other person, and making them uncomfortable. Politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson are known Face Threatening Act (FTA), it is acts that infringe on the hearer need to maintain esteem, and be respected. There are four types of politeness behavior, namely:

a. Bald on record

In this strategy, a speaker will surprise and embarrass the other person because this does not minimize the threat to the listener’s face. Thus, it is most often used in situations where the speaker has a close relationship with the listener, such as a family relationship or close friend e, g. "Watch out!"

b. Positive Politeness

In this strategy, the speaker recognizes that the listener has a desire to be respected. This minimizes threats to positive faces, for example: self-image or self-esteem to show solidarity, emphasizing that both speakers want something and that they have a common goal.

c. Negative Politeness

This strategy is similar to recognizing that listeners want to be respected about their privacy and freedom. Negative politeness is oriented towards the negative face of people who tend to show differences, emphasize the importance of the time or problems of others, and even include apologies for coercion and interaction.

d. Off-record Indirect Strategies

This strategy is to remove the pressure from the speakers. This strategy is not directly addressed to others and becomes ambiguous because the speaker leaves the listener to decide
how to interpret the action, e.g. "It's hot here". The hidden meaning of speech can be a request to open a window or turn on the air conditioner.

4. Criticism Utterance

People are doing criticism about opinion, idealism, behavior, or resolution to other people because s/he wants to give opinion or show disapproval. Criticizing is an act which pointing out someone’s bad attitude, fault and given bad judgment. Criticism is the act of expressing disapproval of something or someone and opinions about their bad qualities and statements of disapproval (Oxford, 2003). In other hand, it is the action of passing judgment especially faults finding (Brown in The New Shoter Oxford English Dictionary, 1993). It can be concluded that criticism utterances is used to point someone’s fault and giving bad opinion or judgment about their speech or their attitude. This utterance aims to give suggestion to make them better or reduce their fault or prevent them not to make the same mistake.

Method

This study takes descriptive qualitative research. It is type of research which does not include any calculation or enumeration (Moleong, 2004).

1. Method of data collection

The data of the study was criticism utterances in the form of words, phrase, or sentence in Aristocratic movies manuscript entitled “Troy and King Arthur” manuscripts. The data were collected by reading the movies manuscripts and seeing that movie. It began from reading and selecting the data belong to criticism. Next, the data of criticism was gathered. To make easy to find the data source, the study use abbreviation: “KING” for “King Arthur” and “TROY” for “Troy”. Then, it was added number to show the number of data. In coding data, there were some rules, namely the first was number of data and second was letter to show where was the data exist, e.g. 01/KING means that the first data of criticism which was taken from King Arthur movies while 02/TROY means that the second data of criticism which was taken from Troy movies. In fact, credibility test was the most important way in checking data of this study. One of the technique tests was triangulation. Triangulation was selected as comparison to another data i.e. the source of data, method or theory being applied (Cresswell, 2012).

2. Techniques of Data Analysis

In this study, the data of criticism utterances were analyzed by using the Nunan’s implicature theory (Nunan, 1983). The next analysis was politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson with FTA (Face Threatening Acts) theories. Finally, the last is discussing the findings.

Results and Discussion

The Impicature of Criticizing Utterances and Maxim

All of the data is conversational implicature which need context of speech situation and maxim to analyse. Here, the study uses context of speech situation by Nunan to analyze data. They are presented in table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Implicature</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Mocking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Contradiction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Disappointment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the table, contradiction is greater finding than other implied. These results are mocking, contradiction, order, disappointment, forbid, satire, anger, advice.

Table. II. Cooperative Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Violation of Maxim</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Clarify</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>No Indicate of Violation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maxim of conversation of criticism utterances in movies manuscript is not many of maxim violation when speakers say critiques. In term maxim of quantity, 12 data fulfill this maxim. Meanwhile, 22 data violate this maxim. In the maxim of quality, 21 data obey this maxim and 14 data violate this maxim. In maxim of relevance found 18 data fulfilled this maxim and 17 data violate the maxim relevance.

**Politeness Strategies**

Politeness strategies have four types, they are bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record, but in this study just finds three strategies. They are presented in the table:

Table III. Politeness Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Types of Politeness</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Bald On Record</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Positive Politeness</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Negative Politeness</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Off-Record</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bald on record is strategy which many people use to give criticism in *King Arthur* and *Troy* movies, because this story tell about knight, struggle, idealism, and many self-background so people give it to other people without save the hearer. From the table above, the researcher writes down sentences meaning between implicature, politeness patterns and politeness patterns is inconstant based on context of situation.

In this part, this study analyzed the implicature with context of situation by Nunan (1983). It can be found that there are eight implicatures namely mocking, contradiction, order, disappointment, forbid, satire, anger, and advice. The second analysis is cooperative principles by Grice. It can be found that there are two violations of maxim namely maxim of clarify and quantity. The last analysis is
politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson. It can be found that there are three type politeness strategies which are used in criticism utterances in “Troy and King Arthur” movies manuscript namely bald on record, positive politeness, and negative politeness.

Discussion
In this analysis, the writer has found 8 types of criticizing utterances in the movies (mocking, contradiction, order, disappointment, forbid, satire, anger, and advice), 2 types of cooperative principles (maxim of clarify and quantity), and 3 types of politenesses of strategies (bald on record, positive and negative politeness).

Conversation Implicature and Cooperative Principles

Mocking

02/KING

Arthur : (looking at the man in the carriage) that is not the Bishop
Bishop’s Aide : (scared as hell) God help us. What are they?
Bors : Blue demons who eat Christians alive-you are not a Christian, are you?
Bors : (imitating prayer) Does this... really work? (Mumbles) Nothing.. maybe I’m not doing it right...

The topic is Bors critizes Bishop’s aide when he prays in the fight. The setting is on the forest border. The situation is knight and Roman troops’ war with Wood’s troops in the forest border, and they want to kill Bishop. The participants are Arthur and his knight, Bishop, Rome’s troops, and Woods’ troops. Bors is one of the Sarmantian knights. Bors is speaker of the criticizing utterances and Bishop’s aide because in war situation he just can pray and whimpers to God. Bors is not Roman so he does have not a religion and does not believe to God. He must not just pray and whimpers when he is in the war. He ought to takes a part in fight. The background knowledge is Bors mocks Bishop’s aide act. Bors satire Bishop’s aide by saying “Blue demons who eat Christians alive-you are not a Christian, are you?”, because Woad always attacked Roman who they were Christian or Catholic and when the bishop's aides prayed and whined, Bors imitated and mocked the actions of the bishop's aides by saying “Does this... really work? Nothing.. maybe I’m not doing it right...” he shows that what Bishop’s aide doing is not useful because Bishop’s aide is not taking part in against. The purpose of event is Bors mocks behavior of Bishop’s aide when they are fighting. Based on the purpose of the event, it implies that Bors’s criticism is mocking to Bishop’s aide. In that utterances above, Bors answers of Bishop’s aide question is too much, than he say something that it does not need to answer of question. Hence, it indicates that Bors’s utterance violates maxim of quantity.

Contradiction

01/KING

[Insert battle cries and fighting noises here] [more fighting noises and sounds of people dying] [and screaming]

Bors : (insert incoherent yelling here) (waves tongue out at retreating Woads) [more fighting, but on a smaller scale]
Bors : Roarrrrrrr!!! (approaches the Bishop’s carriage and sees an arrow has struck through his chest)

[Gawain and Bors stare with a bit of disbelief at the dead man in the carriage]

Bishop’s aide : (hiding under the carriage) (panic-stricken, fear-ridden chants in Latin)
Gawain : (stabs his knives angrily into the group) (sits down and notices the Bishops’ Aide) (panting) Save our prayers, boy. Your God doesn’t live here.
Bishop’s aide is not brave to fight with Woads, he just prays and hides under the carriage. The type of communication is communicative. The topic is Gawain criticizes Bishops’ aide looks afraid and trembles when the knights and Rome’s troops fight with Woads. The situation is on the forest border. The setting is knight and Rome’s troops fight with Woads in the border of forest when they want to meet Arthur and knights. The participants are Bishops’ aide, Bishop, Woads, Arthur, and his knights. The background of knowledge is after war finished, knights look Rome’s troops who died. Gawain looks at Bishops’ aide hide under carriage with panics, stress, and praying. Then Gawain says “Save our prayers, boy. Your God doesn’t live here” it means that his prayers and hopes for God are useless because prayer cannot save the Bishop without effort, and Gawain failed to save the Bishop who brought the letter of independence, so that he is very disappointed. The purpose of event is Gawain gives understanding to Bishop’s aide that fears and prays are not useful in fighting. Based on the purpose, Gawin’s criticism can imply that he is disappointment and giving suggestion to Bishops’ aide, it show that Gawain is contradiction with Bishop’s aide acts. There is a violation maxim of clarify done by one participant, that is Gawain. It is presented in utterance “Save our prayers, boy. Your God doesn’t live here”, this utterance in this context is not brief and have ambiguity in meaning.

**Order 06/KING**

Bishop : (strenuous smile) Gentlemen. Your discharge papers with safe conduct throughout the Roman Empire. But first, I must have a word with your commander.[knights still standing and watching]

Bishop : (sitting down) In private.

Arthur : (looking around) We have no secrets.[loud bang]

Lancelot : Come. Let’s leave Roman business to Romans. (take a sip from his goblet)

Dagonet : (painting Bors on the shoulder) Let it go, Bors. [other knights follow Lancelot out]

Bishop : (Bishop smirks)

The topic is Arthur criticizes Bishop, because he disagrees with Bishop to speak in private. The setting is in the forest. Bishop wants to final meeting and he wants talk in private with Arthur. The participants are Bishop, Arthur, and his knights. Arthur is speaker of criticism utterance Bishop and knight is as hearer. The background of knowledge is that day knight will get freedom from Rome. Arthur and knights are very happy in that day and they have many dreams after it. Arthur, his knights and Bishop gather in fortress, knights wait Bishop to give freedom letter for them. But in the meeting, Bishop just shows letter of freedom, he asks to say something to Arthur about Saxon’s attack. The relation between Arthur and his knights is very close so there are not secret between them. The purpose is Arthur gives understanding to Bishop that Arthur and knights do not have secret between them and order to talk in front of him and his knights. It is implied that Arthur order to Bishop to talk in front of them with transparency. There is no indication of violation of maxim done by the participant. It is direct command; they give appropriate sentences in the conversation.

**Disappointment 05/KING**

[Bishop smiles back] [Knights sit bank down]

Bishop : The pope’s taken a personal interest in you. He inquires after each of you, and is curious to know if your knights have converted toward our Savior, or..

Arthur : They retain the religion of their forefathers. I’ve never questioned that.

Bishop : Oh-of course, of course. They are pagans. [Galahad and other knights shift somewhat uneasily]

Bishop : For our path, the church has deemed such beliefs innocence. But you, Arthur. Your path to God is through Pelagius? I saw his image in your room.
Arthur: He took my father’s place for me. His teachings on free will and equality have been of great influence. I look forward to our reunion in Rome.

The topic is Bishop criticizes Arthur angrily concerning Pelagius wherever it's in Arthur’s space. The setting is within the fort. Bishop talks concerning faith within the meeting with knights. The participants are Bishop, Arthur, and his knights. The background of information is Bishop finds Pelagius coin in Arthur’s space, he thinks that Arthur worship to God by Pelagius and he judges that Arthur is heated. Arthur is Rome thus he's Roman. Bishop accuses Arthur heathen individuals as a result of the worships to God through Pelagius. Although, Arthur thinks that Pelagius is successor his father, he’s attracted Pelagius theories concerning freedom and quality having nice influence. Bishop shows anger along with his criticism so that Arthur realizes that Bishop is not a good match for him. Therefore, Bishop’s critique is implicit that Bishop’s criticism suggests that to disillusion that Arthur is Roman, and Roman is Catholic. On the voice communication, there’s no indication of violation of maxim done by the participants. The voice communication has consummated all of maxims.

Forbid 08/KING
[Arthur starts to saddle up and prepare for the next morning] [Arthur throws saddle onto the ground in frustration]
Arthur: O merciful God, I have such need of Your Mercy now. Not for myself, but for my knights, for this is truly their hour of need. Deliver them from their trials a head and I will pay You a thousand fold with any sacrifice, You ask of me. And if in Your wisdom, You should determine that sacrifice must be my life for theirs; so that they can once again taste the freedom that is so long been denied to them, I will gladly make that covenant. My death will have a purpose. I ask no more than that.

[Lancelot is sneaking around the entire time]
Lancelot: Why do you always talk to God and not to me? Pray. (gestures for Arthur to continue) To whomever you pray that we don’t cross the Saxons.
Arthur: My faith is what protects me, Lancelot. Why do you challenge this?
Lancelot: I don’t like anything that puts a man on his knees.
Arthur: No man fears to kneel before the God he trusts. Without faith, without belief in something, what are we?

Based on the conversation, the setting is in the loose box. The situation is Arthur starts to saddle up and prepare for the next morning Arthur throws saddle onto the ground in frustration. The participants are Lancelot and Arthur. The background of knowledge is Arthur as a knight who is strong and brave. After he talks about the last duty to his knights, he is so sad because it makes disappointed for them; they are not free in that day. Now, Arthur kneels and prays to God, and Lancelot sees it. Then, Lancelot says, “I don’t like anything that puts a man on his knees” he comments on Arthur because of his act. Lancelot is unbeliever, so he is never kneels and prays, he thinks that a man should be not kneels. Besides that, Arthur is a roman so he believes God, Catholic, praying with kneel is normal. The purpose is Lancelot advices that kneel is not reasonable for man. Therefore, it is implied that he does not kneel, because kneel show powerlessness. There is no indication of violation of maxim done by the participants. The conversation has fulfilled all of maxims. The hearer’s answer is consequence with the speaker’s command.
Satire
14/KING
[British scout and Saxon army gather in their camp] [they talk about Roman]
Cynric (enraged): Who is this Arthur?
British Scout : It is said he has never been defeated in battle. It is said he is a great warrior.
Cerdic : (place one hand on British scout’s shoulder) Why should I thrust you? You are a traitor to your own people.
Cynric : Tell my father of the Roman estate. (Silence) Speak up!
British Scout : A very high ranking family live there. They are of great importance to Rome.

Based on the conversation above, British scout gives information about Roman. The type of communication is communicative. The setting is in Saxon army camp. The participants are Cerdic, Cynric, and British scout. The background knowledge is Saxon wants to attack Rome’s castle and all member of Roman’s family inside there. Saxon wants to kill and burn everything in there. Therefore, Bishop commands Arthur and his knights to save that family. That news is delivered by British scout that Arthur and his knights have saved Roman’s family, it makes Saxon more attentive and covers their emotion with critique to British scout. The purpose is Cerdic satire to British scout who is betraying his people, so he cannot believe his information about Arthur. It is implied that Cerdic’s criticism uses to satire British scout’s behavior. Based on the conversation, there is no violation of maxim done by the participant. They speak in conversation follow of cooperative principles by Grice.

Anger
18/TROY
[Hector shoves his brother backwards. The older brother’s physical power is obvious. Sailors watch in awed silence.]
Hector : To Sparta? They’ll kill you.
Paris : Then I’ll die fighting
[Hector laughs bitterly. He grabs the collar of Paris’s tunic.]
Hector : That sounds heroic to you, doesn’t it? To die fighting. Tell me, little brother, have you ever killed a man?
Paris : No.

The setting is in Trojan ship. The older brother’s physical power is obvious. Sailors watches in awed silence. The participants are Paris and Hector. The background knowledge is Hector wants to bring Helen back to Sparta. However, Paris does not agree and he threatens if Hector brings Helen back to Sparta, he will stay with Helen in Sparta, and fight with Melenaus. Paris is not afraid if he must die in the fight to Helen. Hector doubts the statement of Paris whereas smile bitterly, because he never fights and kills a man. Hector gives her opinion with some question to Paris. The statement of Paris makes Hector angry and annoyed, because he does not think to Trojan but to love and to woman. The purpose is Hector gives opinion and criticism, because he wants to give understanding that he does not know with hero, dying in fight is not pride, so he must be careful in action or speak. It is implied that Hector is very angry towards Paris behavior. There is no indication of violation of maxim done by the participants.

Advice
19/TROY
Hector : Have you ever even seen a man die in combat?
Paris : No
(Hector’s face is flushed with anger. Paris tries to look away but Hector won’t let him).
Hector : I’ve killed men, brother. I’ve watched them dying, I’ve heard them about dying. I’ve smelled them dying. (beat) There’s nothing glorious about it, nothing poetic. You think you want to die for love, but you know nothing about dying. You know nothing about love.

Paris : All the same, I go with her.

[He Hector releases his brother. He stares at the sea.]

Follow the conversation above seem that Hector is very angry to Paris. The type of communication is communicative. The setting is in Trojan ship. The situation is Hector angers to Paris in Trojan ship. The participants are Hector and Paris. The background knowledge is Paris usually think everything is game, like as women, love, die, etc. He always roams from town to town to get woman, so Hector is not believed when he talks about love. Moreover, he talks that he will fight to Menelaus and ready to die for Helen. Besides that, Paris is never fight and kills man, so it make Hector angers because Paris talks like that, in even he do not know about die, war, and love. He did not think that his behavior could create a new war between Trojans and Sparta which would kill many Trojans. The goal, Hector’s criticism, is that Paris realizes that death is not beautiful. Based on the purpose, it is implied that Hector uses his criticism to advice. This conversation is not violation of maxim. Participants of conversation are cooperative and consequence in cooperative principles.

Politeness Strategies
This study finds four kinds of politeness strategies which is used in King Arthur and Troy movies manuscript, they are: Bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, off-record indirect strategies.

Bald on record
This strategy uses direct utterance. The speaker does not effort to reduce the impact of FTA, speaker will mostly shock the hearers embarrass them or make them feel uncomfortable.

01/KING
[Insert battle cries and fighting noises here] [more fighting noises and sounds of people dying] [and screaming]
Bors : (insert incoherent yelling here) (waves tongue out at retreating Woads)
[more fighting, but on a smaller scale]
Bors : Roarrrrrrrr!!! (approaches the Bishop’s carriage and sees an arrow has struck through his chest)

[Gawain and Bors stare with a bit of disbelief at the dead man in the carriage]
Bishop’s aide : (hiding under the carriage) (panic-stricken, fear-ridden chants in Latin)
Gawain : (stabs his knives angrily into the group) (sits down and notices the Bishops’ Aide) (panting) Save tour prayers, boy. Your God doesn’t live here.

On the conversation between Gawain and Bishop’s aide above, Gawain uses bald on record strategy, because Gawain command direct to Bishops’ aide startle and quite. The statement is directly addressed to the other as expressing the speaker’s need, called bald on record. In bald on record is usually make shock another person.

Negative Politeness
20/TROY
The bronze warhead blazes between the template’s walls and drives leading a black horse, standing inches from the quivering shaft of an old fir. Only now do we see Odysseus, leading a black horse, standing inches from the queering shaft of the spear blocking his path. Before ducking his head under the shaft and walking forward, he stares at the spear for a moment
Odysseus : I’m not asking you to fight for him. I’m asking you to fight for the Greeks.
Achilles : Why? Are the Greeks tired of fighting each other?
Odysseus : For now.
Achilles: The Trojans never did anything to me.
Odysseus: They insulted Greece.
Achilles: They insulted one Greek, a man who couldn’t hold on to his wife. What business in that of mine?
Odysseus: Your business is war, my friend.

On conversation above, Achilles employs negative strategy. Achilles is close friend with Odysseus, so just Odysseus that is his respected. In negative politeness, a face saving act is more commonly performed and oriented to the person’s negative face. Negative politeness strategy protects the politeness face, for example: personal authority, freedom, and privacy.

Positive Politeness

08/KING

[Arthur starts to saddle up and prepare for the next morning] [Arthur throws saddle onto the ground in frustration]

Arthu: O merciful God, I have such need of Your Mercy now. Not for myself, but for my knights, for this is truly their hour of need. Deliver them from their trials a head and I will pay you a thousand fold with any sacrifice, you ask of me. And if in your wisdom, you should determine that sacrifice must be my life for theirs; so that they can once again taste the freedom that is so long been denied to them, I will gladly make that covenant. My death will have a purpose. I ask no more than that.

[Lancelot is sneaking around the entire time]

Lancelot: Why do you always talk to God and not to me? Pray. (Gestures for Arthur to continue) To whomever you pray that we don’t cross the Saxons.

Arthur: My faith is what protects me, Lancelot. Why do you challenge this?

Lancelot: I don’t like anything that puts a man on his knees.

Arthur: No man fears to kneel before the God he trusts. Without faith, without belief in something, what are we?

Lancelot employs positive politeness strategy on the conversation above. Lancelot asks to Arthur why he does not talk to Lancelot about his problem to Lancelot, because they have close relationship. Positive politeness strategies lead the speaker to attract common goals and even friendship through expression. It has to do with the positive face of a person who tends to show solidarity, emphasizing that both speakers want something and they have the same goal. It also confirms the relationship is friendly and expresses group reciprocity.

Conclusion

This study analyzes conversation implicature of criticism utterances in Aristocratic movies manuscript entitled King Arthur and Troy. Kind of data is criticism utterances in conversation form so this study is also studying cooperative principle and politeness strategies which are important aspect to make conversation is more understanding of participants. This study finds eight implicature with context of situation by Nunan (1983) such as mocking, contradiction, order, disappointment, forbid, satire, anger, and advice. The second analysis is cooperative principles by Grice (1989), it finds two violation of maxim, there are maxim of clarify and maxim of quantity. The next analysis is the politeness strategy by Brown and Levinson, this analysis finds three types of politeness strategies used in critical speech in the Troy and King Arthur movies script, namely bald on notes, positive politeness and negative politeness. The studies of implicature, maxim and politeness strategies have large field such as a social community in our society, politic, culture, education, etc to be object of the study. Therefore, the future study can develop analysis about the data source, the data analysis, and other factor which influence with implicature, maxim and politeness strategies like relationship of the participant or the intension of the utterances.
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