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ABSTRACT


This research is aimed at classifying the types of conversational implicature resulted from the non-observance maxims which have been done by the characters Movie Iron Man 3 and then explaining their meanings. The writer uses Grice’s theory for analyzing the conversational implicature that found in the dialogue of the characters in the movie.

In conducting research, the writer uses descriptive qualitative method to describe and identify the conversational implicature, without use any statistical procedure in the analysis. The data in this research are collected by watching the movie and taking notes the dialogues that estimate as implicature in data cards. And then the selected data will be analyzed one by one using relevant theory about the research.

After analyzing Iron Man 3 Movie, the writer finds conversational implicatures rising because the utterances of the characters non-observance maxims, they are; flouting maxim of quantity (2), flouting maxim of quality (2), flouting maxim of relation (2), flouting maxims of manner (5), opting out maxim of manner (1), opting out maxim of quantity and manner (1) and violating maxim of quantity and manner (1). The writer also finds the existence of two types of conversational implicature, those are generalized conversational implicature (2) and particularized conversational implicature (13).
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of Study

Humans’ lifestyle today is all about practicality. High technology is increasingly supporting practical behavior in humans at this time. The practical behavior of humans also occurs in the current communication, especially verbal communication. Communication is defined as the process by which meaning is exchanged between individuals through a common system symbols, sign or behavior.\(^1\) As social creatures, human always communicate with each other by using language.

However, the language used by human is dynamic and it always evolves according to human needs as its users. The practical behavior and language characteristic above make the using of language happen in the conversation.\(^2\) It makes people do not give enough contribution as required in their communication. Sometimes, when speaking, people use certain words to imply other things that have different meanings. Therefore, to understand the utterance we have to relate it with the outside aspect of the language, such as culture of the participants. This conditions in Pragmatics study is called implicature.\(^3\)

\(^1\) Judy Pearson and et.al, Human Communication (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2003), p. 34
\(^2\) Rudi Adi Nugroho, Analisis Implikatur Percakapan Dalam Tindak Komunikasi Di Kelompok Teater Peron Fkip Uns, Universitas Negeri Semarang, p.1
\(^3\) Kushartanti, Pragmatik, In Kushartanti, Untung Yuwono and Multamia RMT Lauder, Pesona Bahasa: Langkah Awal Memahami Lingusitik (Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama, 2007), p. 106
Look at the dialogue below, Mary and Ringo were talking about operating system of smartphone.

(1) Mary: Do you like Jelly Bean or Kitkat as operating System your phone?

Ringo : I like iOS.

The example (1), the dialogue is about operating system of smartphone. Ringo’s answer does not relate with Mary’s question. A was mention the series of android’s operating system but B mention about iOS as known as operating system for IPhone product. So that Ringo certainly implicates Ringo dislike any android operating systems.

The answered of Ringo in the example above results a conversational implicature. It is because in his conversation, he does not give enough contribution with making statement that does not relate with the question but it indirectly answered the question. The phenomenon like the example above often occurs in the communication today. Therefore, it makes the conversational implicature important to be studied.

Furthermore, the phenomenon of conversational implicature also occurs in the entertainment industry, like movie. In the movie, most of utterances of the characters make the audiences think for a moment to understand what the meaning of the spoken, it is because the characters’ utterances sometimes has a meaning or purpose that is different from what is spoken. Many of the characters in the movie deliberately violated the cooperative principle. Look at the piece of conversation in the movie *The Avengers* below:
(2) Context: Tony Stark, Bruce Banner and Steeve Roger were debating about Nick Fury as chief in the SHIELD. Tony felt incredulity to Fury and he tried to convince to Steeve there are another purposes about Tesseract.

Steeve: You need to focus on the problem, Mr. Stark.

Tony: Do you think I'm not? Why did Fury call us in? Why now? Why not before? What isn't he telling us? I can't do the equation unless I have all the variables.

Steeve: You think Fury's hiding something?

Tony: He's a spy. Captain, he's "the" spy. His secrets have secrets.

In the conversation above, Tony in his utterance certainly implicates Fury is the big liar. Spy never said the truth, and Fury always has something very undiscovered from people around. The utterance of Tony is conversational implicature because Tony does not cooperative in his answer and rises obscurity information.

The study of conversational implicature in the movie is important, especially in super hero movies, because, the super hero movies are popular in the world today. So that, for more enjoying the movie, we have to know what is exactly meant by the characters in the movie. This is the reason why the writer studies about implicature and takes a super hero movie as subject. The writer uses one of famous

---

4 Elliot Smith, Phoenix Forward Magazine, University of Phoenix. Access from http://www.phoenix.edu/forward/perspectives/2014/02/why-are-superhero-movies-so-popular.html on 15 September 2014 at 01:00 AM
movie that is *Iron Man 3* which is adapted from *MARVEL Comics*, that is *Iron Man*. In the movie, the character of Tony Stark who played by *Robert Downey Jr.* described as a physicist and wealthy man who owns *Stark Industries* but has very eccentric characteristic that most of his speech implies different from what he speaks. Look at the example (3).

(3) Context: *Tony and Rhodes are lunch in a café. They are talking about Mandarin who is estimate as Terrorist and has responsible for explosion cases in some place. Tony offers him for helping Government to solve the problem but Rhodes sees Tony like unusual and not focus.*

Rhodes : When's the last time you got a good night's sleep?

Tony : *Einstein slept 3 hours a year. Look what he did.*

In the example above, Tony directly answers the Rhodes’s question by comparing him with Einstein. Einstein and him are scientist that always doing something that sacrifice their time to sleep. Hence, the utterance certainly implicates Tony rarely has a good sleeping.

The uniqueness character of Tony stark makes the writer interesting to use the movie as corpus of the study. The writer uses *Iron Man 3*, which is the latest sequel of the movie.

However, studies about conversational implicature in the movie have been carried out by researchers, but most of these studies only discussed about the violation of maxim and do not discuss further what the conversational implicature
itself that basically not only about does not observe maxims. With all these considerations, the writer creates a study discussing further about conversational implicature such as the types of implicature in the movie.

B. Focus of Study

The research will focus on the conversational implicature which was resulted from non-observance maxims by characters in their dialogue in Iron Man 3 Movie which is released in 2013. The implicatures will be analyzed using the theory proposed by H. Paul Grice.

C. Research Question

Based on the background and the focus of study, there are four questions in this research, those are:

1. What are the maxims of cooperative principle that non-observance in the dialogue of the characters in the Iron Man 3 Movie?

2. How the non-observance of maxim occurs in the dialogue of the characters in the Iron Man 3 Movie?

3. What type of conversational implicatures found in the dialogue of the characters in Iron Man 3 Movie?

4. What is the meaning of each conversational implicature found in the dialogue of the characters in the Iron Man 3 Movie?

D. Significance of Study

This research will useful for reader to know more about conversational implicature and of course, the research theoretically can be additional
information for the next researcher who interested in conversational implicature. Besides having beneficial as additional information, the research practically can help the readers especially for movie lovers more understand the exact meaning of each utterance of the characters in the movie.

E. Research Methodology

1. Objective of Study

Based on the research questions above, the objectives of the study are:

a. To identify the maxims of cooperative principle that non-observance in the dialogue of the characters in the *Iron Man 3 Movie*

b. To explain how the non-observance of maxim occurs in the dialogue of the characters in the *Iron Man 3 Movie*.

c. To identify the types of conversational implicature used by the characters in their dialogue in the *Iron Man 3 Movie*.

d. To describe the meaning of each conversational implicature found in the dialogue of the characters in the *Iron Man 3 Movie*.

2. Method of Study

Because the data in this research are utterances of the characters in the Movie, this research applies descriptive qualitative methodology. Descriptive qualitative is the method of research used to describe nature phenomenon happened and relevancies between one phenomena and the
others. The research doesn’t use any statistical procedure so that the writer will describe the data obtained to answer the research questions.

3. Instrument of The Research

To get selected data, this research record the data in data card. Data card will be analyzed one by one. The form of data card will like following table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Data</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Observance Maxim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type CI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direction:

**No Data**: Data are numbered based on the order in writing to the data card

**Context**: Context of the utterances is written based on the situation that is going on in the conversation of characters in a movie

**Utterance**: The utterances of the character in the movie that were resulted conversational implicature

**Non-Observance Maxim**: Type of Non-observance and Type Maxims.

---

**Type CI:** Type of Conversational Implicature.

**Meaning:** Meaning of the implicature found

4. **Unit of Analysis**

   As the unit of analysis, the research uses super hero movie titled *Iron Man 3* by Shane Black, production of Marvel Studios released in 2013.

5. **Technique of Data Collection and Analysis**

   a. **Data Collection**

      This research uses watch and take notes technique for collecting data. The watch and take notes technique are Conducting an investigation into the use of spoken language and held a spontaneous recording of relevant data in accordance with the aims and objectives of the study. Therefore, in this study the instrument used is the data card as a tool to collect data. So this research uses two steps in collecting data. The watching technique by watching the movie from the beginning until the end of the movie to know the story line of the movie and it is also to help the writer for understanding the context in the movie. Then the writer uses taking notes technique to make transcript the dialogue of the characters that were estimate as implicature by use the data card that was prepared before.

---

b. Data Analysis

In the phase of data analysis, data in this research which implicatures resulted by the characters in the *Iron Man 3 Movie* will be analyzed with pragmatic theory. The theory that uses in the research is conversational Implicature by H.P Grice. The selected data will be analyzed through two steps. First, data are classified into their types based on Grice’s theory about conversational implicature and then, the data will be analyze one by one to generate implicatures found from utterance of the characters based on the context.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Previous Research

For consideration in this study, the writer listed some of the results of previous studies by several researchers that had ever read by the writer, first is the thesis was conducted by Lestari in 2013 with titled “The Analysis of Conversational Implicature in the Movie Script of “Despicable Me””. This study was conducted to analyze the using of conversational implicature in the movie’s script “Despicable Me”. The study focuses on conversational implicature based on cooperative principle on movie’s script. The writer of this study analyzes the four cooperative principles, which are maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of manner and maxim of relation in the movie’s script. The conclusion is the most of violated maxim which happened in the movie are maxim quality and maxim manner. The writer of this study also explains context and situation of each utterances does not follow the rules of aphorism to make the movie funny and not too serious.

The study was conducted by Yunita Nugraheni with the title "Movie Script Analysis implicature In Harry Potter and The Goblet of Fire" in 2010. In this study, the writer describes that in communicating a person is required to always adhere to the principle of conversational fluency in communicating that may occur. In this case, the authors use Grice’s conversational principle known as cooperative Principle. However, this study was limited to identify what the
non-observance maxims by the characters in the movie. Through previous studies that is conducted by the writer from several existing studies about conversational implicatures, including two studies above, which have similar topic and also use a movie for research media like this study who was done by the writer. The writer concludes that most of the research on conversational implicatures is limited on finding the non-observance of maxims in the dialogue of characters, and then describe the meaning.

However this study is different with two studies above. This study will describe further about the types of conversational implicatures which has explained by H. Paul Grice. Studying about implicature is very important today. The same culture and the sufficient knowledge make the people more often use practical language while communicating each other. It makes many people, in many times do not observe the cooperative principle in their communication such as giving a little or giving irrelevant information than required, and sometimes giving obscurity information that makes the interlocutor confuses.

Therefore, the writer conducts a study of conversational implicature not only about the non-observance of maxims, but also discusses the types of conversational implicatures. Depend on Grice’s theory that conversational implicature has two types, they are generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. In this part that will make the difference this study with the other researchers that analyze about conversational implicature.
B. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is concerned with the interpretation of linguistic meaning in context.\(^7\) Furthermore, pragmatics is also about language use.\(^8\) Yule said Pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and the users of those forms. In this three-part distinction, only pragmatics allows humans into the analysis.\(^9\)

Moreover, Levinson said that pragmatics is the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language.\(^10\) In addition, Brown and Yule said that any analytic approach in linguistics which involves contextual considerations, necessarily belongs to that area of language study called pragmatics.\(^11\) In the other hand, to know pragmatics work we have to know what context is. Context influenced in the aptitude system of language.\(^12\)

Based on Oxford Dictionary, context is situation in which an event happens.\(^13\) Context is an essential factor in the interpretation of utterances and expressions. The most important aspects of context are: (1) preceding and following utterances and/or expressions (‘co-text’), (2) the immediate physical

---

8 Ibid., p. 208
situation, (3) the wider situation, including social and power relations, and (4) knowledge presumed shared between speaker and hearer. In addition, Mey said that Context is about understanding what things are for; it is also what gives our utterances their true pragmatic meaning and allows them to be counted as true.

As long as the development of pragmatics, there are two scope in pragmatics. According to Mey, the scope of pragmatics is divided into micro pragmatics and macro pragmatics. Micro pragmatics contains deiksis, anafora, reference, speech act, indirect speech act and implicature. In the opposite, macro pragmatics discusses about conversational analysis, discourse analysis and so on. Besides of micro pragmatics and macro pragmatics, there are subclass of pragmatics, those are meth pragmatics and societal pragmatics. And in this time, the research will discuss about one of micro pragmatics that is implicature.

C. Cooperative Principle

Grice said that, in communication you have to make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which are engaged. Cooperative principle is the principle when the concept of there being an expected amount of information provide in conversation is just one aspect of the more general

15 Jacob L. Mey, Pragmatics an Introduction 2nd Ed (UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2001.), p. 41
idea that people involved in a conversation will cooperate with each other. In most circumstances, the assumption of cooperation is so pervasive that can be stated as cooperative principle of conversation and elaborated in four sub-principles, called maxims, and those maxims are:18

1. Maxim of Quantity19

   The maxim quantity related to the quantity of information to be provided, and under it fall the following maxim:

   a. Make your contribution as informative as required (for the current purposes of the exchange.

   b. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

2. Maxim of Quality20

   Try to make your contribution one that is true

   a. Do not say what you believe to be false.

   b. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

3. Maxim Relation

   Grice said that, in the communication we have to be relevant in the other words make your contribution relevant, so that the process of

---

20 Ibid., p. 47
communication does not met any interruption. This maxim is the easiest one, pointing out that participants center about the same topic and avoid asserting something irrelevant.

4. Maxim of Manner

Unlike the previous categories, the maxim manner concerned to how what is said is to be said. Be perspicuous.

a. Avoid obscurity of expression.

b. Avoid ambiguity.

c. Be brief.

d. Be orderly.

The example below will shows when speaker observes all maxims.\textsuperscript{21}

(4) Husband : Where are the car keys?
Wife : They're on the table in the hall.

In the example (4), the wife has answered clearly (Manner) truthfully (Quality), has given just the right amount of information (Quantity) and has directly addressed her husband's goal in asking the question (Relation). She has said precisely what she meant, no more and no less, and has generated no implicature (i.e. there is no distinction to be made here between what she says and what she means, there is no additional level of meaning).

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{21} Jenny Thomas, Meaning In Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics (New York: Rutledge, 2013), p. 64
\end{flushright}
D. The Non-observance Maxim

However, that there are very many occasions when people fail to observe the maxims. People may fail to observe a maxim, for the example in some situation they are incapable of speaking clearly, or because they deliberately choose to lie. There are five ways of failing to observe a maxim:\textsuperscript{22}

1. Flouting a maxim\textsuperscript{23}

A flout occurs when a speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim at the level of what is said, with the deliberate intention of generating an implicature. Look the example:

(5) A: How are we getting there?
   B: Well \textit{we're} getting there in Dave's car.

B blatantly gives less information than A needs, thereby generating the implicature that, while she and her friends have a lift arranged, A will not be travelling with them.\textsuperscript{24}

2. Violating a maxim\textsuperscript{25}

Grice defines Violation' very specifically as the unostentatious non observance of a maxim. If a speaker violates a maxim s/he 'will be liable to mislead. Violating a maxim is the exact opposite of flouting a maxim.

(5) Context: An English athlete, Dianne Modahl, the defending Commonwealth Games 800 metres champion, pulled out of her

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{22} Jenny Thomas, \textit{Meaning In Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics} (New York: Rutledge, 2013), p. 64
\item \textsuperscript{23} Ibid., p. 65
\item \textsuperscript{24} Ibid., p. 69
\item \textsuperscript{25} Ibid., p. 72
\end{itemize}
opening race and returned to England. Caroline Searle, press officer for the England team, said:

‘She has a family bereavement; her grandmother has died.’

The next day it was announced that Ms Modahl had been sent home following a positive test for drugs. What Ms Searle had said was true, but the implicature (that the reason for Modahl’s returning home was a bereavement) was false.

3. Infringing a maxim

Infringing a maxim occur because the speaker has an imperfect command of the language (a young child or a foreign learner), because the speaker's performance is impaired in some way (nervousness, drunkenness, excitement), because of some cognitive impairment, or simply because the speaker is constitutionally incapable of speaking clearly, to the point, etc.


Japanese customer: Do you have lice?

English seller: What??

The Japanese often pronounce "r" as "l" so he says "lice" instead of "rice", thus infringing the maxim and causing misunderstandings.  

---

26 Ibid., p. 74
4. Opting out of a maxim

Opting out occurs, when the speaker cannot, perhaps for legal or ethical reasons, reply in the way normally expected, this is usually occur in the public life. On the other hand, the speaker wishes to avoid generating a false implicature or appearing uncooperative. Another reason frequently given for 'opting out' is that giving the requested information might hurt a third party. Look Example (6)

(7)

Context: The first speaker is a caller to a radio chat show. The second speaker is the host, Nick Ross:

Caller: ... um I lived in n uh a country where people sometimes need to flee that country.

Ross: Uh, where was that?

Caller: It's a country in Asia and I don't want to say any more.

When speakers expressly opt out of observing a maxim in this way, they make explicit reference to the way in which speakers normally attend to the maxims, which in turn offers support for Grice's contention that interact ants have a strong expectation that, ceteris paribus and unless indication is given to the contrary, the CP and the maxims will be observed.

5. Suspending a maxim

Suspending a maxim occurs when there is no need to opt out of observing the maxims because there are certain events in which there is no

---

29 Ibid., p. 75
30 Ibid., p. 76
expectation on the part of any participant that they will be fulfilled. Look at the example (7 and 8).

**Context:** *The speaker in this example and the next is the daughter of a murdered man. She is talking to Officer Jim Ghee of the Navajo Tribal Police:*

'Last time you were with that FBI man — asking about the one who got killed,' she said, respecting the Navajo taboo of not speaking the name of the dead. 'You find out who killed that man?'

'... they told him he could not be cured,' Bistie's Daughter said in a shaky voice. She cleared her throat, wiped the back of her hand across her eyes. 'That man was strong,' she continued. 'His spirit was strong. He didn't give up on things. He didn't want to die. He didn't hardly say anything at all. I asked him. I said, "My Father, why —" ' She stopped.

Never speak the name of the dead, Chee thought. Never summon the *chindi* to you, even if the name of the ghost is Father.

In examples (8) and (9) the speaker fails on three occasions to observe the maxim of Quantity. On the first occasion she refers vaguely to 'the FBI man', thereby generating the (true) implicature that she does not know his name. Then she refers in a similarly vague fashion to 'the one who

---

got killed' and 'that man'. Normally this would generate exactly the same implicature (that she does not know the name of the man). However, among the Navajo this implicature would not be generated in the case of a person who had died a violent or premature death, because to mention his or her name in these circumstances is taboo. In this case the non-observance of the maxim of Quantity generates no implicatures because all the participants know that it is suspended.32

E. Implicature

The term of ‘implicature’ uses by Grice to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean, as distinct from what the speaker literally says.33 According to Gazdar an implicature is a proposition that is implied by the utterance of a sentence in a context even though that proposition is not a part of nor an entailment of what was actually said.34 An implicature does not require correct conditions of the uttered sentence or in the other word, it can just be a thought.35 Grice was the first to systematically study the case where different speakers meaning of sentences in jerkin. He introduced the verb (Implicate) and nouns of implicature which is technically a term that indicates “the act of meaning or implying something by saying something else.” Consider the following dialogue:

32 Ibid., p. 77
33 Gillian Brown and George Yule, Discourse Analysis (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p. 31
Ann: Where can I get gasoline?

Bob: There's a station around the corner.

In the example (9), it shows the existence of conversational implicatures where Bob shows where Ann can get gasoline. But the emphasis here is not the concept of implicature requires the correct conditions of sentences uttered. When Ann asked where he could get petrol then Bob replied no gas stations on the corner. Meaning contained in the speech of Bob is Ann can get gasoline at the pump but you have to remember that the statements are not guarantees Ann will be able to get gasoline there, because it could be gas station is closed or out of stock gasoline.36

Grice distinguished two different sorts of implicature, they are conventional implicature and conversational implicature. They have in common the property that they both convey an additional level of meaning, beyond the semantic meaning of the words uttered. They differ in that in the case of conventional implicature the same implicature is always conveyed, regardless of context, whereas in the case of conversational implicature, what is implied varies according to the context of utterance.37

1. Conventional Implicature

According to Grice, conventional implicature is the implicature that have conventional meaning of the words used.38 Conventional implicatures

36Ibid., p. 5
37 Jenny Thomas, Meaning In Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics (New York: Rutledge, 2013), p. 57
38 Gillian Brown and George Yule, Discourse Analysis (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p. 31
are associated with specific words and result in additional conveyed. Conventional implicatures are not based on the cooperative principle or the maxims. They do not have to occur in conversation, and they do not depend on special context for their interpretation.\textsuperscript{39} The specific words are \textit{but}, \textit{even}, \textit{therefore} and \textit{yet} (to these we might add some uses of \textit{for}).\textsuperscript{40} Look at the following example:

(10) \textit{... she was cursed with a stammer, unmarried but far from stupid.}

Notice that although it is not actually asserted that unmarried people (or, perhaps, people who stammer) are stupid, the word \textit{but} definitely implies that this is the case.

2. Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature is usually also called implicature as shorthand. The term of implicature was introduced by Grice which refers to implied meaning from what is said. Levinson adds that implicature “provides some explicit account of how it is possible to mean (in some general sense) more than what is actually said. Moreover, implicature means a hint which a speaker indicates intentionally by means of language. In this case the message that the speaker utters may be not understood by the hearer.”\textsuperscript{41}

\footnotetext{40}{Jenny Thomas, \textit{Meaning In Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics} (New York: Rutledge, 2013), p. 57}
\footnotetext{41}{Ana Fergina.. \textit{Analyzing Utterances in Movie by Using the Gricean Maxim} (Tanjungpura University), Vol 26, No. 02. 2011p. 2., access from http://jurnal.untan.ac.id/index.php/jgmm/article/view/317/323 on November 15, 2014}
The implicature which has been resulted by violating the cooperative principle is conversational implicature. To understand the meaning of conversational implicature, sometimes we must relate it with situation or context where it’s happening. In Levinson’s book titled Pragmatics, Grice distinguishes conversational implicature into two types, those are generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature.

a. Generalized Conversational Implicature

According to Yule in his book Pragmatics, generalized conversational is a conversational implicature which does not require special knowledge in the context to calculate additional conveyed meaning. In the same aim, Levinson said that generalized conversational implicature arise without any particular context and special scenario being necessary. Look at the example below:

(11) A: Did you buy cheese and bread?
B: I buy bread.

By the example (12), it means that the speaker B does not buy cheese and it can be understood although the speaker B does not give information about that. There is no special background knowledge of the implicature.

---

45 Stephen C. Levinson, op.cit.
Grice also said that generalized conversational implicatures arise when "one can say that the use of a certain form of words in an utterance would normally (in the ABSENCE of special circumstances) carry such-and-such an implicature or type of implicature." Information or inference of generalized implicature is obtained by using word which expresses one value from scale of value. Hence, another way to identify generalized conversational implicature is using scalar implicature.

Scalar implicature is general implicature which marked with scale of values. This is particularly obvious in terms for expressing quantity, where terms are listed from highest to the lowest value as show below:

- all, most, some, few
- always, often, sometimes

In Levinson's book entitled *Pragmatic* (1983), Horn also gives addition scale for generalized conversational implicature that can be an indicator to define which one the generalized conversational implicature.

Look at the following table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horn’s Scale</th>
<th>[and, or]</th>
<th>[necessarily p, p, possibly &gt;]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[n, ..., 5, 4, 3, z, r]</td>
<td>(necessarily p, probably that p, possible that p)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Excellent, good)</td>
<td>(cold, cool)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Look the examples below, they will describe how generalized conversational implicature working:

(12) Some of the boys are come
Scalar implicates $\Rightarrow$ Not all of boys are come.\(^{49}\)

(13) Sometimes George had breakfast with noodle.
Scalar implicates $\Rightarrow$ George not always breakfast with noodle

(14) A: Are you Greek?
B: I can speak some Greek
$\Rightarrow$ I am not Greek.

b. Particularized Conversational Implicature

Particularized conversational implicature is the one of subclass of kind of Grice’s conversational implicature. The particularized conversational implicature have been calculated without special knowledge of any particular context. However, most of the time our conversations take place in very specific context in which locally recognized inferences is assumed.\(^{50}\) Particularized conversational implicature arise because of some

---


special factor inherent in the context of utterance and are not normally
carried by the sentence used. Look the example:

(15) Context: *James and Lily talk about Blackberry Messenger in android Smartphone.*

James: Have you tried using the Blackberry Messenger in your android?

Lily: *It is only Gingerbread.*

Lily's answer clearly implicates that he cannot use the app blackberry messenger in her android Smartphone. Specialized knowledge is needed to be able to understand the implicature of the utterance above. Knowledge about the minimum operating system android platform for running applications Blackberry Messenger has already in operating system Android Ice Cream Sandwich or Jelly bean. However, because the operating system android Lily still the old type Ginger Bread, so it is indirectly answered the James's question.

---

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH FINDINGS

A. Data Description

In collecting data, the research uses watch and take notes technique which is used data card as instrument of research. Because the technique of collecting data are watch and take notes technique, there are two steps to get selected data. First is using watch technique by watching the movie directly and then uses take notes technique to mark the utterance of the characters in the movie that were contained implicature into the data card that is prepared before.

By using the techniques, there are 15 data found the movie and all data was record in data card and will be analyze without through phase of processing of data. After that, the selected data in data card were rewritten in the table to classified data depend on their types.

Table 3.
Table of Conversational Implicature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Data</th>
<th>Non-Observance</th>
<th>Maxim</th>
<th>Types of Conversational Implicature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Datum (1)</td>
<td>Flouting</td>
<td>Relation</td>
<td>Particularized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum (2)</td>
<td>Flouting</td>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>Generalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum (3)</td>
<td>Opting out</td>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>Particularized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum (4)</td>
<td>Flouting</td>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>Particularized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum (5)</td>
<td>Flouting</td>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>Particularized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum (6)</td>
<td>Flouting</td>
<td>Relation</td>
<td>Particularized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum (7)</td>
<td>Flouting</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Particularized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum (8)</td>
<td>Opting out</td>
<td>Quantity and Manner</td>
<td>Particularized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum (9)</td>
<td>Flouting</td>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>Particularized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum (10)</td>
<td>Flouting</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Generalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum (11)</td>
<td>Violating</td>
<td>Quantity and Manner</td>
<td>Particularized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum (12)</td>
<td>Flouting</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Particularized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum (13)</td>
<td>Flouting</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Particularized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum (14)</td>
<td>Flouting</td>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>Particularized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum (15)</td>
<td>Flouting</td>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>Particularized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Data Analysis

Datum (1)

Context: Tony Stark is attending a scientific conference in Bern-Switzerland. He and his female friend named Maya Hansen was talking, but suddenly there is a man calling Tony and introduced himself.

Ho Yinsen: Mr. Stark… Ho Yinsen.

Tony Stark: I finally met a man called Ho

The dialogue above shows that Tony not observe the cooperative principle in his conversation. The utterance I finally met a man called Ho rising conversational implicature. Tony flouting maxim of relation with blatantly gives irrelevant information than required of the interlocutor. Tony can say greeting back to the Ho Yinsen but he does not do it. Thereby, for generating the implicature above we must know the knowledge of the initial name Ho. Ho is usually used in the name of Asian people.52

The utterance of Tony certainly implicated he just met an Asian people. As in context the conversation occurred in the science conference in Switzerland that most participants were Europeans. When the utterances rises implicature and needed a special knowledge to generate it, it must be particularized conversational implicature.

Datum (2)

Context: Tony, Maya and Happy enter a hallway and head for the elevator. As they do, Aldrich Killian walks by and notices three.

Happy: What floor you going to, pal?

Killian: Well, now, that is an appropriate question. The ground floor, actually, of a proposal I'm putting together myself. It's a privately funded think tank called Advanced Idea Mechanics. <Giving name card>

Tony: She'll take both. One to throw away and one to not call.

In the dialogue, the utterance of Tony one to throw away and one to not call above uncooperative. Tony flouting maxim of manner with makes the statement that obscurity. There are no particular situation or any inability that makes Tony speak unclearly, so that Tony not observe maxim of manner and rises conversational implicature.

Tony actually wants to refuse the card. He can simply have replied ‘No’, because the utterance above has an implication I will not use both. There is no relation between the contexts for generating implicature from the utterance, so the implicature is classified as generalized conversational implicature.

Datum (3)

Context: In the main hall of the company office, Virginia 'Pepper' Potts walks alongside Happy. Pepper scoffs and shakes her head. She then stops and turns to face Happy.
Pepper: *I am thrilled that you are now the Head of Security.*

Happy: Okay?

Pepper: *It is the perfect position for you.*

Happy: Thank you.

Pepper: *However...*

Happy: I do appreciate it.

Pepper: *since you've taken the post...*

Happy: You don't have to thank me.

Pepper: *we've had a rise in staff complaints of 300%.*

If the utterance of Pepper is written to a full utterance it must be *I am thrilled that you are now the head of Security, It is the perfect position for you. However since you've taken the post we've had a rise in staff complaints of 300%.* The utterance is a conversational implicature. Pepper is opting out a maxim of manner which causes the utterance becomes unclear between praise and insult the workings of Happy.

Pepper is actually saying that the workings of Happy is not good this is evidenced by its increasing complaints from the staff since he served as head of security. However, Pepper does not say it directly because it does not want to hurt Happy. To understand the meaning of utterances Pepper we have to connect it to
the context, so the above conversational implicatures is particularized conversational implicature.

Datum (4)

Context: Happy tells Tony, there is a man who meets Pepper and he looks like familiar. Happy remembers the Guy, the guy is Aldrich Killian that they meet in science conference in Switzerland. Happy tries to put in mind of the guy to Tony but Tony has problem in memorizing a man.

Happy: He is Aldrich Killian. We actually met the guy back in, where were we in '99? The science conference?

Tony: Switzerland.

Happy: Right, right, exactly.

Tony: Killian. No, I don't remember that guy.

Happy: Of course you don't remember him. He's not a blond with a big rack.

The utterance of Happy of course you do not remember him. He's not a blond with a big rack in response to answer Tony is conversational implicature. Happy does flouting the maxim of manner in the conversation. The utterance He's not a blond with a big rack cause obscurity, where Happy with subjects he when he refers to the characteristics of a sexy woman. Hence, the utterance of Happy above implies that Tony is easier to remember women than any man in his life. This is because the character of Tony is described as a playboy in the Iron Man movie.
When for understanding an implicature we have to connect it to the context, then the implicature included in the particularized conversational implicature.

**Datum (5)**

Context: When Happy talks with Tony, Aldrich Killian who sits together with Pepper shows his project to Pepper and makes Pepper amazed. Happy sees that but indefinitely does not like the activity of them and wants to show it to Tony but He can’t.

Happy: He's showing her his big brain.

Tony: His what?

Happy: Big brain and she likes it. Here, let me show you. Hold on. See?

Tony: Look at what?

Happy: You, watching them?

Tony: Flip the screen, and then we can get started.

Happy: I'm not a tech genius like you.

The utterance of Happy *I'm not a tech genius like you* is uncooperative based on Grice’s theory in conversation. He does not observe maxim with flouting the maxim of manner. Happy’s reply blatantly does not gives enough information as Tony needs. Tony asks Happy to flip the screen his smartphone but Happy makes unclearly respond by saying *he is not a genius like Tony*. Although Happy’s answer are rising an obscurity information, the utterance has actually answered the request.
Therefore, to generate the implicature we have to know who Tony is. From context of movie, Tony is described as genius especially in the field of machine, almost no one he could not do when it comes to machinery technology. So the real intention of Happy is he cannot flip the screen because he does not have enough knowledge to do it. To understand the implicature above we need context, it makes the implicature above included into particularized conversational implicature.

Datum (6)

Context: Rhodes tells the truth about the explosion bom in some area and it is because a new terrorist that is called Mandarin. Hearing that, Tony looks like worrying, and begins talking uncontrolled. Rhodes knows there is something wrong with his best friend because he is like unusual that always calm down and relax.

Tony: So, what's really going on? With the Mandarin. Seriously, can we talk about this guy?

Rhodes: It's classified information, Tony. Okay, there have been 9 bombings.

Tony: 9?

Rhodes: The public only knows about 3. But here's the thing, nobody can ID a device. There's no bomb casings.


Rhodes: When's the last time you got a good night's sleep?

Tony: *Einstein* sleeps 3 hours a year. Look what he did.
In the dialogue above, Tony does not observe the cooperative principle. Tony flouting maxim of relation with blatantly give irrelevant information than Rhodes needs. Rhodes asking about when he got a good sleep, but Tony replies with saying about habitual of Einstein. It is not relevant with the question and it is rising conversational implicature. Hence, for generating the implicature we have to know who Einstein is. Einstein is a scientist who had a major influence on science development at this time\textsuperscript{53}.

So that the utterance certainly implicated smart people rarely slept, because in the context of participant, Tony is a scientist as well as Einstein, it made the implicature had the implication Tony is lack of his sleep because he must do something important same as with Einstein that lack his sleep for something. The special knowledge needs to infer conversational implicature, the implicature was clearly included in particularized conversational implicature.

Datum (7)

Context: Tony tells pepper there are disturbing his mind. The incident in New York which makes him almost died always comes to scary him. He never got relax and fells frustrating when he remembers his enemies or the next enemies that must be come to him instead he only ordinary human that uses technology for protecting himself.

Tony: Nothing's been the same since New York.

\textsuperscript{53} Encyclopedia Britannica. \textit{Albert Einstein}. Access from http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/181349/Albert-Einstein on 15 September 2014 at 01:00 AM
Pepper: Really? I didn't notice that at all.

Tony: You experience things and then they're over, and you still can't explain them.

Gods, aliens, other dimensions. *I'm just a man in a can.*

The Tony’s utterance *I'm just man in a can* in the dialogue above is conversational implicature. It is because Tony does not observe the maxim of quality. Tony flouting maxim of quality which he lies when he said just man in a can. In fact, Tony is not man in a can. He is a super hero who used high technology iron suit which was called Iron Man to fight with his enemies. Tony’s utterance *I'm Just a man in a can* had the implication that he is weak.

He only an ordinary human who only use high technology machine, and does not have any super power like the other super hero, but his enemies come from everywhere, everything like Aliens, and God who must be have special power. So that he feels frustration about them. He is afraid when his enemies came again next time and his power is not enough to protect Pepper. The knowledge about the participant is including particular context, so it could be said the implicature above is particularized conversational implicature.

Datum (8)

Context: Maya Hansen who is Tony’s girlfriend that never meet again since in 1999 is seen knocking on the door. The door then opens and she walks in. After taking a moment, Tony walks up to Maya in the Mark Forty-Two armour.

Tony: Right there is fine. You're not the Mandarin. Are you? Are you?
Maya: You don't remember. Why I am not surprised?

Tony: Don't take it personally. *I don't remember what I had for breakfast.*

In the dialogue above, Tony’s reply uncooperative. The utterance *I don’t remember what I had for breakfast* rising conversational implicature. Tony opting out a maxim of quantity and manner by giving more and unclearly information than interlocutor needs. In context said they never have met again since 1999 and the conversation above occur in 2013, so how can Tony remember her after fourteen years, whereas he forgets with what he breakfast that only occur some hours ago. The utterance comes to strengthen the impression that Tony is the one who really forgetful person and also so as not to hurt interlocutor. Therefore the utterance *I don’t remember what I had for breakfast* implicates *I don’t remember you*. For generating the implicature, we must relate it with context, so it must be particularized conversational implicature.

**Datum (9)**

Context: Tony wants to know more about Mandarin, He goes to Tennessee and meets with Mrs. Davis which her son is a victim of explosion Bom. Tony found her in a café when she was sitting alone and then Tony come approach her.

Tony: Excuse me. Mrs. Davis? Mind if I join you?

Ms. Davis: Free country.
Ms. Davis can simply answer ‘Yes for the request of Tony, but she replies *free country* that rising an obscurity information. It means that Ms. Davis does not observe cooperative principle in the conversation. She is flouting maxim of manner by giving unclearly information than Tony needs. For generating the implicature we have to relate where the setting of the conversation. The word *free* refer to that we can do anything that we want without permission. Notwithstanding the answer of Ms. Davis does not clear enough about with the question, it still answer the question of Tony. Therefore the utterance *free country* certainly implicates accept the request. The attendance of the utterance is supported by setting of conversation which is in America that known as free country. Because the implicature present because some particular context, the implicature is included as particularized conversational implicature.

**Datum (10)**

Context: Tony stark who was driving car began suspicious about AIM (Advanced Idea Mechanics) which was company in the military sector and redesign the War Machine which has Tony Stark be going to Iron Patriot, had related with The Mandarin which caused the explosion of bombs in many area. Therefore, Tony called his friend, Rhodes who was using Iron Patriot which was doing mission from President in the Pakistan. Tony knew that Iron Patriot was redesign by AIM, so Rhodes must be known something about AIM and had an access to go to the official site of AIM.

Tony: Your redesign, your big rebrand. That was AIM, right?
Rhodes: Yeah.

Tony: I'm gonna find a heavy-duty comm sat right now, I need your login.

Rhodes: *It's the same as it's always been, "WarMachine68."*

The Rhodes’s utterance *It’s the same as it’s always been, warmachine68* above is conversational implicature. Rhodes in his utterance uncooperative by flouting maxim of quantity which has blatantly given more information than required. Rhodes can simply replies “*it’s warmachine68*” it was clear enough to answer the Tony’s request.

To understand the implicature, we do not must relate it with the any context, because the utterance present not in the particular situation or we had to know the participants, so it could be said that we could generate the implicature from the utterance itself. Using of word “always” in that utterance be marked the meaning of the utterance. It was certainly implicate “Rhodes never change his user name of his account (Login)”. When there was no special knowledge to know about conversational implicature, it must be a generalized conversational implicature.

**Datum (11)**

Context: Savin who assistant of Aldrich Killian finds Stark in the room of Trevor.

Savin hits Stark and makes Stark unconscious. However, Savin suspicious that Trevor has told everything to Stark about the plan of Aldrich and the secret of who Mandarin is.

Savin: Okay, Trevor, what did you tell him?
Trevor: I didn't tell him anything.

Savin: Nothing?

Trevor: No.

The assertion of Trevor in the dialogue is not whole truth. Trevor that simply reply No causes conversational implicature. Trevor is opting out maxim of quantity and manner. He gives less information that makes the answer not clear enough. When Savin asks nothing? Trevor answered ‘No. It means that Trevor has said something, in this case Trevor is telling something to Tony. Trevor makes a statement that obscurity to protecting himself, because if he said all to Savin, he will in danger. For generating the implicature we needs context, so it the implicature belongs to particularized conversational implicature.

Datum (12)

Context: Killian tells the story when he gets a desperation from Tony because Tony lie to meet him in the rooftop of Hotel.

Killian: If you think back to Switzerland, you said you'd meet me on the rooftop, right? Well for the first 20 minutes, I actually thought you'd show up and the next hour... I considered taking that one-step shortcut to the lobby.

The utterance of Killian I considered taking that one-step shortcut to the lobby is conversational implicature. Killian is flouting maxim of quality which he does not say true information. In the context described, position of Killian is in rooftop of Hotel so when he said to go to the lobby by one step, it means that he
wants to jump to lobby and the ordinary human must be died when do it. So that the utterance *I considered taking that one-step shortcut to the lobby* implicates *I want to suicide.* For generating implicature we have to relate it with context, it means that the implicature belongs to particularized conversational implicature.

**Datum (13)**

Context: After the one of crew of Mandarin successful entered to the Air Force One (Special Plane for President of America) with incognito in the Iron Patriot, he killed guards and abducted The President. Then he exploded the Plane and throw all the passengers out of the plane. There were 13 passengers in the sky. Suddenly Tony Stark who used Mark 42 (one of his Iron Man suit) came and tried to talk with the stewardess what must doing next.

Tony: Listen to me. See that guy? I'm gonna swing by, you're just gonna grab him. You got it?

Heather: What?

Tony: I'll electrify your arm, you won't be able to open your hand. We can do this, Heather.

*<Heather grabs one of the people>*

Tony: Easy, see? 11 more to go. *Remember that game called Barrel of Monkeys? That's what we're going to do.*

The utterance of Tony above is conversational implicature. Tony is flouting maxim of quality by blatantly not saying truth command. He said like want to
playing game barrel of monkeys, in fact he wants to people like in the game. So that, we have to know the game Barrel of Monkey to understand implicature. Barrel of Monkey game (was) the first game created by Lakeside Toys in 1965. Such games required players to make a monkey with a chain linking one with the other monkeys.54

Tony has another purpose in his utterance, Tony certainly implicates he wants to people who are scattered in the sky at that time to make a chain by holding hands with each other as in the game Barrel of the Monkey. The utterance can be understood by the stewardess because they have same knowledge about the game. When a special knowledge needed to understand conversational implicature, surely this implicature was included into the particularized conversational implicature.

Datum (14)

Context: When Tony and Rhodes cornered by an enemy attack, suddenly all the iron suit Tony came very much. Tony then ordered all his iron suit to attack the enemy. Rhodes who does not expect Tony has armor as it was surprised and delighted. He thought that during his free time just make armor.

Rhodes: This is how you've been managing your down time, huh?

Tony: Everybody needs a hobby.

Toni utterances above do not adhere to the principle of cooperation. He is flouting the maxim of manner. He did not provide clear information to the listener. Tony can simply answer 'Yes, but Tony wants to show that in fact he was busy and all the free time that she has since giving the position of CEO of Stark Industries to Pepper to prepare the strength to fight his enemies that come in the future.

He realizes that he is only human and therefore he just did something that he can build strength with engine technology which in this case is his armor. So the actual utterance above is Tony has not been jobless. The context makes clear the implicature of the utterance, then it belongs to particularized conversational implicature.

Datum (15)

Context: The conversation occurred in the Harbor. Tony and Rhodes which know that the President was arrested by Mandarin there. When they under attack of guards there, they shoot them all with pistol who is stolen from other guards before. But suddenly, the gun of Tony out of magazines and asked Rhodes to give him some.

Tony: I'm out. Give me, you got extra magazines?

Rhodes: They're not universal, Tony.

Rhodes’s utterance they’re not universal above is a conversational implicature. It is because Rhodes is uncooperative in the conversation. He is flouting maxim of manner with blatantly gives unclear information. He has simply
refusing the Tony’s request. One type of gun was Pistol and Pistol had some variety of magazine. Magazine is one component of a gun, so it explained that Rhodes owned magazines which cannot be used for all guns.55

The utterance included in the implicated premise inference that bore gun used Tony cannot use a magazine owned by Rhodes. The implicature requires special knowledge to understand it can be ascertained that the above implicature is particularized conversational implicature.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

Based on the findings, the existence of two types of conversational implicatures by Grice theory found in this movie, generalized and particularized conversational Implicature. In the analysis, the writer found a number of implicatures in the character’s dialogue that are very imbalanced, which writer often finds more particularized conversational implicature that is 13 from 15 data which is got by the writer. Most of conversational implicatures rises because the characters flouting maxim of manner. Furthermore, many of the characters in the movie, in many times give obscurity information in their communication. It happens because the characters want to show a confirmation of what they exactly meant to the interlocutor.

In addition, as we know that particularized conversational implicature rises because some particular contexts or needs special knowledge to understand. So as long as the participants know the limit of knowledge and the culture of the interlocutor, the process of communication does not meet any interruption instead in makes the dialogue looks interesting. It may be also the reason why movie makers produces the movie which includes many implicature there. It is because the movie maker wants to show the uniqueness of the characters not only from how their acting in a movie but also form their utterances. So that to understand the implicature in a movie we have to focus on the movie. When we are focus on the
movie, we will get more information about the participants or the context of the movie. When we get information, we will understand the movie and are going to be interested in it and it is something that the movie maker wants from us, interested in what they have made.

B. Suggestion

In this research the writer has some suggest for the next research

1. Pragmatic research need context in analyzing data so movie is good corpus for pragmatic research because in movie, we can see the outside aspect of language like setting (time and place) or characteristic of participants, so that, it will provide context clearly than the other object such as book or novel.

2. Types of implicature are not only generalized and particularized conversational implicature, there is still another type such as conventional implicature, so that for the next research, it can be a consideration to analyze that types.

3. Movie not only can be analyzed in topic implicature, but also it can be analyzed in the other topic like speech act or metaphor or other linguistics area like semantic or morphology.

Finally, this subject of the study will be one of the references for the researchers and the students of the English Department in the Department of English who want to research the similar case.
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A. Synopsis Iron Man 3

Tony Stark (Robert Downey, Jr.) wrestles with inner demons while contending with monsters of his own creation in this sequel from writer-director Shane Black. The story in Iron Man 3 picks up shortly after the events of The Avengers. Having previously entered another dimension in order to save New York City, Tony remains deeply haunted by the experience. Unable to sleep, he throws himself into his work with such intensity that it begins to take a heavy toll on both his mental health and his relationship with Pepper Potts (Gwyneth Paltrow). Tony has only started to appreciate the gravity of his problems when an enigmatic terrorist named the Mandarin (Ben Kingsley) hijacks the airwaves and threatens to bring America to its knees with a painful series of "lessons" that even President Ellis (William Sadler) won't be able to ignore. When Tony's former security guard Happy Hogan (Favreau) is badly injured in an explosion caused by one of the Mandarin's agents, the vengeful playboy issues a public threat that results in his home being completely destroyed in a devastating attack, leaving him to face his enemy with only one badly damaged prototype suit. Fortunately, Tony isn't on his own, and with the help of Col. James Rhodes (Don Cheadle) and a young boy named Harley (Ty Simpkins), he pieces together the mystery of the Mandarin, whose final "lesson" promises to be the most painful of all.56

Datum (1)

I finally met a man called "Ho."

Datum (2)

Shell take both.
One to throw away and one to not call.

Datum (3)

I am thrilled that you are now the head of Security.
It is the perfect position for you.
However since you've taken the post we've had a rise in staff complaints of 300%.
Datum (4)

Einstein slept 3 hours a year. Look what he did.

Datum (5)

Of course you don't remember him. He's not a blond with a big rack.

Datum (6)

I'm not a tech genius like you. Just trust me. Get down here.
Datum (7)

Gods, aliens, other dimensions. I'm just a man in a can.

Datum (8)

Don't take it personally. I don't remember what I had for breakfast.

Datum (9)

Free country.
Datum (10)

It's the same as it's always been, "WarMachine68."

Datum (11)

No.

Datum (12)

I considered taking that one-step shortcut to the lobby.
Remember that game called Barrel of Monkeys?

- You got extra magazines?
- They're not universal, Tony.

Everybody needs a hobby.