



GONE GIRL

—◆—
Manuel Trombetta

[CP/03939]

EXTERNAL CONTEXTUALIZATION

Gone Girl is a 2014 American psychological thriller film directed by David Fincher and written by Gillian Flynn, based on her 2012 novel of the same title. Set in Missouri, the story is a postmodern mystery that follows the events surrounding Nick Dunne (Ben Affleck), who becomes the prime suspect in the sudden disappearance of his wife Amy (Rosamund Pike)

Fictional, dialogical text

INTERNAL CONTEXTUALIZATION

In this scene Nick, under the advice of his lawyer, decides to be interviewed in order to convince the public that he didn't kill his wife. At the same time, he asks Amy to come home, aware of her strategy of playing dead in revenge for her husband's betrayal. All the main characters watch Nick's interview, conducted by Sharon, on television.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

- Through her impoliteness strategy, will the interviewer be able to pick up new information for the case of Amy's disappearance and threaten Nick's face?
- Will Nick be able to save his Face by getting the interviewer on his side?

FIRST SEGMENT

Sharon: Nick Dunne, you're **probably** the most hated man in America right now

Nick: I **probably** am. And I **probably** deserve it

Amy: (ASIDE) I bought that tie

Sharon: **Did you Kill your wife, Nick?**

Nick: **I did not kill my wife. I am not a murderer.**

Sharon: **but you were unfaithful.**

Nick: I was unfaithful. And **I am deeply ashamed**

Sharon: **and**, on the top of that, you allowed Amy's parents, her friends, all the people in your hometown **believe you were a loving husband**, desperate to find his missing wife.

Through modal adverbs they use **hedges of quality**

This is a **Bald on record impoliteness**: the FTA is performed without redressive action(**FTA**)

He uses this **representative** in order to save his face

Implicature of contrast followed by **bald on record impoliteness** in order to damage his positive face (**FTA**)

Expressive speech act in order to show his repentance

Implicature of addition followed by **Positive impoliteness** which damages Nick's willingness to be approved by the public (**FTA**)

SECOND SEGMENT

Nick: well, I am desperate to find my missing wife.

Sharon: you say that, but I'm wondering how you expect us to believe you now that we know you're a liar

Nick: I didn't come forward with my affair because I knew it would make me look really, really bad. But I don't care about that anymore. I just want to find my wife.

Sharon: I'm just trying to get clear—

Nick: let me be clear. Just because I am not a murderer doesn't make me a good guy. I'm not a good guy. I was a bad husband to a great wife. I broke the vow that I made to her.

Sharon: those are pretty words, nick. But what does that really mean to you?

He flouts the maxim of quantity in fact Nick decides to respond to the one sentence he can use to save his positive face without taking into account everything Sharon said. therefore he says less information than required

Once again Bald on record impoliteness (FTA), preceded by an implicature of contrast, because she reminds the audience that Nick is not a good person

Nick uses an implicature of contrast in order to introduce his positive face

Nick interrupts a probably FTA (he threatens her Floor), which was going to be performed by Sharon, in order to increase his positive face. Flouting the maxim of quantity

Sharon makes sarcasm, flouting the maxim of quality, placing it alongside a question that is part of her positive impoliteness strategy because it sows doubt on Nick's positive face. This utterance is Off-recordness

THIRD SEGMENT

Nick: it basically means that I was a con artist. I met Amy Elliot seven years ago. I was completely **transfixed**. Amy can do that to you. **I was this average guy from an average place with mediocre aspirations and I met a woman who dazzled me.** And I wanted her to love me, so I pretended to be better than I was. **When we got married, I promised to be that guy. That guy who works harder. That guy who, who lives and acts and loves with as much passion as she does. But I failed her. Instead of doing what was right I did what was easy.**

Sharon: **You talk like a man who believes he can make amends to his wife. Who believes his wife is still alive.**

Nick: she is still alive.

Nick uses a metaphor, **flouting the maxim of quality**

Nick shows his **positive face** because he is trying to appear weak to justify his actions becoming the victim in the public eyes

Saying too much information, Nick **flouts the maxim of quantity**

Sharon performs an **indirect speech act**: this declarative stands for an indirect directive.

FOURTH SEGMENT

Sharon: will you look at that camera for me? Will you look in the lens and talk to your wife? If she is out there, able to hear and see you tonight what would you like to say to her, Nick?

Nick: Amy, I love you. You're the best person I've ever known. And I've taken myself to the woodshed for the way that I've treated you. And if you come back, I promise I will spend every day making it up to you. I will be the man that I promised you I would be. I love you. Come home.

Sharon gives up on her impoliteness strategy to switch to a positive politeness strategy, embodying the role of a friend and reducing the social distance with Nick

Once again we find Nick's positive face, achieved thanks to expressive speech acts

Implicature of addition

FIRST SEGMENT

Hedge of quality

Bold on record
impoliteness X2

Positive
impoliteness(FTA)

Expressive speech
act

SECOND SEGMENT

Flouting maxim of
quantity X2

Bald on record
impoliteness

Positive impoliteness
(off-recordness)

Positive face X2

Flouting maxim of
quality(sarcasm)

THIRD SEGMENT

Flouting maxim of
quality
-metaphor

Positive face

Flouting maxim of
quantity

Indirect speech act

FOURTH SEGMENT

Positive politeness
X2

Expressive speech
act

QUANTITATIVE DATA COLLECTION

DATA'S INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSION

In this analysis there are an interviewer (Sharon) and an interviewee (Nick). As far as we know, the interviewee is the weakest participant in a conversation, so Sharon takes advantage of her position by using Face Threatening acts to obtain information from Nick. On the other hand, he tries to save his face showing himself as a victim and bringing the audience to his side. This pushes Sharon to implement a positive politeness strategy towards Nick. Through the data we can observe that the interviewer gets Nick point of view about the story of his missing wife and his betrayal, while Nick manages to save his positive face. Therefore, both hypotheses are confirmed, even if Sharon fails to damage Nick's positive face.

Thank you

**GONE
GIRL**

For your attention