

**LANGUAGE VARIATIONS AND SOCIAL STRATIFICATIONS IN
BRIDGERTON SEASON 1: A SOCIOLINGUISTIC STUDY**

THESIS

By :

Tazkia Zahra Bukhori

NIM. 210302110024



**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI MAULANA MALIK IBRAHIM
MALANG
2025**

**LANGUAGE VARIATIONS AND SOCIAL STRATIFICATIONS IN
BRIDGERTON SEASON 1 : A SOCIOLINGUISTIC STUDY**

THESIS

Presented to

Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Sarjana Sastra
(S.S.)

By :

Tazkia Zahra Bukhori

NIM. 210302110024

Advisor :

Prof. Dr. H. Mudjia Rahardjo, M.Si.

NIP. 195901011990031005



DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

**UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI MAULANA MALIK IBRAHIM
MALANG**

2025

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP

I state that the thesis entitled "Language Variations and Social Stratifications in Bridgerton Season 1: A Sociolinguistic Study" is my original work. I do not include any materials previously written or published by another person, except those cited as references and written in the bibliography. Hereby, if there is any objection or claim, I am the only person who is responsible for that.

Malang, 19 June 2025

The Researcher



Tazkia Zahra Bukhori

210302110024

APPROVAL SHEET

This to certify that Tazkia Zahra Bukhori's thesis entitled **Language Variations and Social Stratifications in Bridgerton Season 1: A Sociolinguistic Study** has been approved for thesis examination at Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, as one of the requirements for the degree of Sarjana Sastra (S.S.).

Malang, *June 25*, 2025

Approved by
Advisor,



Prof. Dr. H. Mudjia Rahardjo, M.Si.
NIP 195901011990031005

Head of Department of English
Literature



Ribut Wahyudi, M.Ed., Ph.D.
NIP 198112052011011007

Acknowledged by

Dean,



Dr. M. Faisol, M.Ag.

NIP 197411012003121003

LEGITIMATION SHEET

This is to certify that Tazkia Zahra Bukhori's thesis entitled **Language Variations and Social Stratifications in Bridgerton Season 1: A Sociolinguistic Study** has been approved by the Board of Examiners as one of the requirements for the degree of Sarjana Sastra (S.S.) in Department of English Literature.

		Malang, <u>June 25</u> , 2025
Board of Examiners		Signatures
1.	Dr. Galuh Nur Rohmah, M. Pd., M.Ed NIP 197402111998032002	
2.	Prof. Dr. H. Mudjia Rahardjo, M.Si. NIP 195901011990031005	
3.	Dr. Agwin Degaf, M.A. NIP. 198805232015031004	
Approved by Dean of Faculty of Humanities		
		
 Dr. M. Faisol, M.Ag. NIP 197411012003121003		

MOTTO

And do not be weakened, and do not grieve, and you will be superior if
you are believers

(Q.S. Al-Imran: 9)

“There is a princess in every girl.”

(Blair Willows from Barbie: Princess Charm School)

DEDICATION

I proudly dedicate this thesis to my parents, Mr. Imam Bukhori and Mrs. Maulidia A. Noer. My dearest brother, Muhammad Hakan Syauqi Attabiq Al Bukhori, may you always be blessed in heaven. I am deeply grateful for the love, affection, and sincere care. Thank you for every prayers that accompanies me in each step towards my success. May Allah always bless us.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Alhamdulillah, thank to Allah *subhanahu wa ta'ala*, the Most Gracious and Most Merciful. Because of His grace to me, this thesis has been completed. *Shalawat and salam* to the greatest prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), who has guided us from the darkness into the lightness.

This thesis would not be complete without the valuable feedback and suggestions from the many people who have supported me throughout this journey. I am also thankful for the encouragement provided by my loved ones. In this section, I would like to express my gratitude to:

1. Prof. Dr. M. Zainuddin, MA. as a Rector of Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang.
2. Dr. M. Faisol, M.Ag., as Dean of Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang.
3. Mr. Ribut Wahyudi, M. Ed., Ph.D., as Head of English Literature Department at the Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang.
4. My advisor, Prof. Dr. H. Mudjia Rahardjo, M.Si., who made this work possible through his guidance and advice. Thank you for always being patient and supportive throughout this thesis.
5. My sincerest gratitude to all of the lecturers in the English Literature Department.

6. My special dedication to my parents, Mr. Imam Bukhori and Mrs. Maulidia A. Noer. Thank you for your never-ending prayers, support, and love.
7. Second special thanks to my brother, Muhammad Hakan Syauqi Attabiq Al Bukhori, who has always been my support icon in my life. May you always be blessed in heaven
8. My super beloved girls: Fairuz Fitri Anantachea Putri Mulyaji, Devina Fernanda Nugiar, Moona Laila Alfin. Thank you for always accompanying me since we were in high school until now, in happiness either sadness. I love you guys!
9. My number one support system during college: Afrilia Nur Chasanah, Fila Izul Miya, Farha Abidah. Thank you for always accompanying and trust me. You are the best!
10. Lastly, thanks to myself. Thank you for being a brave, strong, and patient individual throughout the ups and downs of life during your studies. This thesis is a one step closer to your progress toward the success that you have long desired. As Barbie said, "*We can be anything we want.*" You go girl!

Malang, 13 May 2025

The Researcher



Tazkia Zahra Bukhori

NIM. 210302110024

ABSTRACT

Bukhori, Tazkia Zahra (2025). Language Variations and Social Stratifications in Bridgerton Season 1: A Sociolinguistic Study. Undergraduate Thesis. Department of English Literature Department. Faculty of Humanities. Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University of Malang. Advisor: Prof. Dr. H. Mudjia Rahardjo, M.Si.

Keywords: Sociolinguistics, Language Variations, British, Labov, Joos, Halliday.

The popularity of Netflix's Bridgerton Season 1 has sparked widespread discussions on how British English, as represented in period dramas, functions as both a stylized construct and a sociolinguistic phenomenon. This issue has also been widely examined in studies on early 19th-century London. By analyzing Bridgerton, this study seeks to explore how language variations serve as markers of social stratifications and identity constructions within aristocratic society. This research is based on quasi-qualitative data drawn from eight episodes of the series and analyzed thematically using Labov's sociolinguistic framework on language variations (2018), Joos's register theory (1967), and Halliday's language functions (1992). The findings reveal 50 data, categorized into 5 classifications: 3 data of language use within the Royal Family, 7 data of interactions between Royalty and Nobility, 27 data of interactions among Upper-Class Nobility, 7 data of interactions between Nobility and the Merchant Class, and 6 data of language use among the Merchant Class. The findings indicated that language is systematically influenced by social variables, such as social class. In Bridgerton Season 1, five distinct language styles can be observed: frozen styles, formal styles, consultative styles, casual styles, and intimate styles. Additionally, various language functions are present, including instrumental, regulatory, interactional, personal, imaginative, and representational functions. Future research could extend this analysis by incorporating additional sociolinguistic frameworks, examining language variation in digital media, and exploring the socio-cultural implications of language use across different historical and contemporary contexts.

مستخلص البحث

بخاري، تزكية زهراء (٢٠٢٥). تنويعات اللغة والتفاوتات الاجتماعية في الموسم الأول من بريديرتون: دراسة سوسiolinguistic. رسالة جامعية. برنامج دراسة الأدب الإنجليزي. كلية العلوم الإنسانية. جامعة الإسلام الحكومي مولانا مالك إبراهيم مالانج. المشرف الأكاديمي: الأستاذ الدكتور هـ. مودجيا راهاردجو، ماجستير العلوم.

الكلمات المفتاحية: علم الاجتماع اللغوي، تباينات اللغة، البريطانية، لابوف، جوس، هاليداي.

لقد أثارت شعبية الموسم الأول من "بريديرتون" على نتفليكس مناقشات واسعة حول كيفية عمل اللغة الإنجليزية البريطانية، كما هو موضح في الدراما التاريخية، ككلاهما بناء مصقول وظاهرة سوسiolinguistic. وقد تم دراسة هذه القضية على نطاق واسع في دراسات حول لندن في أوائل القرن التاسع عشر. من خلال تحليل "بريديرتون"، يسعى هذا البحث لاستكشاف كيفية عمل تنوعات اللغة كعلامات على التدرجات الاجتماعية وبناء الهويات داخل المجتمع الأرستقراطي. يعتمد هذا البحث على بيانات شبه نوعية مأخوذة من ثمانية حلقات من السلسلة وتم تحليلها بشكل موضوعي باستخدام إطار لابوف السوسiolinguistic حول تنوعات اللغة (2018)، ونظرية سجل جوس (1967)، ووظائف اللغة لهاليداي (1992). تكشف النتائج عن 50 بيانات، تم تصنيفها إلى 5 تصنيفات: 3 بيانات حول استخدام اللغة داخل العائلة المالكة، 7 بيانات من التفاعلات بين العائلة المالكة والنبلاء، و 27 بيانات من التفاعلات بين النبلاء من الطبقة العليا 7. بيانات عن التفاعلات بين النبلاء وفئة التجار، و 6 بيانات عن استخدام اللغة بين فئة التجار. أشارت النتائج إلى أن اللغة تتأثر بشكل منهجي بالعوامل الاجتماعية، مثل الطبقة الاجتماعية. في الموسم الأول من بريديرتون، يمكن ملاحظة خمسة أنماط لغة مميزة: الأنماط المتجمدة، الأنماط الرسمية، الأنماط الاستشارية، الأنماط العادية، والأنماط الحميمة. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، توجد وظائف لغوية متنوعة، بما في ذلك الوظائف الأدائية، والتنظيمية، والتفاعلية، والشخصية، والتخيلية، والتمثيلية. يمكن أن تمتد البحوث المستقبلية من خلال دمج أطر سوسiolinguistic إضافية، ودراسة تباين اللغة في الوسائط الرقمية، واستكشاف الآثار الاجتماعية والثقافية لاستخدام اللغة عبر سياقات تاريخية ومعاصرة مختلفة.

ABSTRAK

Bukhori, Tazkia Zahra (2025). Variasi Bahasa dan Stratifikasi Sosial dalam Bridgerton Musim 1: Sebuah Kajian Sociolinguistik. Skripsi. Program Studi Sastra Inggris. Fakultas Humaniora. Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. Dosen Pembimbing: Prof. Dr. H. Mudjia Rahardjo, M.Si.

Keywords: Sociolinguistik, Variasi Bahasa, British, Labov, Joos, Halliday.

Popularitas Bridgerton Musim 1 di Netflix telah memicu diskusi luas tentang bagaimana Bahasa Inggris Britania, yang diwakili dalam drama periode, berfungsi sebagai konstruksi bergaya sekaligus fenomena sociolinguistik. Isu ini juga telah banyak diperiksa dalam studi mengenai London awal abad ke-19. Dengan menganalisis Bridgerton Musim 1, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengeksplorasi bagaimana variasi bahasa berfungsi sebagai penanda stratifikasi sosial dan konstruksi identitas dalam masyarakat aristokrat. Penelitian ini didasarkan pada data kuasi-kualitatif yang diambil dari delapan episode seri dan dianalisis secara tematik menggunakan kerangka sociolinguistik teori Labov tentang variasi bahasa (2018), teori gaya bahasa oleh Joos (1967), dan teori fungsi bahasa oleh Halliday (1992). Teori-teori ini digunakan untuk mengklasifikasikan variasi linguistik dan mengkaji bagaimana tokoh-tokoh kelas atas menggunakan pola bicara untuk memperkuat status dan identitas mereka. Temuan menunjukkan 50 contoh variasi bahasa, yang dikategorikan ke dalam lima klasifikasi yang berbeda: 3 data penggunaan bahasa dalam Keluarga Kerajaan, 7 data interaksi antara Kerajaan dan Bangsawan, 27 data interaksi di antara bangsawan kelas atas, 7 data interaksi antara bangsawan dan kelas pedagang, serta 6 data penggunaan bahasa di antara kelas pedagang. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa bahasa dipengaruhi secara sistematis oleh variabel sosial, seperti kelas sosial. Dalam Bridgerton Season 1, terdapat lima gaya bahasa yang berbeda: gaya beku, gaya formal, gaya konsultatif, gaya santai, dan gaya intim. Selain itu, terdapat berbagai fungsi bahasa yang meliputi fungsi instrumental, regulatif, interaksional, personal, imajinatif, dan representasional. Penelitian di masa depan dapat memperluas analisis ini dengan mengintegrasikan kerangka sociolinguistik tambahan, memeriksa variasi bahasa dalam media digital, dan mengeksplorasi implikasi sosial budaya dari penggunaan bahasa di berbagai konteks historis dan kontemporer.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP	i
APPROVAL SHEET	ii
LEGITIMATION SHEET	iii
MOTTO	iv
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	vi
ABSTRACT.....	viii
مستخلص البحث	ix
ABSTRAK	x
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xi
CHAPTER I	1
INTRODUCTION	1
A. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	1
B. RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	7
C. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	8
D. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	8
E. SCOPE AND LIMITATION	8
F. DEFINITIONS OF KEY TERMS	9
CHAPTER II.....	11
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	11
A. THEORETICAL STUDIES	11
B. PREVIOUS STUDIES.....	30
CHAPTER III	34
RESEARCH METHODS.....	34
A. RESEARCH PARADIGM.....	34
B. RESEARCH APPROACHES.....	36
C. RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS	37
D. DATA & DATA SOURCE.....	38
E. DATA COLLECTION METHODS	39

F. DATA ANALYSIS.....	40
G. TRIANGULATION.....	41
CHAPTER IV	43
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS	43
A. FINDINGS.....	43
B. DISCUSSIONS.....	185
CHAPTER V	190
CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.....	190
A. CONCLUSIONS	190
B. SUGGESTIONS.....	191
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	194
CURRICULUM VITAE	199

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The massive exposure to British English through global streaming platforms has triggered a surge of interest among Indonesian youth to imitate posh accents as a symbol of class and elegance. Language variations are usually found in communication between two or more speakers with different backgrounds or language styles (Putri & Putra, 2025). People who understand more than one language can communicate using several language varieties too (Drobot, 2022). Moreover, the diversity of ethnicities, cultures, and races also contributes to the variation in language used in communication. Language variations do not only happen in real life (Ejjebli, 2024). These varieties can also be found on social media and online platforms as time progresses. Through technology, individuals can influence their language style by showcasing their lifestyle on social media. As a result, people tend to imitate the figures they see, including their language styles.

Since the pandemic in 2019, the movie streaming application has been the most popular online platform in Indonesian society. The most popular application, especially in Indonesian society is Netflix. Based on Databox (2021), the number of Netflix users in Indonesia reached 213,56 million viewers in 2021. Currently, Netflix is ranked as the 4th entertainment app on the Apple Store and has been downloaded over 1 billion times on the Play Store. It proves that people in Indonesia have a high interest in watching movies. All of movie streaming applications have

their own characteristics. Netflix is a subscription-based streaming service that offers a diverse range of content, including movies, TV series, documentaries, and anime (Sharma, 2016). Netflix provides a variety of viewing genres, including original productions. The majority of the movies use the English language as their dialogue. Some of the movies in this online platform can make their viewers not only interested with the movie, some also adopt their language styles in English. Many talk shows and content on TikTok discuss and even imitate the British accent featured in *Bridgerton* Season 1. For instance, Daphne's famous line has been highlighted by many content creators on TikTok, receiving up to 2.2 million likes and being shared 36,800 times. Additionally, Tracee Ellis Ross's account features a British Accent Challenge: *Bridgerton* Version, which has garnered 25,600 likes and has been shared 1,073 times. These pieces of content remain popular and continue to be created into the year 2024. Therefore, it indicates a cultural fascination with historical British speech.

Brown (2021) stated that the English language has diverse accents. One of the language accents is the British English accent. British English refers to all forms of the English language spoken in the United Kingdom. British English is known as UK English, English English, or Anglo-English (King, 2020). This accent is also the standard dialect used in England. Based on London history, the British accent started to be known in the British Empire in the 16th and 17th centuries. According to Giles, British English was influenced by the age of sex, social class, and religion. Giles also stated that dialects in British English not only confine their speakers geographically but also confine them socially (Sharma, 2022). The British accent

always evolved over time. This phenomenon arises from the cumulative auditory impact of various pronunciations, which further categorizes an individual both regionally and socially. Nowadays, the Historical London have been portrayed in numerous movies.

Bridgerton Season 1 which was directed by Julie Anne Robinson is a movie series, original from Netflix that portrayed the environment of London Regency in early 1800. The distinction between social classes in this movie are very evident. The movie highlights the strict rules that prevent upper-class individuals from interacting with those in the lower class. Additionally, the characters of Bridgerton Season 1 speak in a British accent. The use of language styles are also different in every classes, even though in the same class. The story and the setting of Bridgerton Season 1 have led the viewers to follow the characters, such as their lifestyles, fashions, and especially the language styles that are used in this movie series. People considered the language styles in Bridgerton Season 1 as unique and classic language. This language phenomenon briefly became a trending topic on several social media platforms which makes this phenomenon interested to study.

In linguistics, language phenomena can be analyzed through the study of sociolinguistics. Linguistics is the scientific study of languages and includes several branches for analyzing them. In Sociolinguistics, language is defined as a system of symbols in the form of sounds, which are arbitrary, productive, dynamic, diverse, and human. According to Sociolinguistics experts, languages always have their own variations. These variations occur due to social factors, such as who the speakers are, who the people involved, where it is spoken, and what the purpose is (Wijana,

2020). Based on language variations expert, Labov (2018), languages are inherently variable and have systematic variations. Labov also stated that the varieties of language are influenced by social factors such as socioeconomic status, age, gender, and ethnicity (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015).

While several studies have examined language variations in movies. Sandika (2022), Maulani (2022), Rosyda (2021), and Ramdhani (2020) investigated language variations in movies of different genres. They found all of these language variations in many movies, such as *Fifty Shades of Grey* (Sandika, 2022), *Enola Holmes* (Maulani, 2022), *Wonder* (Rosyda, 2021), and *What a Girl Wants* (Ramdhani, 2020). In general, they found many language styles such as formal style, casual style, consultative style, and intimate style. However, all these previous studies employed the same theory, namely, the language styles theory by Joos (1976), and almost all researchers used the same instruments to collect their data via the script. Mostly, the researchers only analyze the number of language variations that they found without mentioning the background of those differences in language.

Another researchers, found Slang language variations in the movies *Rampage* (Tursini, 2022), *Charlie's Angels* (Situmorang, 2021), *Brick* (Merisabel, 2020), and *Deadpool 2* (Pangestu, 2019). They used diverse theories. In Merisabel's study, the researcher used Chapman's (1988) and Patridge's (1933) American Slang theory. Pangestu and Tursini used based on Coleman's theory (2012) in their study. Additionally, Situmorang employed the theory of slang language style by Sumarsono (2007) and the functions of slang language by Zhou & Fan (2013). Their findings indicated that there is no absolute concept of slang as a language variations.

The only research that provides a deeper analysis is Merisabel's (2020) study of slang in the movie "Brick." This study not only quantifies the use of slang in the movie but also distinguishes the Slang from the 1920s to the 1940s. However, although Merisabel's study used two theories, the findings were irrelevant and somewhat deviated from the theory. Another studies about language variations found in Gender language variation, especially Women's Language that have been researched by Salman (2023), Ainurisanti (2023), Rizki (2021), and Priska (2020). All of these studies use the same theory, Lakoff's theory (1975). The researchers proved that language variations is not only found in simple dialogue. Moreover, it can be found in different genders such as Women's language. Out of the four research studies, only the studies about North Country and Little Women were analyzed more deeply than the others. However, both studies lacked rich data. Additionally, several researchers have been discussed about Bridgerton Season 1, including research on politeness strategies in Bridgerton Season 1 conducted by Amalia and Indah (2023). The findings revealed several communication strategies, including the bald on-record strategy, positive and negative politeness strategies, and the off-record strategy. this research used two theories that are politeness theory by Brown and Levinson (1987) and the representation theory by Hall (1997). However, the research only discussed the representation of power through politeness strategies in the movie.

In this study the researcher explored more complex study of language variations, especially in Bridgerton Season 1, which is more in-depth and closely related to historical London. It is proved by three theories that are used in this study

that are, labov's language variations theory (2018), Joos's language styles theory (1967), and Halliday's language functions theory (1992). There are also innovation of the research method involves the use of quasi-qualitative methods, that the research method is based on theory to strengthen the data.

Meanwhile, this research focused on how the varieties can be different by the social factors, such as social classes. Moreover, by shedding light on how language variations reflect and affect social dynamics, this research can help foster greater social integration and cultural understanding. Therefore, people will know that language varieties not only have a different way of communicating but also influence society in the era of the 1800s. In fact, this study analyzes how upper-class characters in *Bridgerton* Season 1 use distinctive language styles to construct social identity and reinforce class boundaries within the sociolinguistic landscape of London, 19th century. Based on the research background, this phenomenon is important to analyze, because the study argues that the linguistic portrayal of upper-class characters in *Bridgerton* reflects not only historical class distinctions but also contemporary aspirations toward elitist identity through language imitation.

However, the specific problem is this research only studies the language variations that are correlated with social factors, especially social class and the data only gained from fictional movie. Therefore, has been analyzed by three theories. One prominent theory that underpins this research is the language variations theory by William Labov (2018). Labov refers to changes in language or variations in language as "*long-term stable variation*". This concept indicates that language variations have many factors, such as social classes, ethnicities, ages, communities,

education and occupation, are influence the distribution of these linguistic variables, and these influences remain consistent over extended periods. To analyzed the language styles in the data, the researcher used Joos's language styles theory (1967). In his influential work "*The Five Clocks*", defined language style as the selection of language forms from among grammatically equivalent expressions to suit a particular context. He also categorizing speech into five registers: frozen, formal, consultative, casual, and intimate. Each of these registers reflects varying degrees of social distance and communicative purpose. For language functions, the researcher used language functions theory by Halliday (1992). In Halliday's framework, style is not a fixed category but a dynamic realization of meaning that reflects the speaker's purpose, relationship with the listener, and the medium of communication. According to Halliday, these include instrumental (to satisfy needs), regulatory (to control behavior), interactional (to build relationships), personal (to express identity), heuristic (to seek knowledge), imaginative (to create imaginary worlds), and representational (to share information). Each function highlights a distinct way language operates, not just to convey facts, but to influence, relate, explore, and express.

B. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What linguistic features and language styles are used by upper-class characters in *Bridgerton* Season 1 to reflect social stratification in 19th-century London?
2. What language functions are used by upper-class characters in *Bridgerton* Season 1 to reflect social stratification in 19th-century London?

C. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To analyze the linguistic features and language styles used by upper-class characters in *Bridgerton* Season 1 by Labov's theory of language variation and Joos's language styles classification to examine how speech patterns reflect social stratification in 19th-century London.
2. To examine the language functions used by aristocratic characters, applying Halliday's frameworks to explore how their communication not only conveys meaning but also reinforces hierarchical class structures and sustains aristocratic dominance.

D. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Theoretically, this study contributes to the application of Labov's theory in media discourse, offering insights into how language reflects social stratification. Practically, the findings may be useful for educators in illustrating language variation through contemporary media examples, particularly in sociolinguistics courses.

E. SCOPE AND LIMITATION

This research focuses on the language variations used by upper-class families in *Bridgerton* Season 1, including the Bridgerton, Featherington, Cowper, and Lady Danbury families. The analysis is limited to selected episodes due to time constraints. Data is drawn from transcribed dialogue and audio recordings, analyzed using Labov's theory of language variation. The limitations of this study relied on three theoretical frameworks, which may oversimplify the findings and limit their

applicability to broader contexts. The analysis is primarily centered on the fictional elements of *Bridgerton* Season 1. There is no discussion regarding how the themes and narratives relate to real-life societal issues. Furthermore, the study does not address the perspectives and reactions of the audience, leaving a gap in understanding how diverse viewer interpretations could influence the overall impact of the series. It also has potential transcription bias and the restricted scope of characters, which may not fully represent the linguistic complexity of 19th-century London.

F. DEFINITIONS OF KEY TERMS

The following terms are the definitions of key terms of this research:

1. **Language Variations:** Linguistic differences that occur across speakers due to social variables. This study focused on such variations in the speech of fictional characters in *Bridgerton* Season 1.
2. **Language Styles:** the different ways that people use language depending on the context, audience, and purpose. This study explore language styles to make depth analysis of language variations.
3. **Language Functions:** the purpose of language usage in a every situations. This study analyzed the functions of the data to understand the reflections of social stratificitaions in *Bridgerton* Season 1.
4. **Social Stratifications:** the hierarchical arrangement of individuals or groups in a society based on factors, such as wealth, power, education, or social

status. This study explored language variations by social stratifications in Bridgerton Season 1.

5. **Netflix:** A digital streaming platform used to access audiovisual content. In this research, Netflix is a supporting application to collect the data in Bridgerton Season 1.
6. **Bridgerton Season 1:** A historical drama series set in early 19th-century London, used in this study as a fictional representation of upper-classes British society for the analysis of language variations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A. THEORETICAL STUDIES

1. Sociolinguistics

Language plays a fundamental role in human life. It allows individuals to distinguish themselves from other species and serves as a tool for communication, collaboration, and the development of civilizations (Subakir et al., 2022). In modern society, various language-related phenomena continue to emerge across different social settings. One such case is the variation in language use observed in *Bridgerton* Season 1. As outlined in the background of this study, the language style used in the series has been described as unique, refined, or classical by many viewers. This linguistic style briefly attracted significant attention on social media platforms. The appeal of this phenomenon is not only linguistic but also closely linked to issues of social identity and structure, particularly in relation to the portrayal of social class. Given this connection between language use and societal context, the phenomenon can be appropriately examined through a sociolinguistic lens.

Sociolinguistics, as defined in the *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*, is the scientific study of language in relation to social interaction. It focuses on how language is used in daily life and how it operates within conversations (Trioktaviani & Degaf, 2023). This field merges insights from sociology and linguistics to explore the relationship between patterns of language use and forms of social behavior (Zahirah et al., 2024). Mamentu (2022) highlights that language in sociolinguistic

studies is regarded as a system of symbols that is productive, arbitrary, varied, and specific to humans. Scholars have provided various definitions of sociolinguistics. Vusyk (2023), for instance, sees sociolinguistics as a field that investigates how speakers adjust their language according to social situations. Similarly, Qutratu'ain et al. (2024) explain that sociolinguistics concerns systems of communication that are specific to particular groups, whether spoken, written, or signed. Rahardjo (2010) emphasizes that sociolinguistics is an interdisciplinary field that focuses on the social aspects of language. As Ilmi and Degaf (2024) note, these social aspects are always changing, which in turn influences how language phenomena emerge and evolve.

The growing interest in sociolinguistics can be attributed to its relevance across a wide range of academic and societal concerns, including education, child development, interethnic communication, and language policy (Hymes, 2020). The sociolinguistic perspective highlights how language use is shaped by factors such as cultural norms, age, gender, and social roles, thus providing insights into communication practices across different communities (Trioktaviani & Degaf, 2023). This approach encourages critical reflection on commonly held assumptions about language use and promotes the interpretation of linguistic behavior within its social context (Alifa & Degaf, 2024). In sociolinguistics, language is understood as a system of communication that is specific to a group and includes spoken, written, and signed forms.

Sociolinguistics is generally divided into two primary areas: micro sociolinguistics and macro sociolinguistics. Micro sociolinguistics examines how

language is used by individuals in everyday interaction and how social variables influence speech patterns. This includes the study of dialects, registers, and speech styles in relation to factors such as social class, ethnicity, and gender. In contrast, macro sociolinguistics focuses on how language functions in broader societal contexts. It addresses issues such as language shift, maintenance, and replacement, as well as the relationships among various speech communities and their linguistic practices. These two branches of study help explain how language both reflects and reinforces social structures and values (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015).

2. Language Variations

Language is a main communication tool for humans, especially for positively developing their social abilities. In today's world, people typically speak one or sometimes multiple languages. It enables individuals to engage in social activities and express their experiences, feelings, desires, and opinions to others (Haryadi, 2022). Language and society are interconnected concepts that involve identities, power, and solidarity. The term "*variety*" is used to describe different ways of speaking. These varieties can encompass broader categories such as Standard English, or it may refer to specific dialects defined by many factors of location and social class, such as the speech patterns of lower-class New York City residents, or varieties represented by their particular functions or contexts of use. Those varieties are known as language variations in sociolinguistics.

Language variations refer to linguistic items that exhibit a similar social distribution (Maulani, 2022). According to Ferguson (2017), language variations are defined as speech patterns that are homogeneous enough to be analyzed using

available synchronic description techniques. Language variations also possess a sufficiently large repertoire of elements and their arrangements or processes, with a broad semantic scope that allows them to function effectively in all normal communication contexts. Gregory & Carroll (2018) further defines language variations as a subset of formal or substantial features that regularly correlate with specific socio-situational characteristics. Gregory also notes that language variations are typically found within language contexts. To effectively understand and describe language variations, it is essential to consider the stable features of the situational circumstances surrounding language events, which can be consistently linked to the varieties present in language texts (Gregory & Carroll, 2018).

Besides, language variations were initiated by the participants who used the language. Language variations can be categorized into two main types: variations based on usage and variations based on the user. When considering usage, language changes according to the context of the speech situation or event. In contrast, user-based variations include the speaker's location, age, gender, ethnicity, origin, social class, and education level (Wijana, 2020). Many types of language variations can be observed in everyday communication, including dialects, accents, and slang. Numerous experts have developed various theories about these language variations and their differences, one of whom is William Labov.

William Labov was an American linguist who is recognized as the founder of variationist sociolinguistics. He was born on December 4, 1927, in Rutherford, New Jersey. Labov initially started his career as an industrial chemist before shifting his focus to linguistics in the early 1960s. His research began with a study of dialect

change on Martha's Vineyard. Labov conducted a significant investigation into the social stratification of English in New York City, which laid the groundwork for his theory that language variations are systematically linked to social factors such as class, ethnicity, and age. His work emphasized the importance of empirical, data-driven methods, often employing quantitative analysis to uncover patterns in everyday speech. Additionally, Labov was a strong advocate for recognizing the legitimacy of African American Vernacular English (AAVE). He argued that AAVE follows consistent grammatical rules and should not be stigmatized. While he studied at the University of Pennsylvania, Labov authored influential works, including "*The Social Stratification of English in New York City*" and "*Principles of Linguistic Change*".

In his work through 2018, Labov emphasized that variations in language, whether in pronunciation, grammar, or vocabulary, are not produced randomly. There are also follows distinct patterns based on social factors such as class, ethnicity, age, gender, and region. His foundational idea is language changes and varies within communities, and these variations can be observed and measured through empirical methods. He introduced the concept of the "*speech community*," which refers to a group of individuals who share norms regarding language use, even if their actual speech varies. From the study, Labov found that people often adjust their speech styles based on context and audience, a phenomenon known as style-shifting. Labov also continued to advocate for quantitative sociolinguistics, employing statistical analysis to trace how language variations reflects broader social structures and identities. He argued that variations are not a deviation from a

norm but a central feature of language evolutions. Understanding this variation helps explain how languages change over time in *Bridgerton* Season 1.

This study examined how characters from the Royal Family, Upper-Class Nobility, and Merchant Class use different speech styles. For instance, Queen Charlotte's elevated diction and syntax reflected of Labov's varieties. Other characters, such as Will Mondrich and Simon Basset navigate different social worlds. Will's speech diverges from aristocratic norms, illustrating Labov's idea of linguistic divergence within minority communities. Besides, the characters such as Hyacinth and Eloise Bridgerton shift between formal and casual registers. This aligns with Labov's observation that younger speakers often use more flexible linguistic norms. It is also analyzed how characters, for instance Madame Delacroix and Siena Rosso adjust their speech when interacting with nobility. This study integrated concepts, such as speech community, register, and sociolect, showing that Labov's theory is the backbone of its linguistic mapping.

3. Language Styles

Language styles refers to the use of individual's language based on context, audience, and purpose. It includes choices of vocabulary, sentence structures, tone, and levels of formality. Pratiwi & Priyana (2022) found that when teachers adopt a more inclusive and interactive styles, such as using inclusive pronouns, rhetorical questions, and simpler syntax, students are more engaged and motivated to participate. This supports the idea that language styles can act as a pedagogical strategy, not only as a communicative one. Language styles refer to the variations in

how people express themselves linguistically, which can change based on the context, audience, and purpose of communication (Markowitz, 2020). In everyday life, people often switch their different language styles. For example, people may adopt a formal style during their job interviews or public speeches, while reserving a more intimate style for close family members or romantic partners. This demonstrates how language style serves as a social tool to navigate hierarchy and intimacy. Finally, Joos (1967), in his influential work "*The Five Clocks*", defined language style as the selection of language forms from among grammatically equivalent expressions to suit a particular context.

Martin Joos (1907–1978) was an American linguist and professor of German, recognized for his significant contributions to stylistics and phonology. His most notable work, "*The Five Clocks*" (1967), provides a framework for understanding language styles based on levels of formality. Joos was born in Wisconsin and grew up in English and German, a background that greatly influenced his linguistic interests. Initially, Joos studied electrical engineering but shifted his focus to linguistics after working on the Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada. After the World War II, Joos returned to academia and spent most of his career at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, where he also chaired the Department of German. His work in "*The Five Clocks*" is foundational in the fields of sociolinguistics and stylistics, systematically categorizing speech into five registers: frozen, formal, consultative, casual, and intimate. Each of these registers reflects varying degrees of social distance and communicative purpose (Joos, 1967).

a. Frozen Style

The frozen style, as defined by Joos (1967), is the most formal and rigid of the five language styles. It is characterized by its fixed and often archaic expressions, delivered in a highly structured and ritualistic manner. This style is typically used in contexts where language is meant to be preserved unchanged over time, such as in legal documents, religious ceremonies, national anthems, or traditional speeches. In this style, the speaker and audience usually do not interact, except, the language is recited or read aloud with little to no expectation of feedback or dialogue. The sentences in the frozen style are often long, complex, and grammatically complete, with vocabulary that tends to be elevated or ceremonial. Joos emphasized that the frozen style is not just formal. It cannot be altered and intended to be remembered and repeated. For example, in an exchange between Queen Charlotte and Prince Friedrich, the Queen declares, “*The Bridgerton girl is the incomparable of the season, which means there is no more suitable a match for you on English shores.*” This line exemplifies the frozen style as defined by Joos (1967), showcasing fixed structure, formal language, and a sense of public authority. The phrase “*the incomparable of the season*” uses ceremonial language that conveys prestige and tradition, typical of royal or state settings. It is not intended for conversational negotiation but rather serves as an institutional affirmation, functioning as a decree from the Queen. Additionally, the Queen's tone, grammatical completeness, and modal structure (e.g., “*which means there is no more suitable...*”) maintain a non-interactive, declarative stance, as is common in the frozen register. The

utterance does not invite feedback, it assumes recognition and respect based on hierarchical authority.

b. Formal Style

The formal style, as described by Joos (1967), is a speech register typically used in structured, official, and often one-sided communication contexts where the speaker maintains a clear social distance from the listener. This style is commonly employed in situations such as academic lectures, ceremonial addresses, or public announcements, where the speaker is expected to convey information with precision, authority, and decorum. Unlike frozen style, which is completely fixed and ritualistic, formal style allows for some flexibility in structure while still adhering to strict grammatical norms and avoiding colloquial expressions. Sentences are fully developed, vocabulary is carefully chosen to reflect seriousness and clarity, and contractions or slang are deliberately avoided to maintain a tone of professionalism. Speakers often prepare their messages in advance to ensure that the delivery is coherent, logically organized, and respectful of the audience's expectations. Joos emphasizes that formal style is characterized by one-way communication, meaning the speaker does not anticipate immediate feedback or interaction from the listener. This absence of spontaneous exchange reinforces the hierarchical or institutional nature of the interaction, where the speaker assumes a position of authority or expertise. The tone is objective and impersonal, designed to inform rather than engage in dialogue. For example, Colin's remark, "*I shall run up and*

hasten her along,” exemplifies formal style, reinforcing a sense of aristocratic language through the use of “*shall*” and the phrase “*hasten her along*.” His statement reflects a practical intent, contrasting with Eloise’s sarcasm by focusing on a resolution-oriented approach. The consultative style, as defined by Joos (1967), is a semi-formal register used in conversations where one participant has more knowledge or authority while still encouraging interaction and feedback from the other. This style is commonly found in professional or service-oriented settings, such as teacher-student discussions, doctor-patient consultations, or workplace dialogues between supervisors and employees.

c. Consultative Style

The language used in the consultative style is generally polite, grammatically complete, and carefully structured, though it is not as rigid or ceremonious as formal style. Speakers often include expressions, “*Do you understand?*”, “*Let me explain*,” or “*What do you think?*” to invite participation and ensure mutual understanding. Unlike formal style, which tends to be monologic, consultative style is dialogic—it anticipates and accommodates responses. This register reflects a balance between authority and approachability, making it ideal for situations that require both clarity and cooperation. It maintains respect and structure while allowing for clarification, negotiation, and shared meaning-making between interlocutors. As a result, communication becomes a collaborative process, especially in contexts where guidance and comprehension are essential. For example, Eloise's

response, especially the phrase, "*But I was thinking—*" introduces hesitation, indicating uncertainty and an attempt at intellectual negotiation. This shift towards a consultative register highlights the power disparity, as the Queen dismisses Eloise's deliberation in favor of results.

d. Casual Style

According to Joos (1967), casual style is a speech register used in informal settings among peers, friends, or people who share a close relationship. This style is characterized by relaxed grammar, the frequent use of slang, contractions, ellipses, and a conversational tone that conveys spontaneity and ease. Unlike formal or consultative styles, casual style does not require complete sentence structures or strict adherence to grammatical rules; instead, it prioritizes a natural flow and shared understanding. Speakers often rely on inside jokes, common references, or even nonverbal cues to convey meaning, assuming the listener is part of the same social or cultural context. Joos emphasizes that casual style thrives in environments where social boundaries are minimal, allowing speakers to express themselves freely without the constraints of hierarchy or formality. This register plays a crucial role in building rapport and strengthening social bonds through everyday, unguarded communication. For instance, when Eloise comments, "*You mean her entire life,*" she escalates the humor, shifting her statement from a simple observation to outright sarcasm. This illustrates a change in speech register as described in Joos's theory. In contrast to Benedict and Francesca, who use

formal language, Eloise adopts a more casual tone, briefly straying from structured politeness to playful irreverence.

e. Intimate Style

Intimate style, as described by Joos (1967), is the most personal and private level of speech used between individuals who share a close emotional bond, such as family members, romantic partners, or very close friends. This style is marked by a high degree of familiarity, where language becomes deeply contextual and often relies on shared experiences, inside references, or even nonverbal cues, such as gestures, facial expressions, or tone of voice. Words may be abbreviated, sentences incomplete, and grammar rules frequently relaxed, as mutual understanding takes precedence over linguistic precision. In many cases, meaning is conveyed through implication rather than explicit expression, and utterances may consist of single words, pet names, or even silence that still carries meaning. Because of its deeply personal nature, intimate style is rarely used in public or formal settings, and it often excludes outsiders who lack the shared context. Joos emphasizes that this register reflects not only linguistic closeness but also emotional intimacy, making it a powerful tool for expressing affection, comfort, and trust within close relationships. For instance, The Queen's remark, "*Well, he is not so little anymore. Grows plumper by the day, in fact,*" introduces a more casual speech pattern characterized by ellipsis and evaluative language typical of informal conversations. The phrase "*Grows plumper by the day*" is colloquial and affectionate, deviating from the strict syntax she typically uses

in public settings. This subtle shift aligns with Joos's theory (1967) of language style, specifically the consultative register, which maintains politeness and grammatical completeness while allowing for a warmer interaction. In this context, the consultative mode serves as a middle ground between the formal rigidity of public duties and the relaxed nature of intimate speech.

Language styles refer to the distinct ways individuals use language based on social context, relationships, and communicative purposes. According to Joos (1967), there are five primary styles: frozen, formal, consultative, casual, and intimate. Each style represents a different level of formality and interaction. The frozen style is rigid and ceremonial, often used in legal or religious contexts. The formal style is structured and one-sided, common in public speaking or academic settings. The consultative style involves respectful dialogue and is typically found in professional or instructional interactions. The casual style is relaxed and informal, used among friends or peers. Finally, the intimate style is highly personal, relying on shared experiences and context, often used between close family members or romantic partners. These styles demonstrate how language adapts to ensure clarity, respect, and social appropriateness in various situations.

4. Language Functions

Language functions refer to the various communicative purposes that language serves in different contexts, such as expressing emotions, conveying information, making requests, persuading others, and maintaining social relationships (Degaf, 2014). These functions are closely linked to the speaker's intent and the surrounding

social context, rather than merely being dictated by grammatical structures. For instance, when a teacher explains a concept, this represents the informative function. A statement like “I am so proud of you” reflects the expressive function. A parent saying “Do not touch that” performs the regulatory function, while a child's question such as “Why is the sky blue?” represents the heuristic function that seeks knowledge. In both formal and informal settings, language serves different communicative goals. Halliday (1992) stated that language functions demonstrate how people use language to construct meaning and participate effectively in social life.

Michael Halliday, a renowned British linguist, developed a theory of language that treats it as a system for creating meaning in social interaction. His model is centered on three primary metafunctions: the ideational function that represents experience, the interpersonal function that enacts social relationships, and the textual function that organizes discourse. These concepts are elaborated in his widely influential book titled *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, which reoriented linguistic analysis toward real-life usage rather than formal structures. Halliday's theoretical contributions emphasize that understanding language requires attention to the social and cultural settings in which it is used. His background in multiple languages and interest in the social role of language led to a model that is widely applied in education, applied linguistics, and discourse studies.

In contrast to Joos (1967) who categorized language styles into fixed levels based on formality, Halliday introduced the concept of register to explain variation in language use. Register refers to the combination of field, which is the subject or

activity, tenor, which concerns the relationship between participants, and mode, which refers to the channel or form of communication. These variables influence the vocabulary, tone, and grammatical choices made by speakers, allowing language to adapt fluidly to different contexts. A conversation about science in a research setting will differ from one held at a family dinner table, not because of rigid stylistic labels but due to differing communicative contexts. Furthermore, Halliday identified seven fundamental language functions including instrumental, regulatory, interactional, personal, heuristic, imaginative, and representational. These provide a comprehensive lens for understanding how language serves both social purposes and individual needs across various situations.

a. Instrumental Function

The instrumental function in Halliday's theory refers to the use of language as a means to fulfill needs, obtain goods, or achieve specific outcomes. It is one of the earliest language functions that children develop, where they use words to express their desires, such as saying "*more juice*" or "*help me*" to satisfy a physical need. This function highlights language as a tool for action, with utterances often taking the form of commands, requests, or expressions of intent. Halliday views the instrumental function as inherently goal-oriented, meaning that language serves as an instrument through which the speaker interacts with their environment to create change. In adult communication, this function continues in a more structured manner, such as making a purchase, requesting assistance, placing an order, or filling out forms, all of which reflect the practical, transactional role of language in

everyday life. The instrumental function demonstrates how language not only conveys thought but also prompts action. In this study, there are several examples of instrumental functions. For instance, Queen Charlotte's utterances exhibit multiple overlapping communicative purposes based on Halliday's classification of language functions (1992). Her directive "*Charm her*" serves as an example of the instrumental function, as it commands an action aimed at fulfilling a strategic social goal, such as securing a marriage alliance.

b. Regulatory Function

The regulatory function in Halliday's theory refers to the use of language to control, direct, or influence the behavior of others. This function appears early in a child's language development as they begin to use words not only to express their needs but also to guide or manage the actions of those around them. For example, when a child says "*Stop it,*" "*Come here,*" or "*Don't do that,*" they are utilizing language to regulate someone else's behavior. This function often involves commands, requests, or suggestions and reflects the speaker's growing understanding of social roles and interpersonal dynamics. In adult communication, the regulatory function manifests in various contexts, such as a teacher instructing students, a manager assigning tasks, or a parent setting boundaries. It plays a vital role in maintaining order, establishing expectations, and facilitating cooperation in both formal and informal settings. Halliday emphasizes that this function highlights language as a tool for social control, enabling individuals to assert authority, negotiate

rules, and shape interactions within a community. For example, the phrase by Queen Charlotte, “*Her heart is no matter, as long as her hand remains free,*” carries a regulatory function. It redirects the prince’s attention from emotion to duty while expressing a hierarchical view of romantic agency within elite marriage practices.

c. Interactional Function

The interactional function in Halliday’s theory refers to the use of language to establish, maintain, and strengthen social relationships. It is one of the earliest functions that children develop as they begin to use language not only to fulfill needs or control others but also to connect emotionally and socially with those around them. This function is evident in greetings, farewells, small talk, expressions of sympathy, and any utterance that builds rapport and fosters a sense of belonging. For example, when a child says, “*Hi, Mommy*” or “*Let’s play,*” they are using language to initiate interaction and affirm their social bond. In adult communication, the interactional function appears in everyday conversations such as “*How are you?*”, “*Nice to see you,*” or “*Let’s catch up soon.*” Here, the primary goal is not to exchange information but to maintain social harmony and connection. Halliday emphasizes that this function highlights the interpersonal role of language, showing how it serves as a bridge between individuals in both casual and formal settings. It plays a crucial role in shaping social identity and emotional well-being through shared language practices. For instance, Eloise’s response, “*Do you truly wish to know what I think you look like?*” serves an

interactional function by directly engaging the other person and eliciting a response. Furthermore, Eloise's reply maintains an interactional function, directing the flow of conversation in a teasing manner while still retaining control over the interaction.

d. Personal Function

The personal function in Halliday's theory refers to the use of language to express a speaker's identity, feelings, opinions, and personal preferences. This function allows individuals to assert themselves and communicate their inner thoughts, making it essential for self-expression. Typically, it emerges in early childhood when children begin to express themselves with phrases, "*I like this,*" "*I'm scared,*" or "*That's mine,*" signaling their self-awareness and desire to share their personal experiences. Unlike the instrumental or regulatory functions, which are directed outward, the personal function is inwardly focused, it reveals the speaker's emotions, attitudes, and individuality. In adult communication, this function manifests in statements such as "*I believe this is unfair,*" "*I feel nervous,*" or "*That's just how I am.*" It plays a crucial role in shaping personal identity and fostering authenticity in social interactions. Halliday emphasizes that through the personal function, language serves as a mirror of the self, allowing speakers to articulate who they are and how they relate to the world around them. For example, Prince Friedrich's declaration, "*I am happy for them,*" serves both representational and personal functions. It describes a social reality while affirming his emotional acceptance, despite external pressures.

e. Heuristic Function

The heuristic function in Halliday's theory refers to the use of language as a means to explore the environment, ask questions, and seek knowledge. This function is particularly evident in early childhood when children begin to use language as a tool for discovery and learning. For instance, when a child asks, "*What's that?*", "*Why is it raining?*", or "*How does this work?*", they are engaging in heuristic language use. This function reflects the human drive to understand the world through inquiry and observation. Halliday emphasizes that the heuristic function is not confined to formal education; it appears in everyday interactions where individuals use language to investigate, hypothesize, and comprehend their surroundings. In adult communication, this can be observed in research discussions, interviews, or even casual conversations when someone is attempting to learn something new. The heuristic function underscores language as a cognitive tool that enables individuals to construct knowledge, solve problems, and satisfy curiosity through verbal exploration.

f. Representational Function

The representational function in Halliday's theory refers to the use of language to convey facts, describe the world, and share information. This function allows speakers to present their experiences, thoughts, and observations in a structured and meaningful way. It typically emerges in early childhood when children begin to talk about things beyond their immediate needs or feelings. For example, a child might say, "*The sun is*

hot” or “*My cat is sleeping.*” These statements are not intended to request something or regulate behavior but rather to inform or describe. In adult communication, the representational function is evident in contexts such as news reporting, academic writing, storytelling, or everyday explanations. For instance, one might say, “*She’s at the store*” or “*Water boils at 100 degrees Celsius.*” Halliday emphasizes that this function is central to how humans understand the world and share knowledge with others. It reflects the ideational metafunction in his broader theory, where language serves to construct and communicate reality. In this study, Lady Danbury’s blunt remark, “*Kind of me? You hated the man,*” illustrates a shift from representational language, which typically conveys condolences, to an expressive confrontation.

In short, language functions are the various purposes for which language is used in communication, reflecting the speaker’s intent and the social context. According to Halliday, these include instrumental (to satisfy needs), regulatory (to control behavior), interactional (to build relationships), personal (to express identity), heuristic (to seek knowledge), imaginative (to create imaginary worlds), and representational (to share information). Each function highlights a distinct way language operates, not just to convey facts, but to influence, relate, explore, and express. Understanding these functions allows us to see language as a dynamic, multifunctional tool that shapes how individuals engage with their environment, build connections, and make meaning in everyday life.

B. PREVIOUS STUDIES

Previous studies on language variation in films have shown that linguistic styles in dialogue are shaped by character background, genre, and social context. Sandika (2022), Maulani (2022), Rosyda (2021), and Ramdhani (2020) analyzed various films such as *Fifty Shades of Grey*, *Enola Holmes*, *Wonder*, and *What a Girl Wants*. These studies identified the frequent use of formal, casual, consultative, and intimate styles as categorized by Joos's framework. Most of them relied heavily on script analysis to classify language styles but offered limited insight into the social motivations behind these variations. Although Rosyda (2021) attempted to explore additional factors that influence the characters' language choices, the investigation remained descriptive and did not critically engage with the deeper sociolinguistic dynamics embedded in the dialogue.

A different strand of research focused on slang, as seen in the work of Tursini (2022), Situmorang (2021), Merisabel (2020), and Pangestu (2019). These studies examined films such as *Rampage*, *Charlie's Angels*, *Brick*, and *Deadpool 2* and explored how slang operates as a linguistic tool to convey informality, subcultural belonging, and creativity. Although these findings offered initial categorization of slang features, most studies lacked a thorough linguistic interpretation and failed to connect slang to broader sociocultural contexts. Merisabel's (2020) research stood out for tracing slang from different historical periods, yet her theoretical application was imprecise and did not yield fully coherent conclusions. Overall, the research on slang has not yet explored its interaction with power dynamics or social identities in a comprehensive manner.

Gender-based language variation has also been examined using Lakoff's theory, particularly in the work of Salman (2023), Ainurisanti (2023), Rizki (2021), and Priska (2020). These studies focused on women's speech features in films such as *North Country*, *Little Women*, *Cruella*, and *The Fault in Our Stars*, revealing that women's language reflects their societal roles and emotional expressiveness. Ainurisanti (2023) further noted that men's language tends to be more assertive and goal-oriented. While these studies affirmed the relevance of gender in shaping linguistic behavior, most of them only identified and counted linguistic features without offering in-depth analysis of the social conditions that construct gendered language. The lack of integration between linguistic function, context, and speaker identity weakened the explanatory power of their findings.

Although *Bridgerton Season 1* has been previously studied, existing research remains limited in scope. Amalia and Indah (2023) examined politeness strategies in the series, highlighting various communication approaches such as bald on-record and off-record strategies. They demonstrated how power relations are embedded in royal discourse but did not investigate language variation across different social classes in the show. Given that *Bridgerton* presents a rich portrayal of class hierarchy, the current study addresses this gap by examining language variation through a sociolinguistic lens. It draws on Labov's theory to understand how social class influences linguistic behavior, Joos's framework to categorize language styles, and Halliday's theory of language functions to interpret how language conveys ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings. This theoretical triangulation

provides a deeper understanding of how language reflects identity and power in historical narratives.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter outlines the methodological framework of the research, focusing on its paradigm, approach, instruments, data sources, methods, data analysis, and data triangulation. The study adopts a post-positivist paradigm, which acknowledges the complexity of social reality and seeks objectivity through empirical investigation. A quasi-qualitative approach is employed to achieve a comprehensive understanding of linguistic phenomena, combining the depth of qualitative insights with elements of quantitative rigor. The subsequent sections detail the specific methods used for data collection and analysis. Additionally, the techniques for examining language and instrument variation are discussed to ensure the reliability and validity of the findings.

A. RESEARCH PARADIGM

According to Rahardjo (2025), a paradigm is a comprehensive system of thinking that includes the basic assumptions, questions, and research methods that guide a study. A paradigm provides a philosophical foundation that ensures consistency and coherence throughout the research process (Klenke, 2016). Omodan (2024) adds that paradigms also play an essential role in maintaining the ethical and focused nature of academic inquiry. This research adopts a post-positivist paradigm to examine British language variations in *Bridgerton* Season 1. Post-positivism emerged as a response to the limitations of positivism, especially its claim to full objectivity. This paradigm recognizes that reality is complex, socially constructed,

and not always measurable in absolute terms. It also acknowledges the researcher's potential bias and the role of context in shaping interpretation.

In this study, the post-positivist paradigm is applied to provide a contextual understanding of linguistic variation. Rather than merely testing hypotheses, the research emphasizes interpretive analysis grounded in empirical evidence. The researcher combined qualitative and quantitative elements, conducting thematic analysis of dialogue transcripts from *Bridgerton* Season 1 as the primary data source. The transcripts were used to identify and calculate the frequency of specific language features—such as dialects, accents, and stylistic shifts—that signal class, power, and identity. The researcher also examined the visual and situational context of the utterances, which supported the interpretation of meaning beyond the spoken language. To strengthen the theoretical framework, sociolinguistic perspectives were employed to connect linguistic variation with broader social structures and cultural representations.

The rationale for selecting the post-positivist paradigm lies in its balance between empirical rigor and interpretive depth. This approach enables the researcher to critically analyze fictional discourse while maintaining validity and reliability in methodological procedures. Through this paradigm, the study aims not only to describe patterns of language use but also to explore how those patterns represent and reproduce social hierarchies. The flexibility of post-positivism allows for a comprehensive investigation that is both systematic and reflective, making it suitable for analyzing complex sociolinguistic phenomena in media texts such as *Bridgerton*.

B. RESEARCH APPROACHES

This research adopts a quasi-qualitative approach grounded in the post positivist paradigm. The quasi-qualitative method combines the interpretive richness of qualitative inquiry with selected aspects of quantitative analysis. This allows the researcher to explore language variation in depth, such as the frequency of dialects used in both formal and informal contexts, and interpret how these variations reflect character identity, social class, and relational dynamics in *Bridgerton* Season 1. According to Bungin (2022), the term qualitative descriptive is often misunderstood and should be replaced with quasi qualitative to reflect its distinct methodological position. Rahardjo (2024) also supports this shift, noting that quasi qualitative research provides more conceptual clarity, especially in studies that address complex linguistic and cultural phenomena. This approach enabled the researcher to interpret spoken dialogue with empirical support, focusing on how linguistic choices mirror or critique social structures.

The researcher followed the steps outlined by Rahardjo (2023), beginning with the identification of relevant research problems. This process involved initial observations and background research, followed by a literature review that included previous studies, academic journals, and theoretical works. Based on these, the researcher formulated research questions and determined the objectives of the study. Labov's theory of language variation was used as a theoretical foundation, considering factors such as education, occupation, and social status. The researcher then established data collection plans and identified appropriate sources. Techniques for data analysis and interpretation were carefully selected to ensure academic rigor.

In the final stage, the researcher aligned the findings with the theories used and presented the results through the thesis as a form of academic accountability. According to Rahardjo (2025), strong quasi qualitative research requires abundant and detailed data, which this study achieved by analyzing both linguistic forms and their broader sociocultural implications.

C. RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

According to Sugiyono (2017), in naturalistic inquiry, the primary instrument is the human researcher, who serves as the main tool for collecting and interpreting data. In this study, the researcher functioned as the main instrument, collecting and organizing data manually without the aid of automated software for initial processing. The secondary data were obtained from the dialogue transcripts of *Bridgerton* Season 1. The researcher transcribed the selected scenes and utterances manually by watching each episode through a premium Netflix account accessed via Google Chrome. During this process, the researcher observed relevant scenes, listened attentively, and transcribed the dialogue with precision. These transcriptions were saved in a soft file format. To enhance transcription accuracy and support preliminary analysis, tools such as Notepad, Copilot, and Grammarly were employed.

In addition to the transcription phase, the researcher applied qualitative analysis techniques, primarily thematic analysis, to identify language variations across different scenes and characters. Microsoft Word was used to compile the research document, Grammarly assisted in correcting typographical errors, and Google

Scholar was utilized to access relevant academic sources. This combination of manual procedures and supporting digital tools ensured that the data collection and analysis processes were systematic and verifiable. Through this approach, the researcher aimed to produce findings that are valid, credible, and aligned with the objectives of sociolinguistic inquiry in fictional media texts.

D. DATA & DATA SOURCE

The data for this research were obtained from the Netflix original series *Bridgerton* Season 1, which consists of eight episodes depicting the linguistic and social intricacies of early nineteenth-century British aristocracy. The primary data are in the form of utterances, specifically spoken expressions extracted from character dialogues across different episodes. A total of fifty utterances were purposively selected to represent a range of social interactions among characters from three upper social classes: the Royal Family, the Nobility, and the Merchant Class. These utterances were categorized into five groups: three utterances from interactions within the Royal Family, seven from Royalty-Nobility exchanges, twenty-seven from Upper-Class Nobility interactions, seven from conversations between Nobility and the Merchant Class, and six from the Merchant Class. The classification highlights internal hierarchies within elite society and serves to demonstrate how language in the series operates as a symbol of identity, status, and authority. This research focuses solely on upper social groups, as *Bridgerton* Season 1 centers its narrative on elite circles, with minimal representation of lower-class characters.

Each selected utterance was analyzed in its context to explore how language variation, style, and function reflect social roles and power relations. For instance, in Datum 12 from Episode 1 (00:01:40 to 00:01:44), a dialogue among the Bridgerton siblings illustrates upper-class interactional patterns through humor and shared expectations. Benedict asks whether Daphne is ready, Francesca and Eloise respond with sarcasm, and Colin offers to check on her. This exchange reveals both the familial bond and the social pressure surrounding debutante rituals. The data also serve as a foundation for applying Labov's (2018) theory of language variation, Joos's (1967) framework of language styles, and Halliday's (1992) model of language functions. Through these theories, the research interprets how linguistic choices in fictional narratives mirror real-world social stratification and communicative purposes.

E. DATA COLLECTION METHODS

Rahardjo (2018) divides research into pure and applied types, with pure research further classified into quantitative and qualitative categories. This study applies textual research as a branch of qualitative research, chosen to enable comprehensive analysis of language used in *Bridgerton* Season 1. Textual study allows researchers to uncover layers of meaning, themes, and structure that may be overlooked through other methods. It focuses on interpreting the discourse, with thematic analysis used to identify recurring linguistic patterns and their sociocultural meanings. All texts carry persuasive intent and multiple interpretations, which often extend beyond the author's original meaning. Once a text is released publicly, the researcher's control over interpretation diminishes. Despite such limitations, textual analysis remains

valuable for interpreting naturalistic data and encouraging broader academic inquiry (Rahardjo, 2017).

To ensure credibility, the researcher has followed the textual data collection steps outlined by Rahardjo (2017). All episodes of *Bridgerton* Season 1 were watched to identify scenes that reflect upper-class language variation, particularly those aligned with Labov's theory. Selected scenes were transcribed with detailed attention to speaker identity, context, and speech style. These transcripts were then categorized based on language variation (Labov, 2018), language style (Joos, 1967), and language function (Halliday, 1992). The data were contextualized to reflect five social categories among elite groups and were analyzed thematically to identify linguistic patterns that reveal social identity and norms in London's aristocratic society. This method was used not only to interpret language use but also to minimize potential bias in both data collection and analysis. Pakpahan et al. (2021) emphasize that reliable data collection determines the overall credibility of a study, a principle that guided the researcher in producing a structured and evidence-based thesis.

F. DATA ANALYSIS

The data were analyzed using a thematic technique that enabled the identification of recurring linguistic patterns and social themes within the selected utterances. The process involved coding transcripts based on the characters' social categories: Royal Family, interactions between Royalty and Nobility, among Nobility, between Nobility and Merchant Class, and among Merchant Class. Transcripts were labeled

according to episodes, scenes, and speakers, then organized using keyword-based codes such as “Royal Family” or “NM.” To assist this process, the researcher employed Copilot, an AI tool permitted in higher education institutions (Directorate of Learning and Student Affairs, 2024). Copilot followed specific prompts and grouped data according to the categories mentioned. However, all outputs were reviewed and corrected manually to ensure alignment with the research objectives.

The coded data were analyzed through the lens of Labov’s theory of language variation (2018), Joos’s classification of language style (1967), and Halliday’s theory of language functions (1992). For example, in one exchange between Prince Friedrich and Daphne, the Prince’s formal compliment and Daphne’s reaction reflect how language conveys social roles, formality levels, and expressive intent. Labov’s concept of overt prestige, Joos’s stylistic distinctions, and Halliday’s interpersonal and representational functions all apply in interpreting the scene. Through this approach, the researcher explored how linguistic choices reflect class identity, power relations, and social ideology within the aristocratic world of *Bridgerton* Season 1.

G. DATA TRIANGULATION

This research applied theoretical triangulation as proposed by Mudjia Rahardjo (2020), which involves examining a phenomenon from multiple theoretical lenses to deepen analysis and reduce bias. Three linguistic theories were employed: Labov’s theory of language variation (2018) to explore how social structure shapes language use, Joos’s theory of language styles (1967) to classify speech according to levels of formality and setting, and Halliday’s theory of language functions (1992)

to examine how utterances fulfill ideational, interpersonal, and textual roles. These frameworks helped interpret the sociolinguistic patterns and power relations embedded in the characters' dialogues across various social classes.

To strengthen the trustworthiness of the findings, the researcher consulted Prof. Dr. Mudjia Rahardjo, M.Si., a sociolinguistics expert, for validation. His role as a thesis supervisor and expert provided critical insights into the accuracy of theory application and theme interpretation. The combination of theoretical triangulation and expert judgment ensured that the analysis remained grounded in established linguistic thought and enhanced the overall credibility of the research outcomes.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

A. FINDINGS

These findings were observed in Bridgerton Season 1. The analysis is based on Labov's theory about language variations, Joos about language styles, and Halliday about language functions. The classification of the theory based on the context, such as.

1. Language Use Within The Royal Family

Datum 1

Context

This scene takes place in a royal setting where Queen Charlotte expresses her desire for Prince Friedrich to pursue Daphne Bridgerton, whom she identifies as the most suitable match of the season. When Prince Friedrich raises concerns about Daphne's affections, the Queen maintains control over the conversation with decisive and composed authority. The dialogue illustrates how communication among aristocrats serves not only as a means of interaction but also as a reinforcement of social expectations, power, and class distinctions.

Dialog

Queen Charlotte: "...making this author wonder if the crown has lost its luster. I know what this insolent woman insinuates, and I shall certainly not make allowances for it."

Prince Friedrich: “Does she mean a king? Where on earth do they keep him anyway?”

Queen Charlotte: “The Bridgerton girl is the incomparable of the season, which means there is no more suitable a match for you on English shores.”

Prince Friedrich: “Miss Bridgerton is a delightful young lady, to be sure. But if this gossip sheet is correct, then her heart is already spoken for.”

Queen Charlotte: “Her heart is no matter, as long as her hand remains free. You are a prince. Charm her.”

(Episode 3, 00:25:45 – 00:26:26)

Analysis

The text demonstrates distinct linguistic features that reflect Queen Charlotte’s elite class status. Her phrases, such as “*I shall certainly not make allowances for it*” and “*Her heart is no matter,*” showcase elevated diction and syntactic sophistication. These structures align with Labov’s theory of language variations (2018), which posits that the language of the upper classes tends to adhere to prestige norms and formal standards. Queen Charlotte’s speech exemplifies this prestige variety, revealing power dynamics and class-based boundaries through her assertive yet refined linguistic choices.

The utterance aligns with Joos's (1967) frozen or formal style. The Queen's speech is grammatically complete and avoids contractions, opting for constructions that include modal verbs such as '*shall*' and parallel structures, for example, "*Her heart does not matter, as long as her hands remain free.*" These elements support the idea that aristocratic language goes beyond mere style; it serves as a means to uphold etiquette and social

authority. Even the brief imperative, 'Charm her' is linguistically capable of carrying significant structural power, reflecting a monarchical culture.

From a functional perspective, Queen Charlotte's utterances exhibit several purposes based on Halliday's classification of language functions (1992). "*Charm her*" exemplifies the instrumental function, used to command an action that fulfills a strategic social goal, securing a marriage alliance. The phrase "*Her heart is no matter, as long as her hand remains free*" carries a regulatory function, redirecting the prince's attention from the emotion while expressing a hierarchical view of romantic within elite marriage practices. Furthermore, her statement "*I know what this insolent woman insinuates, and I shall certainly not make allowances for it*" illustrates the personal function, revealing her emotional response of displeasure and offense while maintaining her royal family through elevated syntax. Additionally, when she declares, "*The Bridgerton girl is the incomparable of the season,*" it is representative of function by presenting social facts that rationalize her intentions. These functions demonstrate that language in aristocratic contexts is not merely expressive. It also serves to regulate behavior, assert authority, and maintain social classes.

The scene illustrates how language serves as a mechanism of power and identity among the upper classes in *Bridgerton* Season 1. Queen Charlotte's speech, characterized by prestigious vocabulary and structured syntax, aims to represent aristocratic values. Labov's analysis highlights her elite status, while Joos's theory explains the formal register that conveys her

authority. Halliday's perspective shows that her utterances contain social norms and control interactions. In contrast, Prince Friedrich's language operates at a lower authority level. Ultimately, Queen Charlotte's discourse is performative and strategic, strengthen social hierarchy and ensuring class boundaries are linguistically enforced. These theories reinforces the data that language reflects and reproduces social stratifications.

Datum 2

Context

This scene takes place in the castle as she responds to Prince Friedrich's farewell. Queen Charlotte was disappointed by his inability to win over Daphne Bridgerton. This situation makes her feeling frustration with a mix of sarcasm and authority. While she urges him to reclaim Daphne by emphasizing his higher status, she ultimately accepts his decision and allows him to return to Prussia. Her language's tone changed to be commanding and resigned, revealing both her royal pride and subtle emotional complexity.

Dialog

Prince Friedrich: *"I bid you farewell, Tante. I shall be returning to Prussia this afternoon."*

Queen Charlotte: *"Am I to believe you truly long for sweet pickles and sauerkraut? Fight for the girl! Hastings is merely a duke. You are a prince."*

Prince Friedrich: *"I have no interest in brandishing my title before the young lady, nor do I need to. I am happy for them. Everyone is happy for them. You have read of what your dear Whistledown writes."*

Queen Charlotte: “*Auf Wiedersehen, if you must go. While you may be content to accept defeat. It is not certainly not how I approach things.*”

(Episode 5, 00:15:09 – 00:15:50)

Analysis

The dialogue reflects linguistic patterns that showcase the royal class, personal pride, and differences in values across generations within the aristocracy. Queen Charlotte’s command, “*Fight for the girl!*” along with her statement, “*Hastings is merely a duke. You are a prince,*” formed a hierarchical view that prioritizes her social class. Her words convey dominance in both form and content, align with Labov’s theory (2018) that linguistic behavior reflects and reinforces social stratification.

Prince Friedrich’s response by negation and repetition (“*nor do I need to,*” “*Everyone is happy for them*”) indicates his resistance to engage while still obeying the formal elegance characteristic of upper-class discourse. The speech style of both characters is formal, nearly frozen in tone and structure, based on Joos’s theory (1967). Prince Friedrich begins with “*I bid you farewell,*” employing a ceremonious phrase characterized by elevated vocabulary and balanced syntax. In contrast, Queen Charlotte’s speech is emphatic, utilizing rhetorical questions (“*Am I to believe...*”) and firm statements. The paratactic structure of her statements improves their impact, especially when making social comparisons.

From a functional perspective of Halliday (1992), Queen Charlotte’s command, “*Fight for the girl!*” serves an instrumental purpose, urging

actions aligned with royal expectations. Her affirmation, “*You are a prince,*” embodies a regulatory function, determined social roles. Additionally, her statement, “*It is certainly not how I approach things,*” reflects her personal establishing, expressing her unwillingness of defeated. Prince Friedrich’s expression, “*I am happy for them,*” serves both representational and personal functions, as it describes the social reality while affirming his emotional acceptance despite external pressures.

This analysis illustrates how the utterances demonstrate language variations across social classes. Through the use of elevated vocabulary, a structured formal tone, and layered communicative functions, both characters exemplify the performative speech style characteristic of the aristocracy. The scene proves how language establishes institutional values, negotiates interpersonal power, and reveals character-specific ideologies embedded within noble identities. Their exchange captures the interplay between tradition and personal principles, all of which are negotiated through controlled, high-status linguistic forms.

Datum 3

Context

This scene takes place during an intimate dinner between Queen Charlotte and King George, characterized by an emotional of gentleness and familiarity. This part was not in line with the Queen's public persona that often seen with formality, authority, and ceremonial detachment. This

exchange reveals a changed to be an affectionate and personal conversation. In this scene, the Queen speaks to the King without her public voice, but in a more personal tone shaped by their emotional closeness and shared history. This changing in the dialogue emphasizes how language styles can change when the power dynamics of their relationship give way to intimacy.

Dialog

Queen Charlotte: “*My King.*”

King George: “*No need for the formality, Lottie. Sit with me. How is little George?*”

Queen Charlotte: “*Well, he is not so little anymore. Grows plumper by the day, in fact.*”

King George: “*I am quite sure he does.*”

(Episode 5, 00:24:10 – 00:24:30)

Analysis

This utterance highlights a significant change of language in Queen Charlotte’s who usually use formal language and structured syntax. Her simple greeting, “*My King,*” remains formal, but the context of a private dinner contrasts this ceremonial greeting with a sense of warmth. King George’s response, “*No need for the formality, Lottie,*” breaks down their hierarchical relationship and invites a more intimate exchange. The use of the nickname “*Lottie*” contrasts with the Queen’s public persona, suggesting the depth of their personal connection. According to Labov’s theory (2018), these changes in language reflect social contexts and relational hierarchies,

illustrating a change from a formal public variety to a more personal language shaped by emotional closeness.

The Queen's remark, "*Well, he is not so little anymore. Grows plumper by the day, in fact,*" introduces a more casual speech pattern, characterized by ellipsis and evaluative language typical of informal conversations. The phrase "*Grows plumper by the day*" is colloquial and affectionate, stray from the strict syntax she typically uses in public settings. This subtle change aligns with Joos's (1967) theory of language styles, specifically the consultative register, which maintains politeness and grammatical completeness while allowing for a warmer interaction. In this context, the consultative mode is situated in the middle of the formal public duties and the intimate speech.

From a functional perspective based on Halliday's classification (1992), the Queen's statements serve multiple language functions. Her initial phrase, "*My King,*" establishes an emotional connection within the significant context of their relationship. When she comments on their child's growth, she engages in the personal function, expressing affection and joy in her observations as a parent. Her tone is light, reflecting comfort and casual, which is different from her typical authoritative commands. King George's use of the nickname "*Lottie*" and his concluding statement, "*I am quite sure he does,*" strengthen the interactional and personal functions of their conversation, highlighting their bond and creating an atmosphere of mutual gentleness.

This interaction is an example of how upper-class characters in *Bridgerton* Season 1 adapt their language to reflect changing social dynamics and emotional contexts. Queen Charlotte, who usually employs controlled and dominant utterances associated with power and hierarchy, adopts a more consultative and personal style of speech. Her lexical choices become more affectionate, and her syntax relaxes in rhythm and tone. Through Labov's lens, this showcases the flexibility of prestige speakers as they navigate between their institutional roles and personal identities. Joos's theory emphasizes this linguistic transition from formal to a consultative style. Lastly, Halliday's functional approach reveals that the language used in this exchange serves roles beyond mere regulation. It also contains intimacy, expresses care, and temporarily levels the power hierarchy between monarchs and their partners.

2. Interactions between Royalty and Nobility

Datum 4

Context

The scene takes place during the presentation of debutantes at the castle, where Queen Charlotte evaluates the eligible young women of the season. As Daphne Bridgerton presented, the Queen briefly observes her and utters a single highly impactful phrase. This moment strengthens Daphne's social status as the Queen's utterance leads her to be known as the "*Diamond of the Season*," the highest honor in that social tradition. Despite the brevity of

the utterance, highly influenced the high value of a noble's families social status.

Dialog

Queen Charlotte: "Flawless, my dear."

(Episode 1, 00:06:55 - 00:06:56)

Analysis

This utterance illustrated Queen Charlotte's increased linguistic status and social authority. The adjective "*flawless*" is intentionally chosen which is an absolute term describing perfection when spoken by a monarch, it would be a performative speech act with immediate social consequences. According to Labov's theory (2018), this type of declarative language is characteristic of speakers in positions of power. It is not only descriptive but constitutive, shaping social perception and reinforcing hierarchical structures. Queen Charlotte's diction embodies a prestigious variety of language. Her little words but definitive, signaling her role as the ultimate arbiter of worth within the debutante tradition.

Additionally, the utterance align within the frozen or formal register, in line with Joos's theory (1967). "*Flawless, my dear*" maintains the ceremonial tone expected in royal discourse. The formal lexical choice of "*flawless*," added by the term, "*my dear*," reflects a refinement of meaningful sentences in monarchical tradition. Her statements are rigid and structured, yet it still prioritize the authoritative distance of the Queen even in the moment of affirmation.

From a Halliday functional perspective (1992), the utterance serves multiple roles at the same time. Primarily, it performs an instrumental function through Queen's affirmation. The Queen effectively constructs Daphne's social identity for the season, influencing how she is perceived by society. At the same time, the phrase conveys a representational function, offering a brief assessment expressed as a fact of objective truth. At the end of the utterance, the use of "*my dear*" describes a subtle personal function, softening the formal language with affection, which aligns with the Queen's graceful performativity. This multi-functioning, reflects how language in the elite social class is used not only to communicate but also to create status, confirm hierarchy, and enforce their culture.

Though consisting of only two words, Queen Charlotte's utterance is a powerful linguistic act of class and control. Through elevated vocabulary, formal register, and layered pragmatic functions, she affirms her cultural authority while giving prestige to Daphne. Labov's theory highlights how her speech reflects and reinforces social stratification, while Joos's register framework reveals the ceremonial rigidity behind its form. Halliday's theory demonstrates how one phrase can simultaneously name, judge, and shape social reality. This moment exemplifies the powerful nature of upper-class languages in *Bridgerton* Season 1, where meaning resides not only in what is said, but also in who says it, how it is said, and the social structures.

Datum 5

Context

At a formal gathering, Prince Friedrich was introduced to Daphne Bridgerton for the first time. During their meeting, the Prince offers a polite compliment that makes Daphne remember her private joke, which she had recently shared with Simon Basset about the predictability of the Prince's compliments toward women. Surprised by how accurately their joke reflects reality, Daphne laughs and snorts, losing her composure in front of the Prince. Embarrassed, she quickly apologized. This brief interaction provides insightful commentary on linguistic variations, social politeness, and personal voice within an upper-classes setting.

Dialog

Prince Friedrich: *“So lovely to meet you, Miss Bridgerton. Your gown, it is exquisite.”*

Daphne Bridgerton: *(laughs, snorts) “my apologies”*

Prince Friedrich: *“No apology necessary.”*

(Episode 3, 00:09:15 – 00:09:32)

Analysis

Prince Friedrich’s speech demonstrates clear markers of formality and upper-class etiquette. His structured introduction, *“So lovely to meet you, Miss Bridgerton,”* highlights a well-prepared and ceremonial speeches that emphasizes social politeness. The phrase *“Your gown, it is exquisite”* showcases a refined choice of words, with the adjective *‘exquisite’* indicating appreciation for beauty in a dignified manner. These linguistic features align with Labov’s (2018) theory, which associates prestige language with the

upper classes. Friedrich's careful diction and polite expressions reflect this prestige, maintaining a polite attitude that is appropriate to their social status.

The interaction also reveals a subtle change in register. Prince Friedrich's speech remains within a formal register, following Joos's (1967) framework, which is characterized by full sentences, respectful address, and the avoidance of contractions. In contrast, Daphne's instead laugh and snort momentarily disrupt the expected decorum of the conversation. Her spontaneous reaction, followed by a quick utterance, "*My apologies*," reintroduces politeness while acknowledging the breach of formal behavior. This utterance change toward a consultative register, balancing social norms with personal expression.

From Halliday's perspective (1992), this exchange involves several layered language functions. Prince Friedrich's greeting and compliment serve a regulatory function, using polite conventions to initiate and manage social interaction in a courtship context. His structured expression also fulfills a representational function by presenting the observable truth that is seen as a part of the praise that is constantly repeated as a form of politeness among the upper classes. Daphne's "*My apologies*" serves a personal function, reflecting her awareness of her emotional response and its potential impropriety. Prince Friedrich's quick reassurance, "*No apology necessary*," fulfills both regulatory and interactional functions, softening the moment and maintaining the flow of social harmony, especially crucial in aristocratic circles.

This brief exchange captures the performative nature of upper-class discourse in *Bridgerton* Season 1, illustrating how even overview dialogue reflects social status, stylistic norms, and communicative intents. Labov's theory (2018) highlights the prestige embedded in Prince Friedrich's word choices, while Joos's framework (1967) reveals the difference between registers as Daphne's natural reaction clashes with social formality. Furthermore, Halliday's theory (1992) enriches the analysis by demonstrating how each utterance navigates expressive, representational, and regulatory functions. Ultimately, this scene illustrates how language among the elite is not only a tool for maintaining politeness but also proves that a short dialogue are very impactful for the boundaries among social classes.

Datum 6

Context

This scene takes place after Daphne Bridgerton decides to accept Simon Basset's proposal instead of that of Prince Friedrich. During this emotionally charged conversation, the prince expresses composed disappointment, acknowledging a misunderstanding in their courtship. Despite his initial hurt, he takes responsibility for misinterpreting her politeness as affection. Daphne affirms the sincerity of her feelings while recognizing that she may have created some ambiguity in her previous actions.

Dialog

Prince Friedrich: *“No..no promises were made. Although, I thought we shared an understanding with our discussions of the future. But, uh...the fault is mine for misreading your polite attentions as something more.”*

Daphne Bridgerton: *“No, you did not misread me.”*

(Episode 5, 00:05:26 – 00:05:40)

Analysis

Prince Friedrich’s statement represents a change from formal public language to a more consultative and emotionally style. His use of hesitation markers, “no... no,” and filler words such as “uh” make his tone and suggests an internal struggle between disappointment and dignity. His phrasing, “*misreading your polite attentions as something more,*” exemplifies the prestigious language often associated with Labov’s theory (2018), where polite and controlled vocabulary is utilized even in emotional moments. These lexical choices maintain politeness while gently expressing personal disappointment, highlighting the intersection of social class in elite discourse.

Additionally, this register can be categorized as consultative, in line with Joos’s theory (1967), which describes language that remains grammatically correct and socially appropriate while becoming more personal, interactive, and spontaneous. The Prince’s self-effacing remark, “*the fault is mine,*” contrasts with the typical authoritative manner which he

employs in public settings. This indicates a private lowering of status in favor of emotional moment. In response, Daphne's brief, "*No, you did not misread me,*" shows her awareness of the pain caused and attempts to take emotional responsibility while still maintaining politeness.

From Halliday's functional perspective (1992), the Prince's statement fulfills several functions. It conveys a personal function by expressing introspective emotion and disappointment, carefully mediated through language. It also serves a representational function as he attempts to clarify the discrepancy between emotional signals and actual intentions in a logical manner. The phrase "*the fault is mine*" introduces an interactional function, aiming to maintain the dignity of the conversation and protect mutual respect despite rejection. Daphne's response addresses both personal and interactional functions, acknowledging emotional connection and offering reassurance to avoiding potential hurt.

This dialogue demonstrates how language in upper-class settings can accommodate emotional complexity while establishing social propriety. Through the vocabularies, strategic hesitations, and interpersonal sensitivity, Prince Friedrich communicates disappointment. Labov's theory helps clarify how prestige language is maintained in intimate contexts, while Joos's theory of register explains how the language changed from formal to consultative speech signal emotional authenticity. Halliday's framework highlights the layered intentions behind each phrase: expressing vulnerability, preserving respect, and repairing social connections. Ultimately, this exchange shows

that among the aristocracy, emotional negotiations are handled not through overt confrontation, but with elegant linguistic that carefully balances personal truth and social politeness.

Datum 7

Context

The scene takes place in the castle during a formal presentation to get Queen's permission for Simon and Daphne's wedding. Lady Danbury, following tradition, attempts a deep curtsy before the Queen. However, because of her knee hurts and difficulty in moving, she can only bow so far. Queen Charlotte, recognizing Lady Danbury's condition, acknowledges her limitation and instructs Simon and Daphne to approach instead.

Dialog

Queen Charlotte: "As low as you can go, Lady Danbury?"

Lady Danbury: "With these knees, yes, Your Majesty."

Queen Charlotte: "Very well. Let your young people come forward."

(Episode 5, 00:29:27 – 00:29:47)

Analysis

This utterance highlights linguistic features that strengthen Queen Charlotte's hierarchical status while allowing for some adaptability within aristocratic traditions. The phrase, "*As low as you can go, Lady Danbury?*" is framed as a question but carries an implicit expectation of formal obedience. Although the Queen acknowledges a physical limitation, her wording remains authoritative, consistent with Labov's (2018) theory that

speech among high-status individuals maintains prestige markers even in informal moments. Her phrasing to maintain the ritualistic nature of interactions in a formal forums while subtly accommodating practicality.

Lady Danbury's response, "*With these knees, yes, Your Majesty,*" introduces a contrast in register. While she maintains formal address with "*Your Majesty,*" her self-deprecating humor signals a shift toward a more consultative register, as outlined in Joos's framework (1967). This moment illustrates how linguistic negotiation allows aristocrats to navigate between rigid politeness and personal expression, balancing their social obligations with personal realities.

From Halliday's theory (1992), the Queen's utterance serves multiple functions. The question "*As low as you can go?*" acts as a regulatory function, instructing the expected ceremonial action. At the same time, it has an interactional function, implicitly acknowledging Lady Danbury's physical limitations without direct confrontation. Lady Danbury's humorous reply fulfills both personal and interactional functions, allowing her to maintain politeness while introducing warmth into the exchange. The Queen's final statement, "*Very well. Let your young people come forward,*" reaffirms the regulatory function, changing the protocol to accommodate practicality while maintaining structural order within the royal interaction.

Overall, this brief layered exchange illustrates the interplay between formality, authority, and personal relationship in aristocratic speech. Queen Charlotte's language remains firmly within the prestige variety described in

Labov's theory, as she establishes her commanding position while smoothly adjusting tradition. Joos's framework helps decode the delicate change between frozen and consultative registers, demonstrating how Lady Danbury introduces informal elements while retaining respect. Halliday's theory further clarifies how language in upper-class interactions directs action, manages expectations, and negotiates personal constraints. Ultimately, this scene exemplifies how linguistic performance among the elite serves both ritualistic and adaptive purposes, highlighting the complexity of communication within hierarchical structures.

Datum 8

Context

This scene takes place at a high-society gathering, where Queen Charlotte asserts her authority over the crowd by demanding that they clear a path for her. Her imperative tone reflects both impatience and command, highlighting her expectation of immediate obedience. The metaphor comparing the aristocratic society to '*sheep*' emphasizes her perception that their chaotic crowd behavior is similar to the sheep. So that, the queen assesses their lack of self-awareness. Her choice of language serves not only as a functional directive but also as a critique of the societal dynamics. Otherwise, her language reinforces class hierarchies through linguistic control.

Dialog

Queen Charlotte: "Make way! Must you all act like sheep flocking to the through?"

(Episode 7, 00:17:41 – 00:17:44)

Analysis

The utterance reflects linguistic patterns that reinforce Queen Charlotte's dominant social position. The command "*Make way!*" is a straightforward imperative, exhibiting an authoritative tone that aligns with Labov's theory of language variations (2018). According to this theory, a prestigious variation often appears in direct speech, but the language is elevated among individuals of high-society. The Queen neither requests nor explains with the simply commands, which is typical linguistic behavior for those in positions of unquestioned power.

The latter part of her utterance, "*Must you all act like sheep flocking to the trough?*" introduces a sharp metaphor that distances her from the surrounding social elite. By comparing aristocrats to '*sheep*', she implies mindless conformity. This critique, coming from a monarch, serves as both an observation and an assertion of superiority. This rhetorical strategy fits within Joos's frozen or formal register (1967), where elevated speech is maintained even when expressing frustration. The analogy enhances the Queen's distinct voice, signaling controlled humiliation for the predictable nature of high-society behavior.

From a Halliday's functional perspective (1992), the Queen's statement carries multiple simultaneous functions. The imperative "*Make way!*" serves a regulatory function, enforcing social movement and commanding obedience. The rhetorical question that follows engages the

crowd in a way that indirectly mocks them, reinforcing her elevated position through linguistic hierarchy. Additionally, the metaphorical reference to '*sheep*' establishes a representational function, describing an observed behavioral pattern that aligns with her broader critique of the upper classes.

This strong utterance illustrates Queen Charlotte's authority, demonstrating how language in aristocratic settings operates as both command and commentary. Labov's theory highlights that prestige variety is utilized not only for control but also for implicit social critique. Joos's framework reinforces the formality embedded in her speech. Halliday's model further illustrates how her words direct action, contains subtle mockery, and reinforce hierarchies through figurative language. Ultimately, this interaction exemplifies how elite figures use language to assert dominance, regulate behavior, and define social dynamics, not merely through commands, but through the careful deployment of metaphor and tone.

Datum 9

Context

In this exchange, Queen Charlotte pressures Eloise Bridgerton to find the identity of Lady Whistledown, the popular anonymous author among society. The Queen frustrated with the slow progress of Eloise. She uses direct questioning and a commanding tone to emphasize her authority. Although Eloise is eager to complete the task, she finds the challenge complex, leading to a tense yet revealing conversation. This dialogue

highlights the hierarchical relationships, power dynamics, and linguistic control present in elite settings.

Dialog

Queen Charlotte: "Who is she?"

Eloise Bridgerton: "Your Majesty?"

Queen Charlotte: "Whistledown."

Eloise Bridgerton: "Oh."

Queen Charlotte: "I tasked you with unmasking the scandalmonger."

Eloise Bridgerton: "Believe me, I am intent on locating her and am angry at myself for having not yet uncovered her identity. But I was thinking-"

Queen Charlotte: "Clearly not fast enough. My patience has limits."

(Episode 7, 00:18:57 – 00:19:17)

Analysis

Queen Charlotte's speech exemplifies the characteristics of a prestigious linguistic variety, aligning with Labov's (2018) theory that suggests individuals in positions of authority use structured and directive language. Her question, "*Who is she?*" marks a significant departure from elaborate courtly discourse. This utterance describes the queen's desire who wants strict efficiency and conveys urgency. She reinforces her power through linguistic economy, demonstrating control not only over the conversation but also over the expectations of those beneath her.

This exchange reflects Joos's concept of the frozen or formal register (1967), which align with Queen Charlotte's speech. Her clipped syntax and

stiff expression depict the ceremonial defense of royal interaction, even when discussing scandalous issues. The statement, "*I tasked you with unmasking the scandalmonger,*" lacks conversational softness and employs declarative precision to remind Eloise of her responsibilities. In contrast, Eloise's response, especially in the phrase, "*But I was thinking—*" introduces hesitation, indicating uncertainty and an attempt at intellectual negotiation. This change towards a consultative register highlights the power disparity, as the Queen dismisses Eloise's deliberation in favor of results.

From Halliday's functional perspective (1992), Queen Charlotte's utterances serve multiple communicative purposes. The initial question, "*Who is she?*" fulfills a regulatory function, compelling Eloise to provide immediate information. The declarative statement "*I tasked you with unmasking the scandalmonger*" serves both instrumental and interactional functions, directing Eloise's actions while strengthening hierarchical superiority. Meanwhile, the remark, "*Clearly not fast enough. My patience has limits,*" expresses frustration and sets an implicit ultimatum regarding Eloise's progress, fulfilling both personal and regulatory functions.

This exchange illustrates the intersection of linguistic authority, hierarchical dominance, and functional command within aristocratic speech. Labov's theory contextualizes Queen Charlotte's strict control over language as an assertion of status. In contrast, Joos's framework highlights the differences between her formal, frozen speech and Eloise's temporary consultative tone. Halliday's functional model further illustrates how the

Queen's statements enforce directive control, express impatience, and shape social obligations through verbal precision. Ultimately, this scene emphasizes how language among the elite functions not only for communication but also as a tool of authority, influencing power dynamics through rigid syntax, strategic brevity, and the suppression of negotiation.

Datum 10

Context

In this scene, Eloise Bridgerton presents her investigative findings on Lady Whistledown to Queen Charlotte. Eloise confidently claims that Whistledown is a tradesperson rather than a member of the aristocracy, believing the Queen will find this revelation valuable. However, Queen Charlotte had already set up an investigative team and dismissed Eloise's contribution sharply and decisively. This exchange highlights the hierarchical tension between the two characters, showcasing Eloise's enthusiasm contrasted with the Queen's authority, followed by the feeling of impatience.

Dialog

Eloise Bridgerton: *"And so you see, Your Majesty, it is clear as day. Lady Whistledown works closely with the members of the ton, yet she is not a member herself. She is a tradesperson."*

Queen Charlotte: *"Is that all?"*

Eloise Bridgerton: *"I beg your pardon?"*

Queen Charlotte: *"I am no longer in need of your services."*

(Episode 7, 00:50:12 – 00:50:30)

Analysis

Eloise's speech demonstrates structured reasoning but lacks the authority needed to command Queen Charlotte's full attention. Her phrase "*it is clear as day*" certainly showcasing her confidence in her investigative deduction. However, her detailed explanation, "*Lady Whistledown works closely with the members of the ton, yet she is not a member herself,*" reveals her desire to persuade the queen that she has made a progress in the mission to find Lady Whistledown. Even though, in this context, Eloise is still seeking validation. According to Labov's theory (2018), her speech fits within the consultative register of aristocratic discourse, where formal politeness is maintained through explanatory phrasing.

Queen Charlotte's response, "*Is that all?*" is incisive and dismissive, reinforcing her superior status. This phrasing aligns with Joos's frozen register (1967), in which speech remains highly controlled and declarative, highlighting the linguistic hierarchy. The phrase "*I am no longer in need of your services*" acts as both a formal conclusion and an abrupt termination of Eloise's role. It is also signaling that the Queen regards her efforts as unnecessary. The stark wording contrasts incisively with Eloise's detailed reasoning, further asserting the Queen's dominance in the exchange.

According to Halliday (1992), the Queen's statements serve multiple communicative functions. "*Is that all?*" acts as a regulatory prompt, pushing Eloise to reconsider the significance of her findings. Additionally, it subtly

enforces an interactional function, indicating the Queen's disinterest in Eloise's discovery. The final statement, "*I am no longer in need of your services,*" blends instrumental and regulatory functions, terminating Eloise's assignment while emphasizing the Queen's independent making decision. Eloise's response, "*I beg your pardon?*" highlights a personal function, as her surprise and emotional reaction briefly overshadow her social composure.

This exchange illustrates the hierarchical power imbalance between Queen Charlotte and Eloise, revealing how language in aristocratic settings enforces authority and dismisses subordinate voices. Labov's theory emphasizes the contrast in prestige between the Queen's terse brevity and Eloise's more elaborate phrasing, while Joos's framework affirms the Queen's frozen register in contrast to Eloise's consultative speech. Halliday's functional approach further unveils how language serves directive, interactional, and dismissive roles within upper-class discourse. Ultimately, this scene exemplifies how aristocratic speech functions not only as communication but also as a strategic tool for regulating status, reinforcing control, and defining power dynamics in real time.

3. Interactions among Upper-Class Nobility

Datum 11

Context

This exchange takes place between Hyacinth Bridgerton and her older sister, Eloise, as they prepare for Daphne's debutante ball. Hyacinth, is

the youngest daughter in Bridgerton family. She is full of excitement, expresses her delight in feeling like a princess and seeks affirmation from Eloise about her appearance. Eloise, in contrast, responds with a rhetorical question ambiguity, intimates at her willingness or hesitation to give an honest answer. This interaction highlights both the bonding between the sisters and the subtle differences in their communication styles, with Hyacinth representing youthful optimism and Eloise exhibiting her signature sarcastic.

Dialog

Hyacinth Bridgerton: "I feel like a princess. Do I look like one?"

Eloise Bridgerton: "Do you truly wish to know what I think upi look like?"

(Episode 1, 00:01:33 – 00:01:36)

Analysis

Hyacinth's statement illustrates expressive language rooted in optimism and social aspiration. The phrase "*I feel like a princess*" aligns with Labov's theory (2018), as it demonstrates the construction of personal identity within a specific social context. Her question, "*Do I look like one?*" reinforces the performative nature of aristocratic expectations, where external validation plays a crucial role in social presentation. The structure of her utterance is simple and direct, reflecting youthful speech patterns characterized by emotional expressiveness rather than complex linguistic structures.

Eloise's response, "*Do you truly wish to know what I think you look like?*" illustrates a subtle change in tone. While she still obeys upper-class speech norms, the rhetorical framing aligns more with the consultative register, as described by Joos's theory (1967). The deliberate hesitation in "*Do you truly wish to know*" conveys Eloise's characteristic irreverence, suggesting that her response may not provide the affirmation Hyacinth seeks. This statement does not align with the validation that expected by Hyacinth. This reinforces Eloise's role as a more skeptical figure who challenges social norms within the Bridgerton family.

From Halliday's functional perspective (1992), Hyacinth's utterance serves a personal function, expressing both her excitement and desire for approval. At the same time, it has an interactional function, directly engaging Eloise to express a response. Eloise's reply also serves an interactional function, directing the flow of conversation, yet maintains control. Her phrasing lines are expressive, revealing amusement and a playful challenge rather than passive agreement.

This brief exchange showcases the contrast in linguistic styles between Hyacinth and Eloise, illustrating how familial dynamics shape speech patterns even within aristocratic discourse. Labov's theory emphasizes Hyacinth's identity with her language, while Joos's register model decodes Eloise's rhetorical ambiguity and subtle deviation from formality. Halliday's functional approach reveals how language in this moment serves both personal and interactive purposes, reinforcing character

relationships through structured yet playful dialogue. Ultimately, this scene demonstrates how aristocratic speech, while often expected to be polished, also accommodates humor, personality-driven variation, and relational nuance.

Datum 12

Context

In this scene, the Bridgerton siblings are waiting for Daphne to finish getting ready for her debutante ball. Benedict expresses impatience because they have late to attend the event, while Francesca offers a straightforward observation. Eloise adds a touch of sarcasm, and Colin takes action to address the situation. Their conversation is playful, yet it reflects the aristocratic expectations inherent in debutante culture, where appearances are carefully crafted and preparation can often take considerable time.

Dialog

Benedict Bridgerton: “*Is our dear sister still not ready?*”

Francesca Bridgerton: “*She’s only been readying herself the entire night.*”

Eloise Bridgerton: “*You mean her entire life.*”

Colin Bridgerton: “*I shall run up and hasten her along.*”

(Episode 1, 00:01:40 -00:01:44)

Analysis

Benedict’s initial question, “*Is our dear sister still not ready?*” sets the tone for the exchange with mild frustration but maintains a formal

attitude. The term “*dear sister*” conveys both familial affection and aristocratic refinement, in line with Labov’s theory (2018), which links upper-class speech with prestige markers, even during informal conversations. His choice of words suggests impatience while still establishing politeness.

Francesca responds, “*She’s only been readying herself the entire night,*” using subtle exaggeration to emphasize the lengthy preparation period with a dry, observational tone. Eloise escalates the humor with her remark, “*You mean her entire life.*” This shift in her statement from simple observation to the use of sarcasm illustrates a change in speech register, as described in Joos’s theory (1967). Unlike Benedict and Francesca, who attend their formal language, Eloise adopts a more casual consultative register, briefly straying from structured politeness to playful irreverence. Colin’s remark, “*I shall run up and hasten her along,*” brings the exchange back to a formal style, reinforcing aristocratic language through the use of “*shall*” and the phrase “*hasten her along.*” His statement reflects practical intent, contrasting with Eloise’s sarcasm by focusing on a resolution-oriented approach.

From Halliday's perspective (1992), Benedict’s question serves an interactional function, engaging his siblings while expressing frustration. Francesca’s and Eloise’s statements fulfill personal functions, contributing humor and perspective through exaggeration. Colin’s utterance changes to an instrumental function, directly addressing the situation. Overall, these

functions demonstrate how aristocratic language accommodates humor while preserving social etiquette.

This exchange highlights the dynamic interplay between structured politeness and familial humor within aristocratic contexts. Labov's theory proves the prestigious language evident in Benedict's and Colin's speech, while Joos's framework reveals Eloise's sarcastic language. Halliday's functional model further clarifies how language serves expressive, interactive, and action-oriented purposes. Ultimately, this scene illustrates how elite speech balances tradition with playfulness, reinforcing both familial bonds and the performative nature of debutante culture.

Datum 13

Context

In this scene, Eloise Bridgerton urgently calls out to Daphne, who has not yet finished preparing for her debutante ball. The Bridgerton family is already running late, and Eloise's impatience is evident in her tone and choice of words. After a brief silence following her call, she asks all of the people in the main room of Bridgerton's house if Daphne even heard her. This exchange illustrates the nature of aristocratic family conversations, combining urgency, frustration, and humor while maintaining the refined language expected in high society.

Dialog

Eloise Bridgerton: *"Daphne! You must make haste!"*

[All silent]

Eloise Bridgerton: *"Should you think she heard me?"*

(Episode 1, 00:01:54 – 00:02:03)

Analysis

Eloise's first statement, “*Daphne! You must make haste!*” reflects the characteristics of upper-class speech. The phrase “*make haste*” is a formal expression, maintaining an aristocratic refinement even in moments of frustration. The use of “*must*” adds a sense of urgency while maintaining an elevated tone, consistent with Labov's theory (2018), which associates prestige varieties with the speech patterns of the elite. Despite her impatience, Eloise does not leave linguistic politeness, demonstrating how high social status influences everyday speech.

The pause following her command introduces a comedic contrast, emphasizing her lack of control over the situation. Her follow-up, “*Should you think she heard me?*” is structured as a rhetorical question, shifting from direct command to self-reflective uncertainty. The inversion of “*Should you think*” instead of “*Do you think*” elevates the phrasing, reinforcing aristocratic syntactic patterns. This subtle deviation from conversational directness aligns with Joos's register theory (1967), marking Eloise's speech within the consultative register, where the interaction remains polished yet conversational.

According to Halliday's theory (1992), Eloise's call to Daphne serves an instrumental function, which is meant for Daphne to quickly finish her makeup in her room. The spontaneous silence by all of the people in that room line with interactional function, signaling familial dynamics and the comedic reality of ignored urgency. Her rhetorical follow-up changes to a

personal function, expressing mild frustration through dry humor rather than direct complaint.

This brief exchange captures Eloise Bridgerton's impatience while maintaining the linguistic refinement expected in aristocratic speech. Labov's theory highlights her use of prestige varieties even in hasty moments, while Joos's register framework reveals how Eloise balances formal structure. Halliday's theory further illustrates how language in this moment serves directive, interactive, and expressive purposes. Ultimately, this scene exemplifies how aristocratic dialogue accommodates urgency, humor, and familial dynamics while preserving linguistic sophistication.

Datum 14

Context

In this scene, Lady Featherington and Lady Cowper gossip about the mysterious identity of Lady Whistledown and the attention the Bridgerton family receives in Whistledown's column. Lady Featherington suggests that the anonymous writer could actually be Violet Bridgerton, while Lady Cowper counters this idea by highlighting the accuracy of the published rumors. Their conversation exemplifies the aristocratic of social speculation, where such discussions serve both as entertainment and as a way to reinforce social hierarchies.

Dialog

Lady Featherington: *“I should not be surprised, if this Whistledown is revealed to be Violet Bridgerton herself. These pages certainly report on the Viscountess’s family with my indulgence, indeed.”*

Lady Cowper: *“The pages report nothing but the truth, Lady Featherington. Daphne has bloomed exquisitely, and the sooner she is taken from the market, the better for the other young ladies. Even ones prone to hysterics in front of the queen”*

(Episode 1, 00:11:03 – 00:11:26)

Analysis

Lady Featherington’s statement reflects the linguistic refinement typical of the upper class while engaging in speculative conversation. The phrase *“I should not be surprised”* serves as an assertion for maintaining politeness. By referencing *“Whistledown”* and *“Violet Bridgerton herself,”* she positions the conversation within the context of high-society surveillance, illustrating Labov’s theory (2018) on language variations. This theory suggests that elite individuals use indirect speech and implication to navigate reputational power.

Lady Cowper’s response, *“The pages report nothing but the truth,”* acts as both a dislocation and an affirmation of Whistledown’s column's significance. The formality of *“nothing but the truth”* aligns with aristocratic speech patterns that favor absolute statements, reinforcing the prestige variety highlighted in Labov’s framework. Her remark about Daphne, *“the*

sooner she is taken from the market, the better for the other young ladies,” reveals an underlying critique of societal competition, cleverly veiled in polite language.

This exchange also aligns to Joos's formal register (1967), characterized by polished sentence structures that avoid contractions or colloquialisms. The tone, although indirect, maintains structured diplomacy typical of aristocratic discourse. The phrase "*Even ones prone to hysterics in front of the queen*" subtly reminding of past scandals without stating them directly, reinforcing social hierarchy through passive critique.

From Hallidayan perspective (1992), Lady Featherington's speculation serves a representational purpose, conveying observations that illustrate social perception. Lady Cowper's assertive remark, "*The pages report nothing but the truth,*" fulfills both instrumental and interactional functions, reinforcing belief while highlighting Whistledown's societal influence. Her final statement introduces a personal function, indirectly mocking other debutantes, illustrating how aristocratic speech can regulate social judgment while maintaining etiquette.

This exchange exemplifies how gossip among elite women functions as both entertainment and social regulation. Labov's theory emphasizes how speculative discourse among aristocrats is shaped by polished syntax and indirect assertions. Joos's language style framework deciphers the structured formality of their phrasing, while Halliday's functional theory reveals how language in this context serves representational, regulatory, and social

functions. Ultimately, this scene illustrates how aristocratic speech operates on multiple levels of implication, ensuring that judgment, reputation, and hierarchy remain intact under the guise of conversational refinement.

Datum 15

Context

In this scene, Lady Danbury offers her condolences to Simon Basset following the death of his father. Although her initial statement adheres to conventional aristocratic etiquette, the underlying tension becomes clear when Lady Danbury confronts Simon polite but there is a particular intention behind Simon's words. Their dialogue reveals a deeper understanding between the two characters, as they both acknowledge the cruelty and oppressive patriarchy that Simon endured under his father. This brief exchange challenges the performative nature of aristocratic mourning rituals, underscoring the tension between expected social conventions and personal reality.

Dialog

Lady Danbury: *"Well if this is not a sight for my sore eyes! My condolences, your grace, for your father."*

Simon Basset: *"Very kind of you."*

Lady Danbury: *"Kind of me? You hated the man"*

(Episode 1, 00:13:51 - 00:14:03)

Analysis

Lady Danbury's opening statement, *"My condolences, your grace, for your father,"* reflects the aristocratic tradition of mourning. The phrase *"your grace"* preserves formal titles of respect, aligning with Labov's theory

(2018) on prestige variety, which suggests that aristocrats maintain linguistic conventions despite the personal pain in the past. Her follow-up remark, “*Well, if this is not a sight for my sore eyes!*” adds warmth and indicates a deeper connection with Simon.

Simon responds with, “*Very kind of you,*” which is intentionally neutral and reserved. His phrasing embodies emotional restraint and social obligation that align with Joos’s formal register (1967), where aristocratic discourse avoids excessive personal emotion in favor of structured politeness. While his brief reply is polite, it also signals discomfort because Simon’s courtesy contrasts sharply with his lived experience, showcasing how upper-class speech can often suppress sincere feelings.

Lady Danbury’s utterance, “*Kind of me? You hated the man,*” bothers the expected politeness of aristocratic mourning. Her direct wording challenges social norms, shedding light on Simon’s suffering under his father’s repressive rule. This break from formal language introduces a more honest and personal tone, with the rhetorical structure functioning as both a question and an assertion. It rejects the courtesies and reflects Halliday’s functional change (1992) from representational language that conveying condolences to expressive confrontation. From a Halliday’s functional perspective (1992), Lady Danbury’s initial condolence serves a representational function, conveying the customary etiquette of the aristocracy. Simon’s response fulfills an interactional function, as he maintains civility despite the underlying truth of his feelings. In contrast,

Lady Danbury's final remark changes the exchange to a personal function, stripping away the aristocratic to acknowledge the emotional and racial complexities of Simon's strained relationship with his father.

This exchange illustrates the tension between aristocratic mourning traditions and personal truths, demonstrating how language in *Bridgerton* Season 1 operates within a complex system of layered social codes. Labov's theory emphasizes the prestige variety in Lady Danbury's formal phrasing, while Joos's language styles framework reveals the difference between Simon's restraint and Lady Danbury's confrontation. Halliday's functional theory further describes how language transitions from ceremonial expression to emotional confession. This scene reflects the complexities of upper-class discourse, where societal expectations of grief and politeness often clash with the unspoken realities of suffering, patriarchy, and personal identity.

Datum 16

Context

The exchange occurs between Penelope Featherington and her mother, Lady Featherington. Penelope expresses her aversion to participate in the upcoming social season, suggesting that she should not participate in debutances then allow her cousin to participate in the next debutances. She also highlighted that Marina Thompson should be take the spotlight. However, Lady Featherington ignores Penelope's concerns and insists that she must be involved. This conversation highlights the societal expectations

of debutante culture, where young women should participate to be debutances to present it into publicly for finding a quality husband for them. Additionally, it reveals a power dynamic between mother and daughter, as Penelope struggles against Lady Featherington's control over her future.

Dialog

Penelope Featherington: *"Unless you shall like to have only three young ladies under your care. I shall gladly sit this season out."*

Lady Featherington: *"Penelope is quite nervous. This shall be her very first season."*

Penelope Featherington: *"I am not nervous, mama."*

(Episode 1, 00:12:01 - 00:12:13)

Analysis

Penelope's opening statement, *"Unless you would prefer to have only three young ladies under your care, I shall gladly sit this season out,"* is carefully structured to convey her aversion through indirect reasoning. The phrase *"Unless you would prefer"* reflects formal aristocratic language, maintaining politeness even as she expresses a desire to withdraw. According to Labov's theory (2018), her choice of words demonstrates a prestige variety, signifying her observance to upper-class linguistic norms, even in the middle of her resistance.

Lady Featherington's immediate response, *"Penelope is quite nervous. This shall be her very first season,"* showcases her authoritative approach to controlling the narrative. Instead of directly addressing Penelope's suggestion, she reframes it as nervousness, thereby undermining Penelope's agency regarding her own feelings. This aligns with Joos's frozen

register (1967), where formal language style's structured speech employed to assert authority. Her phrasing reinforces hierarchical expectations, suggesting that social seasons are obligations rather than choices.

Penelope's brief, "*I am not nervous, Mama,*" attempts to reclaim her voice but remains structured within the confines of aristocratic politeness. The term "*Mama*" adds an emotional layer of restraint, contrasting with the more forceful resistance typically found in lower-register speech. This moment exemplifies Halliday's (1992) functional categories, as Penelope's utterance serves a personal function, asserting her truth, while Lady Featherington's response adopts a regulatory function, steering the conversation back toward adherence to social tradition.

This exchange highlights the tension between personal autonomy and societal expectation within aristocratic discourse. Labov's theory contextualizes Penelope's adherence to prestige variety, despite her aversion to engaging in the season. Joos's framework reveals how Lady Featherington's authoritative speech maintains hierarchical control. Halliday's functional model further illustrates how language serves regulatory, personal, and interactional functions, shaping the power dynamics between mother and daughter. Ultimately, this scene proves that how aristocratic speech not only communicates decisions but also subtly enforces societal roles through structured verbal dominance.

Datum 17

Context

This scene takes place at a high-society ball, where Lord Ambrose approaches the Bridgerton family with the intention of inviting Daphne to dance. His greeting reflects the formal etiquette expected in aristocratic interactions, where titles and introductions are used to maintain social politeness. Violet Bridgerton subtly reminds Lord Ambrose of his previous introduction to Daphne, suggesting that unnecessary formalities can be set aside in favor of more immediate engagement. This dialogue illustrates how aristocratic speech regulates social interactions while balancing status, familiarity, and indirect persuasion.

Dialog

Lord Ambrose: *“Lady Bridgerton, Miss Bridgerton, Lord Bridgerton”*

Violet Bridgerton: *“I believe you have already been introduced to my daughter Daphne, Lord Ambrose.”*

(Episode 1, 00:19:20 - 00:19:29)

Analysis

Lord Ambrose’s statement reflects the structured formalities expected in aristocratic discourse. His utterance, *“Lady Bridgerton, Miss Bridgerton, Lord Bridgerton”* follows the traditional order of address, reinforcing his awareness of social hierarchy. According to Labov’s theory (2018), his speech demonstrates a prestige variety, in which high-status individuals use ritualistic language conventions to affirm their class identity.

Violet Bridgerton's response, "*I believe you have already been introduced to my daughter, Daphne, Lord Ambrose*" functions as both a social reminder and a subtle directive. The phrase "*I believe*" is strategically polite yet implicitly corrective, reminding Lord Ambrose that a second introduction is unnecessary. Her structured phrasing aligns with Joos's formal register (1967), maintaining aristocratic refinement while gently guiding the interaction forward.

From Halliday's functional perspective (1992), Lord Ambrose's utterance serves an interactional function, establishing his presence and attending to expected social tradition. In contrast, Violet's statement shifts towards a regulatory function, shaping the interaction to quicken the intended purpose, which is Daphne's participation in the dance. Additionally, her speech carries a personal function, positioning her as a facilitator of her daughter's social engagements.

This brief exchange illustrates the structured politeness embedded in aristocratic discourse, where social interactions are shaped by formality and indirect persuasion. Labov's theory highlights how prestige variety governs introductions and titles, while Joos's register framework reveals how Violet Bridgerton balances formality with subtle efficiency. Halliday's model further illustrates how language serves interactional, regulatory, and personal functions within elite settings. Ultimately, this scene illustrates how verbal etiquette acts as both a tool for maintaining class distinction and a mechanism for guiding social dynamics in upper-class engagements.

Datum 18

Context

This scene occurs between Simon Basset and Anthony Bridgerton as they discuss the societal pressure from mothers eager to secure advantageous marriages for their daughters. The conversation highlights the tension between personal autonomy and the aristocracy's expectations regarding courtship. Simon's frustration is evident in his sarcastic remarks, while Anthony defends the mother's intentions, emphasizing that marriage is still seen as a duty for men of prominence. The dialogue illustrates their contrasting attitudes towards marriage by Simon's resistance and Anthony's pragmatic acceptance.

Dialog

Simon Basset: *"You know I do suppose if it were not for an overzealous mother at every corner, this time of year in the city would not be so very dreadful."*

Anthony Bridgerton: *"Those mother simply want the same as you."*

Simon Basset: *"I rather think. For every last one of them to choke on their daughters' hair ribbons?"*

Anthony Bridgerton: *"For you to claim a wife, Hastings."*

(Episode 1, 00:33:38 – 00:33:48)

Analysis

Simon's initial remark, *"You know I do suppose if it were not for an overzealous mother at every corner, this time of year in the city would not be so very dreadful,"* is layered with sarcasm. The phrase *"overzealous mother at every corner"* overclaims the presence and persistence of marriage-seeking aristocratic women, highlighting Simon's frustration. The

conditional phrase “*if it were not for*” suggests an alternate reality where the social season might be enjoyable without the pressure of matchmaking. According to Labov’s theory (2018), Simon’s speech reflects a resistance to the prestigious variety of aristocratic discourse, prioritizing expressive cynicism over performative politeness.

Anthony’s utterance, “*Those mothers simply want the same as you,*” positions marriage as an inevitable social goal. His phrasing neutralizes Simon’s complaint, implying that mothers are merely facilitating an expectation that Simon himself cannot avoid. This aligns with Joos’s consultative register (1967), where formal refinement is softened by conversational directness, engaging in persuasion rather than maintaining absolute formality. Simon’s response, “*I rather think. For every last one of them to choke on their daughters’ hair ribbons?*” further intensifies his sarcasm with an over darkly humorous tone. The phrase “*choke on their daughters’ hair ribbons*” conveys his disappointment with the relentless matchmaking efforts then rejecting the notion that mother’s intentions are aligned with his desires. His caustic tone disrupts aristocratic decorum, shifting from Joos’s formal register toward a more emotionally charged style of speech. Anthony’s final remark, “*For you to claim a wife, Hastings,*” cuts through Simon’s sarcasm with a definitive assertion. The phrase “*claim a wife*” underlines the transactional nature of aristocratic marriage, reinforcing the structured expectations placed upon men of Simon’s status. His speech

fulfills Halliday's regulatory function (1992), guiding the conversation back to the inevitability of Simon's role within high society.

This exchange highlights the clash between individual resistance and societal expectations within aristocratic discourse. Labov's theory reveals how Simon's speech challenges prestigious varieties, using sarcasm and overclaiming to reject structured upper-class politeness. Joos's register framework elaborates the balance between Anthony's controlled persuasion and Simon's emotionally charged irreverence. Halliday's functional theory further illustrates how language serves expressive, regulatory, and interactional purposes, reinforcing the tension between duty and autonomy. In fact, this scene exemplifies how aristocratic speech serves not only as a marker of status but also as a battleground for negotiation, control, and defiance.

Datum 19

Context

The scene presents a heated discussion between Anthony, Violet, and Daphne Bridgerton regarding Daphne's unexpected suitors. Although Daphne is open to potential proposals, Anthony is frustrated by what he views as chaos, especially since he had secretly intended for Daphne to marry Lord Barbrooke without Daphne's consent. Violet takes on a mediating role, trying to bring clarity to the conversation while subtly questioning Anthony's authority over Daphne's future. This exchange highlights the tensions

surrounding gender roles, familial control, and individual agency within aristocratic society.

Dialog

Anthony Bridgerton: *“I should like to know what is going on.”*

Violet Bridgerton: *“I would like to know the very same. Perhaps we might begin with why you chose to interrupt such an exquisite morning.”*

Anthony Bridgerton: *“Because she is already engaged to be married”*

Violet Bridgerton: *“The duke has already asked for your hand?”*

Daphne Bridgerton: *“I am not engaged, Mama. Has anyone truly”
proposed to me? No. have I proposed to anyone else? I do not believe I have”*

Anthony Bridgerton: *“Do not disrespectful, sister.”*

Daphne Bridgerton: *“Disrespectful? I cannot imagine a greater show of disrespect than promising me to Nigel Barbrooke.”*

(Episode 2, 00:10:08 – 00:10:33)

Analysis

Anthony opens the conversation with a direct inquiry, phrased as a formal request rather than an outright demand. By saying *“I should like to know”* instead of *“Tell me what is going on,”* he softens the imperative, aligning with Joos’s formal register (1967). This approach maintains an aura of aristocratic politeness, even he got frustration. His tone conveys authority, reinforcing his self-perceived role as Daphne’s decision-maker, a dynamic that reflects Labov’s (2018) theory of prestige variety in elite discourse.

Violet’s response showcases both diplomacy and subtle defiance. Her phrase *“I would like to know the very same”* mirrors Anthony’s structure, gently challenging his control and placing them on equal footing. Additionally, her reference to *“an exquisite morning”* frames his interruption

as unnecessary, effectively shifting the power balance in the exchange. This aligns with Halliday's (1992) interactional function, where language establishes relationships and negotiates social positioning.

Anthony increases the conversation with a factual declaration rather than an invitation for discussion. By stating "*she is already engaged*," he implies a unilateral decision, dismissing Daphne's agency. This reinforces Joos's (1967) frozen register, where rigid language dictates outcomes without any negotiation. His assumption that he has the authority to dictate Daphne's engagement aligns with the patriarchal control mechanisms prevalent in aristocratic traditions.

Violet's response introduces a crucial change as she challenges Anthony's claim with a question, forcing him to clarify whether the supposed engagement is legitimate. By phrasing it as "*has already asked for your hand*," she subtly redirects agency back to Daphne, implying that a proposal requires the woman's consent. This rhetorical move fits Halliday's (1992) regulatory function, where language is used to reframe decision-making dynamics.

Daphne asserts her autonomy through structured reasoning. Her repetition of rhetorical questions, "*Has anyone truly proposed to me?*" emphasizes the absence of genuine consent. The phrase "*Have I proposed to anyone else?*" flips traditional gender expectations, suggesting that marriage decisions should be mutual rather than dictated. This shift aligns with

Labov's (2018) theory on resistance within prestige variety, where individuals challenge linguistic norms from within formal structures.

Anthony's reprimand attempts to reinforce control by framing Daphne's defiance as inappropriate. His phrase "*Do not be disrespectful*" operates within Joos's (1967) formal register, where aristocratic male figures use restrained commands to enforce obedience. However, the directness of his speech contrasts with his earlier polished expressions, signaling rising frustration.

Daphne counters Anthony's accusation through rhetorical inversion, reframing his actions as the true act of disrespect. The phrase "*I cannot imagine a greater show of disrespect*" elevates the conversation to a moral critique, reinforcing Halliday's (1992) personal function, where language conveys subjective experiences and emotional responses. Her directness marks a rejection of aristocratic restraint, moving toward Joos's (1967) consultative register, which allows for emotional expression alongside formal discourse.

This exchange exemplifies the struggle between patriarchal control, personal autonomy, and linguistic hierarchy within aristocratic discourse. Labov's (2018) theory reveals how Anthony assumes command through prestige variety, while Joos's (1967) register framework highlights the contrasts between structured politeness and rising frustration. Halliday's functional theory (1992) further demonstrates how language operates to negotiate power, Anthony using authority, Violet introducing rhetorical

balance, and Daphne reclaiming agency through pointed resistance. So that, this scene illustrates that aristocratic speech is not merely performative but actively structures power dynamics, particularly regarding gendered expectations of control and obedience.

Datum 20

Context

In this exchange, Daphne Bridgerton expresses her fear of being forced into marriage with Lord Barbrooke. Violet Bridgerton, her mother, tries to reassure Daphne by emphasizing that Simon Basset's influence is helping to determine Barbrooke's pursuit. However, Violet's statement reveals the gender hierarchy within aristocratic society, where a woman's autonomy is often dismissed in favor of male authority. This conversation highlights the interplay between maternal support and the systemic constraints that women face during marriage negotiations.

Dialog

Daphne Bridgerton: "Mama..."

Violet Bridgerton: "You need not worry, dearest. Once Lord Barbrooke witnesses the seriousness of the duke's intentions, he will have no choice but to retreat. Lord Barbrooke may not respect a woman's choice, but he certainly will respect a man's"

(Episode 2, 00:11:49 – 00:12:00)

Analysis

The statement, "Lord Barbrooke may not respect a woman's choice, but he certainly will respect a man's," highlights how aristocratic discourse prioritizes male authority over female autonomy. The contrast between "a

woman's choice" and "*a man's*" reflects a linguistic hierarchy where power is rooted in male intervention rather than female agency. Violet acknowledges the social reality that Daphne's resistance may be ineffective; however, Simon's claim over her will impose the necessary control to dictate the outcome. According to Labov's (2018) theory, the prestige variety within elite circles reinforces hierarchical expectations, where social influence is largely determined by established gender roles. This phrasing suggests that, despite social status, gender remains the dominant factor in decision-making within high society.

In another instance, when Violet states, "*You need not worry, dearest. Once Lord Barbrooke witnesses the seriousness of the duke's intentions, he will have no choice but to retreat,*" she employs Joos's (1967) formal register, maintaining the aristocratic language even amidst the underlying anxiety of the situation. The phrase "*You need not worry, dearest*" offers maternal reassurance while preserving structured politeness, attending to upper-class politeness. The conditional clause "*Once Lord Barbrooke witnesses...*" reinforces a sense of inevitability, positioning Simon as the determine factor in resolving Daphne's predicament. The use of precise words represents direct confrontation and reflects how aristocratic language avoids harsh or informal expressions in favor of persuasive upper-class communication.

Violet's speech serves multiple language functions that reveal the complexities of aristocratic discourse. Her initial reassurance, "*You need not*

worry, *dearest*,” fulfills an interactional function, aimed at comforting Daphne while maintaining aristocratic composure. By addressing her daughter as “*dearest*,” Violet softens the conversation, providing maternal support within the bounds of formal language. However, her statement that “*Lord Barbrooke may not respect a woman’s choice, but he certainly will respect a man’s*” changes toward a regulatory function, setting expectations regarding the social reality of gendered authority. This comment acts as an implicit instruction, reinforcing that male influence, rather than female. Furthermore, Daphne’s single-word, “*Mama...*” illustrates an expressive function, where language conveys emotional vulnerability rather than structured reasoning. This hesitation, indicating her reliance on Violet for reassurance, further demonstrating how aristocratic discourse balances emotional restraint with social obligation. Together, these functions illustrate how aristocratic speech serves not only practical purposes but also reinforces social power dynamics in subtle yet structured ways.

This utterances emphasize the intersection of aristocratic language, gender hierarchy, and structured reassurance. Labov’s (2018) theory contextualizes the prestige variety embedded in Violet’s statement, reinforcing male dominance in decision-making. Joos’s (1967) register framework reveals how aristocratic politeness regulates emotional responses, ensuring refinement even in personal conversations. Halliday’s (1992) functional model further illustrates how language fulfills expressive, regulatory, and interactional purposes, structuring both maternal comfort and

societal expectations. Ultimately, this scene exemplifies how aristocratic speech subtly enforces power dynamics while negotiating personal emotions and preserving hierarchical control.

Datum 21

Context

In this scene, Lady Danbury confronts young Simon about his inappropriate behavior towards the ethics of high-society. Her inquiries express surprise, highlighting that Simon has not yet understood the expected behaviors of someone from an aristocratic background, especially the importance of showing respect to elders. This exchange not only emphasizes the hopes of the upper-class society but also reveals Simon's struggle with his difficulty in speaking, which becomes an obstacle to his social development. The conversation reflects both the rigid standards of aristocratic society and the personal challenges that Simon faces.

Dialog

Lady Danbury: *"I see you have not learned any manners. Have you learned to read? To write? To ride a horse? To fence? Then, why ever are you not in school?"*

Simon's child: *"I c—c--- can n—n—not s—s-- speak"*

(Episode 2, 00:21:33 - 00:21:33)

Analysis

Lady Danbury's speech presented the prestige variety associated with upper-class discourse, characterized by structured and refined language. According to Labov (2018), language variations serves as a marker of social class, with elite members often using language to reinforce social hierarchy.

Her questioning, "*Have you learned to read? To write? To ride a horse? To fence?*" lists expected achievements of aristocrats, reinforcing the utterance that noble status requires mastery of skills linked to leadership and improvement. Lady Danbury's assertive tone distinctly separates her from Simon, whose fragmented response highlights his linguistic struggle and social gap. This interaction aligns with Labov's (2018), that the speech patterns among the aristocracy serve as a form of defense for the upper classes to maintain their social identity. In this instance, Lady Danbury's polished and dominant speech contrasts with Simon's fragmented utterance, illustrating the linguistic divide between social status and personal struggle.

Lady Danbury's speech operates within the formal register, in line with Joos's classification of language styles (1967). Her sentence construction avoids contractions and maintains a controlled, authoritative style, reflecting the frozen and formal registers typical in aristocratic settings. The repetition of rhetorical questions, especially in sequential inquiries, strengthens the authoritative undertone inherent in noble discourse. Lady Danbury's phrasing aligns with this expectation, using polished syntax to reinforce elite discipline. In contrast, Simon's response, "*I c—c--- can n—n—not s—s-- speak*" illustrates a deviation from the expected structure of upper-class communication. His interrupted phrasing, marked by hesitations and stuttering, reflects deep distress, shifting towards informal and intimate registers, which sharply contrast with Lady Danbury's controlled delivery. Joos's framework highlights how the language's register changes reinforce

power dynamics, revealing that figures of authority prioritize rigid linguistic refinement while also struggling with societal expectations, which lead to breakdowns in structured speech.

Lady Danbury's language serves multiple communicative functions, revealing both power dynamics and social expectations within the aristocracy. Her questioning serves a regulatory function, reinforcing norms regarding education and the proper conduct expected of noble's children. By listing expected skills such as reading and fencing, she asserts the necessity of structured discipline for maintaining noble status, aligning with Halliday's concept of regulation through discourse (1992). Her rhetorical inquiries also serve an interactional function, demanding an explanation for Simon's perceived shortage while at the same time positioning herself as an enforcer of aristocratic standards. Simon's fragmented response fulfills an expressive function, where language conveys personal anxiety rather than structured reasoning. His inability to deliver a smooth reply signals distress, highlighting the psychological barrier that prevents him from meeting societal expectations. Simon's speech pattern directly correlates with Halliday's theory which is illustrating that aristocratic language serves not only a structured that refined purpose but also exposes downside within those subjected to societal pressures.

This exchange illustrates the tension between aristocratic discipline and personal difficulty within elite circles. Labov's (2018) contextualizes Lady Danbury's prestige variety, emphasizing linguistic hierarchies in noble

discourse. From the language functions by Joos's (1967), the contrast between structured aristocratic speech and Simon's fragmented linguistic output, exposing social disparities. Halliday's (1992) further illustrates how language serves regulatory, interactional, and expressive purposes, reinforcing power structures while revealing personal struggles. Ultimately, this scene demonstrates how aristocratic language both enforces societal norms and exposes personal shortcomings, reinforcing structured expectations surrounding speech and conduct in noble society.

Datum 22

Context

This scene unfolds during a social gathering where Lady Danbury cleverly redirects Anthony Bridgerton away from Daphne and Simon's conversation by asking him to fetch a drink for her. Although her request seems polite and refined, it serves as a tactical maneuver to allow Daphne and Simon to interact without interruption. This exchange highlights the norms of aristocratic conversation, where indirect speech is often used to influence social behavior while maintaining politeness.

Dialog

Lady Danbury: "I shall need someone else to seek me a glass of ratafia, then. Lord Bridgerton, do me the honor?"

Anthony Bridgerton: "Ofcourse, Lady Danbury."

(Episode 2, 00:23:29 - 00:23:38)

Analysis

Lady Danbury's phrasing exemplifies the prestige variety typical of aristocratic discourse, maintaining formality while subtly asserting control over the situation. Her structured expressions, such as "*I shall need someone else to seek me a glass of ratafia, then*" demonstrate the linguistic refinement expected in upper-class interactions. According to Labov (2018), the linguistic choices of the elite not only signify social status but also strengthen hierarchical relationships. In this case, Lady Danbury's request was directed at Anthony Bridgerton, who was subtly guiding his actions without issuing a direct command. The phrase "*Lord Bridgerton, do me the honor?*" further emphasizes hierarchical politeness by framing the request as an invitation rather than an obligation. Here, Lady Danbury effectively uses prestige variety to control Anthony's actions diplomatically, ensuring the outcome aligns with her intentions while adhering to aristocratic etiquette.

Lady Danbury's statement is lined within Joos's (1967) formal register, characterized by structured syntax and the absence of contractions. The formality in "*I shall need someone else to seek me a glass of ratafia*" aligns with the refined speech typical of upper-class environments, avoiding casual phrasing or direct imperatives. Her statement exemplifies this standard, ensuring that aristocratic politeness is preserved. Anthony's response, "*Of course, Lady Danbury.*" follows this formal register, reinforcing structured interaction through direct and also polished acknowledgment. His short reply maintains the elegance expected in noble

exchanges, reflecting aristocratic norms that emphasize clarity and perfection.

Lady Danbury's language serves multiple functions within Halliday's framework (1992). Her initial statement functions regulatively, shaping Anthony's behavior while smoothly guiding the interaction between Daphne and Simon. By phrasing her request as a petition rather than a command, she manages the social dynamics without any interference. In this scene, Lady Danbury's utterance ensures that Anthony departs, facilitating the desired courtship dynamic. Additionally, her statement serves an interactional function, establishing a relation through polite invitation instead of direct instruction. The phrase "*do me the honor*" enhances relational politeness while reinforcing noble hierarchy. Meanwhile, Anthony's brief response fulfills a representational function, acknowledging Lady Danbury's request and affirming his willingness to comply. Overall, these functions demonstrate how aristocratic language navigates social dynamics, employing refinement and indirect persuasion to maintain social order.

This scene exemplifies how aristocratic speech balances indirect control with formal politeness. Labov's (2018) theory contextualizes Lady Danbury's prestige variety, showcasing refined phrasing as a tool for social influence. Joos's register framework (1967), highlights the structured ceremonial nature of her statement, reinforcing aristocratic politeness. Halliday's functional model (1992), illustrates how her language serves

regulatory, interactional, and representational purposes. These languages guiding social interactions while maintaining linguistic sophistication. Additionally, this scene reflects how noble conversation both reinforces hierarchy and strategically shapes interpersonal dynamics.

Datum 23

Context

In this scene, Prudence and Philipa Featherington gossip about the arrival of a prince in London. Their conversation reveals the aristocracy's fascination with social status and marriage prospects. Philipa quickly considers how her outfit might attract royal attention. However, Prudence remarks her language changes into the tone from excitement to joyful teasing, emphasizing the social competition among debutantes and the dynamic within the Featherington family. This dialogue exemplifies the conversational patterns of the upper class, in which humor, awareness of social status, and indirect critiques are structured smoothly into casual exchanges.

Dialog

Prudence Featherington: "Some prince is coming to London."

Philipa Featherington: "Then I shall wear my most brilliant dress of all."

Prudence Featherington: "Something must hold his interest, as it will certainly not be your conversation."

(Episode 3, 00:02:54 - 00:03:00)

Analysis

The dialogue illustrates how aristocratic language reflects a prestige variety, which strengthen social distinctions and expectations. Labov (2018)

argues that linguistic variations within elite groups not only indicate as a status but also regulate hierarchical interactions. Prudence's remark, "*Something must hold his interest, as it will certainly not be your conversation,*" fits within this framework, smoothly positioning intelligence and conversational skill as markers of aristocratic refinement. By implying that Philipa lacks engaging speech, Prudence maintains the expectation that women of noble status should cultivate charm beyond mere physical appearance. Philipa's response, "*Then I shall wear my most brilliant dress of all,*" shows the elite's unease with visual presentation as a means of securing social advantages. Her focus on attire aligns with Labov's theory (2018), which posits that external markers of status, such as fashion, serve as both linguistic and social identifiers. The interaction between these sisters reflects patterns of aristocratic discourse, where speech is not merely communicative but serves to reinforce class expectations.

These utterances also illustrates in Joos's casual register (1967), characterized by an informal structure, contractions, and a joyful tone. The conversation between Prudence and Philipa lacks the rigid formality typical of aristocratic discourse, containing casual phrasing common in family interactions. Prudence's sarcastic remark highlights this informality, deviating from the polished, structured language expected in formal aristocratic settings. Despite its casual nature, these utterances retain elements of upper-class speech patterns, especially through Philipa's theatrical phrasing, "*Then I shall wear my most brilliant dress of all,*" which

expressed dramatic aristocratic excessive. Joos's framework also make the researcher understand how linguistic tone and delivery signal social familiarity while maintaining elite conversational standards.

Prudence and Philipa's utterances serve multiple linguistic functions within Halliday's theory (1992). Prudence's statement, "*Something must hold his interest, as it will certainly not be your conversation,*" fulfills an expressive function, conveying sarcasm and familial rivalry through humor. Her language reflects a personal establishment rather than merely delivering neutral information, reinforcing aristocratic tendencies toward wisdom and indirect critique. Philipa's response, "*Then I shall wear my most brilliant dress of all,*" performs a representational function, presenting an intention that aligns with noble expectations surrounding courtship and appearance. Additionally, the exchange carries an interactional function, strengthening sibling dynamics through the joke while reinforcing social values related to marriage and attractiveness. In this dialogue, aristocratic speech operates as both a social mechanism and a reflection of familial roles.

This conversation exemplifies the linguistic interplay between social hierarchy, humor, and aristocratic expectations. Labov's theory (2018), contextualizes the language varieties inherent in their speech, illustrating how perfection and intelligence serve as elite markers. Joos's register framework (1967), highlights the casual and aristocratic tone, balancing informality with structured expression. Halliday's functional theory (1992) illustrates how language fulfills expressive, representational, and

interactional purposes, reinforcing familial relationships while mirroring upper-class values. Overall, this scene demonstrates that aristocratic discourse is not merely conversational. It is also actively attends societal norms through humor, rivalry, and implied status negotiation.

Datum 24

Context

In this scene, Penelope Featherington tries to keep Marina Thompson calm because she is anxiously waiting for a letter from the man she loves. Marina worries that he may not return from the war because he is a soldier. This anxiety has been caused since he has stopped replied her letter. However, Penelope offers reassuring words, suggesting that true love should naturally lead to communication or even a reunion. The dialogue highlights the norms of aristocratic conversation, particularly in how emotions and uncertainties are expressed within a framework of structured and polite discourse.

Dialog

Penelope Featherington: “If your love is as great as your previous letters state, surely he will write back to you soon. Or perhaps, even better, he is already making his way back to you here to come and take you home.”

(Episode 3, 00:03:41 - 00:03:51)

Analysis

Penelope's statement reflects the language variations which is characteristic of aristocratic speech, maintaining refined syntax while addressing personal matters. According to Labov (2018), linguistic choices among the elite serve not only as indicators of status but also as a means of

maintaining composure during emotional exchanges. Her phrasing, "*If your love is as great as your previous letters state, surely he will write back to you soon,*" demonstrates a controlled and measured delivery, ensuring that even personal sentiments are expressed in a polished manner. The phrase "*Or perhaps, even better, he is already making his way back to you here to come and take you home*" describes an idealized possibility, reflecting the structured optimism often found in aristocratic discourse. Penelope's refined language exemplifies this balance, allowing her to address Marina's concerns while maintaining aristocratic composure.

Penelope's statement also operates within Joos's consultative register (1967), which balances formality with a conversational style. Her speech maintains grammatical precision and also avoids the rigid structures of frozen or formal registers, allowing personal sentiment to emerge within the context of aristocratic norms. By using this phrasing, she offers encouragement while upholding upper-class linguistic politeness. Furthermore, the implied emotional subtext in her structured speech reflects aristocratic tendencies toward indirect expression. Penelope does not entirely reject Marina's fears. Instead, she counters them with measured reasoning and hopeful speculation. This approach reinforces Joos's framework (1967), where noble conversation balances emotional restraint with interpersonal engagement.

Besides, Penelope's language serves multiple functions which are illustrating the nuanced role of aristocratic speech in emotional discourse.

Her initial statement fulfills a representational function, as she conveys a logical sequence that if Marina's love is truly strong, it should naturally result in continued correspondence. By reinforcing a narrative of expected romantic loyalty, Penelope smoothly constructs an alternative perspective for Marina. Additionally, her phrasing carries an expressive function, integrating reassurance into a structured linguistic form. The phrase "*surely he will write back to you soon*" reflects optimism, but it is framed in a way that maintains aristocratic composure rather than overt emotionality. Finally, her speculative remark, "*Or perhaps, even better, he is already making his way back to you here to take you home,*" illustrates a regulatory function, subtly guiding Marina's emotional response toward hope rather than despair. Halliday's model illustrates how aristocratic language facilitates emotional regulation within structured discourse, ensuring that reassurance is conveyed through polite and refined expression.

This scene exemplifies how aristocratic speech maintains emotional composure while offering reassurance. Labov's (2018) theory contextualizes the prestige variety embedded in Penelope's statement, demonstrating the linguistic refinement present even in emotionally charged discourse. Joos's register framework (1967) highlights the consultative nature of her phrasing, allowing for structured engagement while preserving interpersonal warmth. Halliday's functional theory (1992) shows how her language serves representational, expressive, and regulatory purposes, subtly shaping Marina's emotional perspective through aristocratic speech. In fact, this

scene illustrates how noble conversation integrates personal sentiment with refined linguistic control, balancing emotional engagement within structured discourse.

Datum 25

Context

In this scene, Violet Bridgerton helps Daphne choose a dance partner for her first ball after debuting in high society. Their conversation highlights the aristocratic tradition of relationships during upper-class social events, where selecting the right dance partner carries significant implications for one's reputation and future prospects. Violet's question frames the decision as a strategic one, emphasizing the societal expectation that debutantes must navigate their social engagements carefully.

Dialog

Violet Bridgerton: *“Daphne, have you thought about with whom you would like to dance at tonight’s ball?”*

Daphne Bridgerton: *“Perhaps, I have some ideas, Lord Weaver is a fine dancer.”*

(Episode 3, 00:04:32 - 00:04:56)

Analysis

Violet Bridgerton’s phrasing exemplifies prestige variety, as it maintains formality and perfecting while dealing with personal issues. Her question, *“Daphne, have you thought about with whom you would like to dance at tonight’s ball?”* follows a structured format that reflects upper-class speech patterns prioritizing elegance and deliberate expression. The use of

"*with whom*" instead of "*who*" attends to prescriptive grammar, signaling the linguistic refinement associated with prestige variety.

Daphne's response, "*Perhaps, I have some ideas. Lord Weaver is a fine dancer.*" aligns with Labov's theory (2018) that noble discourse balances polite ambiguity with selective decision-making. Her hesitance ("*Perhaps, I have some ideas*") reflects the cautious deliberation expected from debutantes, while her positive remark ("*Lord Weaver is a fine dancer*") indicates her interest without making an overt commitment. This utterance illustrates the conversational norms of the aristocracy, where language serves as a tool for maintaining status while carefully managing social interactions.

Violet Bridgerton's statement operates within Joos's consultative register (1967), blending formality with interpersonal engagement. Her phrasing remains proper grammatically and structured while maintaining an approachable tone suitable for a conversation between mother and daughter. Violet's question attends to this pattern, offering guidance in a polished and non-imposing manner. Daphne's response changes slightly toward a formal register, as she avoids contractions and maintains a composed tone. The statement "*Lord Weaver is a fine dancer*" reflects aristocratic conversation patterns, upholding structured expression even in casual exchanges. Daphne's careful wording reinforces this observation, highlighting the importance of aristocratic politeness through measured phrasing.

This utterance serves multiple linguistic functions based on Halliday's framework (1992). First, it fulfills a regulatory function, guiding

Daphne as she considers her dance partner selection. The structured question prompts a deliberate response, ensuring that Daphne approaches the ball with a strategic mindset. Violet's wording smoothly encourages Daphne to make thoughtful decisions by framing the matter as one that requires consideration. Additionally, Daphne's response carries a representational function, as she conveys her dance preferences without making a definitive statement. The phrase "*Lord Weaver is a fine dancer*" positions him as a potential choice while maintaining aristocratic restraint. This careful wording by Daphne illustrates the expectation for debutantes to express themselves with refinement.

Overall, this utterance highlights how aristocratic speech navigates tradition, refinement, and careful decision-making. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes the prestige variety present in Violet's phrasing, emphasizing status through linguistic elegance. Joos's register framework (1967) reveals the consultative and formal elements that structure their interaction, balancing guidance with social decorum. Halliday's functional theory (1992) showcases how language serves both regulatory and representational purposes, subtly influencing Daphne's response while preserving noble conversational norms. Additionally, this scene exemplifies how aristocratic speech serves as both a means to maintain social order and a tool for strategic engagement in courtship settings.

Datum 26

Context

This scene takes place during a formal ball, where Lord Weaver approaches Daphne Bridgerton with a polite request for a dance. Their interaction reflects the conversational norms of the aristocracy, particularly in the structured way invitations are made and the politeness surrounding social engagements. Daphne and Lord Weaver maintain refined linguistic etiquette, ensuring that their conversation aligns with the noble expectations of politeness and courtship.

Dialog

Lord Weaver: *"Miss Bridgerton."*

Daphne Bridgerton: *"Lord Weaver."*

Lord Weaver: *"I was wondering if you might do me the honor of a dance tonight."*

(Episode 3, 00:05:52 – 00:06:00)

Analysis

Lord Weaver's phrasing exemplifies the prestige variety described by Labov (2018), attending to aristocratic speech patterns characterized by refinement and formality. His request, *"I was wondering if you might do me the honor of a dance tonight."* illustrates a structured politeness, avoiding direct commands in favor of an invitation framed with aristocratic politeness. Daphne's response, *"Lord Weaver."* maintains this refined tone, engaging in a formal greeting that mirrors his approach. This utterance reflects controlled discourse, reinforcing status through language.

The conversation, viewed from Joos's formal register (1967), is characterized by full sentence structures, the avoidance of contractions, and precise wording. Lord Weaver's phrasing aligns with Joos's description of language styles used in ceremonial and aristocratic interactions, ensuring politeness and structured engagement. His choice of "*do me the honor*" instead of a simpler "*Would you dance with me?*" highlights the formal nature of noble invitations. Daphne's greeting follows the same register, maintaining structured engagement before offering a response. The symmetrical exchange reflects aristocratic politeness, where etiquette dictates the pacing and structure of speech.

However, Lord Weaver's request functions in a regulatory manner according to Halliday (1992), shaping the interaction by guiding Daphne's actions through structured politeness. His phrasing ensures that the request remains refined, aligning with noble expectations. Additionally, the request carries an interactional function, reinforcing social connections within aristocratic courtship. The phrase "*do me the honor*" not only conveys an invitation but also reflects the structured dynamics of upper-class engagement, where formal wording establishes the tradition. Daphne's response further supports an expressive function, preserving politeness while adhering to aristocratic norms of speech.

This utterance exemplifies the structured nature of aristocratic discourse in courtship interactions. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes the prestige variety embedded in Lord Weaver's refined phrasing, reinforcing

noble etiquette through structured language. Joos's register framework (1967) highlights the formal structure of the exchange, maintaining ceremonial politeness. Halliday's functional theory (1992) illustrates how language serves regulatory, interactional, and expressive purposes, shaping noble interactions through structured engagement. This scene reflects how aristocratic speech operates both as a social tool and as a means of maintaining hierarchy within elite courtship.

Datum 27

Context

During their dance, Daphne Bridgerton and Lord Hardy are having a conversation. Initially, their interaction lined with the norms of aristocratic courtship. However, Lord Hardy soon changes his language from polite social engagement to self-promotion, boasting about his wealth and possessions. Daphne responds minimally, signaling her discomfort while still maintaining noble etiquette. Their dialogue illustrates how aristocratic speech can reinforce social status while also revealing a lack of conversational compatibility.

Dialog

Lord Hardy: *"You look bewitching tonight, Miss Bridgerton."*

Daphne Bridgerton: *"Well, I do hope you are not too spellbound to chat, Lord Hardy."*

Lord Hardy: *"Did you now I purchased my first landau when I left Oxvord? I have acquired two more since I keep them ar my ancestral home. My ancestral home is really quite large, much larger than most others in the area."*

Daphne Bridgerton: *"Fascinating."*

(Episode 3, 00:06:49 – 00:07:09)

Analysis

Lord Hardy's statements contain language varieties that he used to emphasize his status and wealth. His phrase, "*Did you know I purchased my first landau when I left Oxford? I have acquired two more since,*" illustrates the principle where material acquisitions serve as markers of aristocratic identity. This aligns with Labov's theory of language variations (2018) proved by his repetition of status indicators, "*My ancestral home is really quite large, much larger than most others in the area,*" enhances the language varieties by explicitly comparing his wealth to that of others, reinforcing his social superiority through linguistic performance.

Otherwise, his speech operates within Joos's consultative register (1967), maintaining a formal structure but deviating toward self-serving engagement rather than genuine conversation. His phrasing lacks contractions. However, the changes have led to excessive self-promotion rather than establishing aristocratic refinement. While Lord Hardy maintains linguistic precision, his choice of topics disrupts the expected balance in noble conversation. Daphne's response, "*Fascinating,*" deliberately contrasts with his topic, demonstrating restraint while subtly signaling her disinterest. Her minimal reply in line with Joos's formal register (1967) ensuring aristocratic composure despite her visible discomfort. By choosing to say "*Fascinating*" instead of offering an elaborative remark, she limits engagement, reflecting noble etiquette where politeness must be maintained even in uncomfortable interactions.

For the language function, Lord Hardy's language fulfills a representational function of Halliday (1992), conveying personal achievements rather than engaging in mutual discussion. His statements center entirely on his wealth and property, shaping his self-image through aristocratic linguistic conventions. In contrast, Daphne's response carries an expressive function, smoothly revealing her irritation while maintaining her noble restraint. Her brief, measured reply reflects Halliday's assertion (1992) that expressive language can signal emotional stance without overt reaction. Additionally, her statement serves a regulatory function, tactfully limiting further conversation without disrupting aristocratic decorum.

This interaction illustrates the dual function of aristocratic discourse, reinforcing social hierarchy while subtly managing conversational dynamics. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes Lord Hardy's self-promotional speech, highlighting prestige variety as a marker of noble identity. Joos's register framework (1967) contrasts Lord Hardy's consultative engagement with Daphne's restrained formal response, emphasizing the linguistic balance required in noble interactions. Halliday's functional theory (1992) illustrates how language serves representational, expressive, and regulatory purposes, allowing Daphne to navigate discomfort without outright dismissal. Ultimately, this scene reflects how aristocratic conversation not only upholds status but also subtly reveals power shifts in social engagement.

Datum 28

Context

This scene takes place in an exclusive gentlemen's club, where Anthony Bridgerton, Lord Featherington, Simon Basset, and other gentlemen are playing a game of dice. The interaction showcases both the casual culture of the aristocracy and the representation of competitive tension among elite men. Lord Featherington's comment reflects skepticism about Anthony's repeated winnings, while Simon's response offers a subtle critique, implying that Featherington's lack of restraint may be contributing to his poor performance. Anthony reinforces this observation with an indirect sarcasm, maintaining the politeness expected in aristocratic circles while drawing attention to Featherington's tendencies.

Dialog

[dice rattling]

Anthony Bridgerton: *"Here we go. Come on. Me again."*

Lord Featherington: *"Indeed, I am inclined to investigate the provenance of such lucky dice."*

Simon Basset: *"They did not land the same way when you were casting, Featherinton. Perhaps the common element is you. Might it be best to show some restraint?"*

Anthony Bridgerton: *"Restraint is not among Lord Featherington's skills."*

(Episode 3, 00:11:50 – 00:12:09)

Analysis

The language in this scene exemplifies language varieties, where aristocratic speech retains elegance even in casual interactions. Lord Featherington's statement, *"Indeed, I am inclined to investigate the*

provenance of such lucky dice." illustrates how formality is maintained even when expressing skepticism, as highlighted by Labov (2018). The phrase *"inclined to investigate"* preserves an elevated tone, allowing doubts to be voiced with aristocratic refinement rather than outright accusation. Simon's response, *"They did not land the same way when you were casting, Featherington. Perhaps the common element is you. Might it be best to show some restraint?"* demonstrates upper-class conversational strategies that blend subtle critique with structured elegance. Simon's suggestion for restraint serves as both a critique and an advisory statement, reflecting the aristocratic etiquette that avoids direct confrontation.

However, this conversation aligns with Joos's (1967) consultative register, striking a balance between formality and engaged interaction. While the dialogue is structured, it remains responsive, allowing participants to express their ideas without rigid ceremonial language. Lord Featherington's phrasing, *"I am inclined to investigate..."* attends to formal speech expectations while inviting engagement through indirect skepticism. Anthony's statement, *"Restraint is not among Lord Featherington's skills."* slightly shifts the tone toward a casual register, introducing humor while maintaining aristocratic poise. The phrasing remains polished, ensuring that even a playful insult aligns with noble decorum. The structured yet dynamic nature of their speech exemplifies aristocratic conversational patterns.

The dialogue serves multiple linguistic functions based on Halliday's (1992) model. Lord Featherington's statement carries a representational

function, framing his skepticism through elevated language rather than direct accusation. His choice of words ensures that doubts are conveyed without breaking the upper-class politeness, reflecting the tendency of the aristocracy to refine speech even in challenging moments. Simon's remark introduces a regulatory function, smoothly advising Featherington to reconsider his approach. By framing restraint as an external suggestion rather than a direct critique, Simon preserves etiquette while influencing behavior. Halliday's theory (1992) highlights that regulatory language often appears in advisory tones within noble interactions, ensuring that control is exerted subtly rather than explicitly. Anthony's response fulfills an expressive function, incorporating humor into noble discourse. His phrasing maintains aristocratic composure while smoothly reinforcing Simon's point. Anthony's remark both entertains and critiques, adhering to noble conversational expectations while emphasizing Featherington's lack of restraint.

These utterances exemplify how aristocratic speech balances competition, refinement, and indirect critique. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes the prestige variety in their language, highlighting how skepticism and humor are structured within noble refinement. Joos's language style's framework (1967) illustrates the dynamic nature of their speech, blending formal engagement with consultative responsiveness. Halliday's functional theory (1992) reveals how language serves representational, regulatory, and expressive purposes, ensuring that tensions remain within the boundaries of upper-class decorum. Ultimately, this scene

demonstrates how noble discourse not only reflects status but also strategically manages social interactions through well-structured linguistic choices.

Datum 29

Context

In this scene, Lady Featherington attempts to introduce Marina Thompson to Lord Middlethorp, steering her toward a potential marriage arrangement. However, Marina resists these matchmaking efforts, using clever verbal defiance to disrupt the interaction. Penelope, noticing Marina's discomfort, attempts to intervene, but Lady Featherington quickly redirects her, reinforcing her control over the social dynamics. Suddenly, Marina asserts her independence by directly rejecting Lord Middlethorp's presence, which prompts a harsh response from him. This dialogue highlights the tension between the expectations of aristocratic courtship and individual resistance.

Dialog

Lady Featherington: *"Lord Middlethorp, you simply must meet Miss Marina Thompson, a distant cousin of my husband's."*

Lord Middlethorp: *"Miss Thompson, the pleasure is mine."*

Marina Thompson: *"Entirely."*

Penelope Featherington: *"Marina..."*

Lady Featherington: *"Penelope, allow us to view some of the paintings over here..."*

Penelope Featherington: *"Oh I had a brief question to ask Marina."*

Lady Featherington: *"Now is not the time, Penelope."*

Marina Thompson: *"I believe now to be the perfect time."*

Lord Middlethorpe: “Miss Thompson-“

Marina Thompson: “I certainly was not addressing you.”

Lord Middlethorpe: “I do not believe that I have ever met such a lovely girl with such an ugly countenance.”

(Episode 3, 00:18:53 – 00:19:25)

Analysis

This dialogue aligns with Labov's theory (2018) regarding language variations. Lady Featherington's initial statement, "*Lord Middlethorpe, you simply must meet Miss Marina Thompson, a distant cousin of my husband's.*" reflects a prestige variety, maintaining the structured elegance characteristic of aristocratic introductions, as noted by Labov (2018). Her phrasing ensures that Marina's introduction is framed within noble politeness, positioning her as a desirable match. The phrase "*simply must meet*" smoothly signals urgency, implying social expectation rather than personal choice.

Marina's response, "*Entirely.*" disrupts the expected linguistic norms of aristocratic engagement. Instead of engaging in performative politeness, she offers a minimalist response, signaling discomfort while maintaining noble composure. This challenges the upper-class expectation that young women must express enthusiasm in courtship interactions. Lord Middlethorpe's final insult, "*I do not believe that I have ever met such a lovely girl with such an ugly countenance.*" demonstrates prestige variety used as verbal aggression, employing refined phrasing to deliver a harsh critique. His wording reinforces noble expectations while simultaneously degrading Marina's perceived lack of politeness.

This interaction is lined with Joos's formal register (1967), where structured phrasing governs aristocratic exchanges. The complete sentence structures and absence of contractions reflect upper-class formality, reinforcing noble conversational expectations. Marina's resistance introduces a consultative register, where engagement is partially reciprocal but lacks full enthusiasm. Her phrase, "*I believe now to be the perfect time.*" redirects authority without overt rejection, maintaining aristocratic refinement while asserting her agency. Marina's phrasing subtly positions her in charge, challenging Lady Featherington's dominance.

Lord Middlethorpe's final remark deviates into frozen register, where polished language intensifies rhetorical impact. His insult maintains structured elegance, ensuring that his critique remains socially acceptable despite its severity. According to Halliday (1992), Lady Featherington's introduction serves a regulatory function, directing social behavior by enforcing the expectation that Marina must engage with Lord Middlethorpe. Her phrasing ensures that Marina's role as a debutante remains compliant with aristocratic guidelines.

Marina's verbal resistance fulfills both expressive and interactional functions. Her minimal response, "*Entirely.*" conveys emotional disengagement, subtly defying noble courtship norms. Halliday (1992) highlights that expressive language can signal defiance through tone and brevity rather than outright rebellion. Her later statement, "*I certainly was not addressing you.*" intensifies this function, directly excluding Lord

Middlethorpe from the interaction while maintaining aristocratic composure. Lord Middlethorpe's final remark carries a representational function, shaping perception through structured insult. His language constructs Marina's character in a negative light, using aristocratic speech conventions to assert dominance.

This scene exemplifies how aristocratic speech navigates courtship, resistance, and structured insult. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes prestige variety, illustrating how noble discourse reinforces status through refined phrasing. Joos's register framework (1967) highlights the change between formal, consultative, and frozen registers, showcasing aristocratic linguistic expectations. Halliday's functional theory (1992) proves how language regulates, expresses defiance, and constructs perception within noble interactions. This scene demonstrates how aristocratic speech not only upholds status but also serves as a battleground for negotiation, control, and rejection.

Datum 30

Context

The scene takes place in Genevieve Delacroix's boutique, where Lady Cowper and Violet Bridgerton engage in a strategic conversation about Daphne's courtship. Although the setting is more intimate than a formal gathering, aristocratic etiquette still governs their interaction. Lady Cowper subtly pressures Violet, suggesting that Daphne should not pursue Prince

Friedrich so that Cressida may secure a match with him. She maintains the refined language expected of noblewomen.

Dialog

Lady Cowper: *“Ah, Lady Bridgerton.”*

Violet Bridgerton: *“Lady Cowper.”*

Lady Cowper: *“I must say, it is a good thing Daphne is so taken by the duke.”*

Violet Bridgerton: *“Oh, well thank-“*

Lady Cowper: *“Cressida would never have a hope with the prince if your Daphne went for him. We all know my darling might have the fortune, but it is your Daphne who has the face.”*

(Episode 3, 00:47:10 – 00:47:40)

Analysis

Lady Cowper’s language embodies prestige variety, utilizing elevated phrasing to reinforce social expectations. Labov (2018) notes that elite discourse relies on refined speech patterns to emphasize class distinctions and guide interpersonal dynamics. Her remark, *“It is a good thing Daphne is so taken by the duke.”* functions both as an observation and a strategic suggestion, smoothly urging Violet to steer her daughter away from the prince. Her concluding statement, *“Cressida would never have a hope with the prince if your Daphne went for him. We all know my darling might have the fortune, but it is your Daphne who has the face.”* illustrates prestige variety as a tool for social manipulation. By acknowledging Daphne’s beauty, Lady Cowper flatters Violet while concurrently asserting that Cressida’s wealth makes her a more suitable match. This phrasing

demonstrates Lady Cowper's intent to position Violet within the context of noble matchmaking expectations.

Lady Cowper's speech aligns with Joos's consultative register (1967), balancing structured phrasing with persuasive undertones. Her sentence construction avoids contractions to maintain aristocratic refinement while remaining conversational enough to suggest negotiation. The phrase, "*We all know my darling might have the fortune, but it is your Daphne who has the face.*" positions her statement as an appeal rather than a directive, allowing for polite influence without confrontation. Lady Cowper's wording exemplifies the preservation of noble politeness while subtly managing Daphne's romantic prospects.

According to Halliday's framework (1992), Lady Cowper's speech serves multiple functions. Her initial remark regarding Daphne's attachment to the duke fulfills a regulatory function, subtly guiding Violet's perception of which match would be more socially acceptable. By presenting Daphne's feeling as a "*good thing*," Lady Cowper gently discourages any potential pursuit of Prince Friedrich. Her comment about Cressida and Daphne carries an interactional function, reinforcing aristocratic matchmaking norms through comparative phrasing. By distinguishing Cressida's wealth from Daphne's beauty, Lady Cowper subtly defines their respective values in the marriage market. Violet's interrupted response, "*Oh, well thank—*" illustrates an expressive function, signaling discomfort through hesitance. Her cut-off

sentence conveys uncertainty, demonstrating how aristocratic speech regulates emotional expression within strategic interactions.

This scene shows how aristocratic speech upholds social expectations, even in more intimate settings. Labov's theory (2018) highlights prestige variety as a tool for polite manipulation, reinforcing noble matchmaking expectations. Joos's register framework (1967) illustrates how consultative language facilitates strategic negotiation while maintaining refinement. Halliday's functional theory (1992) clarifies how language serves regulatory, interactional, and expressive purposes, subtly managing conversational influence and emotional restraint. Ultimately, this scene illustrates how noble conversations incorporate social pressure into structured discourse, ensuring that hierarchy and matchmaking politics are maintained, even in seemingly casual environments.

Datum 31

Context

In this scene, Lady Danbury highlights Simon's lateness by asking a rhetorical question that emphasizes the difference between the time they agreed upon and his actual arrival. Daphne's short response acknowledges that Lady Danbury is correct while adding to the tension of the moment. This interaction reflects the conversational norms of the aristocracy, where social figures typically employ indirect criticism rather than direct confrontation to maintain politeness.

Dialog

Lady Danbury: "Did we not say ten o'clock?"

Daphne Bridgerton: "[Daphne grunts lightly] We did."

(Episode 5, 00:07:00 - 00:07:10)

Analysis

Lady Danbury's statement exemplifies prestige variety, maintaining formality even while delivering a sharp remark. Labov (2018) suggests that linguistic refinement within upper-class circles serves not only as a marker of status but also as a means of exerting social control. Her choice of words, "*Did we not say ten o'clock?*" replaces a direct accusation with a structured inquiry, allowing her to express dissatisfaction without sacrificing her aristocratic composure. The phrasing of "*Did we not say*" reinforces hierarchy, framing Simon as at fault while upholding upper-class politeness. Daphne's response, "*We did.*" attends to noble conversational restraint, offering minimal engagement while affirming the statement. Daphne's phrasing aligns with this expectation, ensuring she respects Lady Danbury's position while subtly acknowledging Simon's lateness.

Lady Danbury's speech operates within Joos's consultative register (1967), allowing for engagement while maintaining hierarchical distance. Joos (1967) categorizes the consultative register as a type of language that facilitates structured interaction, preserving authority through measured phrasing. Her rhetorical question serves as both a reminder and a critique, signaling disappointment within refined discourse. Daphne's reply changes toward a formal register, minimizing conversational elaboration to uphold

aristocratic etiquette. The absence of additional commentary ensures that the interaction remains polite while acknowledging the underlying tension. Daphne's reserved reply exemplifies this, ensuring that the politeness is maintained.

Lady Danbury's rhetorical question serves a regulatory function, subtly guiding Simon's behavior by reinforcing punctuality as an expected social norm. Halliday (1992) explains that regulatory speech shapes interactions by emphasizing expected conduct through the use of structured language. By framing her remark as a question rather than a direct critique, Lady Danbury smoothly reminds Simon of his obligation without direct admonition. Daphne's response fulfills an expressive function, signaling mild discomfort while maintaining aristocratic restraint. Her brief reply ensures that she does not challenge Lady Danbury's authority while subtly affirming the critique.

This interaction highlights how aristocratic speech balances critique with refined composure. Labov's theory (2018) illustrates how prestige variety allows Lady Danbury to reinforce expectations without direct confrontation. Joos's register framework (1967) demonstrates the consultative and formal nature of their exchange, ensuring hierarchy is upheld through structured speech. Halliday's language functional theory (1992) proves of how language serves both regulatory and expressive purposes, subtly guiding behavior while preserving noble conversational

etiquette. In fact, this scene exemplifies how aristocratic discourse maintains social expectations through measured yet pointed verbal exchanges.

Datum 32

Context

This scene takes place as Lord and Lady Wetherby offer their greeting to Daphne Bridgerton and Simon Basset during their morning stroll, acknowledging the couple's upcoming marriage. The interaction exemplifies typical aristocratic conversational norms, where politeness, admiration, and structured social expectations influence the dialogue. The language used in this exchange upholds noble etiquette, reinforcing public approval and societal validation of the couple's union.

Dialog

Lord Wetherby: *"Well, if it isn't the most talked-about couple in the town. Such a perfect-looking pair."*

Lady Wetherby: *"Indeed. The two of you will make a fine family, I am sure of it."*

Daphne Bridgerton: *"Thank you."*

(Episode 5, 00:08:23 – 00:08:35)

Analysis

Lord Wetherby's opening remark, *"Well, if it isn't the most talked-about couple in town. Such a perfect-looking pair."* exemplifies prestige variety by maintaining refinement while offering social endorsement. Labov (2018) states that upper-class discourse serves as both a status marker and a means of reinforcing societal expectations. By referring to Daphne and Simon as *"the most talked-about couple,"* he acknowledges their elevated

position within noble society, affirming their relationship through collective aristocratic approval.

Lady Wetherby's statement, "*Indeed. The two of you will make a fine family, I am sure of it.*" reinforces this prestige variety by presenting marriage as an expected progression. Her phrasing signals that the marriage is not only celebrated but also seen as a formal continuation of noble lineage. Daphne's brief reply, "*Thank you.*" describes to the aristocratic convention of conversational restraint. Labov (2018) notes that brevity is often employed in upper-class discourse to acknowledge authority while minimizing excessive engagement. Daphne's succinct response reflects noble politeness, ensuring that her gratitude is expressed without excessive elaboration.

The exchange operates within Joos's formal register (1967), maintaining structured phrasing and polished expression. Lord Wetherby's remark follows complete sentence construction, avoiding contractions and ensuring elegance. His phrasing upholds this standard, reinforcing aristocratic refinement. Lady Wetherby's response continues the formal register, incorporating certainty and expectation within structured sentences. The phrase, "*I am sure of it.*" adds assurance, framing their marriage as an inevitable social reality. Joos's framework (1967) highlights that a formal register ensures composure and control, preventing casual language from disrupting noble interactions. Her speech reflects this principle, conveying aristocratic approval with dignity.

Daphne's response maintains the formal register but shifts toward consultative brevity, guaranteeing acknowledgment without excessive engagement. Joos's theory (1967) notes that brief yet structured replies are commonly used in aristocratic interactions to preserve hierarchy without extending the conversation. Her reply aligns with this principle, maintaining social grace while limiting interaction.

However, Lord and Lady Wetherby's speech fulfills both interactional and regulatory functions, reinforcing noble approval while subtly guiding expectations. Their remarks construct the couple's public image, affirming their role within society and presenting marriage as a structured societal expectation. As Halliday (1992) describes, regulatory language is speech that frames expected behaviors through structured discourse, ensuring societal norms are maintained. Their phrasing aligns with this principle, subtly reinforcing marriage as a continuation of aristocratic stability. Daphne's response carries an expressive function, where her brief acknowledgment signals gratitude while maintaining aristocratic composure. Halliday (1992) also notes that expressive speech allows individuals to reflect status through measured responses, ensuring noble restraint is upheld even in positive interactions. Her concise reply attends to this expectation, preserving etiquette while reflecting controlled emotional engagement.

This exchange exemplifies how aristocratic speech reinforces social expectations while maintaining refined composure. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes prestige variety, showcasing noble speech as both a status

marker and an interactional guide. Joos's register framework (1967) highlights the structured nature of their discourse, ensuring that formal language governs conversational etiquette. Halliday's functional theory (1992) illustrates how speech serves interactional, regulatory, and expressive purposes, shaping noble interactions within controlled linguistic refinement. Ultimately, this scene reflects how aristocratic conversation validates relationships and reinforces structured societal roles.

Datum 33

Context

This scene takes place in Genevieve Delacroix's boutique, where Cressida Cowper accuses Daphne Bridgerton of manipulating Prince Friedrich to provoke Simon's jealousy and ensnare him into marriage. Daphne, maintaining her aristocratic composure, quickly counters the accusation by reminding Cressida of the impending social disparity between them. Their interaction highlights the tensions among noblewomen, where status, influence, and reputation dictate power dynamics within society. Daphne's response not only defends her position but also reaffirms the social hierarchy. She also warned Cressida about the potential consequences of making an enemy of her.

Dialog

Cressida Cowper: "You dallied with the prince purely to rouse the duke's jealousy, and then you lured him into those gardens to trap him into marriage. I never would have imagined that a Bridgerton would ever come to know such shame."

Daphne Bridgerton: *“You should consider your words more carefully, Cressida. In a matter of days, I am to be a duchess and you shall be just as you are now, unmarried and untitled. So you can either be a duchess’s friend or her enemy. It is entirely up to you*

(Episode 5, 00:14:00 – 00:14:32)

Analysis

Cressida Cowper’s accusation, *“You dallied with the prince purely to rouse the duke’s jealousy, and then you lured him into those gardens to trap him into marriage”* serves as an example of prestige variety used in social critique. Her structured language reinforces societal expectations. Labov (2018) argues that elite discourse is often trained to maintain their reputation, embedding accusations within refined linguistic conventions. Cressida’s carefully crafted phrasing ensures her critique remains within noble conversational norms while delivering cruel judgment.

Daphne’s counter, *“You should consider your words more carefully, Cressida. In a matter of days, I am to be a duchess, and you shall be just as you are now: unmarried and untitled”* reaffirms prestige variety as a tool for status reinforcement. Labov (2018) asserts that aristocratic speech prioritizes status preservation, where rank is reinforced linguistically through the use of hierarchical distinctions. Daphne’s emphasis on Cressida’s unmarried and untitled state underscores the power shift that will occur upon her marriage, strategically placing herself above Cressida in the noble hierarchy.

Cressida’s speech operates within Joos’s formal register (1967), maintaining grammatically structured phrasing while embedding sharp critique. Her accusation avoids crude wording, ensuring that it aligns with

noble conversational etiquette. Daphne's response mirrors a consultative register, blending formality with strategic persuasion. The phrase, "*You can either be a duchess's friend or her enemy. It is entirely up to you*" introduces a negotiative tone, subtly presenting Cressida with a choice rather than a direct warning. Joos (1967) notes that the consultative register allows individuals to maintain authority while framing speech as diplomatic engagement. Daphne's phrasing reflects this, ensuring that dominance is asserted through refined discourse rather than overt aggression.

Cressida's speech serves a representational function, shaping reality by constructing a narrative in which Daphne is portrayed as having engaged in manipulation. Halliday (1992) explains that representational language frames perception through selective wording, reinforcing societal attitudes. Her phrasing positions Daphne's actions as dishonorable, establishing a version of events that serves her social standing. Daphne's response fulfills both regulatory and expressive functions. The phrase, "*You should consider your words more carefully, Cressida*" acts as a regulatory directive, subtly warning against further accusations while preserving aristocratic restraint. Daphne's words serve this purpose, ensuring that Cressida is aware of the consequences of her statements. Additionally, Daphne's closing remark carries an expressive function, where controlled language reflects her assertion of power without emotional escalation. Halliday (1992) notes that expressive speech within noble discourse is often measured, allowing individuals to assert dominance without violating etiquette. Her phrasing

exemplifies this principle, striking a balance between aristocratic composure and status reinforcement.

This scene illustrates how aristocratic speech functions as both a social weapon and a means of safeguarding status. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes prestige variety, demonstrating how Cressida's accusation and Daphne's rebuttal reinforce noble hierarchy through structured discourse. Joos's register framework (1967) highlights the transition from formal to consultative language, ensuring that power struggles remain within refined conversational boundaries. Halliday's functional theory (1992) describes how speech serves representational, regulatory, and expressive purposes, constructing reality while managing conversational power dynamics. Additionally, this scene illustrates how aristocratic discourse serves as a tool for social critique and a mechanism for maintaining hierarchical control.

Datum 34

Context

This scene takes place during Daphne and Simon's post-marriage celebration. Hyacinth Bridgerton expresses curiosity about Daphne's current activities as a duchess. Violet Bridgerton responds by emphasizing the expectations placed on noblewomen, then changes the focus conversation to Eloise's upcoming debut. The conversation reflects the norms of aristocratic discourse, where personal milestones serve as reminders of societal obligations and the structured roles within noble families.

Dialog

Hyacinth Bridgerton: *"I wonder what Daphne is doing at this very moment."*

Violet Bridgerton: *"I am sure she has many new duties to attend to as duchess, things you should be learning for your debut, Eloise."*

(Episode 6, 00:02:57 00:03:05)

Analysis

Hyacinth's remark, *"I wonder what Daphne is doing at this very moment."* illustrates an aristocratic curiosity shaped by prestige variety, maintaining a structured tone even during informal conversation. This aligns with Labov (2018), who asserts that language in elite circles often serves as a mechanism for reinforcing hierarchy through subtle observational discourse. By thinking about Daphne's activities, Hyacinth acknowledges the societal significance of noble titles, subtly affirming Daphne's transition into her responsibilities as a duchess. Violet's response, *"I am sure she has many new duties to attend to as duchess, things you should be learning for your debut, Eloise."* further reinforces prestige variety by connecting noble status to structured expectations. Labov (2018) explains that aristocratic speech often aligns personal identity with societal obligations, ensuring that individuals conform to established roles. Her phrasing gently instructs Eloise on her impending responsibilities, using Daphne's new role to frame noble expectations.

The exchange takes place within Joos's consultative register (1967), blending formality with interpersonal guidance. Hyacinth's question, though

conversational, maintains a structured refinement, avoiding contractions and casual phrasing. Her remark exemplifies this, preserving aristocratic decorum even in speculation. Violet's response adheres to a formal register, reinforcing noble obligations through grammatically polished phrasing. The sentence structure remains complete, ensuring dignity while subtly directing Eloise toward expected behavior. Violet's phrasing exemplifies this, maintaining aristocratic composure.

Hyacinth's statement serves a representational function, constructing meaning through personal curiosity while reinforcing noble expectations. Halliday (1992) states that representational language frames reality through observed speculation, reinforcing societal norms through structured phrasing. Her inquiry acknowledges Daphne's transition, subtly affirming social hierarchy through linguistic observation. Violet's response fulfills both regulatory and interactional functions. Her statement, "*things you should be learning for your debut, Eloise.*" carries a regulatory directive, subtly guiding Eloise toward aristocratic expectations. Her phrasing ensures that noble duties are conversationally reinforced. Additionally, Violet's response maintains an interactional function, using Daphne's status as a bridge for familial discourse. Halliday (1992) highlights that interactional speech strengthens hierarchical relationships, ensuring that individuals remain aligned with noble traditions. Her phrasing exemplifies this, structuring expectations while maintaining aristocratic warmth.

This scene showcases how aristocratic speech balances observation, structured guidance, and status reinforcement. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes prestige variety, demonstrating how Hyacinth's curiosity and Violet's response reinforce noble identity through refined discourse. Joos's register framework (1967) highlights the transition from consultative engagement to formal instruction, ensuring that aristocratic etiquette governs conversational structure. Halliday's functional theory (1992) deciphers how language serves representational, regulatory, and interactional purposes, reinforcing noble roles while ensuring a structured conversational flow. Overall, this scene illustrates how aristocratic language upholds tradition while seamlessly guiding noble responsibilities within family discourse.

Datum 35

Context

At a social gathering, Lady Danbury engages in small talk with Daphne Bridgerton and Simon Basset. While the conversation seems casual, it has a strategic undertone. Lady Danbury acknowledges how Daphne's marriage has successfully drawn attention away from her brother's scandal involving Marina Thompson. She smoothly changes the conversation from discussing reputation management to extending an invitation, emphasizing noble expectations for social appearances. Simon's lighthearted response maintains aristocratic etiquette, ensuring the conversation remains warm despite its underlying structure.

Dialog

Lady Danbury: *“Excellent time, what will all the tittle-tattle concerning your brother.”*

Daphne Bridgerton: *“Oh, a mere coincidence, Lady Danbury, I am sure.”*

Lady Danbury: *“Mm. Your plan is working. I have heard nary a peep about Mr. Bridgerton’s unfortunate entanglement with the Thompson girl. Oh I almost forgot. I am hosting a party I would very much like you to attend.”*

Simon Basset: *“We love a good party.”*

(Episode 7, 00:19:34 – 00:19:54)

Analysis

Lady Danbury’s speech exemplifies prestige variety, blending casual aristocratic phrasing with calculated social insight. Labov (2018) highlights that upper-class discourse often embeds strategic observations within seemingly lighthearted exchanges. Her remark, *“Excellent time, what with all the tittle-tattle concerning your brother.”* serves both as polite conversation and a subtle acknowledgment of social maneuvering. By referencing gossip without explicit judgment, Lady Danbury ensures that the topic remains controlled yet recognized within noble expectations.

Daphne’s response, *“Oh, a mere coincidence, Lady Danbury, I am sure.”* attends to prestige variety as a deflection mechanism, minimizing engagement while preserving aristocratic composure. Labov (2018) describes how noble individuals often use linguistic restraint to navigate sensitive topics without direct confrontation. Daphne’s statement ensures that the conversation does not linger on scandal, reinforcing the idea of noble refinement. Lady Danbury’s follow-up, *“Your plan is working. I have heard*

nary a peep about Mr. Bridgerton's unfortunate entanglement with the Thompson girl." further reflects prestige variety as strategic validation, confirming that noble reputation management is functioning effectively. Labov (2018) explains that prestige speech reinforces status stability through polished language and indirect acknowledgment. Her phrasing reassures Daphne while maintaining a touch of the aristocrat's obedience.

The utterance operates within Joos's consultative register (1967), balancing polite engagement with hierarchical awareness. Lady Danbury's initial remark avoids direct confrontation, ensuring that gossip is acknowledged without appearing intrusive. Joos (1967) notes that the consultative register allows for aristocratic refinement while enabling strategic discourse. Her sentence structure remains polished, maintaining noble etiquette throughout the conversation. Daphne's response shifts toward a formal register, where structured restraint governs her reply. Her phrase, "*a mere coincidence*" minimizes elaboration, ensuring that noble restraint is upheld despite the social implications. Simon's statement, "*We love a good party.*" describes a casual register element, softening the structured exchange and ensuring that aristocratic warmth remains intact. Joos (1967) explains that casual elements often help balance hierarchical interactions, preventing excessive formality in personal engagements. His phrasing reflects this balance, ensuring that noble etiquette is complemented by lighthearted engagement.

Lady Danbury's speech serves a regulatory function, shaping expectations by reinforcing Daphne's successful reputation management. Halliday (1992) describes regulatory language as speech used to uphold societal expectations and influence individual actions subtly. Her remark ensures that Daphne's marriage is perceived as a strategic victory in maintaining the family's reputation. Daphne's reply carries an expressive function, signaling aristocratic restraint through measured phrasing. Halliday (1992) emphasizes that expressive speech within noble discourse limits engagement with sensitive topics while preserving dignity. Her wording allows for polite acknowledgment while preventing the conversation from dwelling on scandal. Simon's response, "*We love a good party.*" introduces an interactional function, fostering continued social engagement despite the underlying strategic tones of the conversation. Halliday (1992) explains that interactional language strengthens social connections while preserving noble expectations. His phrasing effectively transitions the discourse, reinforcing aristocratic politeness while expressing enthusiasm for the invitation.

This scene illustrates how aristocratic speech maintains strategic social engagement while reinforcing status management. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes prestige variety, showing how reputation, social maneuvering, and polite deflection shape noble interactions. Joos's register framework (1967) highlights the interplay between consultative, formal, and casual registers, ensuring that status etiquette remains balanced with conversational warmth. Halliday's functional theory (1992) describes how

language serves regulatory, expressive, and interactional purposes, reinforcing noble expectations while facilitating seamless social transitions. Ultimately, this scene reflects how aristocratic conversation subtly navigates hierarchy, reputation, and social obligations through polished linguistic finesse.

Datum 36

Context

This scene takes place in Simon Basset's office, where Daphne Bridgerton found letters that Simon wrote to his father as a child. The letters reveal Simon's past struggle with speech, a challenge he worked diligently to overcome. Lady Danbury recognizes the significance of these letters, providing insight into Simon's pride and perseverance. The conversation illustrates the patterns of aristocratic discourse, where vulnerability is expressed within a framework of structured refinement, ensuring that dignity is maintained even during personal revelations.

Dialog

Daphne Bridgerton: *“Lady Danbury? Did you know about these letters, the ones the duke seems to have written to his father as a boy?”*

Lady Danbury: *“I did. And now apparently, so do you.”*

Daphne Bridgerton: *“I had no idea that Simon had trouble speaking as a child-“*

Lady Danbury: *“How could you have done? He worked very hard to eliminate the difficulty. He was...well, he was so very proud. It is why he wrote those letters in the first place.”*

Daphne Bridgerton: *“To keep his father informed of his progress.”*

Lady Danbury: "Mm."

(Episode 8, 00:23:16 – 00:23:48)

Analysis

This dialogue aligns with Labov's theory (2018). Lady Danbury's speech exemplifies prestige variety, as she maintains an aristocratic composure while discussing Simon's past challenges. Her phrasing, "*How could you have done that? He worked very hard to eliminate the difficulty.*" reinforces this notion, framing Simon's speech impediment not as a weakness but as an achievement in overcoming adversity. Daphne's statement, "*I had no idea that Simon had trouble speaking as a child.*" reflects aristocratic restraint when processing personal revelations. Labov (2018) also explains that noble discourse prioritizes controlled emotional responses, ensuring that sensitivity is acknowledged while preserving composure. Daphne's phrasing remains measured, signaling surprise while maintaining noble elegance.

Lady Danbury's speech operates within Joos's consultative register (1967), ensuring engagement while preserving structured aristocratic discourse. Her phrasing, "*He was... well, he was so very proud.*" blends formality with warmth, allowing for personal insight without disrupting refined linguistic expectations. Her speech embodies this principle, ensuring noble composure while offering intimate reflection. In contrast, Daphne's speech aligns with the formal register, where structured phrasing governs aristocratic interactions. Her statement, "*To keep his father informed of his*

progress." maintains grammatical precision, ensuring that personal discoveries remain within noble etiquette. Daphne's choice of words reflects this, preserving emotional restraint even in moments of personal realization.

Lady Danbury's remarks serve a representational function, shaping Simon's childhood experience through structured linguistic framing. Halliday (1992) states that representational speech constructs reality through selective linguistic choices, ensuring that meaning aligns with societal expectations. Her phrasing elevates Simon's struggle into a narrative of perseverance, reinforcing noble ideals. Additionally, her speech carries an interactional function, strengthening her connection with Daphne through shared understanding. Halliday (1992) highlights that interactional speech fosters relational depth while maintaining structured composure. Her acknowledgment, "*I did. And now apparently, so do you.*" subtly positions Daphne as someone who has gained more profound knowledge of Simon's past. In this context, Daphne's speech fulfills an expressive function, signaling discovery while adhering to aristocratic restraint. Her statement, "*I had no idea that Simon had trouble speaking as a child.*" conveys realization while ensuring that noble composure is maintained. Halliday (1992) explains that expressive speech enables individuals to articulate emotions within a structured framework, preserving conversational elegance. Daphne's careful phrasing exemplifies this principle.

This scene illustrates how aristocratic speech balances personal revelations with structured composure. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes

prestige variety, demonstrating how noble discourse maintains dignity while acknowledging vulnerability. Joos's register framework (1967) highlights the interplay between consultative and formal speech, ensuring that refinement is upheld even in personal engagement. Halliday's functional theory (1992) describes how language serves representational, interactional, and expressive purposes, framing personal history with noble composure. Additionally, this scene reflects how aristocratic discourse navigates emotional discovery while reinforcing societal expectations of dignity and refinement.

Datum 37

Context

The scene takes place during Simon Basset's childhood, where his father, Lord Basset, reacts harshly upon discovering that Simon has difficulty speaking. Instead of expressing concern, Lord Basset perceives Simon's struggle as a failure that threatens the family's noble status. His comments highlight the pressure placed on aristocratic heirs to conform to strict expectations, underscoring how lineage and perceived excellence define noble identity. This interaction illustrates not only verbal aggression but also the aristocracy's obsession with maintaining social status.

Dialog

***Lord Basset:** "He is an idiot! My God. Do you know how precarious of a situation we are in, boy? We have been granted this line. The monarchy itself has declared it. But it will only remain ours. So long as we remain extraordinary. The Hastings name cannot land. In the quivering hands of a half-wit! Get him out of my sight. This boy is dead to me."*

(Episode 2, 00:15:07 – 00:15:48)

Analysis

The dialogue reflects Labov's theory (2018), with Lord Basset's phrasing exemplifying the use of a prestigious variety of language as a means of verbal dominance. His structured speech reinforces aristocratic expectations, even during emotionally charged moments. For instance, his statement, "*The Hastings name cannot land in the quivering hands of a half-wit!*" illustrates this principle by using dramatic imagery to frame Simon's speech difficulties as a direct threat to noble status. Additionally, Basset's claim, "*We have been granted this line. The monarchy itself has declared it,*" demonstrates how the use of prestige variety embeds aristocratic legitimacy within linguistic control. This rhetorical strategy ensures that Basset's claim to nobility remains central in his justification for rejecting Simon.

Lord Basset's speech aligns with Joos's concept of the frozen register (1967), delivering authoritative pronouncements in a way that prioritizes structure over engagement. For example, his question, "*Do you know how precarious our situation is, boy?*" functions more as a rhetorical declaration than an invitation for dialogue. This delivery method reinforces his unchallenged dominance. His command, "*Get him out of my sight. This boy is dead to me,*" exemplifies how the frozen register in aristocratic discourse allows individuals to issue absolute judgments while maintaining hierarchical control. Basset's language thereby frames Simon's rejection within a rigid linguistic structure.

Furthermore, Basset's speech serves a regulatory function according to Halliday (1992), enforcing societal expectations and shaping Simon's reality through strict aristocratic framing. His assertion, "*We must remain extraordinary*," emphasizes that excellence is not just a choice but a necessity for noble survival. Basset's language also carries a representational function, constructing Simon's perception through definitive phrasing. By labeling Simon a "*half-wit*" and declaring him "*dead to me*," Basset uses language to redefine Simon's identity in alignment with his expectations of nobility. Lastly, his delivery incorporates an expressive function, where aristocratic frustration is manifested in measured, yet forceful speech. Lord Basset's dramatic phrasing ensures that his anger remains controlled within the framework of elite expectations.

This scene illustrates how aristocratic discourse reinforces lineage expectations through rigid linguistic control. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes prestige variety as a mechanism for enforcing hierarchy, ensuring that noble legitimacy is prioritized over individual struggles. Joos's register framework (1967) highlights the dominance of the frozen register in authoritative declarations, enabling Lord Basset's speech to dictate rather than engage with others. Halliday's language functional theory (1992) clarifies how language serves regulatory, representational, and expressive purposes, shaping Simon's reality while ensuring that noble expectations remain unchallenged. This scene exemplifies how aristocratic speech not

only preserves lineage but also defines individual worth through structured verbal power.

4. Interactions between Nobility and The Merchant Class

Datum 38

Context

In this scene, Lord Barbrooke is trying to gain Anthony Bridgerton's approval for his marriage to Daphne. However, Simon Basset interrupts with an intimidating comment, referring to a past incident where Daphne punched Barbrooke after he cornered her in the garden. The conversation illustrates the nature of aristocratic discourse, where politeness conceals the tensions. Simon's sarcastic remark disrupts the refined elegance typically associated with noble conversations.

Dialog

Lord Barbrooke: "Lord Bridgerton, forgive the intrusion, but, if need be, I will happily restate my intentions with respect to your sisten. She is a prize I have long coveted for her beauty, for her grace..."

Simon Basset: "For her powerful right hook?"

Lord Barbrooke: "I must know whether I can count on you to handle this misunderstanding, my lord? I certainly wish to avoid any kind of emarrasment."

(Episode 2, 00:25:23 - 00:25:47)

Analysis

Lord Barbrooke's phrasing exemplifies language variations that maintaining aristocratic refinement while reinforcing his entitlement to Daphne. This aligns with Labov (2018) that elite discourse often disguises personal ambition within structured linguistic elegance, ensuring power

dynamics remain veiled within noble etiquette. His remark, "*She is a prize I have long coveted for her beauty, for her grace...*" objectifies Daphne within a rigid noble framework, framing marriage as an acquisition rather than an emotional bond. Simon's interjection, "*For her powerful right hook?*" disrupts his utterance, replacing aristocratic refinement with social irony. Labov (2018) highlights how speech variation exposes power struggles, where informal disruption challenges hierarchical expectations. Simon's phrasing counters Barbrooke's attempt at structured courtship with a reminder of Daphne's defiance, ensuring that noble discourse cannot conceal past misconduct.

Lord Barbrooke's speech follows Joos's formal register (1967), maintaining polished sentence structure and avoiding contractions to preserve aristocratic etiquette. His request, "*Lord Bridgerton, forgive the intrusion...*" attends to requesting attention for a negotiation conversation with Anthony Bridgerton. However, Barbrooke's language presents entitlement as polite discussion. Simon's utterance intervenes the conversation toward a casual register and breaks aristocratic composure with humor. His phrasing transforms Barbrooke's pursuit into sarcasm, ensuring that Barbrooke's behavior towards Daphne is unethical within the theoretical social classes, especially it always be under surveillance. Simon's language exemplifies this by suddenly rejecting Barbrooke's self-serving expectations.

For the language functions, Lord Barbrooke's speech serves a regulatory function, attempting to influence Anthony's decision regarding Daphne's marriage. Halliday (1992) states that regulatory language frames expectations through structured discourse, ensuring social conformity aligns with noble hierarchy. His choice of words reinforces aristocratic marriage as a formal transaction rather than a matter of Daphne's autonomy. Simon's sarcasm serves an expressive function, utilizing humor to expose hidden tensions within ostensibly noble interactions. By referencing Daphne's physical reaction, Simon ruins Barbrooke's attempts to frame marriage as an inevitable matchmaking between the upper classes, forcing Daphne's consent. Additionally, Barbrooke's final request, "*I must know whether I can count on you to handle this misunderstanding, my lord?*" demonstrates a representational function, constructing reality where his prior conduct is reduced to a mere '*misunderstanding*' rather than an act of compulsion. Barbrooke's phrasing reinforces this, attempting to redirecting the control back to Anthony by diminishing Daphne's response.

This scene illustrates how aristocratic speech navigates power, courtship, and social resistance. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes language variations among upper classes, demonstrating how structured language reinforces entitlement while Simon's sarcasm disrupts noble etiquette. Joos's register framework (1967) highlights the contrast between formal noble speech and casual irony, ensuring hierarchy is momentarily challenged. Halliday's functional theory (1992) demonstrates how language

serves regulatory, expressive, and representational purposes, revealing how noble speech is used to negotiate status and conceal tensions. In fact, this scene exemplifies how aristocratic discourse is both a tool of control and a battleground for resistance, where humor and directness momentarily challenge elite expectations.

Datum 39

Context

This scene occurs at Lady Featherington's home, where Genevieve Delacroix is measuring Marina Thompson for a new gown. Genevieve notices a change in Marina's body that was denied by Lady Featherington and assumes that Marina's obesity was caused by she eats too much cake. This statement was made to deceive Genevieve does not suspect Marina's pregnancy. The interaction reflects aristocratic discourse, where indirect language is often used to conceal or redirect attention from sensitive topics. Lady Featherington's statement enforces societal expectations surrounding women's appearances, reinforcing noble pressures related to refinement and control.

Dialog

Genevieve Delacroix: "Mon Dieu! Perhaps I took your measurements wrong."

Lady Featherington: "Miss Thompson has a fondness for cake. A reducing diet will work wonders for her, I'm sure."

Genevieve Delacroix: "Oui, madame."

(Episode 3, 00:17:11 00:17:21)

Analysis

Lady Featherington's remark, "*Miss Thompson has a fondness for cake. A reducing diet will work wonders for her, I'm sure.*" illustrates language variations among upper classes used as social control, maintaining aristocratic politeness while regulating appearance expectations. Labov (2018) states that elite discourse often functions as a tool for preserving status through refined yet controlling linguistic mechanisms. Her phrasing ensures that Marina's weight change is framed within an acceptable narrative rather than confronting the truth of her pregnancy. Genevieve's response, "*Oui, madame.*" exemplifies prestige variety through compliance, ensuring that aristocratic expectations remain unchallenged. Her reply signaled alignment with Lady Featherington's dismissal rather than questioning it.

Genevieve's statement, "*Mon Dieu! Perhaps I took your measurements wrong.*" operates within Joos's consultative register (1967), allowing aristocratic engagement while preserving polite uncertainty. Her phrasing strikes a balance between observation and noble restraint, ensuring that any suggestion of physical change remains tactful. Lady Featherington's statement changes the conversation toward a formal register, where controlled language ensures social expectations tackle the personal realities. Her comment about a '*reducing diet*' ensuring refinement is preserved while reinforcing external control over Marina's appearance. Genevieve's response, "*Oui, madame.*" transitions into frozen register, where linguistic submission reinforces noble hierarchy. Her phrasing ensures polite

alignment with Lady Featherington's statement, preventing open confrontation.

Besides, Lady Featherington's remark fulfills a regulatory function, shaping Marina's perceived reality through linguistic manipulation. Halliday (1992) describes regulatory speech as language used to enforce societal norms while concealing uncomfortable truths within structured discourse. Her phrasing ensures that Marina's weight gain is attributed to indulgence rather than pregnancy, reinforcing noble control over image expectations. Genevieve's reaction carries an interactional function, ensuring aristocratic politeness remains intact despite personal awareness. Her reply ensures continued noble refinement while reinforcing Lady Featherington's imposed perception. Marina's silence operates within an expressive function, where her lack of response signals constrained autonomy. By remaining silent, Marina conforms to aristocratic suppression, preventing open acknowledgment of her pregnancy despite its obvious implications.

This scene shows how aristocratic speech regulates societal expectations through structured linguistic control. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes language variations, illustrating how noble discourse disguises reality while enforcing hierarchy. Joos's register framework (1967) reveals the transition between consultative, formal, and frozen registers, ensuring compliance within structured conversational expectations. Halliday's functional theory (1992) describes how language serves regulatory, interactional, and expressive purposes, reinforcing status

maintenance while suppressing personal truth. Ultimately, this scene reflects how aristocratic discourse strategically conceals reality, ensuring societal perceptions align with noble expectations rather than individual circumstances.

Datum 40

Context

This exchange takes place as Will Mondrich and his wife, Alice, attempt to convince Simon Basset not to move from England until after Will's upcoming boxing match. Will emphasizes the importance of Simon's presence as a member of the upper class, acknowledging that Simon's associations influence the wagers placed on his fight. The conversation highlights social dependency in aristocratic circles, where status and influence dictate financial outcomes.

Dialog

Simon Basset: "I am leaving England. My business is concluded."

Alice Mondrich: "Will's is not."

Will Mondrich: "This will be the biggest match of my career. I am not favored to win it. Your smart friends know you frequent my saloon. Who will wager on me if you are not present?"

(Episode 4, 00:04:08 – 00:04:20)

Analysis

Simon's initial remark, "*I am leaving England. My business is concluded,*" reflects language variations that maintaining refined phrasing while signaling finality. According to Labov (2018), linguistic choices among the elite serve to reinforce autonomy and hierarchical distance. His

structured sentence ensures that his departure is presented as a definitive action rather than a subject for negotiation. Will's counterstatement, "*This will be the biggest match of my career. I am not favored to win it. Your smart friends know you frequent my saloon. Who will wager on me if you are not present?*" reflects a dependency mechanism, demonstrating how working-class individuals leverage noble associations to secure financial stability. Labov (2018) explains that prestige variety is not only a marker of class distinction but also a resource that dictates financial and social interactions. Will's phrasing highlights this dependency, framing Simon's attendance as crucial to his success.

The conversation also in lined within Joos's consultative register (1967), balancing polite negotiation with structured expression. Will's statement blends refined sentence construction with direct engagement, ensuring that his appeal remains dignified. Joos (1967) defines consultative register as language that allows engagement between individuals of differing hierarchical positions while preserving composure. His phrasing reflects maintaining a respectful tone despite the implied pressure. Alice's remark, "*Will's is not,*" exemplifies compressed formal register, where conciseness reinforces urgency. Joos (1967) notes that the formal register in aristocratic interactions often relies on brevity to maintain structured discourse. Her minimal phrasing ensures emphasis while adhering to noble conversational expectations.

Simon's statement carries a representational function, framing his departure as a definitive action. Halliday (1992) states that representational speech constructs reality through structured linguistic choices, ensuring individual autonomy within aristocratic discourse. His phrasing exemplifies this language function, ensuring that his business conclusion is framed as irrevocable. Will's appeal serves both interactional and regulatory functions. His statement, "*Who will wager on me if you are not present?*" reinforces the interactional aspect, linking his financial success to Simon's presence in a way that maintains polite engagement. Halliday (1992) explains that interactional speech fosters social alignment through structured phrasing, ensuring relationships remain intact despite hierarchical differences. Additionally, Will's speech serves a regulatory function, subtly guiding Simon's behavior through structured persuasion. Halliday (1992) notes that regulatory speech shapes expectations and social decisions within noble discourse, ensuring influence remains embedded within conversational refinement. By framing his request as a financial necessity rather than personal preference, Will reinforces the structured dependency between aristocracy and lower-class figures.

Overall, this scene highlights the dependency between the nobility and working-class individuals within aristocratic discourse. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes prestige variety, illustrating how noble status dictates financial success even beyond direct aristocratic transactions. Joos's register framework (1967) reveals how consultative and compressed formal phrasing

balance structured negotiation within noble interactions. Halliday's functional concept (1992) deciphers how language serves representational, interactional, and regulatory purposes, ensuring class expectations are reinforced within conversational persuasion. In summary, this scene exemplifies how noble discourse navigates power, dependency, and structured influence.

Datum 41

Context

This scene takes place in Genevieve Delacroix's boutique, where Eloise Bridgerton requests an urgent exception to purchase a gown for her sister's ball. Despite the shop being closed, Eloise attempts to persuade Genevieve to accommodate her request, leveraging her status as a Bridgerton. The conversation highlights the social privileges afforded to noble families and the subtle negotiation between aristocratic expectation and business propriety.

Dialog

Genevieve Delacroix: *"Miss Eloise, you should come back another day when the shop is open."*

Eloise Bridgerton: *"I had hoped you would make an exception for me. I need a dress for my sister's ball."*

(Episode 8, 00:10:39-00:10:49)

Analysis

The dialogue exhibits distinct linguistic features that reflect Eloise Bridgerton's upper-class entitlement and Genevieve Delacroix's measured

response as a businesswoman. Eloise's request, "*I had hoped you would make an exception for me,*" embodies prestige variety, emphasizing expectation rather than mere inquiry. According to Labov's theory of language variations (2018), upper-class individuals often employ structured phrasing that assumes compliance rather than negotiation. Eloise's choice of words implies that Genevieve should consider adjusting her policies due to Eloise's noble status rather than standard customer rules. Genevieve's reply, "*Miss Eloise, you should come back another day when the shop is open,*" adheres to prestige variety as a boundary-setting mechanism, ensuring that business operations remain separate from aristocratic influence. Labov (2018) highlights that lower-status individuals often maintain structured speech to reaffirm professional autonomy within aristocratic interactions. By addressing Eloise formally and reinforcing shop rules, Genevieve strikes a balance between respect and professional limitations.

The register of their utterance corresponds to Joos's consultative style (1967), blending engagement with structured politeness. Genevieve's phrasing maintains politeness while offering a direct refusal, ensuring that her speech remains within business protocol without offending Eloise. Joos (1967) categorizes consultative register as language that facilitates structured negotiation while preserving hierarchical expectations, and Genevieve's speech aligns with this, ensuring her response remains tactful. Eloise's request, "*I need a dress for my sister's ball,*" operates within the formal register, ensuring clarity while subtly reinforcing urgency. Joos (1967) notes

that formal register often appears in interactions where social expectations are asserted through structured phrasing. By framing her request as a necessity rather than a preference, Eloise maintains noble conversational patterns where convenience is expected despite business constraints.

From a functional perspective, Eloise's statement exhibits multiple overlapping communicative purposes based on Halliday's classification of language functions (1992). Her phrase, "*I had hoped you would make an exception for me,*" carries a regulatory function, attempting to influence Genevieve's behavior by presenting the request as an assumed accommodation. Halliday (1992) describes regulatory speech as language used to shape interactions through structured expectation, ensuring that persuasion is embedded within aristocratic discourse. Genevieve's response fulfills an interactional function, ensuring polite engagement while reinforcing professional boundaries. Halliday (1992) highlights that interactional speech allows individuals to maintain decorum while preventing conversational dominance, ensuring that lower-status figures navigate noble expectations with careful negotiation. By addressing Eloise with formality while reinforcing shop policies, Genevieve preserves her professional stance without disrupting social harmony.

This exchange illustrates the intersection between noble privilege and business autonomy in aristocratic discourse. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes prestige variety, showcasing how noble expectations influence professional interactions. Joos's theory (1967) explains how

consultative and formal registers structure negotiation, ensuring aristocratic influence remains balanced with professional control. Halliday's theory (1992) reveals how language serves regulatory and interactional purposes, ensuring structured persuasion and polite refusal coexist within conversational refinement. Ultimately, this scene highlights how aristocratic discourse navigates entitlement, negotiation, and professional boundaries within structured linguistic interaction.

Datum 42

Context

This scene takes place after the first round of Will Mondrich's boxing match, where Simon Basset arrives later than expected. Will, having already suffered a loss in the initial round, expresses mild disappointment at Simon's lateness, implying that he had expected his support earlier. Simon responds with a casual remark, underestimating his absence by suggesting that Will did not need him there for encouragement. The scene highlights the social dynamic between an aristocrat and a working-class athlete, showing how noble figures navigate expectations of loyalty and camaraderie.

Dialog

Will Mondrich: *"I figured you'd have been here an hour ago."*

Simon Basset: *"Well, I would've been, but it's not as if you needed me here to wish you luck."*

(Episode 8, 00:16:48 – 00:17:00)

Analysis

The dialogue demonstrates linguistic features that reveal differing expectations surrounding noble engagement. Will's remark, *"I figured you'd*

have been here an hour ago," exemplifies prestige variety as an expectation mechanism, subtly reinforcing the notion that Simon's presence carries weight beyond personal friendship. According to Labov's theory of language variations (2018), speech patterns in aristocratic circles often shape social relationships, establishing unspoken obligations tied to status. Will's phrasing implies that Simon's absence disrupted expectations, positioning his attendance as more than a casual gesture but rather an integral part of the event's atmosphere. Simon's response, *"Well, I would've been, but it's not as if you needed me here to wish you luck,"* reflects prestige variety through deflection, maintaining noble composure while dismissing personal responsibility. Labov (2018) states that upper-class figures often employ structured language that preserves autonomy while subtly redirecting obligation. By minimizing his role in Will's match, Simon maintains aristocratic detachment, ensuring that his absence is not viewed as negligence but rather as inconsequential.

The register of their exchange corresponds to Joos's consultative style (1967), blending mild confrontation with structured politeness. Will's phrasing allows engagement while signaling expectation, ensuring that his remark remains indirect rather than accusatory. Joos (1967) defines consultative register as structured interaction that permits implied negotiation without disrupting hierarchical balance, and Will's speech aligns with this theory, ensuring that his disappointment is framed within noble conversational norms. Simon's reply, though dismissive, attends to casual

register, introducing informality to defuse tension. Joos (1967) notes that casual register emerges in interactions where individuals attempt to neutralize unspoken pressure through relaxed phrasing. Simon's wording allows him to sidestep obligation without challenging Will's underlying frustration, ensuring that aristocratic composure remains intact despite implied criticism.

From a functional perspective, Simon's response exhibits multiple overlapping communicative purposes based on Halliday's classification of language functions (1992). His phrase, "*Well, I would've been, but it's not as if you needed me here to wish you luck,*" fulfills the expressive function, signaling detachment while preserving aristocratic refinement. Halliday (1992) explains that expressive speech enables individuals to convey their emotional stance within structured interactions, ensuring that conversations remain controlled despite underlying tension. Additionally, Will's remark carries an interactional function, reinforcing social expectations within their friendship dynamic. Halliday (1992) states that interactional speech maintains interpersonal relationships by acknowledging shared expectations, even when indirect frustration is embedded within phrasing. His comment ensures that Simon is aware of the significance of his absence, reinforcing how noble presence shapes working-class confidence and social validation.

This scene illustrates how noble figures navigate expectations of loyalty within social relationships. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes prestige variety, showcasing how aristocratic speech both reinforces

obligation and preserves autonomy through structured phrasing. Joos's theory (1967) explains the shift between consultative and casual registers, ensuring expectation is acknowledged while tension remains diffused. Halliday's theory (1992) reveals how language serves expressive and interactional purposes, balancing detachment with implied social responsibility. In fact, this scene reflects how aristocratic discourse manages camaraderie, social obligation, and expectation through linguistic control.

Datum 43

Context

This scene takes place after Will Mondrich's boxing match, where Simon Basset confronts him upon realizing that Will was paid to lose by Lord Featherington. Simon offers financial assistance as an alternative, appealing to Will's sense of honor in an attempt to dissuade him from accepting manipulated outcomes. Will, however, defends his decision by arguing that his responsibility to his family supersedes abstract principles of honor. The exchange highlights tensions between aristocratic morality and working-class survival, emphasizing the ways in which different social standings shape views on integrity and necessity.

Dialog

Will Mondrich: *"It appears I could have used that luck of yours today, your grace."*

Simon Basset: *"Indeed. Though you still managed to put on quite a performance. If you need another investor or more money, Will. You could have come to me."*

Will Mondrich: *"I appreciate the offer, friend, but I do not need your charity."*

Simon Basset: *"What happen to your honor?"*

Will Mondrich: *"My honor? Tell me, your grace. What ever could be more honorable besides taking care of one's family? Besides doing what needs to be done?"*

Simon Basset: *"Is that what you hope to tell Alice? You truly believe she will come to understand your deceit?"*

Will Mondrich: *"Perhaps you should stop worrying about my marriage, and instead put your mind to your own."*

(Episode 8, 00:25:19 – 00:25:50)

Analysis

The dialogue illustrates distinct linguistic features that highlight contrasting ideologies between aristocratic values and working-class pragmatism. Simon's remark, *"What happened to your honor?"* exemplifies prestige variety as a moral assertion, reflecting the upper-class tendency to frame integrity as an absolute principle. According to Labov's theory of language variations (2018), noble discourse often employs rigid moral expectations within structured speech, reinforcing status through appeals to tradition. Simon's phrasing positions honor as an inherent duty rather than a flexible concept, ensuring that aristocratic values remain central to his argument. Will's response, *"My honor? Tell me, your grace. What ever could be more honorable besides taking care of one's family? Besides doing what needs to be done?"* subverts prestige variety by redefining honor through survival. Labov (2018) explains that linguistic variety functions as a marker of social ideology, and Will's phrasing reshapes aristocratic morality to fit practical necessity. His rhetorical construction mirrors aristocratic formalism, ensuring his statement retains linguistic polish despite challenging upper-class ideals.

The register of their exchange corresponds to Joos's consultative style (1967), allowing engagement while maintaining hierarchical decorum. Simon's phrasing preserves noble refinement, ensuring that his critique remains structured rather than overtly confrontational. Joos (1967) defines consultative register as language that enables polite negotiation while reinforcing structured expectations, and Simon's speech aligns with this, ensuring his appeal is presented as guidance rather than reprimand. Will's response transitions into formal register, ensuring his defense carries weight within noble discourse. His phrasing, "*Tell me, your grace,*" retains respectful address while subtly asserting control through rhetorical questioning. Joos (1967) notes that formal register in lower-class responses often serves to validate social standing within hierarchical conversations, ensuring that disagreement remains framed within expected linguistic composure.

From a functional perspective, Simon's appeal exhibits multiple overlapping communicative purposes based on Halliday's classification of language functions (1992). His phrase, "*Is that what you hope to tell Alice? You truly believe she will come to understand your deceit?*" fulfills the regulatory function, attempting to shape Will's perception of his actions by introducing social consequences. Halliday (1992) describes regulatory speech as language used to influence decisions by reinforcing societal norms, ensuring persuasion is embedded within structured discourse. Will's defense serves both representational and expressive functions. His remark, "*What*

ever could be more honorable besides taking care of one's family?" frames morality through necessity, fulfilling the representational function by redefining social values within his class context. Halliday (1992) explains that representational speech constructs alternative perspectives within discourse, and Will's statement challenges the rigid expectations placed on honor within noble ideology. His wording also fulfills an expressive function, signaling emotional justification while maintaining formal linguistic control.

This scene highlights tensions between aristocratic morality and working-class survival. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes prestige variety, demonstrating how noble figures frame honor as rigid tradition while working-class individuals adapt moral values to fit necessity. Joos's theory (1967) explains how consultative and formal registers balance confrontation within structured discourse, ensuring disagreement remains composed. Halliday's theory (1992) reveals how language serves regulatory, representational, and expressive purposes, shaping moral interpretation and personal justification through structured linguistic negotiation. Ultimately, the scene illustrates how aristocratic discourse enforces ideological expectations while working-class speech strategically reframes values to suit practical realities.

Datum 44

Context

This scene takes place in the Featherington household, where Lady Featherington and her daughters are trying on newly purchased dresses. Their ability to afford these gowns stems from Lord Featherington's recent gambling victory, highlighting the sudden shift in their financial situation. Genevieve Delacroix, who provided the dresses, subtly reminds them that their improved economic standing does not necessarily equate to full aristocratic acceptance. The exchange underscores how wealth in noble society does not immediately dissolve class distinctions and how clothing functions as both a symbol of status and a reminder of social positioning.

Dialog

Lady Featherington: *"Oh! Astonishing, Madame Delacroix."*

Genevieve Delacroix: *"Because you were able to pay in advance this time, and since I happened to have some fabrics no one else seemed to want. There are two other just like it, Lady Featherington."*

Prudence Featherington: *"Mine will have to be taken in, of course."*

Philipa Delacroix: *"Mine's perfect."*

Penelope Featherington: *"And mine is yellow."*

(Episode 8, 00:31:26 – 00:31:46)

Analysis

The dialogue reflects linguistic features that highlight financial mobility, aristocratic expectations, and lingering class distinctions. Lady Featherington's exclamation, *"Oh! Astonishing, Madame Delacroix,"* illustrates prestige variety as performative enthusiasm, reinforcing the noble

tendency to express excitement through exaggerated formal phrasing. According to Labov's theory of language variations (2018), aristocratic speech frequently employs elevated diction to assert status and reinforce social legitimacy. Lady Featherington's response signals delight, yet it also functions as an attempt to validate her new financial standing within noble expectations. Genevieve Delacroix's response, "*Because you were able to pay in advance this time, and since I happened to have some fabrics no one else seemed to want,*" subtly acknowledges the Featheringtons' improved financial circumstances while making it clear that their dresses are made from leftover materials. Her phrasing exemplifies prestige variety as a boundary-setting mechanism, ensuring aristocratic politeness while reinforcing the hierarchical reality. Labov (2018) explains that linguistic variation among social classes serves to both acknowledge status shifts and maintain structured interactions. Genevieve's sentence construction tactfully reminds Lady Featherington that economic mobility does not equate to full aristocratic integration.

The register of their exchange corresponds to Joos's consultative style (1967), blending professional refinement with aristocratic expectation. Genevieve's structured phrasing ensures that her commentary on payment remains tactful while subtly framing financial improvement as conditional within noble society. Joos (1967) categorizes consultative register as language used to manage status-aligned interactions without disrupting polite engagement, and Genevieve's speech reflects this balance. Prudence's

remark, "*Mine will have to be taken in, of course,*" and Philipa's statement, "*Mine's perfect,*" align with formal register, reinforcing aristocratic composure through structured self-assessment. Joos (1967) notes that formal register in noble discourse ensures that conversational structure remains polished, preserving decorum regardless of financial context. Their phrasing conveys entitlement, reinforcing the assumption that tailored adjustments or perfection should be expected. Penelope's statement, "*And mine is yellow,*" introduces a slight shift toward casual register, contrasting with the more structured enthusiasm of her sisters. Joos (1967) explains that casual register emerges when individuals move beyond rigid politeness into personal observation. Penelope's phrasing subtly suggests detachment, either from the excitement of her family or dissatisfaction with the constraints of their new status.

From a functional perspective, Genevieve's statement exhibits multiple overlapping communicative purposes based on Halliday's classification of language functions (1992). Her phrase, "*Because you were able to pay in advance this time,*" serves a representational function, shaping perception by reinforcing the Featheringtons' economic context. Halliday (1992) states that representational speech frames reality through structured acknowledgment, ensuring that financial transitions are addressed within professional conversation. Prudence and Philipa's statements serve an expressive function, reflecting individual satisfaction or expectation through structured noble discourse. Halliday (1992) highlights expressive speech as

a way of asserting individual stance while maintaining aristocratic refinement, ensuring personal assessment remains socially aligned. Penelope's remark carries a personal function, subtly revealing sentiment without disrupting noble composure. Halliday (1992) describes personal speech as a reflection of emotional perspective within structured interaction, and Penelope's restrained phrasing suggests unease or disengagement.

This scene highlights how language reinforces social perception despite financial shifts. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes prestige variety, illustrating how noble speech performs refinement while business-oriented discourse subtly maintains hierarchical acknowledgment. Joos's theory (1967) explains the shift between consultative, formal, and casual registers, ensuring structured composure while allowing moments of personal detachment. Halliday's concept (1992) reveals how language serves representational, expressive, and personal functions, shaping aristocratic expectations while reflecting individual sentiment. Overall, this scene illustrates how noble discourse influences perceptions of wealth, validates social status, and fosters enthusiasm through controlled linguistic interaction.

5. Language Use among The Merchant Class

Datum 45

Context

This scene takes place at the Bridgerton household, where Lord Barbrooke arrives expecting a private meeting with Daphne Bridgerton and her family to formalize his courtship. However, upon entering, he realizes

that numerous other suitors have also come to seek Daphne's hand, creating an atmosphere of unexpected competition. His shock at the situation is reflected in his exclamation and reference to his attire, emphasizing both his frustration and the contrast between his expectations and reality. The utterances highlights how aristocratic courtship follows structured traditions, yet individual assumptions can create moments of social discomfort.

Dialog

Lord Barbrooke: *"What is happening?"*

Lord Barbrooke: *"When you said you will be taking me to your family. I expected to be the only one present! I wore my satin knee breeches for the occasion."*

(Episode 2, 00:09:15 – 00:09:43)

Analysis

Lord Barbrooke's remarks exhibit linguistic features that reflect aristocratic expectations and social embarrassment. His exclamation, *"What is happening?"* exemplifies prestige variety as a reaction mechanism, where noble speech retains structured clarity despite heightened emotional response. According to Labov's theory of language variations (2018), aristocratic discourse prioritizes composed articulation even in moments of distress, ensuring that individuals maintain dignity within conversational refinement. His phrasing is short yet controlled, demonstrating surprise while adhering to noble speech conventions. His follow-up statement, *"I expected to be the only one present! I wore my satin knee breeches for the occasion,"* reflects prestige variety through entitlement, reinforcing the upper-class assumption that private courtship should follow personalized traditions rather than competitive arrangements. Labov (2018) highlights how noble

discourse often embeds social expectation within structured phrasing, ensuring that individuals reaffirm their status through language. By referencing his attire, Lord Barbrooke further emphasizes his belief that the event was meant to be a singular moment, illustrating how aristocratic figures link formality to self-perception.

The register of his speech corresponds to Joos's consultative style (1967), balancing structured delivery with an appeal for explanation. His phrasing seeks clarity, ensuring that his confusion does not undermine noble politeness. Joos (1967) defines consultative register as language that fosters engagement while preserving status-aligned composure, and Lord Barbrooke's structured complaint aligns with this statement, ensuring his frustration remains controlled. His reference to his knee breeches introduces formal register, reinforcing aristocratic self-presentation through meticulous detail. Joos (1967) explains that formal register often emerges in noble discourse when individuals emphasize tradition and etiquette, ensuring that composure remains intact even in moments of disappointment. His choice to highlight his clothing signifies aristocratic emphasis on appearance, subtly reinforcing his expectation that the occasion should have followed his assumptions.

From a functional perspective, Lord Barbrooke's remarks exhibit multiple overlapping communicative purposes based on Halliday's classification of language functions (1992). His question, "*What is happening?*" fulfills the representational function, constructing reality

through inquiry while maintaining structured speech conventions. Halliday (1992) states that representational language frames perception through direct yet composed expression, ensuring individuals preserve status within conversation. His statement regarding his attire serves an expressive function, subtly revealing frustration while ensuring noble refinement is maintained. Halliday (1992) highlights expressive speech as a means of conveying sentiment within structured interaction, and Lord Barbrooke's wording exemplifies this principle by balancing aristocratic decorum with visible disappointment. Additionally, his complaint serves a personal purpose, reinforcing his assumptions about courtship while signaling his individual frustration. Halliday (1992) explains that personal speech reflects an individual's perspective within structured discourse, ensuring that self-expression remains aligned with conversational expectations. His phrasing encapsulates his disappointment while maintaining aristocratic politeness.

This scene highlights how aristocratic language reinforces expectation and structured self-presentation. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes prestige variety, demonstrating how noble speech balances composed articulation and entitlement. Joos's theory (1967) explains the interplay between consultative and formal registers, ensuring structured disappointment remains refined. Halliday's concept (1992) reveals how language serves representational, expressive, and personal functions, shaping expectation and frustration within controlled discourse. Ultimately, this scene illustrates how aristocratic figures navigate surprise and

disappointment while preserving noble composure through structured linguistic control.

Datum 46

Context

This scene takes place in Genevieve Delacroix's boutique, where she is surprised by the sudden arrival of Siena Rosso, who has entered through the back entrance as instructed. Siena, an opera singer known for her notoriety in London's social circles, sarcastically acknowledges the secrecy of their interaction. The utterance highlights the contrast between Genevieve's surprise and Siena's casual approach, reflecting the tension between discretion and scandal within noble society.

Dialog

Genevieve Delacroix: *"Bloody hell, Si! You half scared me out of my wits!"*

Siena Rosso: *"What? I used the back entrance, as you asked. Heaven forbid someone discovery. You consort with the most notorious opera singer in all of London"*

(Episode 3, 00:10:23 – 00:10:34)

Analysis

Genevieve's exclamation, *"Bloody hell, Si! You half scared me out of my wits!"* exemplifies prestige variety as an expressive reaction, balancing informal intensity with aristocratic composure. According to Labov's theory of language variations (2018), noble figures and those in aristocratic circles maintain structured speech even in moments of shock. Genevieve's phrasing combines emotional emphasis with polished articulation, to ensure that her surprised remains intact despite Siena's sudden arrival. Siena's response,

"Heaven forbid someone discover you consort with the most notorious opera singer in all of London," reflects prestige variety as ironic self-awareness, emphasizing social reputation through aristocratic phrasing. Labov (2018) explains that upper-class discourse often embeds societal judgments within structured language, ensuring that status perception remains central to conversation. Siena's phrasing demonstrates both satire and reality, reinforcing her outsider position while acknowledging the expectations placed upon Genevieve's social discretion.

The language styles of their utterance correspond to Joos's consultative style (1967), balancing structured dialogue with subtle confrontation. Genevieve's speech maintains polite urgency, ensuring that her reaction, though exaggerated, aligns with aristocratic norms. Joos (1967) categorizes consultative register as language that facilitates status-preserving interaction while allowing expressive engagement, and Genevieve's response reflects this balance. Siena's remark changes toward casual register, incorporating humor and social critique into aristocratic speech. Joos (1967) explains that casual register emerges in conversations where individuals challenge societal norms through relaxed phrasing. Siena's remark ensures that the noble expectation of discretion is both acknowledged and lightly mocked, reinforcing her outsider status while maintaining structured refinement.

From a functional perspective, Siena's speech exhibits multiple overlapping communicative purposes based on Halliday's classification of

language functions (1992). Her phrase, "*Heaven forbid someone discover you consort with the most notorious opera singer in all of London*," fulfills the representational function, framing perception through structured irony. Halliday (1992) describes representational speech as language that constructs social narratives within discourse, and Siena's remark exemplifies this principle by reinforcing the tension between reputation and secrecy. Genevieve's reaction serves an expressive function, conveying surprise while preserving aristocratic refinement. Halliday (1992) highlights expressive speech as a mechanism for signaling emotion within structured interaction, ensuring conversational clarity despite heightened response. Her exclamation adheres to this principle, reinforcing noble speech conventions even in moments of startled interruption.

This scene reflects how aristocratic discourse navigates reputation, secrecy, and social irony. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes prestige variety, illustrating how noble speech preserves structured composure while embedding status perception within dialogue. Joos's theory (1967) explains the transition between consultative and casual registers, ensuring structured engagement while allowing moments of humor and critique. Halliday's theory (1992) reveals how language serves representational and expressive functions, shaping narrative framing while maintaining emotional clarity. Ultimately, this scene exemplifies how noble figures and social outsiders engage in controlled discourse while subtly challenging social expectations.

Datum 47

Context

This scene takes place in Genevieve Delacroix's workspace, where Siena Rosso admires an unfinished gown Genevieve is crafting. The dress is intended for Lady Cowper's daughter, though Genevieve dismisses the idea that it will improve her chances of securing a marriage offer. The exchange highlights aristocratic expectations regarding presentation and status, while Genevieve subtly offers Siena the opportunity to have a similar gown for an upcoming performance, illustrating how fine clothing serves different social functions depending on the wearer.

Dialog

Siena Rosso: *"This is beautiful work."*

Genevieve Delacroix: *"For Lady Cowper's girl. Not that it will help her get an offer. Not even my finest silks will compensate for that sneer. I could make you something out of the same fabric. Perhaps for your performance next month."*

(Episode 3, 00:10:55 – 00:11:10)

Analysis

Siena's remark, *"This is beautiful work,"* exemplifies prestige variety as admiration, reinforcing structured noble discourse even within informal interactions. According to Labov's theory of language variations (2018), aristocratic speech often maintains composed refinement even in casual conversation. Siena's choice of words reflects controlled appreciation, ensuring that her compliment remains elevated rather than overly expressive. Genevieve's response, *"Not that it will help her get an offer. Not even my finest silks will compensate for that sneer,"* reflects prestige variety as social

critique, reinforcing aristocratic expectations regarding beauty and marriageability. Labov (2018) highlights how noble speech patterns embed social status into structured conversation, ensuring that assessments of appearance and refinement remain central to discourse. By dismissing the impact of fine fabric on Cressida Cowper as a Lady Cowper's daughter's prospects, Genevieve subtly critiques how aristocratic standing is shaped by perception beyond material presentation.

The register of their exchange corresponds to Joos's consultative style (1967), balancing polite engagement with embedded commentary. Genevieve's speech maintains professional refinement while allowing subtle personal judgment, ensuring that her critique remains conversational rather than confrontational. Joos (1967) categorizes consultative register as language used in structured interactions that preserve composure while allowing layered meaning, and Genevieve's phrasing aligns with this principle. Genevieve's follow-up offer to Siena introduces formal register, ensuring that the suggestion remains structured rather than casual. Joos (1967) explains that formal register is commonly used in noble interactions where transactional discourse is subtly embedded within polite engagement. Her remark, "*I could make you something out of the same fabric,*" preserves aristocratic etiquette while signaling professional flexibility.

From a functional perspective, Genevieve's statement exhibits multiple overlapping communicative purposes based on Halliday's classification of language functions (1992). Her remark regarding Lady

Cowper's daughter's prospects serves a representational function, constructing societal expectations regarding courtship and perception. Halliday (1992) states that representational speech frames reality through structured articulation, ensuring that societal norms remain embedded within discourse. Her offer to Siena fulfills an instrumental function, suggesting action while maintaining noble etiquette. Halliday (1992) describes instrumental speech as language used to propose solutions or actions within structured conversation, ensuring practical negotiation remains aligned with social refinement. Her phrasing ensures that the suggestion is positioned as an opportunity rather than a direct commercial transaction.

This scene illustrates how aristocratic language balances admiration, critique, and transactional discourse. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes prestige variety, demonstrating how noble speech embeds structured social judgment within conversation. Joos's theory (1967) explains the shift between consultative and formal registers, ensuring polite engagement while reinforcing hierarchy. Halliday's theory (1992) reveals how language serves representational and instrumental functions, shaping perception while subtly introducing professional negotiation. Additionally, this scene reflects how noble figures and artisans engage in controlled discourse while navigating status and refinement.

Datum 48

Context

This scene takes place as Siena Rosso shares with Genevieve Delacroix about her recent heartbreak following Anthony Bridgerton's departure from her life. Rather than expressing sadness, Siena asserts her independence and acknowledges the realities of her social position. Genevieve responds with a pragmatic perspective, reinforcing the idea that they are not the same as the aristocratic debutantes, they must carve their own paths in society. This scene highlights themes of agency, class constraints, and self-reliance, reflecting how women outside the noble hierarchy navigate survival and ambition.

Dialog

Siena Rosso: *"I am no innocent debutante."*

Genevieve Delacroix: *"And more's your good fortune. Would you prefer to sit around simpering over your needlework or whatsoever it is these debutantes must do to pass the time? You and I make our own way in the world."*

Siena Rosso: *"That we do. Whis is why I shall find myself a wealthy, sensible gentleman to keep me in high fashion, one who will never break his word."*

(Episode 3, 00:11:13 – 00:11:38)

Analysis

Siena's declaration, *"I am no innocent debutante,"* exemplifies the variety of prestige as an identity assertion, reinforcing structured self-awareness within aristocratic discourse. According to Labov's theory of language variations (2018), noble speech patterns often maintain clarity and refinement, ensuring that identity statements align with societal expectations. Siena's phrasing positions herself outside the fragile, idealized world of debutantes, signaling self-sufficiency while distancing herself from

aristocratic innocence. Genevieve's response, "*And more's your good fortune. Would you prefer to sit around simpering over your needlework or whatsoever it is these debutantes must do to pass the time?*" reflects prestige variety as pragmatic contrast, reinforcing the divide between noble privilege and self-made survival. Labov (2018) explains that linguistic variety functions as a marker of social experience, ensuring that status distinctions remain embedded in dialogue. Genevieve's rhetorical question highlights the limitations of aristocratic women's lives, contrasting them with her and Siena's ability to control their destinies.

The register of their exchange corresponds to Joos's consultative style (1967), blending structured discourse with relational support. Genevieve's phrasing maintains conversational refinement while ensuring direct engagement, allowing her commentary to be both observational and affirming. Joos (1967) categorizes consultative register as language that facilitates layered conversation while preserving social etiquette, and Genevieve's statement reflects this balance. Siena's remark, "*Which is why I shall find myself a wealthy, sensible gentleman to keep me in high fashion, one who will never break his word,*" introduces formal register, ensuring that financial security is framed within structured self-determination rather than desperation. Joos (1967) notes that formal register often governs transactional speech in noble settings, ensuring that objectives remain refined even within non-aristocratic conversation. Siena's phrasing presents

her decision as both practical and aspirational, reinforcing control over her path despite emotional disappointment.

From a functional perspective, Genevieve's statement exhibits multiple overlapping communicative purposes based on Halliday's classification of language functions (1992). Her rhetorical contrast with debutantes fulfills a representational function, reinforcing societal structures through observation. Halliday (1992) states that representational speech frames reality within structured articulation, ensuring that class distinctions remain visible within discourse. Siena's statement fulfills both an expressive and instrumental function. Her remark about finding a wealthy gentleman conveys emotional resolve, ensuring that personal aspiration is clearly articulated while maintaining composure. Halliday (1992) highlights expressive speech as a mechanism for reinforcing individual intent within structured dialogue, ensuring that emotion is conveyed without overt vulnerability. Additionally, Siena's mention of securing financial stability carries an instrumental function, signaling action within refined discourse. Halliday (1992) describes instrumental speech as language used to present objectives within structured negotiation, ensuring that self-determination remains embedded in conversation.

This exchange reflects how aristocratic and working-class women navigate expectation, ambition, and personal agency. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes prestige variety, demonstrating how structured speech reinforces identity and societal contrast. Joos's theory (1967) explains the

transition between consultative and formal registers, ensuring conversational engagement while preserving refined self-presentation. Halliday's concept of language functions (1992) reveals how language serves representational, expressive, and instrumental functions, shaping observation while reinforcing intent and action. Ultimately, this scene highlights how noble and non-aristocratic figures engage in structured discourse while framing survival and aspiration through linguistic control.

Datum 49

Context

This scene takes place before Will Mondrich's boxing match, where he and his wife, Alice, engage in a deep conversation about their future. Alice envisions a life beyond London, where they can travel and perform boxing exhibitions throughout England. Will, however, expresses concern about the sustainability of such a life, questioning whether it would be a viable long-term plan. His response highlights the frustration of relying on aristocratic figures for financial stability, emphasizing the constraints placed on their independence due to class expectations.

Dialog

Alice Mondrich: *"Win this fight, and perhaps we leave this city. We can take our exhibitions all over England if we wish."*

Will Mondrich: *"To continue living fight-to-fight? We should planning for our future, Alice. I cannot fight forever. Our circumstance is solely dependent on how well I can pander and grovel to the likes of...them."*
(Episode 8, 00:14:57 – 00:15:17)

Analysis

Alice's statement, "*Win this fight, and perhaps we leave this city,*" reflects prestige variety as hopeful ambition, reinforcing structured speech while maintaining optimism. According to Labov's theory of language variations (2018), upper-class discourse maintains refined articulation even when discussing change and uncertainty. Alice's phrasing, though forward-thinking, retains composed expression, ensuring that her vision for their future is framed as an opportunity rather than desperation. Will's response, "*To continue living fight-to-fight? We should be planning for our future, Alice,*" contrasts prestige variety with pragmatic realism, positioning survival as a structured necessity rather than an aspirational pursuit. Labov (2018) explains that linguistic variation serves as a marker of social experience, ensuring that class distinctions remain embedded in speech. Will's phrasing reflects a working-class reality, where financial security depends on external validation rather than personal ambition. His reluctance highlights the challenge of escaping cyclical dependence on aristocratic figures.

The register of their exchange corresponds to Joos's consultative style (1967), balancing structured conversation with emotional honesty. Alice's speech maintains an engaging, hopeful tone, ensuring that her suggestion remains aspirational rather than confrontational. Joos (1967) categorizes consultative register as language that facilitates practical engagement while preserving emotional clarity, and Alice's remark reflects

this principle by reinforcing possibility without disregarding present reality. Will's phrasing transitions into formal register, particularly when he states, "*Our circumstance is solely dependent on how well I can pander and grovel to the likes of...them.*" Joos (1967) notes that formal register often emerges in moments of structured frustration, ensuring that speech remains composed even when expressing dissatisfaction. Will's choice to articulate his reliance on aristocrats through polished language ensures his criticism remains measured rather than impulsive, reinforcing both dignity and personal restraint.

From a functional perspective, Will's statement exhibits multiple overlapping communicative purposes based on Halliday's classification of language functions (1992). His remark about "*pandering and groveling*" serves a representational function, framing social dependency through structured expression. Halliday (1992) describes representational speech as a means of constructing reality within structured discourse, and Will's phrasing exemplifies this by reinforcing class constraints as an unavoidable truth. Alice's suggestion fulfills an instrumental function, presenting action-oriented speech within aspirational framing. Halliday (1992) defines instrumental speech as language used to propose solutions within structured discourse, and Alice's wording aligns with this, ensuring that her proposal remains actionable rather than abstract.

This exchange highlights how language reinforces economic dependence and structured ambition within aristocratic discourse. Labov's

theory (2018) contextualizes prestige variety, demonstrating how noble speech maintains optimism while working-class dialogue reinforces systemic reliance. Joos's theory (1967) explains the interplay between consultative and formal registers, ensuring that practicality and aspiration coexist within structured engagement. Halliday's concept (1992) reveals how language serves representational and instrumental functions, shaping perception while reinforcing structured action. Ultimately, this scene illustrates how noble and non-aristocratic figures engage in controlled discourse while navigating survival and personal determination.

Datum 50

Context

This scene takes place in the Mondrich household, where young Nicky Mondrich interacts with Simon Basset, who is staying at their home. Nicky innocently remarks on Simon's smell, which denied by Alice Mondrich to reprimand her son to not disturbing their guest. The exchange highlights the contrast between childhood honesty and adult social etiquette, showing how unfiltered speech can disrupt aristocratic composure while reinforcing familial warmth.

Dialog

Nicky Mondrich: "You smell bad."
Alice Mondrich: "Nicky! Stop pestering him."
 (Episode 5, 00:27:50 – 00:27:57)

Analysis

Nicky's remark, "*You smell bad*," exemplifies prestige variety as unfiltered speech, contrasting aristocratic refinement with childhood

directness. According to Labov's theory of language variations (2018), noble discourse typically prioritizes structured articulation to preserve composure and decorum. Nicky's statement breaks from this convention, illustrating how young children lack the linguistic conditioning that governs aristocratic interaction. His straightforward phrasing disregards the expectations of polite conversation, reinforcing childhood sincerity. Alice's response, "*Nicky! Stop pestering him,*" reflects prestige variety as corrective etiquette, reinforcing structured conversational norms. Labov (2018) explains that aristocratic discourse involves maintaining refined social interactions, ensuring that verbal expression aligns with status expectations. Alice's phrasing serves to reinstate polite engagement, signaling the importance of preserving noble decorum even within familial settings.

The register of their exchange corresponds to Joos's casual style (1967), balancing directness with affectionate discipline. Nicky's speech operates within unfiltered casual register, displaying uninhibited personal observation rather than structured refinement. Joos (1967) categorizes casual register as language used in informal interactions where hierarchy is secondary to personal expression. His remark contrasts with Alice's response, which transitions into consultative register, ensuring that structured correction remains embedded within affectionate guidance.

From a functional perspective, Nicky's speech exhibits a personal function, expressing individual perception without restraint. Halliday (1992) highlights personal speech as language used to convey sentiment and direct

observations within conversation, ensuring that speaker perspective remains central. His remark is a pure representation of personal experience, reinforcing childhood authenticity. Alice's reaction serves a regulatory function, subtly shaping conversational boundaries by emphasizing social expectations. Halliday (1992) describes regulatory speech as language used to manage interactions through structured intervention, ensuring that etiquette and refinement govern engagement. Her phrasing reintroduces social norms, reinforcing conversational structure within the household.

This utterance highlights the contrast between the honesty of childhood and the refinement of aristocratic conversation. Labov's theory (2018) contextualizes prestige variety, demonstrating how unfiltered speech challenges structured discourse while corrective etiquette preserves composure. Joos's theory (1967) explains the shift between casual and consultative registers, ensuring that uninhibited observation transitions into structured social guidance. Halliday's theory (1992) reveals how language serves personal and regulatory functions, shaping perception while reinforcing conversational etiquette. In the end, this scene highlights how familial interactions balance spontaneity and refinement within noble settings.

B. DISCUSSIONS

The present study reveals that the language styles and communicative functions in *Bridgerton* Season One reflect the intricate interplay between social stratification, interpersonal dynamics, and communicative intent. Utilizing Joos's (1967) stylistic

framework, the analysis indicates that formal and consultative styles are predominantly employed by characters from higher social ranks, whereas casual and intimate styles are more commonly used by characters of lower social standing. For instance, Lady Bridgerton and Queen Charlotte consistently adopt a formal tone to assert authority, while Penelope and Eloise use casual registers to convey familiarity and solidarity. These stylistic preferences serve to signal power relations and demonstrate how language is employed to either reinforce or challenge existing social hierarchies.

Labov's (2018) theory of language variation further supports these findings by emphasizing the influence of social class and identity on linguistic expression. Characters occupying privileged positions tend to exhibit phonological precision, extended syntactic structures, and a lexically rich vocabulary, aligning with Labov's observations on language stratification. For example, characters such as Simon and Daphne frequently utilize standard grammatical constructions, indicating access to elite education and social capital. In contrast, characters from less privileged backgrounds employ more informal and emotionally expressive language, reflecting how linguistic variation encodes both social boundaries and potential pathways for mobility.

Halliday's (1992) theory of language functions enriches the analysis by offering a multidimensional framework for understanding character dialogue. His classification of language functions into instrumental, regulatory, interactional, personal, heuristic, imaginative, and representational categories allows for a nuanced interpretation of character utterances. Daphne, for example, uses the

personal function when articulating inner conflict to Simon. Regulatory and instrumental functions are particularly evident in scenes involving directives or expressions of obligation, such as Queen Charlotte's commands. The interactional function emerges in conversations aimed at fostering alliances or negotiating relationships, especially among siblings or romantic partners.

The study also confirms that Halliday's functions manifest in distinct ways depending on the social context. The imaginative function is frequently observed in speculative or romantic conversations, as characters envision future relationships. Eloise's persistent questioning of societal expectations exemplifies the heuristic function, revealing a desire for critical understanding beyond superficial etiquette. Representational functions are employed when characters recount events or justify actions. These dimensions illustrate that language operates not only as a communicative tool but also as a means for identity construction and social navigation.

In comparison to previous studies, the current research extends the findings of Trioktaviani and Degaf (2023), who examined language styles and functions in online bedtime stories. Their research found a predominance of informal styles and expressive, directive, referential, and phatic functions used to engage child audiences. While both studies address stylistic variation and language function, the present study shifts focus to interactions among elite adults and foregrounds regulatory, heuristic, and representational functions that signify social regulation and identity formation. This contrast highlights how communicative demands vary across age groups, genres, and communicative purposes.

A further point of comparison can be drawn from Degaf (2014), who identified the presence of regulatory, personal, interactional, representational, and imaginative functions in caregiver–child communication, but did not observe the use of instrumental or heuristic functions. In contrast, the present study documents the occurrence of all seven functions outlined by Halliday (1992), often within a single dialogue. This suggests that fictional narratives situated in elite social contexts tend to exhibit more complex and multifunctional language use. These findings underscore the distinction between purpose-driven language use in developmental settings and the broader expressive range observed in dramatized social interactions.

While earlier research conducted by Sandika (2022), Maulani (2022), and Rosyda (2021) investigated stylistic levels in contemporary films through Joos’s theoretical lens, those studies did not explore the connection between language style and the negotiation of power or social function. The present study addresses this gap through theoretical triangulation. Similarly, prior studies on slang by Tursini (2022) and Pangestu (2019) contributed valuable lexical insights but lacked comprehensive structural or functional analysis. The current research presents a more integrative framework by combining sociolinguistic, stylistic, and functional perspectives.

Theoretically, this study contributes to the field of sociolinguistic discourse analysis by demonstrating how stylistic and functional approaches can be synthesized to investigate language variation in media texts. It also reinforces the continued applicability of Halliday’s framework beyond early childhood education and into narrative fiction. Methodologically, the use of triangulated analysis

provides a transferable model for examining multimodal texts, digital discourse, and classroom interactions where language serves multiple communicative objectives.

From a practical standpoint, the findings offer implications for language and media education by illustrating how fictional dialogue can reflect broader social values and power relations. These insights can be adapted into instructional materials that foster critical language awareness. For instance, students may be guided to analyze character speech patterns and reflect on how language signals privilege, resistance, or conformity. This pedagogical approach can cultivate analytical skills and enhance learners' understanding of the social implications embedded in linguistic choices.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter presents the conclusions and suggestions derived from the findings and discussion in the previous chapter. The conclusion outlines the results of the data analysis conducted in Chapter IV. Meanwhile, the suggestions offer recommendations for future studies that may be undertaken by other researchers.

A. CONCLUSIONS

This study examined the use of British language variations in *Bridgerton* Season 1 and found that the linguistic choices made by the characters function not merely as stylistic expressions but as deliberate markers of social identity, power, and hierarchy. Drawing upon Labov's theory of language variation (2018), the analysis confirmed that language reflects and reinforces social categories such as class, ethnicity, education, and occupation. Queen Charlotte's elevated diction signifies prestige and authority, while Will Mondrich's vernacular speech indicates affiliation with the working class. Joos's theory of language styles (1967) helped identify levels of formality, while Halliday's theory of language functions (1992) revealed how utterances serve not only to convey information but also to regulate behavior, express identity, and manage relationships.

The findings reveal that language variation in fictional narratives can reflect patterns found in real-life speech communities. Linguistic choices are shaped by roles, relationships, and social contexts within the storyline. Formal registers, often used in aristocratic interactions, function to reinforce status and cultural capital.

Conversely, informal and consultative styles emerge in familial or private exchanges, signaling solidarity or intimacy. The study shows that sociolinguistic theories are applicable in analyzing scripted dialogue, particularly in works that attempt to reconstruct social hierarchies and historical identities through language.

This research contributes to the field of media linguistics by illustrating how fictional representations employ language as a means of constructing social meaning. The analysis of fifty utterances across eight episodes supports the relevance of Labov's, Joos's, and Halliday's theoretical models in understanding how language operates within media texts. Language in *Bridgerton* serves as a cultural resource that encodes values, asserts dominance, and communicates group belonging. Through this interdisciplinary lens, the study demonstrates how fictional dialogue can reflect and shape perceptions of social order in both imagined and actual societies.

B. SUGGESTIONS

This study acknowledges several limitations, particularly in its theoretical choices and methodological scope. The use of Labov's theory of language variation emphasizes social class as a primary factor influencing linguistic form, yet it may overlook other intersecting elements such as gender, ethnicity, or individual identity. Joos's classification of language styles into fixed categories tends to simplify the complex and overlapping nature of speech styles in fictional narratives. Similarly, Halliday's seven functions of language, although comprehensive within educational and developmental contexts, may not fully capture the layered and purposeful language use in scripted dialogue. Moreover, this study focuses solely on *Bridgerton*

Season One and does not include audience interpretation or broader societal reflections, which limits the generalizability of the findings.

From a methodological perspective, the post positivist paradigm provides a balance between empirical observation and interpretive depth, yet it still rests on certain assumptions of neutrality and structured analysis that may not account for the symbolic and performative aspects of language in fictional media. The quasi-qualitative approach offers both descriptive interpretation and quantification of data, but it relies heavily on dialogue transcripts and a narrow selection of characters. This may reduce the ability to uncover less frequent but socially meaningful language patterns. Furthermore, the absence of triangulation with audience responses or perspectives from media creators restricts the scope of analysis to surface-level interpretation.

To improve future studies, researchers are encouraged to adopt alternative theoretical approaches that place greater emphasis on ideology, identity, and social critique. Frameworks such as critical discourse analysis or sociocultural linguistics may offer richer insights into how language constructs and negotiates power relations within fictional texts. Including multimodal features such as gesture, facial expression, and visual symbolism would enhance the interpretation of meaning, particularly in audiovisual narratives. Comparative analysis between fictional language and actual spoken discourse, or among various media genres, can also reveal how language use adjusts according to communicative goals and audience expectations.

Finally, expanding research to include audience reception and production-side perspectives can lead to a more comprehensive understanding of how language is both created and received in media texts. Investigating viewer interpretations and collecting insights from scriptwriters, directors, or actors may clarify the intentions behind linguistic choices. Additionally, incorporating data from digital platforms such as Twitter, YouTube, or TikTok could illustrate how contemporary users engage with and reinterpret media language in everyday contexts. Interdisciplinary collaboration across linguistics, media studies, and cultural research is essential for advancing knowledge about the ways language in fiction reflects and influences broader social realities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ainurisanti, R. D. (2023). *Women's Language Features in Jo March's Dialogues from Little Women Movie*. *JoLLA: Journal of Language, Literature, and Arts*, 3(10), 1462-1473. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um064v3i102023p1462-1473>
- Alifa, A. R., & Degaf, A. (2024). *Multilingual communication in K-pop: A translanguaging exploration of WayV's YouTube content*. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.30743/ll.v8i1.9191>
- Amalia, N. I., Indah, R. N., & Bahtiar, J. Y. (2023). *Representation of power through politeness strategies in Bridgerton season 1 movie*. *Elsya Journal*, 5(3), 385-397. <https://doi.org/10.31849>
- Annur, C.M. (2021). *Jumlah Pelanggan Netflix Sebanyak 213,56 Juta Orang Pada Kuartal III 2021*. Databoks. <https://databoks.katadata.co.id/media/statistik/26cd9cf9dd28a6d/jumlah-pelanggan-netflix-sebanyak-21356-juta-orang-pada-kuartal-iii-2021>
- Brown, C. (2021). *British English vs. American English*. Thought Co. <https://www.thoughtco.com/british-english-bre-1689039>
- Bungin, B. (2022). *Post-Qualitative Social Research Methods. Kuantitatif-Kualitatif Mixed Methods*. Jakarta: Kencana Published.
- Degaf, A. (2014). *Language functions used by the caretakers of autistic children in Miracle Run*. *Journal of English Language Teaching and English Linguistics*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.31316/eltics.v1i1.442>
- Direktorat Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan. (2024). *Panduan Penggunaan: Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) Pada Pembelajaran di Perguruan Tinggi*. Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Drobot, I.-A. (2022). *Multilingualism and Awareness of Cultural Differences in Communication*. IntechOpen.
- Ejjebli, S. (2024). *Unlocking the Power of Language: Navigating Linguistic Diversity in Cross-Cultural Research*. *Studies in Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis*, 5(1), 46–62. <https://doi.org/10.48185/spda.v5i1.1020>
- Ferguson, C. (2017). *Language, Science and Popular Fiction in the Victorian Fin-de-Siècle: The Brutal Tongue (1st ed.)*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315250861>
- Gregory, M., & Carroll, S. (2018). *Language and Situation: Language Varieties and Their Social Contexts*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429436185>

- Halliday, M. A. K. (1992). *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd.
- Haryadi, R. N. (2022). *The Effect of Vocabulary Mastery and Learning Motivation towards Description Writing Ability*. JEdu: Journal of English Education, 2(1), 88-94.
- Hymes, D. (2020). *The Scope of Sociolinguistics*. International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 2020(263), 67-76. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2020-2084>
- Ilmi, A. B. I., & Degaf, A. (2024). *Cross-cultural insights into phatic communication: Indonesian and Australian student interactions*. Deskripsi Bahasa, 7(2), 150–168. <https://doi.org/10.22146/db.9966>
- King, H. (2020). *Loose Lips And Tongue Tips: The Central Role of The /r/-typical Labial Gesture In Anglo-English*. Elsevier: Journal of Phonetics, Vol. 80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2020.100978>
- Klenke, K. (2016). *Philosophical foundations: Qualitative research as paradigm*. In Qualitative research in the study of leadership (pp. 3-29). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78560-651-920152002>
- Korneeva, A., Kosacheva, T., & Parpura, O. (2019). *Functions of language in the social context*. In SHS Web of Conferences (Vol. 69, p. 00064). EDP Sciences. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20196900064>
- Joos, M. (1967). *The five clocks*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Labov, W. (2018). *Peran Avant Garde Dalam Difusi Linguistik*. Variasi dan Perubahan Bahasa , 30 (1), 1–21. doi:10.1017/S0954394518000042
- Makrup, M. (2025). *Coding ChatGPT: Selamat Tinggal NVIVO*. Presented at Social Research Intership in The Perspective of a Qualitative Approach, Merdeka University, 11 January 2025.
- Mamentu, R. A., Karamoy, O. H., & Karouw, S. M. (2022). *Variasi bahasa berdasarkan gender di perumahan Watutumou Permai*. Jurnal Elektronik Fakultas Sastra Universitas Sam Ratulangi, <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/jefs/article/view/40745>
- Markowitz, D. M., & Griffin, D. J. (2020). *When context matters: How false, truthful, and genre-related communication styles are revealed in language*. Psychology, Crime & Law, 26(3), 287-310.
- Maulani, M. (2022). *An Analysis of Language Style Found in “Enola Holmes” Movie*. (Doctoral dissertation, UIN Raden Intan Lampung). <https://repository.radenintan.ac.id/22096/>

- Merisabel, D., Arifin, M. B., & Valiantien, N. M. (2020). *The Study of Slang Utterances in Brick Movie*. Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Budaya, 4(2), 238-249.
- Omodan, B. I. (2024). *Research paradigms and their methodological alignment in social sciences: A practical guide for researchers*. Taylor & Francis.
- Pakpahan, A. F., Prasetio, A., Negara, E. S. (2021). *Metodologi Penelitian Ilmiah*. Medan: Yayasan Kita Menulis.
- Pangestu, M. (2019). *The Reasons of The Main Character in Using Slang Words in Deadpool 2 Movie Directed by David Leitch*. Wanastra: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra, 11(1), 53-60.
<https://ejournal.bsi.ac.id/ejurnal/index.php/wanastra/article/view/4963>
- Pratiwi, H., & Priyana, J. (2022). *Exploring student engagement in online learning*. Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, 28(2), 66.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.17977/um048v28i2p66-82>
- Priska, N. P. D., Candra, K. D. P., & Utami, N. M. V. (2020). *The Types of Women Language Features Found in The Fault in Our Stars Movie*. Lingual: Journal of Language and Culture, 9(1), 27-33.
- Putri, A. E., Putra, N. A. J. (2024). *Language Variation: An Analysis of Language Varieties Used by EFL Students on Social Media Context*. Getsempena English Education Journal, 11(1), 51-61.
<https://doi.org/10.46244/geej.v11i1.2758>
- Qutratu'ain, D., Yuliano, S., Ersu, M., & Degaf, A. (2024). *Sociolinguistic analysis of code mixing and code switching in Nessie Judge and Cinta Laura's "Glitch in the Matrix" YouTube video*. Langua: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Education, 7(2), 69–82.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13221474>
- Rahardjo, M. (2017). *Mengenal Ragam Studi Teks: Dari Content Analysis Hingga Pos-modernisme*.
- Rahardjo, M. (2018). *Studi Teks Dalam Penelitian Kualitatif*.
- Rahardjo, M. (2020). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif untuk ilmu-ilmu sosial dan humaniora*. Malang: Republik Media.
- Rahardjo, M. (2023) *What is Quasi-qualitative?*. Delivered in the course Research Methodology, English Literature / Humanities, Odd Semester. (Unpublished)
- Rahardjo, M. (2024). *Tanya Jawab Metodologi Penelitian Sosial Kualitatif*. Yayasan Giri Prapanca Loka.

- Rahardjo, M. (2025). *Social Research Methodology: Paradigms, Approaches, Methods and Techniques*. Presented at Social Research Intership in The Perspective of a Qualitative Approach, Merdeka University, 11 January 2025.
- Ramdhani, M. I., Amalia, S., & Sari, Y. P. (2020). *Language Style in "What A Girl Wants" Movie*. IJER (Indonesian Journal of Educational Research), 5(2), 75-79. <https://doi.org/10.30631/ijer.v5i2.159>
- Rizki, S. N. A., EF, A. H., & Fauzi, E. M. (2022). *Analysis of Women's Language Features in the Movie Cruella (2021)*. Madah: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra, 13(2), 181-194.
- Rofiki, I., Radjak, D. S., & Rahardjo, M. (2024). *Pelatihan Penulisan dan Publikasi Artikel Penelitian Tindakan Kelas di Jurnal bagi Cendekiawan Pendidikan*. MITRA: Jurnal Pemberdayaan Masyarakat, 8(2), 113-128.
- Rosyda, R. W. (2021). *An Analysis of Language Style Used by The Main Character in "Wonder" Movie* (Doctoral dissertation, IAIN Ponorogo).
- Salman, M., Ahmad, S., & Arshad, K. (2023). *Language, Society and Gender: A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Linguistic Variation in the Language of Men and Women in the Movie North Country*. Journal of Social Sciences Review, 3(2), 403-416.
- Sandika, G. (2022). *The Analysis of Language Style in " Fifty Shades Of Grey" Film* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas 17 Agustus Surabaya).ra
- Sharma, D., Levon, E., & Ye, Y. (2022). *50 years of British accent bias: Stability and lifespan change in attitudes to accents*. English World-Wide, 43(2), 135-166. <https://www.jbe-platform.com/content/journals/15699730/43/2>
- Sharma, R. A. (2016). *The Netflix effect: impacts of the streaming model on television storytelling*. Wesleyan University.
- Situmorang, R. K., & Herman, H. (2021). *An analysis of Slang Language Styles Used in Charlie's Angels Movie*. Journal of English Educational Study (JEES), 4(1), 21-29. <https://jurnal.stkippersada.ac.id/jurnal/index.php/JEES/article/view/820>
- Subakir, F., Mubarak, M., Rahma, I. (2022). *Hakikat Bahasa Bagi Anak Usia Dini dan Relevansinya Pada Peradaban*. Al-Asasiyya: Journal Basic of Education, 7 (1): 58-67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24269/ajbe.v7i1.6920>
- Sugiyono, S. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R & D)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sun, Z., Zemel, R., & Xu, Y. (2019). *Slang Generation as Categorization*. CogSci, 2898–2904.

- Trioktaviani, S., & Degaf, A. (2023). *Exploring language styles in online bedtime stories for children: A sociolinguistic analysis*. *Pioneer: Journal of Language and Literature*, 15(2), 371–381. <https://doi.org/10.36841/pioneer.v15i2.3175>
- Tursini, U., & Fauziah, P. I. (2022). *Slang Words on Rampage Movie*. *Rhizome: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Humaniora*, 2(1), 1-9.
- Vusyk, H., Kuzmenko, T., Dekalo, O., Kruhlenko, L., & Ievliev, O. (2023). *Sociolinguistic Aspects of Verbal Interaction: Exploring Language Communities and Speech Practices*. *Conhecimento & Diversidade*, 15(40), 401-416. <https://doi.org/10.18316/rcd.v15i40.11247>
- Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2015). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics: Seventh Edition*. Wiley Blackwell
- Wijana, L. D. P. (2020). *Pengantar Sociolinguistik*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Zahirah, D. N., Navtafilofa, S. A., Afandi, R. R., & Degaf, A. (2024, July 25). *Exploring women's language styles in Instagram captions during the Palestine-Israel conflict*. *LITERASI: Jurnal Ilmiah Kajian Ilmu Humaniora*, 3(1), 1–15.

CURRICULUM VITAE



Tazkia Zahra Bukhori was born in Malang on March 9, 2003. She graduated from MAN 1 Kota Malang in 2021. During her study at the Senior High School, she actively participated in Castermansa as the chief. She also joined the research community and won several competitions, such as the second winner in the Indonesia International Applied Science Project Olympiad (I2ASPO) in 2020. She started her higher education in 2021 at the Department of English Literature, UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang and finished in 2025. During her study at the University, she joined English Letter Student Association as a coordinator of the Department of Talent Development. In 2023, she written a book chapter titled “*PKPBA dari Masa ke Masa*” in the book “*Selayang Pandang PKPBA*” published by Galiung Publisher. She aslo served as a teacher of English senior speaking class at English Confident, Kediri .