

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED THEORY

This chapter presents the result of the writer reviewing some theories related to the topic of research that is conversational implicatures.

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics deals with context or encyclopedic knowledge. Context can help readers/ listeners to determine the meaning of what is said Grundy (2000:213). Understanding utterances, one is required to understand the context within which the communication takes place. One needs to know who the addresses are, the relationship between addressers and addressees, and when/ where the communication takes place. For the example :

“What time is it ?”

Semantically, the question merely means asking about time. Pragmatically, on the other hand, it might mean either “you are too late or you are too early”, depends on who addressers are, what relationship they have, and when/ where the communication takes place. That utterance might mean “you are too late” when the question is raised to the teacher/ lecturer to his/her student that are coming to the class 5 minutes before the class ends. On another's case, the same question might mean “you are too early” when the question is raised to the teacher/ lecturer to his/her student that are coming to his/her house at 5 o'clock in the morning.

2.2 Implicature

According to Yule (1983:6), implicature is a term which is used to describe something that is conveyed beyond the semantic meaning of the words in a conversation, something that adds an extra level of meaning. implicatures can be divided into two kinds, conventional implicatures and conversational implicatures.

Conventional implicatures are words that can carry an implicature within a sentence. Four words that function as implicatures on the sentence level are *but*, *even*, *therefore*, and *yet* (Thomas 1995:57). Thomas (1995:57) explains that in the utterance “*she was cursed with a stammer, unmarried but far from stupid*” but has the function to convey the opposite of the expectation which is to say that unmarried people are usually stupid.

A conversational implicature, on the other hand, is when an utterance in a conversation has more meaning than the words uttered. Thomas (1995:58) provided the example of an ambulance man who has someone vomit in his lap and utters “*Great, that’s really great! That’s made my Christmas*”. Here something other than the words uttered is being implied; there is an additional set of meaning, the man is actually expressing that he does not enjoy getting vomit all over his lap.

2.3 Conversational Implicature

People exchange meaning and their intention in their communication. They express their ideas and feeling. They do this to get the information from their surroundings. They need communication to interact with other people in their social life. They put in another word, they do conversational interaction. In their

conversational interaction, they provide meaning, explicitly or implicitly. Expressing meaning explicitly means that the actual conversation is stated. While expressing meaning implicitly means that there are more hidden meaning in that conversation. In this case, the conversation which carries meaning more than what is stated in the speaker's utterance. It is what is called by implicature (Saragi, 2011).

Conversational implicature (CI) is a type of indirect communication, first described by the English language philosopher Herbert Paul Grice. He proposes that in a normal conversation, speakers and listeners share a cooperative principle (Grice, p.19). When a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different from the literal meaning of form. The speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning.

Conversational implicature refers to the implications which can be deduced from the form of an utterance, on the basis of certain cooperative principles which govern the efficiency and normal acceptability of conversations, as when the sentence "there's some chalks on the floor" is taken to mean you ought to pick it up. Another example of conversation as follows:

A : Did the minister attend the meeting and sign the agreement ?

B : The minister attended the meeting.

Yule (2004) mentioned that we can represent the structure of what was said, with b (=attend the meeting) and c(=sign the agreement). Using the symbol +> for an implicature, we can also represent the additionally conveyed meaning.

A : b and c ?

B : b (+> not c)

The discussion of implicature is in Pragmatics study. The conversational implicature is the single most important ideas in Pragmatics (Levinson, 1983:97). It is the implication or proposition in conversation which appears because of violating the conversational principle in which the speaker's intention is expressed differently in the speaker's actual utterance (Grice, 1975:43).

Conversational implicatures triggered by “certain general features of discourse” rather than by the conventional meaning of a specific word (Grice, 1975). He also stated some features as follow: (1) linguistic exchanges (conversation) are governed by cooperative principle, in the detailed context of Grice’s maxims and its sub-maxims, (2) when the participants of conversation is not following the cooperative principle, then the hearer will assume that the speaker seems contrary to appearances, the principle have to observe deeply.

2.4 Types of Conversational Implicature

2.4.1 Generalized Conversational Implicature

Generalized Conversational Implicature is type in which the interlocutors do not require special knowledge to know the meaning of a conversation because the context used in this type is a general conversation that makes an interlocutor directly understand the meaning of the conversation (Grice, 1975 cited in Saragi, 2011). As an example of generalized conversational implicature, Grice suggests the use of a/an X,

which carries the implicature that X is only remotely related in a certain way to some person indicated by the context. When someone says “John is meeting a woman this evening”, he certainly means that is, conversationally implicates “The woman John is meeting this evening is not his mother, his sister or his wife”.

Another linguist, Peccei (1999. p.38) in his book entitled *Pragmatics Language Workbooks* distinct generalized implicature to be drawn with very little “inside” knowledge. As the example, the writer presents a conversation adopted from Craston:

A : Did the children’s summer camp go well ?

B : Some of them got the stomach flu.

The conversation above can be interpreted or implicated +> “not all the children got stomach flu” it is usually called as scalar implicature. So that, it can be concluding that the criterions of generalized conversational implicature are two signs such as, using word “some” (in the first example) to implicate not all called scalar implicature and the second is the use of articles a/an X which implicates not speaker’s X as shown in example 2.

Another example of generalized conversational implicature adopted from Grice (1975) can be seen below:

“Fred thinks there is a meeting tonight”.

+> Fred doesn’t know for sure that there is a meeting tonight.

“Marry has 3 children”.

+> Marry has no more than 3 children.

From the example above, the researcher sum up that generalised conversational implicature is one which does not depend on particular features of the context but, it is typically associated with the proposition expected.

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

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

Almost, most, some, few

Always, often, sometimes

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

Look at the following table 1:

Table 1

Horn's Scale

(and,or)	(necessarily p, p, possibly)
(n, ... 5, 4, 3, z, r)	(certain that p, probable that, possible that p)
(excellent, good)	(cold, cool)
(hot, warm)	(must, should, may)
None, not all	(love, like)
(succeed in/ ing, try to V, want to V>)	

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

a) Some of the boys are come

Scalar implicates +> Not all of boys are come.

b) Sometimes George had breakfast with noodle

Scalar implicates +> George not always breakfast with noodle.

c) A : Are you Greek ?

B : I can speak some Greek

Scalar implicates +> I am not Greek.

When no special knowledge is required in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning, it is called a generalized conversational implicatures (Yule, p.41).

One common example in English involves any phrase with an indefinite article of the type “a/a, X”, such as “a garden” and “a child”. These phrase are typically interpreted according to the generalized conversational implicature that: an X \rightarrow not speaker’s X.

2.4.2 Particularized Conversational Implicature

Particularized conversational implicature is a type in which the interlocutors indirectly require more assistance to understand the meaning of a conversation because the context used in this type is not general in nature. Some assumed knowledge which is required in very specific context during conversation is called particularized conversational implicature. As an illustration, consider the example where Lara’s response does not appear on the surface to adhere to relevance. It is simply relevant answer would be “yes” or “no”.

Carol : Are you coming to the party tonight ?

Lara : I’ve got an exam tomorrow.

(Taken from Yule, 2006, p.131)

In order to make Lara’s response relevant, Carol has to draw on assumed knowledge that Lara will be spending that evening with his parents, consequently, he is no at the party.

Another example:

A : Will Sally be at the meeting this afternoon ?

B : Her car broke down.

+> Sally won't be at the meeting.

A 'flouting' (speaker is flagrantly violating a rule).

As in example above, the proposition Sally's car broke down would ordinarily not convey anything about Sally going to a meeting, so the implicature, in this case, depends on the context as well as the utterance itself.

Based on the description above, the researcher is capable of summing up that the criterion of particularized conversational implicature is conversational implicature that its meaning is out part of the utterance so that hearer which only can be work out or interpreted while drawing totally on the specific context of the utterance. Implicature and its types are able to use by speakers in order to create hidden context in some utterances of any kind of situations and conditions.

According to Levinson (1992:126), this implicature focuses on violation of maxims. If the speaker violates these maxims intentionally, the speaker must observe the cooperative principles on a deeper level or the hearer cannot understand the speaker's intentions. It means that particularized conversational implicature is an implicature where some assumed knowledge is required in very specific contexts during a conversation.

Let us imagine this scene in which a husband and wife are reading in the kitchen while their dinner is cooked:

Wife : Do you want to test the potatoes ?

Husband : Can I just finish this sentence ?

Wife : Of course.

The question is not met with something that looks like an answer. Here the second question is presumably intended to mean that the husband will check the potatoes once he has finished his sentence. It implies the positive answer to the question.

The conclusion of both generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature is that, if a speaker utters a sentence with implicit meaning and the hearers can interpret it well it means that the utterance is generalized conversational implicature. Conversely, if a speaker utters a sentence with implicit meaning and the hearers cannot interpret it well it means that the utterance is particularized conversational implicature. Levinson (1995:92) has clarified clearly that some conversational implicatures seem context-bound, while others have a very general currency, a single utterance-form might suggest fundamentally different propositions (PCIs) in two different contexts, while at the same time implicating something else (a GCI) in both these contexts. People have their own purpose in uttering a sentence. Moreover, a sentence with intended meaning but do not show by the speakers. In this case, the purpose of some intended meaning of speaker utterances will be explained as functions of implicature in the following point.

In Gerald Gadsden's book entitled *Pragmatics Implicative, Presupposition, and Logical Form*, particularized conversational implicature

is the one subclass of kind of Grice's conversational implicature. The particularized conversational implicature have been calculated with special knowledge of any particular context. However, most of the time our conversations take place in very specific context in which locally recognized inferences is assumed, particularized conversational implicature arise because of some special factor inherent in the context of utterance and are not normally carried by the sentence used.

2.5 Characteristics of Conversational Implicature

According to Grice (in Taishan, 2016:3) states that conversational implicature had five characteristics:

1. Cancellability

Conversational implicatures are cancelable or defeasible if we add some other premises to the original ones.

For example :

A: Do you want some coffee?

B: Coffee would keep me awake.

Here it seems that B does not want to have a cup of coffee because coffee will keep him awake. But if B adds this sentence:

A: Do you want some coffee?

B: Coffee would keep me awake. And I want to stay awake.

Then, B's meaning changes; we can infer that he is willing to have a cup of coffee.

2. Non-detachability

The conversational implicature is attached to the semantic content of what is said, not to the linguistic form used. Therefore it is possible to use a synonym and keep the implicature intact. In other words, the implicature will not be detached, separated from the utterance as a whole, even though the specific words may be changed.

For example :

A: What did you think of the lecture?

B: Well, I thought the lecture hall was big.

B implies that he is not quite interested in the lecture. If B replaces “thought” with “believe, should say or reckoned, etc.”, “big” with “large, great, etc.”, the implicature of the sentence remains the same.

3. Calculability

The conversational implicature of an utterance is different from its literal meaning. There is no direct link between the two. So if it is to succeed as the speaker intends to, there must be ways for the hearer to work it out.

4. Non-conventionality

Conversational implicature is an extra meaning, not inherent in the words used. One cannot find conversational implicatures listed in the dictionary. To work out the conversational implicature of an utterance,

one needs to know its conventional meaning and the context in which it is used. In other words, a conversational implicature is the adding up of the conventional meaning and the context. The implicature will also change when the context changes.

For example :

A young man invited a lady to dinner and escorted her back home after dinner and said:

Man: Would you like to invite me up for a coffee?

Woman: Oh, I'm afraid the place is in a terrible mess.

Of course, the man does not just want the lady to invite him a cup of coffee. The lady understands it. On the other hand, the lady's response does not lie in declaring the house is in a mess. Obviously, her answer is a polite refuse. This example indicates that conversational implicature should be decided according to the context.

5. Indeterminacy

An expression with a single meaning can give rise to different implicatures on different occasions, and indeed on any one occasion the set of associated implicatures may not be exactly determinable.

For example :

John is a machine. This could convey that John is cold, or efficient, or never stops working, or puffs and blows, or has little in the way of grey matter, or indeed any and all of these.

2.6 Cooperative Principle

The cooperative principle: Make your contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. (Yule, p.37). Cooperative principle (abbreviated: CP) consist of four Pragmatic sub-principles, or ‘maxims’, to wit:

The maxim of quantity:

1. Make your contribution as informative as required;
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than required.

The maxim of quality:

1. Do not say what you believe to be false;
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

The maxim of relation:

1. Make your contribution relevant.

The maxim of manner:

Be perspicuous, and specifically:

1. Avoid obscurity;
2. Avoid ambiguity;
3. Be brief;
4. Be orderly.

The cooperative principle and its component maxims ensure that in an exchange of information is provided and that the interaction is conducted in a truthful, relevant, and perspicuous manner (Yang, 2012:25).

2.7 Violating Maxims

Violating the maxim of cooperative principle means that speaker seems not fail to fulfill the maxim. According to Grice (in Thomas, 1995:72), defined as the term “violation” very specifically as the unostentatious non-observance of a maxim. And according to Grice (1975:49), if a speaker violates a maxim, ‘s/he will be liable to mislead’. And also according to Thomas (1995:74), ‘violating is the exact opposite of flouting a maxim’ where a speaker may say something true in order to imply an untruth. It is different from flouting maxim, where a speaker blatantly fails a maxim at the level of what is said, however it implies something which is true. For the example :

A : What time is it ?

B : Look! The second class is begin.

From that conversation, there is no clear connection between A’s question with B’s answer. “*Look! The second class is begin*” as the response of A’s question has violated the maxim of relation since B seems not directly answer A’s question. In this case, both of them are classmates in a same university and they already know about their schedule of their class. Hence, the response has an implicature: when the second class is begin means that at that time is around 8.40 a.m.

2.8 Flouting Maxim

Another situation of non-observing maxims is when speaker flouts the maxim deliberately. Grice (1975:49) explained that this condition happens when a speaker deliberately fails to fulfill the maxim. According to Thomas (1995:65), ‘a

flouts occurs when a speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim at the level of what is said with the deliberate intention of generating an implicature’.

2.8.1 Flouting the Maxim of Quantity

Flouting the quantity means that a speaker fails to fulfill the maxim of quantity deliberately. It happens whether the speaker provides information either more or less than is required. Look at the example below:

Keenan : Who is the guest ?

Kylie : Mr. Vijay, **a lecturer from Latin. We just met him in the park.**

In this conversation, the required information is just the name of the guest. But, Kylie gives more information. She makes her contribution more than is required. In this occasion, she tries to implicate that ‘the guest is not a stranger’. They already met the guest before.

2.8.2 Flouting the Maxim of Quality

Flouting the maxim of quality means that speakers do not say something that represent what they actually think. The speaker does not observe the maxim of quality that is a maxim which requires the speaker to make a contribution that is true, i.e. avoiding what is believed to be false and not saying that for which the speaker lacks adequate evidence. The example is :

“Marry is so beautiful. **She is like an angel**”

This utterance means that there is a girl whom extremely beautiful and very kind. Hence, to describe the prettiness and the kindness of the girl, the speaker refers her to an angel. The strategy used in this utterance is metaphor, the way of speaking that referring a person to something which has the similiar characteristics (Andresen, 2013:8).

2.8.3 Flouting the Maxim of Relation

Flouting the maxim of relation is appear when the speaker deliberately say something which is not relevant to topic being discussed, it means that they have flouted the maxim of relation. Nevertheless, being irrelevant does not only for speakers do not want to be relevant during the communication. Furthermore, they are being irrelevant for the reasons that they want to say implicitly or hide something to the addressee. Look at the conversation below :

A : What time is it ?

B : Look! The second class is begin.

Fom that conversation, there is no clear connection between A's question with B's answer. "*Look! The second class is begin*" as the response of A's question has violated the maxim of relation since B seems not directly answer A's question. In this case, both of them are classmates in a same university and they already know about their schedule of their class. Hence, the response has an implicature: when the second class is begin means that at that time is around 8.40 a.m.

2.8.4 Flouting the Maxim of Manner

Flouting maxim of manner is when speakers does not speak perspicuously. They may use an obscure expressions, an ambiguous term, or do not speak briefly nor orderly. Notice the example below :

Interviewer : Did the US Government play any part in the Duvalier's departure? Did they, for example, actively encourage him to leave?

Official : I would not try to steer you away from that conclusion.

In this conversation the person who is answering the interview's question is not being deliberately unhelpful since the person could have refrained from responding or said "No comment". The implicature in this case tells the interviewer that the official does not want to admit to their involvement directly, bu does so indirectly by not being direct with the answer (Thomas 1995:71).

Another example that flouts the maxim of manner when a speaker is intentionally ambiguous. Flowerdew (2013:99) provided the example "*Go to work on an egg*" which means either that '*an egg should be eaten before work*' or that the hearer '*should start eating an egg*'. This works since it is posible in both the metaphorical and in the literal sense of the sentence.

2.9 Movie Script

According to Steven Maras (1999), movie script is a written work by screenwriters for a movie or film. It can be original works or adaptations from existing pieces of writing. And then, the movement, actions, expressions, and

dialogues of the characters also narrated. It is containing dialogue and directions for a film. Film script can be called as a blueprint which has come to play a prominent role in organising the relations between different film workers, as well as the ‘conceptual’ and ‘practical’ aspects of production.

2.10 Previous Studies

For consideration of this study, the researcher listed some of the result of previous studies by several researchers that had ever read by the researcher, there are 4 previous studies and the first is the thesis that was conducted by Lestari in 2003 with title “The Analysis of Conversational Implicature in the Movie Script of “Despicable Me”. This study was conducted to analyze the using of conversational implicature in the movie script “Despicable Me”. The study focuses on conversational implicature which is based on cooperative principle on movie script. The researcher of this study analyzes four cooperative principles, which are maxim quality, maxim quantity, maxim relation, and maxim manner. The conclusion is the most of violated maxim which happened in the movie are maxim quality and maxim manner. The researcher of this study also explains contex and situation of each utterance does not follow the rules of aphorism to make the movie funny and not too serious.

Another study was conducted by Yunita Nugraheni with the title “Movie Script Analysis Implicature in Harry Potter and The Goblet of Fire” in 2010. In this research, the writer describes that in communicating a person required to always adhere to the principle of conversational fluency in communicating that may occur.

In this case, the authors use Grice's conversational principle known as cooperative principle in Pragmatics. However, this research was limited to identify what the non-observe maxims by the characters in the movie. Through previous study that is conducted by the writer from several existing studies about conversational implicatures which have similiar topic and also use a movie for research media like this study who was done by the writer. The writer concludes that most of the research on conversational implicatures is limited on finding the non-observance of maxims in dialogue of characters, and then describe the meaning.

Previous research also has been conducted by Solikhul Huda (2013), University of Muria Kudus entitled "An Analysis of Implicature Used by Native and Non-Native Guest in CNN Interview", he attempts to focus and concentrate on kinds of maxims used by native and non-native guest in CNN interview script. In this research, he found that all types of maxims of cooperative priniples are used in the dialogues found in CNN interview script with the guest Ellen Degeneres (Native English) and Yasushi Akimoto (Non-Native English) are the entire cooperative principle maxim; they are maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of manner, and maxim of relation. All of the guests doing their conversation cooperatively, because the total number in using four maxims is higher that flouted cooperative principle. It means that the guests gave information in CNN Interview as required, true, relevance to the topic and did not show ambiguity.

And the last previous study has been conducted by Muhamad Vikry (2014), from State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta entitled "An Analysis of Conversational Implicature in IRON MAN 3", he focus and concentrate

on kinds of maxims that used by the characters inside the movie and the reason of producing those implicatures. In that research, he found 15 data from the utterance of the characters that is 13 PCI and only 2 is GCI. Most of those conversational implicatures rises because the characters do not observe the kinds of maxim. And the reason of producing those implicatures are very numerous, one of them that often appear is to give obscurity information in their communication.

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