CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter researcher theories to collect and analyze the data. The researcher divided this chapter into two parts. The first part is the review of underlying theory and the second is previous study.

A. Review of Related Theory

This sub chapter covers the review of literature are considered related to research topic can used as means to analyze the data.

1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is one of the branches of linguistics. Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker and interpreted by a listener. It has, consequently, more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves.

Yule (1996:3) says that there are four areas that pragmatics is concerned with, that is speech act theory, conversational implicature, talk in interaction and other approaches to language behavior in philosophy, sociology, and linguistics. To understand how it got to be that way, we have to briefly review its relationship with other areas of linguistic analysis.

Pragmatics involves perception augmented by some species of 'ampliative' inference induction and inference to the best explanation. Beside that reasoning, it also considered perhaps some special application of general principle special to communication as conceived by Grice. But in any case a sort of reasoning that goes beyond the application of rules, and makes inferences beyond what is established by the basic facts about what expressions are used and their meanings.

Pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistics forms and the users of those forms. The advantage of studying language via pragmatics is that one can talk about people's intended meanings, their assumptions, their purposes or goals, and the kinds of action that they are performing when they speak. The big disadvantage is that all these very human concepts are extremely difficult to analyze in a consistent and objective way.

In much of the preceding discussion, we have assumed that speakers and listeners involved in conversation are generally cooperating with each other. Someone's utterance that has more than just what the words means, it is an additional conveyed meaning called an implicature.

2. Context

In a study about Implicature are found in particular conversation, it is important to know about context in which utterances occur.

Idamaningati (2013) asserts that context is dynamic, not statistic concept. It is to be understood in the widest sense, as the surrounding, enabling the participants in a

conversation process to interact, and that makes the linguistics expression of their interaction. In addition, context makes us to attend to how senders' and receiver' needs, goals, and wants are personalized not just to the conventional meanings of prior text, but also particular socially and culturally defined communicative situations (Brown and Yule, 1983)

3. Implicature

The concept of implicature was first introduced by Grice in the William James Lectures more than 30 years ago (Grice 1967, 1989). There are some definitions of implicature. They are as follows:

1. Anything is that is inferred from an utterance but that is not a condition for the truth of the utterance.

2. An implicature is something meant, implied, or suggested distinct from what is said.

3. Implicature can be part of sentence meaning or dependent on conversational context, and can be conventional or unconventional.

4. Is a matter of saying something but communicating something else instead something closely related to what is said.

Grice (1989: 372) said that implicature denotes either the act of meaning, implying, or suggesting one thing by saying something else, or the object of that act.

Implicatures can be part of sentence meaning or dependent on conversational context, and can be conventional (in different senses) or unconventional.

While he further "conventional" to denote an implicature that is part of the linguistic meaning of a sentence, even conversational implicatures can be conventional in the non-technical sense in which it is conventional for women to wear a sari in India but not Mongolia, and conventional in some languages to begin interrogative sentences with an inverted question mark but not in others. Consider:

(a) *Some athletes smoke*

(b) *Not all athletes smoke*

It would be unconventional (unusual, idiosyncratic, even unprecedented) for people who say "Some athletes smoke" to conversationally implicate that some physically fit people will develop bladder cancer, but conventional (customary, normal, standard practice) for them to implicate that not all athletes smoke. The customary implicature is not conventional in Grice's sense. For "Not all athletes smoke" is not part of the meaning of "Some athletes smoke."

Conversational implicatures have become one of the principal subjects of pragmatics. Figures of speech such as metaphor, irony, and understatement provide familiar examples. An important conceptual and methodological issue in semantics is how to distinguish senses and entailments from conventional implicatures.

Grice's theory of conversational implicature was first presented as the William James lecture at Harvard University in 1967, and then later partially

published (Grice, 1975, 1989). The theory is brief and rough and not completely worked out. Yet, it is essential insights are profound and the theory has had a tremendous impact on a number of different areas of research.

In this theory, Grice is essentially concerned with how it is possible for people to mean more than what they say; in other words, to convey non literal meaning. He proposes that this is possible because interlocutors abide by whether termed the *cooperative principle*. The *cooperative principle* is simple and straightforward and states simply that one should: "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (p. 45).This very general requirement states that people should communicate in a rational and efficient manner; say what you mean, just the facts, don't wander around, and so on.

H. P. Grice, formerly a Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, now teaches philosophy of language at the University of California, Berkeley. Two aspects of Grice's work are particularly relevant to literary interpretation: his theory of non natural meaning, and his theory of conversational implicature.

In a series of influential and controversial papers, Grice (1957, 1968, 1969) has argued that the meaning of a word (or non natural sign) in general is a derivative function of what speakers mean by that word in individual instances of uttering it. That is, the universal "type" meaning, or set of such meanings, for a given word is an

abstraction from the "token" meanings that speakers mean for the word in specific instances of use.

In addition to identifying and classifying the phenomenon of implicature, Grice developed a theory designed to explain and predict conversational implicatures. He also sought to describe how such implicatures are understood. Grice (1975: 26–30) postulated a general Cooperative Principle and four maxims specifying how to be cooperative. It is common knowledge, he assert that people generally follow these rules for efficient communication.

Grice proposes that participants in conversation understand the following general "*Cooperative Principle*" to be in force: *"Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged."* This super ordinate principle comprises the following subordinate rules or *"maxims"*:

a.	Maxims of Quantity:

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).

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

b.	Maxims of Quality: Try to make your contribution one that is true.

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

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

c.	Maxim of Relation: Be relevant.

d.   Maxims of Manner: Be perspicuous.

   1. Avoid obscurity /of expression.

   2. Avoid ambiguity.

   3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).

   4. Be orderly cooperative principle above. From those it can be inferred that.

Because conversation is a cooperative and social enterprise, children are instilled with these imperatives as part of the process of socialization and language acquisition. Grice (1967) would argue further that observing the maxims is "reasonable (rational)" behavior, because it tends to benefit the speaker's interest. In any case, the ability to realize these imperatives is an important part of a speaker's communicative competence. The result is that a violation of any of these maxims will be linguistically aberrant, or "marked," and literally "remarkable." (Once the violation is detected, that is; some violations are surreptitious.)

Grice thought some implicatures arise by flouting maxims. This happens when what a cooperative speaker says so patently violates a maxim that the hearer must infer that the speaker is implying something different. Irony and metaphor are thought to arise from flouting the maxim of Quality. Thus Candy might answer Alan ironically as follows.

Alan : Are you going to Paul's party?

Candy : I don't like parties.

If Alan knows well that Candy is a party animal, he could reason that if she meant what she said, she would be lying, thus violating Quality. So she must have meant something else. If she means that she does like parties, then she will be in conformity with the maxim. And via Relation, she will have answered Alan's question indirectly.

Generalizing from these examples, Grice (1967) provides a theoretical account of what it is to conversationally implicate something that has been widely adopted, sometimes with subtle variations. A representative formulation goes as follows, with S the speaker and H the hearer.

Implicature has been invoked for a variety of purposes, from defending controversial semantic claims in philosophy to explaining lexical gaps in linguistics. Grice, who coined the term "implicature," and classified the phenomenon, developed an influential theory to explain and predict conversational implicatures, and describes how they arise and are understood.

It is not possible to understand speakers fully without knowing what they have conversationally implicated as well as what they have said. Semantics, conceived as the study of the meaning of words and sentences, does not exhaust the study of meaning. The study of speaker meaning and implicatures is included in pragmatics, which covers the broad range of speech acts that can be performed by using words.

Implicatures is important even in truth conditional semantics. For example, logicians customarily take English sentences of the form "p or q" to be true provided

"p" or "q" or both are true. Thus "It is not the case that cat meow or purr" would be counted as false. But there are also cases in which speakers use "p or q" to mean that "p" or "q" is true but not both. Some maintain that "or" is ambiguous in English, with an inclusive and an exclusive sense. But another possibility is that the exclusive interpretation is a conventional conversational implicatures rather than a second sense.

One piece of evidence supporting the implicatures hypothesis is that the exclusive interpretation seems cancelable. Thus "Bill will visit France or Germany this summer; indeed, he will drive through both countries on his way to Poland" has no interpretation on which it is contradictory. Another is that "Bill hopes he will not visit France or Germany" has no interpretation on which it ascribes to Bill a hope that would be fulfilled if he visits both places. A methodological issue is to describe the evidence that would be needed to decide whether a particular interpretation is a senseor a conventional conversational implicature.

An utterance can be implicated something which is not a part of that utterance. Proposition that has implicated is referred as conversational implicature by Grice. Generally, there are two kinds of implicature, conversational implicature and conventional implicature.

4. Types of Implicature

There are some kinds of implicature, they are conversational implicature and conventional implicature. In our account of Grice's theory of implicature, he

distinguished conversational implicature into two types: generalized and particularized conversational implicature. The former are the implicatures that are generated by saying something in virtue of some particular features of the context.

a. Conversational Implicatures

Grice (1975: 22-24) identifies three types of general conversational implicature as follows :

1. The speaker deliberately flouts a conversational maxim to convey an additional meaning not expressed literally. For instance, a speaker responds to the question "How did you like the guest speaker?" with the following utterance:

   Well, I'm sure he was speaking English.

   If the speaker is assumed to be following the cooperative principle, in spite of flouting the Maxim of Quantity, then the utterance must have an additional non literal meaning, such as: "The content of the speaker's speech was confusing."

2. The speaker's desire to fulfill two conflicting maxims results in his or her flouting one maxim to invoke the other. For instance, a speaker responds to the question "Where is John?" with the following utterance:

   He's either in the cafeteria or in his office.

   In this case, the Maxim of Quantity and the Maxim of Quality are in conflict. A cooperative speaker does not want to be ambiguous but also does not want to give false information by giving a specific answer in spite of his uncertainty. By flouting the Maxim of Quantity, the speaker invokes the Maxim of Quality, leading to the

implicature that the speaker does not have the evidence to give a specific location where he believes John is.

3. The speaker invokes a maxim as a basis for interpreting the utterance. In the following exchange:

   A: Do you know where I can get some gas?

   B: There's a gas station around the corner.

   The second speaker invokes the Maxim of Relevance, resulting in the implicature that "the gas station is open and one can probably get gas there".

   According to Renkenma, (1993:7) a speaker's words often convey more than the literal meaning of the words. So, in understanding a message across by the speaker, the hearers should generate the intended meaning. The meaning itself maybe the one of that is explicitly or implicitly stated. Grice as cited by Hatch (1997:261) that what is conveyed by an utterance falls into two parts, what is said and what is implied. He uses the term 'implicatures' to cover what is implied.

   The word 'implicatures' (Yule, 1996: 35) is derived from the verb 'to imply', as is its cognate 'implication'. Implicatures is used to communicate something which must be more than just what the words mean. Therefore, implicatures is an additional conveyed meaning.

   Charlene: I hope you brought the bread and the cheese.

   Dexter: Ah, I brought the bread

   (Example taken from Yule, 1996: P.40)

We can represent the structure of what was said, with b (= bread) and c (=cheese). Using the symbol +> for an implicature, we can also represent the additional conveyed meaning.

Charlene: b & c?

Dexter: b (+> NOT c)

From the explanation above, it can be said they use symbol +> to symbolic an implicature.

1. Generalized Conversational Implicature

When no special knowledge is required in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning, it is called generalized conversational implicature. It means that we do not need to analyze deeply what the speaker said, it is clear that the utterance of the speaker can be understood by listener easily.

In the case of the example of conversation between Charlene and Dexter above, no special background knowledge of the context of utterance is required in order to make the necessary inference. The same process of calculating the implicatures will take place if Doobie asks Mary about inviting his friends Bella (=b) and Cathy (=c) to a party as shown in the example below.

Doobie: Did you invite Bella and Cathy? (b & c)

Mary: I invited Bella   (b +> not c)

(Example taken from Yule, 1996: P.40)

One common example in English involves any phrase with an indefinite article of the type 'a/an X', such as 'a garden' and 'a child' as in the below example. These phrases are typically interpreted according to the generalized conversational implicature that: an X +> not speaker's X.

I was sitting in a garden one day. A child looked over the fence.
(Example taken from Yule, 1996: P.41)

The implicatures in that sentence, that the garden and the child mentioned are not the speaker's, are calculated on the principle that if the speaker was capable of being more specific, then he or she would have said 'my garden' and 'my child'.

A number of other generalized conversational implicatures are commonly communicated on the basis of a scale of values and are consequently known as scalar implicatures.

2. Scalar implicatures

Certain information is always communicated by choosing a word which expresses one value from a scale of values. This is particularly obvious in terms for expressing quantity, as shown in the scales below, where terms are listed from the highest to the lowest value.

(all, most, many, some, few)

(always, often, sometimes)

When producing an utterance, a speaker selects the word from the scale which is the most informative and truthful (quantity and quality) in the circumstances, as in the example:

I'm studying linguistics and I've completed some of the required courses. (Example taken from Yule, 1996: P.41)

By choosing 'some', the speaker creates an implicatures (+> not all). The basis of scalar implicatures is that, when any form in a scale is asserted, the negative of all forms higher on the scale is implicated. The first scale in had 'all', 'most', and 'many', higher than 'some'. Given the definition of scalar implicatures, it should follow that, in saying 'some of the required courses', the speaker also creates other implicatures (for example, +> not most, +> not many).

The criteria of generalized conversational implicatures are that it is inferable without reference to a special context.

John walks into a house.

The expression implies that the house is not John's house.

3. Particularized Conversational Implicature

Some assumed knowledge which is required in very specific contexts during a conversation is called particularized conversational implicature. As an illustration, consider an example where Tom's response does not appear on the surface to adhere to relevance. (A simply relevant answer would be 'Yes' or 'No').

Rick: Hey, coming to the wild party tonight?

Tom: My parents are visiting.

(Example taken from Yule, 1996: P.43)

In order to make Tom's response relevant, Rick has to draw on some assumed knowledge that one college student in this setting expects another to have. Tom will be spending that evening with his parents, and time spent with parents is quiet (qonsequently +> Tom is not at the party).

There is other more entertaining example where the response initially appears to flout relevance.

Bert : do you like ice cream?

Ernie : is the pope catholic?

(Example taken from Yule, 1996: p.43)

Ernie's response does not provide a 'yes' or 'no' answer. Bert must assume that Ernie is being cooperative, so he considers Ernie's 'Pope' question and clearly the answer is 'Yes'. So, the answer is known, but the nature of Ernie's response also implicates that the answer to the question was 'Obviously, yes'. An additional conveyed meaning in such a case is that, because the answer was so obvious, the question did not need to be asked.

The criteria of particularized conversational implicature are that it is derivable only in a special context and it is context-dependent. Example:

X: What an earth has happened to the roast beef?

Y: The dog is looking very happy In the above exchange,

In the above exchange, X will likely derive the implicature the dog ate the roast beef.

b. Conventional Implicature

In contrast to all the conversational implicatures discussed so far, Grice (1975) explains that the conventional implicatures are not based on the cooperative principle or the maxims. They do not have to occur in conversation, and they do not depend on special contexts for their interpretation. Not unlike lexical presupposition, conventional implicatures are associated with specific words and result in additional conveyed meanings when those words are used.

Conventional implicature is independent of the cooperative principle and its maxims. A statement always carries its conventional implicature. The English conjunction 'but' is one of these words. Example:

Joe is poor but happy.

This sentence implies poverty and happiness are not compatible but in spite of this Joe is still happy. The conventional interpretations of the word "but" will always create the implicature of a sense of contrast. So *Joe is poor but happy* will always necessarily imply "Surprisingly Joe is happy in spite of being poor".

Other English words such as 'even' and 'yet' also have conventional implicatures. When 'even' is included in any sentence describing an event, there is an implicatures of 'contrary to expectation'.

The conventional implicature of 'yet' is that the present situation is expected to be different, or perhaps the opposite, at a later time. For much linguistics, the notion of 'implicature' is one of the central concepts in pragmatics. An implicature is certainly a prime example of more being communicated than is said.

5. Movie Script

In Time Movie Script

Niccol is one of my favourite writer/directors. In fact, one of my favourite films is Gattaca, which has been so under-rated over the years since its release. To me he's been a great Sci-Fi writer, so going into this I was hopeful of something of quality.

Alas, "In Time" is not for the true Sci-Fi thinker. It paints a world in which time is money. That isn't that new an idea, but Niccols does succeed in pushing the metaphor as a commodity. Those with time are rich, those without time are poor. It's a simplistic analogy. As with Niccol's other films, the cinematography is beautiful. The best actors in the film aren't the main characters, rather Cillian Murphy, Vincent Kartheiser and (surprisingly) Alex Pettyfer present more interesting characters. They all shine, especially Murphy. The film seems like one long car chase, when what you actually want to delve into are the complexities - the debates between the characters themselves over the issues of the world they live in. Not a single clever conversation happens between anyone. Murphy is a great actor and I would have been interested to

see the debate about right and wrong become greyed through some thinking. Life is not black and white. The film ending is unrealistic and I wonder if this was the ending envisioned by Niccol or the ending the producers wanted to boost sales.

Sadly this film could have been a great deal more. It had a good topic. It had some great actors, yet it failed because the story lost the nuances and complexities to meet the lowest common denominator, rather than raising questions or making the viewer think critically. See it, but be prepared to be disappointed. It isn't subtle.

B. Previous Study

The following studies are the writer presents considering the study that have similarity with this study. She is Sheila Nanda (2012), student of Pendidikan Indonesia University, Jakarta.

Sheila's study is entitled *"Conversational Implicature of The Presenters in Take Me Out Indonesia"*. She investigates a Reality show, because her research takes data from the utterance by announcer and participant of Reality show.

This study identified Implicature that are flouted by announcer and the participant of that show and also types of each implicature. He found 122 generalized conversational imlicature and 82 of Particuralized conversational Implicature.

Then, Panuntun (2011) with her study entitled *"Implicature found in the Novel Entitled Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone"*. She found 38 utterances were flout of maxim.

Next previous study by Gustawanti (2009) in his study *"Violation of Cooperative Principle Form and the Implicature Meaning of Conversation in the Discourse of Humor "Epen Kah" Merauke Papua Communities: Overview of Pragmatics".* His study described the type of violation of cooperative principle, the causes of the violation, and the implicative meaning of the conversation in the humorous discourse of Merauke Papua Community "Epen Kah". His study only discussed the word "Epen Kah" in the difference conversation.

Then, Harris Edyanto (2010) in his study *"Implikatur Percakapan Tokoh Wanita dan Tokoh Lakilaki dalam Film "Lari Dari Blora"Karya Akhlis Suryapati".* His study described the violation of four cooperative principles by man and women characters in the movie and the meaning of that implicature. In his study, he found 27 implicature, and many violations happened in maxim quantity.

Then, Ika Irifianti (2008) "*Jenis Tuturan, Implikatur, Dan Kesantunan Dalam Wacana Rubrik Konsultasi Seks Dan Kejiwaan Pada Tabloid Nyata Edisi Maret S/D Agustus 2006".* The researcher concluded that the in his study happens four violation of *(1) pelanggaran bidal ketimbangrasaan, (2) pelanggaran bidal kemurahatian, (3) pelanggaran bidal keperkenanan, (4) pelanggaran bidal kesetujuan.*

The last previous study by Rudi Adi Nugroho (2006) in his study *"Analisis Implikatur Percakapan Dalam Tindak Komunikasi Di Kelompok Teater Peron Fkip Uns".* He was concluded that the most found violation happened in maxim of quality.