CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Pragmatics

Leech defined the term of pragmatics, that pragmatics is the study of how utterances have meanings in situations. Studying pragmatics must be from grammar. He stated that:

This means studying the use of language as distinct from, but complementary to, the language itself seen as a formal system. Or more briefly still: grammar (in its broadest sense) must be separated from pragmatics. To argue this, it is not sufficient to define pragmatics negatively, as that aspect of linguistic study which cannot be accommodated in linguistics proper. Rather one must develop theories and methods of description which are peculiar to pragmatics itself, and show that these have to be different from those which are appropriate to grammar. The domain of pragmatics can then be defined so as to delimit it from grammar, and at the same time to show how the two fields combine within an integrated framework for studying language. (Leech, 1983:x)

According to Yule, Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning. Yule (1996:3) says that pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). He added pragmatics has 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.
2.2 Implicature

Implicature is a technical term in the pragmatics subfield of linguistics, coined by H. P. Grice, which refers to what is suggested in an utterance, even though neither expressed nor strictly implied by the utterance.

Yule (1996:36) states that something must be more than just what the words mean. It is an additional conveyed meaning, called implicature. Implicatures are primary examples of more being communicated than is said. For example: *A hamburger is a hamburger.* The sentence is called tautology, but if the sentence is used in a conversation, clearly the speaker intends to communicate more than is said, means there must be implicature.

Grice gives an illustration as a purpose to introduce the verb *implicate* and the related nouns *implicature* (cf. *implying*) and *implicatum* (cf. *what is implied*):

Suppose that A and B are talking about a mutual friend, C, who is now working in a bank. A asks how C is getting on his job, and B replies, *Oh quite well, I think; he likes his colleagues, and he hasn’t been to prison yet.* At this point, A might well inquire what B was implying, what he was suggesting, or even what he meant by saying that C had not been to prison. The answer might be any one of such things as that C is the sort of person likely to yield to the temptation provided by his occupation, that C’s colleagues are really very unpleasant and teacherous people, and so forth. It might, of course, be quite unnecessary for A to make such an inquiry of B, the answer to it being, in the context, clear in advance. It is clear that whatever B implied, suggested, meant in this example, is distinct from what B said, which was simply that C had not been to prison yet. I wish to introduce, as terms of art, the verb *implicate* and the related nouns *implicature* (cf. *implying*) and *implicatum* (cf. *what is implied*). The point of this maneuver is to avoid having, on each occasion, to choose between this or that member of the family of verbs for which implicate is to do general duty. (Grice, 1989:25)

Grice divides implicature into two types, those are conversational implicature and conventional implicature.
2.2.1 Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature is the utterances which the speakers convey that are above and beyond the literal meaning of the words that they speak. It is generated by general rules of conversation, as applied to a particular conversational circumstance. It requires speakers to reason not only in terms of their language but also their understanding of the context and each other's goals and intentions. Grice describes the notion of conversational implicature as follows:

I am now in a position to characterize the notion of conversational implicature. A man who, by (in, when) saying (or making as if to say) that \( p \) has implicated that \( q \), may be said to have conversationally implicated that \( q \), provided that (1) he is to be presumed to be observing the conversational maxims, or at least the cooperative principle; (2) the supposition that he is aware that, or thinks that, \( q \) is required in order to make his saying or making as if to say \( p \) (or doing so in those terms) consistent with this presumption; and (3) the speaker thinks (and would expect the hearer to think that the speaker thinks) that it is within the competence of the hearer to work out, or grasp intuitively, that the supposition mentioned in (2) is required. (Grice, 1989:30-31)

Look at the example from Yule (1996:40)

(a) Charlene : I hope you bring the bread and the cheese.
Dexter : Ah, I brought the bread.

After hearing Dexter’s response, Charlene has to assume that Dexter is cooperating and not totally unaware of the quantity maxim. But he didn’t mention the cheese. If he had brought the cheese, he would say so, because he would be adhering to the quantity maxim. He must intend that she infers that what is not mentioned was not brought. In this case, Dexter has conveyed more than he said via a conversational implicature.
Within conversational implicature, there is a term called cooperative principle. At each stage, some possible conversational moves would be excluded as conversationally unsuitable. Grice (1989:26) says “Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by it accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. One might label this the Cooperative Principle.” The cooperative principle elaborated in four maxims, those are quantity, quality, relation and manner.

a. The Maxim of Quantity
   - Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).
   - Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

b. The Maxim of Quality
   - Do not say what you believe to be false.
   - Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

c. The Maxim of Relation
   - Be relevant.

d. The Maxim of Manner
   - Avoid obscurity of expression.
   - Avoid ambiguity.
   - Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
   - Be orderly.
But these maxims are not always followed, the participant in a talk exchange may fail to fulfil a maxim in various ways:

a. Quietly and unostentatiously violating a maxim

He may quietly and unostentatiously violate a maxim; if so, in some cases he will be liable to mislead.

b. Opting out

He may opt out from the operation both of the maxim and of the cooperative principle; he may say, indicate, or allow it to become plain that he is unwilling to cooperate in the way the maxim requires. He may say, for example, *I cannot say more; my lips are sealed.*

c. Being faced with a clash

He may be faced by a clash: he may be unable, for example, to fulfil the first maxim of quantity (Be as informative as is required) without violating the second maxim of quality (Have adequate evidence for what you say).

d. Flouting a maxim

He may flout a maxim; that is, he may blatantly fail to fulfil it. on the assumption that the speaker is able to fulfil the maxim and to do so without violating another maxim (because of a clash), is not opting out, and is not, in view of the blatancy of his performance, trying to mislead, the hearer is faced with a minor problem: How can his saying what he did say be reconciled with the supposition that he is observing the overall Cooperative Principle? This situation is one that characteristically gives rise to a conversational implicature; and when a conversational implicature is generated in this way, I shall say that a maxim is being exploited.
Conversational implicature could be divided into two categories, those are generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature.

2.2.1.1 Generalized Conversational Implicature

Generalized conversational implicature appears when no special knowledge is required in context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning. The generalized conversational implicature can be seen as the following example:

Dobby: Did you invite Bella and Cathy?
Merry: I invited Bella.

The dialogue above is a kind of generalized conversational implicature because no special background knowledge of the context of utterance is required in order to make the necessary inference. One common example in English involves any phrase with an indefinite article ‘a/an X’, such as ‘a garden’. It is typically interpreted according to the generalized conversational implicature that: an X => not speaker’s X.

Beside ‘a/an X’, a number of other generalized conversational implicatures are commonly communicated on the basis of scale of values and are consequently known as scalar implicature, such as all, most, many, some, or few, as the following example:

X: I get some of this jewellery in Hong Kong – um actually I think I got most of it there.
From the example above, the speaker initially implicates ‘+> not most’ by saying ‘some’, but then she corrects herself by actually asserting ‘most’. That final assertion is still likely to be interpreted, however, with a scalar implicature (+> not all).

The scales bellow shows the list of terms from the highest to the lowest.

a. Scale of quantity: all, most, some
b. Scale of frequency: sometimes, often, always
c. Scale of coldness: cool, cold, freezing
d. Scale of likelihood: possibly, probably, certainly

2.2.1.2 Particularized Conversational Implicature

Particularized conversational implicature strongly depends on context. Context is so important in order to infer right implicature. Most of the time, the conversations take place in very specific context in which locally recognized inferences is assumed. Some inferences are required to work out the conveyed meanings which result from particularized conversational implicature. The particularized conversational implicature can be seen in the following example:

Rick : Hey, coming to the wild party tonight?

Tom : My parents are visiting.

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 (consequently +> Tom is not at the party).
2.2.2 Conventional Implicature

A conventional implicature is generated by meanings of words used. Conventional implicature is independent of the cooperative principle and its four maxims. According to Yule, conventional implicatures do not have to occur in conversation, and they do not depend on special context for their interpretation. They are associated with specific words and result in additional conveyed meanings when those words are used. The specific words are; and, but, even, and yet. The examples are:

Yesterday, Mary was happy and ready to work. (a)
She put on her clothes and left. (b)

In (a) sentence the word ‘and’ is a convention of addition, while in (b) sentence the word and is a convention of sequence.

2.4 Related Study

Putri (2011) the student of Andalas University, Padang. The title of the thesis is An Analysis of Implicature as Found in Transcript of Interview between Barack Obama and Hisyam Melhem from Al-Arabia TV. This thesis discusses about implications which appear in an interview between Barack Obama and Hisyam Melhem. The data are respons of Obama in answering the questions. The writer uses the theory of cooperative principle which developed by Grice. There are 11
violations of maxim from 21 data. From this thesis I learned about cooperative
principle theory which can help to answer the problem of the study in this thesis.

Fadilah (2012) the student of University of Sumatera Utara, Medan. The
title of the thesis is *An Analysis of Implicature in ‘The Neverending Story’ A Film
By Michael Ende*. This study tries to analyze the implicature in *The Neverending
Story* film. The writer uses Grice’s theory in analyzing the implicature. There are 20
implicature which are found in the movie. There are 16 particularized conversational
implicature and 4 generalized conversational implicature in scene I, III, IV, V, VI,
and VII. From this thesis I learned about the problem of the study which can be
found in conversational implicature. In the chapter of analysis and finding, the
cooperative principle was not explained. Hence, I try to analyze each conversational
implicature included the cooperative principle which is elaborated in four maxims in
my thesis.

Siregar (2006) the student of University of Negeri Medan, Medan. The title
of the thesis is *Conversational Implicature Generated by the Exploitation of
Conversational Maxim in Newsweeks’ Interview*. The writer finds the most exploited
maxim is maxim of quality with percentage 47.2% from the total number of 36
exploitations. There are two reasons why interviewees exploit the maxim, those are
to express the politeness and to show the ability to express their language aesthetic.
From this thesis I learned about the theory which can be applied in analyzing the
conversational implicature.

The researches above express that implicature is a tool of communication
which is interesting to be analyzed. Although the speaker adds other meaning inside
his utterance, the hearer could understand. Still, there is also missed meaning
sometime. The researches give contributions to this study (*An Analysis of Conversational Implicature of a BBC One Television Series: Sherlock – A Study in Pink*) those are book references about implicature and research design to analyze the implicature.