

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter describes about review of related literature. It includes pragmatics, implicature, conversational implicature, Sentilan-sentilun Talkshow, and previous studies.

#### **A. Pragmatics**

Pragmatics is study of meaning in relation to the context in which a person is speaking or writing. This includes social, situational and textual context.<sup>1</sup> Context has a key position in communication, meaning could change or imply depend on the context and context has relation with culture. The topic in pragmatics major discuss about how language is used by language users in communicative. Hence, the communication is succeeded if both meaning and context. Pragmatics principle study the way language is appropriate to the contexts, it is used.

Pragmatic is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). This type of study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in particular context and how the context influences what is said. It requires a consideration of how speaker organize what they want to say in accordance with who they are talking to, where, when and under what circumstance.

---

<sup>1</sup> Brian Paltridge, *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*, (London: Continuum, 2008), 53.

According to Yule, one traditional distinction in language analysis contrasts pragmatics with syntax and semantics. Syntax is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms, how they are arranged in sequence and which sequence are well formed.<sup>2</sup> This type of study generally takes place without considering any world of reference or any user of the forms. According to George Yule in “Pragmatics”, semantics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and entities in the world; that is, how words literally connect to things.<sup>3</sup> Semantic analysis also attempts to establish the relationships between verbal descriptions and states of affairs in the world as accurate (true) or not, regardless of who produces that description.

George Yule in “Pragmatics” said that pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and the users of those forms.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, pragmatics is the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized or encoded in the structure of language.<sup>5</sup> In this three part distinction, only pragmatics allows human into the analysis. 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 actions that they are performing when they speak.

Further Kreidler states that pragmatics is another branch of linguistics that is concerned with meaning.<sup>6</sup> While, Peccei states that pragmatics concentrates on the aspect of meaning that could not be predicted by

---

<sup>2</sup> George Yule, *Pragmatics*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>5</sup> Stephen Levinson, *Pragmatics*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 9.

<sup>6</sup> Charles Kreidler, *Introducing English Semantics*, (New York: Routledge, 1998), 18.

linguistic knowledge alone and take into account our knowledge about the physical and social world.<sup>7</sup> The focus of pragmatics analysis is on the meaning of words or sentence.

The relationship between linguistics form and communication function is of central interest in the area of pragmatics and as Cameron argues, is highly relevant to the field of discourse analysis.<sup>8</sup> Pragmatics study has the circumstances of when, where and how language is used. Pragmatics has several distinctive discussions in particular field such as deixis, speech act, implicature, politeness theory, and others. This study takes implicature as main topic idea, implicature is one of theory in discourse that explains about meaning in the context of spoken and written language.

## **B. Implicature**

The term 'Implicature' used by Grice to account for what speaker can imply, suggest or mean as distinct from what speaker literally says. We can see in daily conversation, all of people use some indirect language to give signal or only answer. We can make difference about it, we should realized about the 'what the speaker said?' and 'what the speaker intention?'

In addition, we can take some explanations from other rhetoricians. The contrast between 'say' and 'meant', and derivatively between the 'said' and the 'implicated' (the meant but unsaid), back to the fourth-century

---

<sup>7</sup> Jean Stiwell Peccei, *Pragmatics*, (London and New York: Routledge, 1999), 5.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, 53.

rhetoricians Servius and Donatus who characterized litotes-pragmatics understatement as a figure that we say less but mean more.<sup>9</sup>

The speaker's utterance depend on the context, it means that implicature is a component of speaker meaning which constitutes an aspect of what is meant in speaker's utterance without being part of what is said.<sup>10</sup> In this part, the hearer should understand what is speaker's meant although the speaker did not said what actually they wanted to say. Carston in Ni'maturrohmah said that a very explicature and implicature in the pragmatics processing of utterances. She gives an example:<sup>11</sup>

A : How is Jane feeling after her first year at university?

B : She did not get enough units and cannot continue.

Carston notes that there is ambiguity in 'B' utterance which is the world 'get' and 'units'. The 'B' intention has different meaning in other context. Everyone agree to deny that 'B' utterance is implicit meaning which needs specific context. Based on 'B' utterance and the context, it means that Jane cannot continue her university studies. Moreover, the pragmatics process is sensitive with semantics meaning of specially direct object argument of this verb and has nothing to do with implicature derivation.

Depend on Grice divided into two kinds in meaning. They are natural meaning and non-natural meaning. Natural meaning is depending on 'what said' and conventional implicature. Non-natural meaning is depending on

---

<sup>9</sup>Laurence R. Horn, *The handbook of Pragmatics*, (UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2006), 3.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>11</sup>Ni'maturrohmah, "*Implicature Used in Suzanne Collins' Mockingjay Novel*", (Thesis, STAIN Kediri Kediri, 2015), 10.

conversational meaning which consists of generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature.

Implicature can be considered as an additional conveyed meaning.<sup>12</sup> It is attained when a speaker intends to communicate more than just what the words mean. It is the speaker who communicates something via implicatures and the listener recognizes those communicated meanings via inference. Implicatures are inferred based on assumption that the speaker observes or flouts some principles of cooperation. In pragmatics, there are two types of implicature; they are conversational implicature and conventional implicature. Grice says that conversational implicature can be defined as “A different (opposite, additional, etc) pragmatic meaning of an utterance with respect to the literal meaning expressed by utterance”.<sup>13</sup>

### C. Conversational Implicature

The notion of conversational implicature is one of the single most important ideas in pragmatics (people shall often refer to the notion simply as implicature as a shorthand). Implicature is generated intentionally by the speaker and may (or may not) be understood by the hearer.<sup>14</sup>

Conversational implicature deals with utterance meaning which is the study of extra linguistic. According to Hurford, utterance meaning is what the

---

<sup>12</sup> George Yule, *Pragmatics*, 35.

<sup>13</sup>Jacob L. Mey, *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*, (New York: Elseiver, 1998), 371.

<sup>14</sup>Jenny Thomas, *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*, (England: Pearson Education Limited, 1995), 58.

speaker means (i.e. intends to convey) when he uses a piece of language. Utterance meaning also called pragmatics meaning that means the meaning of a sentence when it is used by speaker and a hearer. Then, sentence meaning is the study of intra linguistic. Sentence meaning is what a sentence (or word) means, i.e. what it counts as the equivalent of in the language concerned.<sup>15</sup>

Furthermore, implicature is related to the method by which speakers work out the indirect illocutions of utterance. When the listeners hear the expression in a certain conversation, they first have to assume that the speaker is being cooperative and intends to communicate something. That something must be more than just what the words mean. It is an additional conveyed meaning which is called an implicature.

Conversational implicature can be defined as a different (opposite, additional, etc) pragmatic meaning of an utterance with respect to the literal meaning expressed by that utterance.<sup>16</sup> This different meaning is, in the prototypical case, intended by the speaker and expected to be understood (implied) by the hearer. The basic assumption in conversation is that, unless otherwise indicated, the participants stick to the cooperative principle and the maxims.

Grice's term of conversational implicature which provides some explicit account of how it is possible to mean (in some general meaning) more than it is actually 'said' (i.e. more than what is literally expressed by the

---

<sup>15</sup> James R. Hurford, *Semantics of Coursebook*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 3.

<sup>16</sup> Jacob L. Mey, *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*, 371.

conventional sense of linguistic expression uttered).<sup>17</sup> Conversational implicature is implied varies according to the context of utterance. Furthermore, Jacob L. Mey in “An Introduction of Pragmatics” said that conversational implicature is dependent on the context of a particular language use.<sup>18</sup>

In contrast to conversational implicature there is conventional implicature. It elaborates about conventional implicature. The conversational implicature discussed here, conventional implicature are not based on the cooperative principle of the maxims. They do not have to occur in conversation, and they do not depend on special contexts for their interpretation. Same with lexical presuppositions, conventional implicatures are associated with specific words and have a result in additional conveyed meanings when those words are used.<sup>19</sup>

In conclusion, it is quite different from conventional implicature. Conversational implicatures are primary examples of more being communicated than is said, but in order for them to be interpreted. Some basic cooperative principle must first be assumed to be in operation.

The theory of Conversational Implicature was first proposed by Herbert Paul Grice, who is an American linguistic philosopher. H. P. Grice delivered three speeches in his William James lectures at Harvard University in 1967. Among these, the second lecture entitled “Logic and Conversation”

---

<sup>17</sup> Stephen Levinson, *Pragmatics*, 97.

<sup>18</sup> Jacob L. Mey, *An Introduction of Pragmatics*, (United State of America: Blackwell, 1983), 103.

<sup>19</sup> George Yule, *Pragmatics*, 45.

came out in Syntax and Semantics. There, he presented the theory of “Cooperative Principle” and “Conversational Implicature.”

In order to understand comprehensively and thoroughly the purpose and the significance of the proposition of “cooperative principle” and “conversational implicature,” we should figure out some ideas of Grice’s basic theory about “meaning,” which can be divided into natural meaning and non-natural meaning. Natural meaning refers to the meaning of the utterance that can be generally gained by the conversational participants. While the non-natural meaning refers to the intended meaning conveyed by the speaker and must be inferred by the receiver in particular contexts.

On the base of it, Grice proposed the key ideas of conversational implicature. If the participants both have the expectation to achieve a successful conversation, they must cooperative with each other, and speak sincerely, sufficiently, relevantly and clearly. To put it another way, they must observe the co-operative principle and the maxims of quality, quantity, relevance and manner. If someone who participate the conversation flouts the co-operative principle and any of the maxims, he must have intended to do so. And the receiver can infer the speaker’s intended meaning in particular contexts. For example:

A: Do you know when John left the pub last night?

B: Eleven o’clock. And he went to Mary’s apartment instead of his own.



According to the quantity maxim, the contribution should not be more informative than is required. In this way, in the example, as the answer to A, generally, “Eleven o’clock,” is enough. However, B adds the later sentence, provides some information that seems not necessary and violates the quantity maxim. We infer that B wants to tell A that John might have some special relationship with Mary.

Cruse (2000: 349) points out that conversational implicatures are characterized as “propositions or assumptions not encoded, completely or incompletely, in what is actually said.” Whether *what is said* and *what is meant* are considered as completing each other or as distinct entities, it could be still vital that meaning identification is the most dynamic and effective conversational tool that the speaker can handle in order to pass the intended meaning (illocutionary force) to reach the desired perlocutionary act by the hearer/listener whether the hearer/listener is a second party or it is the speaker himself/herself (in monologues). The speaker passes the implicated meanings, and if the hearer/listener receives and perceives it, he/she could form inferences out of them.

Grice's theory of conversational implicatures is considered as one of the basic and most interesting theories in the history of pragmatics.<sup>20</sup> It sets forward the mechanism that language users should follow in order to understand each other in so many instances when meanings and intentions are not explicitly conveyed.

---

<sup>20</sup> Stephen Levinson, *Pragmatics*, 97.

In the Gricean scheme, utterances make sense no matter whether there are missing or incomplete elements. Interlocutors are able to derive meanings from what is unsaid (implicated) depending on drawing related inferences to the particular utterance. What is implicated is made reasonable by what Grice calls implicatures or conversational implicatures. Meaning is inferred from the use of some utterance in context. Grice's theory of implicature is concerned with the ways in which meaning can be communicated not only by what is said, but also by how it is said.<sup>21</sup> Grice wants to show the inferential paths that lead interlocutors from what is said to what is meant. Its guiding principle is that "constrains on the use of utterances and the information conveyed by them arise not only from the semantically encoded meaning, but also from the communicative uses to which they are put" (Soames).

The Grice's opinion in Haiyan Wang, conversational implicature has five characteristics. Those are cancellability, non-detachability, calculability, non-conventionality, indeterminacy.<sup>22</sup>

#### 1. Cancellability

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

#### 2. Non-detachability

The conversational implicature is attached to the semantic content of what is said, not to the linguistic form used. Therefore it

---

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 97.

<sup>22</sup> Haiyan Wang, Conversational Implicature in English Listening Comprehension, *Journal Qingdao University of Science and Technology*, 30, 1, (2011), 1163.

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.

### 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 implicature listed in the dictionary. To work out the conversational implicature of an utterance, one needs to know its conversational 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 context changes, the implicature will also change.

### 5. Indeterminacy

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

#### **D. Sentilan Sentilun Talkshow**

Sentilan Sentilun Talkshow is an entertainment program which presented every Saturday at 19:30 pm on Metro TV. The name of talkshow is Sentilan Sentilun because in Indonesian, the meaning of *sentil* is scolding. So, Sentilan Sentilan Talkshow is showed to criticize the political and issue in Indonesia. The talkshow performances with the Javanese culture setting. There are ndoro Sentilan and his assistant Sentilun. They use the traditional clothing of Javanese culture. Besides that ndoro Sentilun always wears male batik headdress and Sentilun always wears napkin in every performance. They use the Indonesian to speak with their guest stars, but sometimes they use Javanese. And they use some attitudes to express their meaning of their conversation in specific situation, it is like say “no” but they receive the offer of the speaker.

The guest stars in *Sentilan Sentilun* Talkshow are often from the politician in Indonesia like Mahfud MD, Yenny Wahid, Brigjen Pol. Rikwanto and others. The talkshow talks about the country and government problems like injustice, social behavior which diverge, and others. In *Sentilan Sentilun* Talkshow, the critical issues presented with satirize between characters of Sentilan and Sentilun, and their guest stars. In the end, Sentilun as the assistant of ndoro Sentilan give the conclusion from the performance.

*Sentilan Sentilun* Talkshow was an adaptation from a manuscript entitled "Death of the Critic" by the famous literary of Agus Noor who played a monologue by an artist Butet Kertaradjasa. In the end, Sentilan and Sentilun

played by the different person who ndoro Sentilan is as an employer of a Java family so wealthy, it played by the old actor Slamet Rahardjo. And Sentilun is as an assistant of ndoro Sentilan, it played by Butet Kertaradjasa.

Basically, the *Sentilan Sentilun* criticism can be seen and digested anyone with ease even though the topics covered in general are heavy topics, because the show is always packed with spoofs a light and fresh comedy. So that this program is not only entertaining, but also as a means of political education, inexpensive or can be said to make the viewer political literacy so that viewers will always know the progress of on going political situation in the country by means of light.

Presenting hot issues and different themes every episode is a major capital program which will certainly attract viewers to watch, so it economically profitable for the manufacturer because the audience will be interested to watch this program. Sentilun scolding continues the theme of the current events surrounding the issue of political, social, economic, and cultural, in packs complete with satirical comedy critical. Starting from the personal lives of politicians, corruption scandals, to be used as a country problemparody in this event. The general public can easily absorb the problems that already exist, with presented drama / parody light and filled with comedy.

## E. Previous Studies

Related to the topic in thesis, there are some previous studies found by the researcher. There are three previous studies that discuss the implicature. The first researcher is Ni'maturrohmah from STAIN Kediri, the second researcher is Adven Desi Niatri from Sanata Dharma University of Yogyakarta. And the third researcher is Tatsuroh Yamazaki from Japan.

The first research on implicature has been conducted by Ni'maturrohmah, the title is *Implicature Used in Suzanne Collins' Mockingjay Novel*.<sup>23</sup> The results of her research was two kinds of implicature in utterances of Suzzane Collins' *Mockingjay* novel that are conventional implicature and conversational implicature. Firstly, her research finds two patterns of conventional implicature which has three utterances. Secondly, in conversational implicature, it is found nine patterns of generalized conversational implicature of maxim organizations which at least one maxim is violated and most three maxims. And there are thirteen patterns of maxim organizations of particularized conversational implicature which at least one maxim is violated and the most three maxims are violated. In the maxim organization, the most maxims violated are quantity, quality and manner.

The next research was a research that had been conducted by Adven Desi Niatri, the title is *Implicature of Conversational Interfigure in Raditya*

---

<sup>23</sup> Ni'maturrohmah, "*Implicature Used in Suzanne Collins' Mockingjay Novel*", (Thesis, STAIN Kediri, 2015), 30.

*Dika's Marmut Merah Jambu Movie*.<sup>24</sup> She found two results of her research. First, the researcher found three types of implicature of conversation interfigure in Raditya Dika's *Marmut Merah Jambu* movie. They were specific implicature of conversation, general implicature of conversation, and scaled implicature of conversation. Each of these types was divided into several types based on the meaning of the utterances and specific characteristic of the implicature of conversation. The third kind of implicature conversation was each divided into several types according markers characteristic and shape the conversation.

The second result of her research is generally the function of conversation implicature interfigure in Raditya Dika's *Marmut Merah Jambu* movie shows the real life occurred adolescents in senior high school (SMA). Specifically, the function of conversation implicature are three. First, the implicature of conversation created characters image (actor) and humor to support the scene. Next, the implicature of conversation used to convey the messages which are advice and appeal for the daily life, in particular the adolescents' life. The last function of conversational implicature refine the speech to draw sympathy and/or quell anger hearer.

The third research conducted by Tatsuroh Yamazaki, the title is *Conversational Implicature in Stand-up Comedies*.<sup>25</sup> This paper investigates

---

<sup>24</sup> Adven Desi Niatri, "*Implicature of Conversation Interfigure in Raditya Dika's Marmut Merah Jambu Movie*", (Thesis, Universitas Sanata Dharma Yogyakarta, 2016), 36.

<sup>25</sup>Tatsuroh Yamazaki, "*Conversational Implicature in Stand-up Comedies*, (Thesis: University of Japan, 2010), 63.

plays on words involving conversational implicatures or hidden meanings in short stand-up comedies by a Japanese duo. It is observed that regular patterns of wording exist in such conversational exchanges which cause the audience to laugh. Those patterns are typically composed of three parts: subtext, punch line and follow-up, and they appear in that order. Each part is allotted a particular function: the subtext carries an implicature, the punch line reveals it to make the audience laugh and the follow-up explains or summarizes the punch line. The duo induces the audience's laughter by intentionally betraying or flouting people's natural assumption or implicature resulting from the conversational flow.

All of the researches above included in pragmatics, that is implicature. There are some differences between all of the researches above and this research. In this research is to describe the implied meaning of conversational implicature in the dialogue between Sentilan and Sentilun, and their guest in *Sentilan Sentilun* Talkshow on Metro TV. And this research is focused on pragmatic field of conversational implicature. This study is limited to the conversation between the two main characters and guest stars in a *Sentilan Sentilun* talkshow in Metro TV, namely Ngoro Sentilan and his assistant Sentilun in two episodes entitled "Godaan Penegak Hukum" and "Indonesia Damai". So, the researcher focuses to analyze the implied meaning on conversational implicature in *Sentilan Sentilun* talkshow in Metro TV which does not researched yet by the researchers above.