

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents some parts such as pragmatics, implicature, conventional implicature, conversational implicature, generalized conversational implicature, particularized conversational implicature, and narrative texts.

A. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the branch of linguistics dealing with language in use and the contexts in which it is used. In other words, pragmatics is a theory of language used by the speaker and listener, the context, the purposes, and the meanings in communication when the utterances are produced. According to Yule (1996), pragmatics is the study of meanings communicated by speaker or writer and interpreted by listener or reader. Besides, he also explained that pragmatics is the study of the relationship between linguistic forms and the user of those forms. Therefore, we can figure out people's intended meanings, their assumptions, their purposes, and kinds of actions they are performing in communication through the context by studying pragmatics.

Furthermore, in studying pragmatics, context is important to interpret the meaning of utterances in communication. It is because people can avoid wrong interpretation regarding to the meaning of an utterance by understanding the context. Cook (1989) stated that the context is knowledge of the world outside language which people used to interpret. It can be said that context is the related factors that contributes to build the understanding

about the intended meaning the speaker wants to convey. In this case, context is divided into two parts those are situational context and linguistic context.

As stated by Halliday and Hasan (1989) situational context used to explain why certain things have been said or written in particular opportunity and what else might have been said or written. Therefore, situational context consist in a bare set of features to answer the question about what, who, when, where, why and how the utterances produced. On the other hand, linguistic context consist in a physical set of features such as referring pronoun in the text. Linguistic context also called as co-text. It is the context inside the text. For example "*John so angry with his friend and he left them*". The linguistic context of that sentence is that the pronoun *them* refers to his friend.

In pragmatics, the meanings of an utterance depend on certain situational context. Therefore, pragmatics has the wider concern in studying about the meaning because different situational context of an utterance can created different meaning. It is different from semantics that has the same learning about meaning but the meanings of semantics do not require the situational context of an utterance to be interpreted. It called as literal meaning. Furthermore, Leech (1983) distinct between the meaning of pragmatics and semantics. He stated that the meaning in pragmatics is defined relative to a speaker or user of the language, while the meaning in semantics is defined purely as a property of expressions in a given language,

in abstraction from particular situations, speakers, or hearers. Thus, the study of pragmatics is important because we can find the meaning in a higher level through understanding the context that cannot be found in semantics.

According to Yule (1996), pragmatics has several branches. Those are deixis, reference and inference, presupposition and entailment, cooperative and implicature, speech acts, politeness, conversation and preference structure, discourse and culture. In this study, a branch of pragmatics which studied the implied meaning of utterances would be discussed.

B. Implicature

Implicature is the one of pragmatic branches that the implied meaning beyond the literal sense of what is explicitly stated. People need to study implicature because the meaning of utterances cannot be understood correctly only by using semantic theory. It is because the utterances may contain the literal meaning and implied meaning. Grice introduced the term of implicature to distinct between “what is said” by the speaker of a verbal utterance and “what is implied”. In other words, the utterances may have hidden meanings, regardless of verbal words.

Generally, Grice (1975) divided the implicature into conventional implicature and conversational implicature. Conventional implicature is a kind of implicature that have an original meaning based on the word used in the utterance itself. On the contrary, the meaning of conversational implicature is closely related to the existence of general principles (Nanda,

2016). According to Potts (2005), conventional implicature is an implicature which has a conventional meaning of the word used or it usually called as properties of the grammar. For example, *I eat cheese cake, but my sister eats chocolate cake*. The word “but” in the utterance shows the contrast between the speaker and his sister which is the implied meaning of that utterance.

On the other hand, conversational implicature exists in the case of the maxims and the cooperative principle as the results of flouting Grice maxims in the conversations. For example:

John : “*May I borrow your pen?*”

Lady : “*I have one only.*”

Lady’s answer seems irrelevant with John’s question. She flouted the maxim of relevance. However, after understanding the context of that conversation, it means that Lady has one pen only, so she cannot lend her pen to John. Therefore, the implied meaning of that utterance is she cannot lend her pen. For more explanation regarding both kind of implicature, the distinction of conventional implicature and conversational implicature would be explained.

C. Conventional Implicature

Conventional implicature is a type of implicature which has a conventional meaning of the word used. As stated by Mey in (Khoiroh, 2017) explained that conventional implicature is implicit utterance that does not depend on a particular context of language use; certain expressions in language implicate by themselves, or ‘conventionally’, a certain state of the

world, regardless of their use. It means that the convention has the meaning of arbitrary social practice. Hence, it can be concluded that the words which have conventional meanings are words that have arbitrary meanings. For example the word “*and*” in the following utterance:

*“Yesterday Marry was happy **and** ready to work”*

(Yule, 1996)

The implied meaning of this utterance comes from the particular word **and** which is conventionally agreed by English language user to has the meaning of “*addition*” or “*plus*”. Therefore, the implied meaning of that utterance is Marry was happy yesterday addition she is ready to work.

As explained above, conventional implicature is commonly called as properties of the grammar which means that the conventional implicature is recognized as regular logical entailments. Entailments mean something logically follows from what is affirmed in the utterance (Yule, 1996). As an example “*She is Javanese, therefore she spoke softly*”. The implied meaning of that utterance is she spoke softly because a consequence of her being Javanese.

Conventional implicature do not occur in conversation. They are independent of both cooperative principle and the context of their interpretation. Besides, conventional implicature has several parts which are contributed into specific words. Those are *but, yet, even, still, manage, fail* and *too*. As an example “*Randy **managed** to score a goal*”. The word

managed has the implied meaning that Randy made some effort to score a goal.

D. Conversational Implicature

According to Paul Herbert Grice, conversation is associated with someone's process of observing in conversation, often what is meant by the speakers exceed from what is the speaker says so the listener must conclude and predict the meaning contained (Aglina, 2018). On the other hand, Levinson (1983) stated that the conversational implicature is one of the topics discussed in the emerging pragmatics from contextual factors and understanding that conventions are observed in conversation. This can occur in all forms of communication that exist both verbal and writing. Besides, it is influenced by the intention of the speaker that appears not only literally speech but it has a hidden meaning also. Another definition for interpreting conversational implicature is the implicit information in statements that understand inference techniques where it cannot be applied logically in conversations.

Nanda (2016) stated that the meaning of conversational implicature is closely related to the existence of general principles. In addition, it is proposed by Grice as a set of maximal rules used by the speaker and the listener during their conversation where the context is tied to the on-going conversation. The implication of conversation can be understood by the listener when he/she has the same knowledge as the speaker to interpret the

meaning of the speaker. This kind of phenomenon can occur when the speaker and listener realize that they must be cooperative in communication.

According to Levinson's concept, conversational implicature is a conclusion that can be rejected by three heuristics that are mutually assumed by both the speaker and the listener which are triggered by speaker choice of speech forms and lexical items (Levinson, 1983). The three heuristics are Quantity Principle (Q-Principle), Informativeness Principle (I-Principle), and Manner Principle (M-Principle). The first heuristic means what is not said, is not the case. The second heuristic means what is not said in simple way is stereotypically exemplified. The third heuristic what is said in an abnormal way, is not in a normal situation.

As stated by Tsuda in (Martini, 2018), there are three functions the implicature of indirect conversation namely a principle violation of Grice's cooperation, strength and solidarity, and jokes as an indirect expression. Besides, Grice introduced his thought to make clearer the speaker says in conversation that is cooperative principles (Igwedibia, 2017; Muhartoyo & Sistofa, 2013; Nanda, Sukyadi, & Ihrom, 2012). It means people must obey the cooperative principle when they were doing conversation. On the contrary, when people disobeyed or flouted the cooperative principle means that conversational implicature was applied.

The aimed of cooperative principle that was purposed by Grice is to avoid misunderstanding between the speaker and the listener so the successful communication was created. Therefore, based on his cooperative

principle, there are four maxims or sub principles that must be obey by the speaker and the listener. Those are maxim quality, maxim quantity, maxim manner, and maxim relevance (Wardah, 2018). In other words, the principle and maxims asked the speaker to give a required contribution when the communication occurs.

The maxim quality means making sure that your information is correctly, do not say something that you believe is not true, and do not say something that is unconvincing proof of the truth. The maxim quantity means providing the right amount of information, making the contribution as informative as is required for the specific purpose, and do not provide more information than is required. The maxim relevance means making sure that your utterances are relevant to the topic of conversation. The maxim manner means that you must be brief and orderly in the conversation, avoid ambiguity, and avoid absecurity of expression.

Furthermore, Grice divided the conversational implicature into two parts. These are generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. For deeper explanation, the distinction between generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature would be explained.

E. Generalized Conversational Implicature

Generalized implicature is a type of conversational implicature that it does not require special knowledge in context to express the conveyed meaning. Generalized conversational implicature arises without any

particular context or special scenario being necessary (Ardine & Ariyanti, 2016; Maiska, 2013; Martini, 2018; Nanda, 2016). In other words, specific background of knowledge is unneeded in understanding the speaker's utterances. Grice suggested the use of indefinite articles “*a* or *an*” which carries the implication that it is only remotely related in certain ways for some people indicated by the context (Moha, 2013). The example of generalized conversational implicature as follows:

Robert : “I have some fruits in my bag. What do you like?”

*Shirley : “Oh..I like **an** apple”*

In conversation above, Shirley answer Robert's question by giving clear information. The indefinite article **an** in her statement showed the clear intentions and it did not have an implied meaning. So, there was no implied meaning that being conveyed by Shirley. On the other hand, according to (Yule, 1996) argued that when no special knowledge in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning, it is called generalized conversational implicature. Therefore, the interpretation of the implied meaning in generalized conversational implicature can be easily seen without concerning the local or special knowledge in the context. For another example:

Woman : “Do you invite Bella and Andre tonight?”

Man : “I invited Bella tonight.”

In conversation above, the man might appear to flout the maxim of quantity because he gave too little information. Despite, he did not explain

that he invited Bella only, while Andre is not invited, generally it can be understood from his answer. Therefore, the woman must assume that Andre was not invited in order to make the conversation cooperative.

F. Particularized Conversational Implicature

Particularized conversational implicature is a type of conversational implicature which emerged requiring special context. Levinson and Paltridge (2006) stated that particularized implicature is a conversation which is chosen from specific context, rather than from the use of words alone. Therefore, if the speaker deliberately denounced the maxims, the listener must pay attention to the principle of cooperation at deeper level by analyzing the specific context. For example:

A: "Why haven't you returned yet?"

B: "The sky is getting cloudy, soon the rain will come."

In conversation above, it can be concluded as particularized conversational implicature because the speaker flouted the maxim of relevance. The speaker gave irrelevant answer to the listener. It can be known when the speaker asked the listener for reasons why he/she has not returned home, the listener answered with different context. The listener said "*the sky is getting cloudy, soon the rain will come*" which means that he/she would be late returning home because it would rain. In other words, the implicature of particular conversation is the conclusion of listener that can only be processed or interpreted while drawing totally on particular utterances context (Moha, 2013).

Another example of particularized conversational implicature can be seen when someone says to her friend *"I like when you sing out of key all the times"*, but in the real situation she did not like to hear it (Wardah, 2018). In that statement, the speaker flouted the maxim of quality because she said something which she/he beliefs to be false. However, she/he did not intend to lie, but she/he asked the hearer to understand what an implied meaning that actually she wanted to convey. In fact, her/his utterance implied that she did not like when the hearer sings out of key all the times.

G. Narrative Text

Narrative text is an English text type to tell a story that has connected chronological collection. The purpose of this text is to attract the reader's intention about a story. The core story of a narrative texts usually exist in the imagination of the writer or real events captured by the author or even only. There are many forms of narrative texts, such as fairy tales (stories about animals behave like humans, the story is fantastic, full of miracles), science fiction, romance horror stories, legends, history, personal experiences, love ballads, etc (Mislaini, 2015).

As stated by Milhorn in (Larasati, 2016), there are six elements of narrative texts such as plot, story, structure consist of setting, characters, point of view, prose, theme and subject. Derewianka, Gerot and Wignell in (Sari & Sabri, 2017) argued that the only characteristics of narrative texts differ among the generic structure or organization of texts stories. In

particular, the characteristics of narrative texts are social function and language features as the aim of the text itself.

In this case, Gerot and Wignell (1994) added deep evaluation and reorientation generic structure of narrative texts. Generic structures used in narrative texts are orientation, complications, and resolution. Therefore, the narrative texts were chosen because it is one of the teaching guidelines used in schools. Furthermore, the social functions and language features of the narrative texts used in this study are the same as those of the experts.