CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL REVIEW

This chapter discusses the theories underlying the study applied in this research. It deals with implicature, types of implicature, characteristic of implicature and previous studies.

A. Implicature

Implicature is a branch of pragmatics that coined by Paul Grice. It is anything that is inferred from an utterance but what is said is not necessary what is meant. According to Grice (1975) implicature is an intentional utterance that suggests something different from what is really talked. Something distinctive is the speaker's deliberate not explicitly stated. In other words, implicatures are covered up intents, desires, or expressions that are not revealed directly in a speech. Based on Endry (2010) Implicature is indirect or implicit meaning of an utterance that is produced by the speaker. Implicature happens when the speaker wants to express something in an implicit or indirect way in a conversation.

Bach and Harnish (1979) claim that implicatures, might be called inference to a plausible explanation. Speakers convey meaning by implicature while hearers, infer meaning from the implicature. Simply put, to imply is to hint, suggest or convey some meaning indirectly by means of language. An implicature is generated intentionally by the speaker and may or may not be understood by the hearer. To infer is to deduce something from evidence (this evidence may be linguistic, paralinguistic, metalinguistic or non-linguistic). Kaburise (2007) An

implicature is an inference, or additional message that the hearer is able to work out from what is said by appealing to various cognitive structures.

Li (2016) noted that the term implicature means something that is implied I the conversation which differs to the literal utterance, then there is left implicit meaning in the real usage of language. Implicature defines his self as expressing more than what is actually said by only little word. Implicatures denotes the act of meaning, implying, or suggesting one thing by saying something else. So the case in which what a speaker means differs from what the sentences used by the speaker means can be viewed as an implicature symptoms.

Paul: Are you going to George's birthday?

Alan: I have to study.

Alan's answer above implicated that she is not going. Alan's answer here is an implicature. The differences between saying and implicating affects whether meaning something one does not believe is a lie. If Alan knew she did not have to work, then she was lying in dialogue. If she knew she was going to George's birthday, she might be guilty of misleading Paul, but not lying.

Mother: How was your exam?

Daughter: Do you want some ice cream?

From the example above, the daughter is flouting the maxim of relevance by saying irrelevant answer to his mother question. With his utterance, the

daughter implied that she does not want to talk about the exam probably because she did not get a good score in her exam.

In conclusion, implicature is the speaker intended meaning or hidden meaning that is implied in the utterances spoken by the speaker. This hidden meaning can be generated by deliberately violating or not following the maxims principles of conversations.

Grice divides implicature into conventional implicature and nonconventional implicature (conversational implicature). Thomas (1995) suggests that both of them have an additional of meaning away from the semantic meaning had by particular utterance. Furthermore, he adds that conversational and conventional implicature are different in the case of context. In conversational implicature, what is implied is varied based on the context of utterance. On the other hand, what is implied in conventional implicature is just the same apart from the context.

B. 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.

1.   Conventional Implicature

According to Grice (1975) the conventional meaning of the words used will determine what is implicated, besides helping to determine what is said. Conventional implicature are associated with specific words and result in additional conveyed meanings when those words are used. Yule (1996) explained that conventional implicature are not based on the cooperative principle of the maxim. They do not have to occur in the conversation, and they do not depend on special contexts for their interpretation.

The other idea, Levinson (1983) defined conventional implicature as non-truth-conditional inferences that are not derived from superordinate pragmatic principle like the maxim, but are simply attached by convention to particular lexical items or expressions.

2.   Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature is a type of implicature that can only be understood and interpreted if the speaker and the listener are able to evaluate the specific context behind the speaker's utterance. Conversational implicature refers to the inference a hearer makes about a speaker's intended meaning that arises from their use of the literal meaning of what the speaker said, the conversational implicature and its maxims.

Griffths (2006) defined that conversational implicature is making infererences which depend on the norms existing for the use of language, such as the extanded agreement that interlocutors should aim to tell the truth when they utter in a conversation. This extended agreement says that the speaker or writer in the communication event is assumed to know and accept the communicational norms. By this general acceptance. The inferences can be made even though sometimes speaker or writer is unable to meet the standard, so he tells a lie.

As Grice (1975) put forward, conversational implicature not only has something to do with linguistic system, but also it is closely related to the general features of discourse. Gibbs (1987) stated that background knowledge, inference rules, and also pragmatic maxims are necessary for appreciating the implied meaning of the speaker's utterance. In this regard, Kleinke (2010) mentioned the context of utterance, background knowledge, and common cultural elements as the key factors contributing to the interpretation of conversational implicature.

Bublitz and Norrick (2011) asserted that conversational implicature is implied or expressed meaning, and inferred or understood from the speaker's utterance without being literally said. Tsuda (1993) explains that functions of conversational implicature is a framework of indirectness conversation that has three functions of indirectness conversation. There are violation of Grice's cooperative principle, power and solidarity, and

joking as indirect expression. Accordingly, the study focuses on analyzing the conversational implicature on Tania Zamorsky's *Pinocchio* novel.

Two types of conversational implicature, there are Generalized Conversational Implicature and Particularized Conversational Implicatures.

a.   Generalized Conversational Implicature

Generalized Conversational Implicature is when no special knowledge is required in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning. Levinson (1983) defines generalized conversational implicature occur without reference to any particular features of the context. Appearance of generalized conversational implicature in conversation do not need special context. In other words, special background knowledge or inferences are not required in calculating the additional conveyed meaning.

Peccei (1999) 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 conversational adopted from Carston:

> Nico: Did the Children's summer camp go well?
>
> Lee: Some of them got the stomach flu.

The conversational 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 conclude that the criterions of generalized conversational implicature are two signs such as using the word "some" to implicate not all called scalar implicature. Another example that include of generalized conversational implicature from the other researcher:

Nike: Did you meet Audy and Ray tonight?

Shela: I met Audy.

From the utterance of Nike and Shela there is no special context of the Shela's statement. Yet, when Nike ask to Shela about whether Shela meet Audy and Ray tonight. Shela only say if she met Audy, she does not say meet Ray also. It means that Shela does not meet Ray. When no special knowledge is requires in the context to calculate conveyed meaning, it is called generalized conversational implicature.

b.   Particularized Conversational Implicature

Particularized conversational implicature is a type in which the interlocutor indirectly required more assistance to understanding meaning of a conversation because the context used in type is not general nature. Yule argued that (1996) particularized

conversational implicature which requires inferences or special background knowledge to understand the context.

Nency: Are you coming the party today?

Dhea: I've got an exam tomorrow.

As an illustration, consider an example where Dhea's response does not appear on the surface to adhere to relevance. It is simply relevant answer would be yes or no. in order to make Dhea's renponse relevant, Nency has to draw on some assumed knowledge that Dhea will be spending today with her parents, consequently she is not the party.

A: "I am so sorry for making you wait in a long time"

B: "That's fine, it just like waiting for one year"

In this context of situation shows that the speaker A requests an apologizing since making B waiting for him in a long time. But in particular context, the hearer B is getting angry even he says "that"s fine" and he extremely bored as he says "it just like waiting for one year". Because there are basically most common, the particularized conversational implicature are typically just called implicature.

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.

C.   Characteristics of Implicature

Grice (1991) formulates the five characteristics of conversation implicature, as follows:

1. In certain circumstances, conversational implicatures can be canceled either explicitly or in a contextual way,

2. The inseparability of conversational implicature by saying something. Usually there is no other more appropriate way to say something so that people use conversations charged with conversation implicatures to convey them,

3. Conversation implicature requires the conventional meaning of the sentence used, but the content of conversation implicature is not included in the conventional meaning of the sentence,

4. The truth of the contents of conversation implicatures does not depend on what is said, but can be calculated from how the action says what is said,

5. Conversational implicatures cannot be given definite specific definitions of their nature.

D.   Previous Studies

There are many previous studies, Anisa (2018) *The Research Examined Conversational Implicature of Indonesian Students of English Education Department in University of Kuningan in The Daily Conversation*. As result, this research found 80 utterances indicating conversational implicature which consist of 32 utterances (40%) belonging to generalized conversational implicature and 48 utterances (60%) belonging to particularized conversational implicature. From the percentage, it can be seen that the dominant of conversational implicature in natural context of Indonesian students is particularized conversational implicature.

Wahyu (2018) conducted the research which is *How to Train your Dragon movie* as the data source. This research aims to analyze the conversational implicature of humor practices in a movie entitled How to Train Your Dragon. Particularized conversational implicature is found as the most dominant type of conversational implicature performed by the characters in the movie since most of the implied meanings needed background knowledge.

The research was conducted by Yuan Li (2017) *An Analysis of the Conversational Implicatures in Bishop's Poetry*. This paper attempts to draw on Grice's cooperative principles as a stylistic device to demonstrate the thematic meaning and the aesthetic effects emerged in the conversational implicatures in Bishop's poetry, particularly North Haven and Insomnia. Applying linguistic theory as a tool to investigate poetry, this paper suggests an innovative approach: a pragmastylistic approach to illustrate literary works. Revealing the relation

between Bishop's violation of cooperative principles including quantity maxim, quality maxim, relation maxim, and manner maxim in specific lines of poetry, and the creation of conversational implicatures, it clarifies the author's connotation underlying the superficial expressions and enables readers to understand the theme in a profound way. By means of developing a particular approach of availing of linguistic principles to demonstrate poetic language, this paper sets up a general scheme to interpret poetry in a stylistic perspective, and sheds light on a multidisciplinary path to explore other literary texts.

Endry (2016) conducted the research entitled *Types of Implicature in Informal Conversational Used by The English Education Study Program Students*. The results was shown that 1) there were three types of implicature found in the informal conversations; conventional implicature, generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature, and 2) the implicature is carried out in the informal conversations by the used of generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. Moreover, a conclusion is students in the informal conversation have potentially implicature that indicates that their utterance has implied meaning.

The research was conducted by Dheril (2015) *Implicature in John Green's The Fault of Our Stars.* The aims of this study are to reveal the use of implicature in a novel by using Grice's cooperative principle framework and to entangle the implied meanings in the conversations in terms of their maxim arrangement. The result of the study shows that there are two kinds of implicature, namely generalized and particularized conversational implicature. It is also found that

there are five patterns of maxims organization in generalized conversational implicatures and four patterns of maxims organization in particularized conversational implicatures.

Sheila Nanda (2012) conducted *Conversational Implicature of The Presenter Take Me Out Indonesia*. This paper is a pragmatics study that aims at investigating conversational implicature that the presenters of Take Me Out Indonesia operate within their utterances along with the possible implications that lie behind the implicature. She found that the generalized conversational implicature in the participants" expressions occur more often than particularized conversational implicature. The comparison of the occurrence is 59.8% generalized implicature and 40.2% particularized implicature.