

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter is about considerable related literatures that support the researcher's ideas, including some terminological field of study, the description of the research object and previous studies.

A. Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is study of language which involves how language is used by the users in accordance with their real language use in their daily life related to language forms, meaning-bound and context influence. Hence, it closely attaches to the notion of how language, both in spoken or written, portrays the relationship between the users, the surface structure of speech or writing, the literal and broad meaning and contextual proportion that influences in language area. 'Discourse analysis considers how language, both spoken and written, enacts social and cultural perspectives and identities.'¹ The focus of the study in discourse analysis is precisely about language beyond its form (spoken or written) and how it can lead to a successful communication. Some discourse analysts are interested in studying texts and linguistic structure of the language, some concern in how speech enacts in the use of successful communication and some are entranced on the relationship between social, culture and language.

Meanwhile, at the top point, discourse analysis, as much as what experts say, deals with the issue of language phenomena takes place peculiarly in the world.

¹ James Paul Gee, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and method*, (New York: Routledge, 2011), 1.

B. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the study of language in practice involving linguistic structures, meaning of words and context-bound. Paltridge (2006) states that “Pragmatics is the study of meaning in relation to the context in which a person is speaking or writing.”² The major topic to discuss in pragmatics is precisely about how language is used by the language users to communicate. How practical language is not far from how meaning relates to the context. Hence, communication will be succeeded if both meaning and context within language use is appropriate. “Pragmaticists study the way in which language is appropriate to the contexts in which it is used.”³

It is very critical in the nature of pragmatics to be aware of the circumstances on how speaker or writer uses their language in particular way to expose what he wants to tell other language users about. Moreover, the presence of the-context-in-which-language-used is the essence of studying pragmatics. Language users will interpret meaning of a certain utterance differently if it occurs on different context. That is the reason why pragmatics carries on how language (spoken and written utterances and meaning) copes appropriately with its context.

The idea of enchaining relationship between the language users and some circumstantial notions of contexts engenders such impression that pragmatics deals with the cooperation of both language users aspects and language itself. There is cooperation of inter-language users as well as between language users, language

² Brian Paltridge, *Discourse Analysis – An Introduction*, (London: Continuum, 2006), 53.

³ Peter Grundy, *Doing Pragmatics*, (London: Arnold, 2000), 19.

and the circumstances of when, where, and how language is used. Concisely, language is used in cooperative way by its users under distinctive context to succeed the communicational aim. “Pragmatics focuses more on how we achieve meaning in particular contexts, by taking into account things like how, where and when something is said, who says it, what the relationship is between the speaker and hearer, and how we make sense of ambiguous uses of language.”⁴

Pragmatics has several distinctive discussion in particular fields such as deixis, speech act, implicature, presupposition, politeness theory etc. All those discussions cope with language study in different point of view but still deliberate how language is used. One of them that cannot be apart from the context properties and cooperative notion is implicature. Thus, Brian Paltridge states that “Pragmatics assumes that when people communicate with each other they normally follow some kind of co-operative principle; that is, they have a shared understanding of how they should co-operate in their communications.”⁵

In conclusion, pragmatics is a language study of such a complex process occurs in communication that embrace the notion of how language and its setting are engaged appropriately to achieve collaborative understanding and communication.

⁴ Paul Baker and Sibonile Ellece, *Key Terms in Discourse Analysis*, (London: Continuum, 2011), 100.

⁵ Brian Paltridge, *Discourse Analysis – An Introduction*, (London: Continuum, 2006), 53.

C. Implicature

The term of *Implicature* was first introduced by H. P. Grice to encounter the issue that there is meaning or intention beyond what merely said or entailed in communication. Implicature is stated by Grice as a term ‘to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean as distinct from what speaker literally says’.⁶ It can occur in any kinds of communication written or spoken. Speaker’s intention does not literally emerge on his utterances but beyond its meaning. There is something more than what a speaker says or utters on the surface form of language which should be regarded as the real intended meaning of the speaker. Furthermore, the issue of implicature is closely associated to context bound which formidably influences in determining the implicature.

Implicature can be explained through a simple example proposed by Peter Grundy in his book, *Doing Pragmatics*. He uses an expression saying, ‘*It’s the taste*’ to draw understanding that context affects how language users interpret the meaning of the utterance. Peter Grundy explained, when ‘*It’s the taste*’ expression is used in the context of Coca-Cola advertisement, we probably draw meaning from it that the taste of the drink is good. In contrast, the implicature will be so much different if the context is in the situation in which someone who refuses her school dinner and says, ‘*It’s the taste*’, it is understandable that she means the taste is not good. From this example, it is a proof that there is meaning beyond particular utterance said by a speaker and the meaning depends on the context when it is said.

⁶ Gillian B and George Yule, *Discourse Analysis*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 31.

In his *Logic and Conversation*, Grice defends on how logic and conversation relates each other in language users' mind during the process of communication.⁷ In the nature of communication where one person speaks to others about certain thing, there is cooperative effort between them to reach eloquent communication. This effort engages the circumstances of linguistic form and intended meaning by the speaker and how audience can make distinctive interpretation amongst them. Likewise, implicature is defined as 'information which is implied in a statement but cannot be derived from applying logical inferencing techniques to it.'⁸ Reflecting to the example about '*It's the taste*' above, to draw a proper understanding about that expression cannot be derived logically based on the lexical figure or literal meaning. The context bound settles what information carried by '*It's the taste*' differently within different context.

Thus, to account for this issue, Grice divided implicature into two types, they are conventional implicature and conversational implicature. The definition and distinction between these two types in details below.

1. Conventional Implicature

Conventional implicature is considered as the conventional meaning of utterances said by speaker. It is regarded to be no more than literal meaning of linguistic form of the speech or writing. Conventional implicature is also determined as mere semantic meaning which is drawn

⁷ H. P. Grice, *Logic and Conversation*, (United States: Harvard University Press, 1991).

⁸ Paul Baker and Sibonile Ellece, *Key Terms in Discourse Analysis*, (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2011), 59.

not more from the lexical word form. Grice gives an instance about conventional implicature in following sentence:

He is an Englishman; he is, therefore, brave.

The presence of word ‘therefore’ as lexical item leads us to the understanding that the man becomes brave is a consequence of his being an Englishman. It appears that conventional implicature of this sentence is ‘the man’s being brave follows from his being an Englishman’.

Another example in which it can be identified that lexicon or grammar (the surface form of utterance) affects the understanding to draw meaning from the utterance is given by Grundy (2000) who calls conventional implicature as non-conversational implicature. The expression written on a tube of toothpaste said:

Actually fights decay.

Grundy says that it is such obvious example of a conventional implicature since the word ‘*actually*’ there does not only state the literal meaning of the lexical item ‘*actually*’ but also give implied meaning which is he states as ‘*although this is hard to credit.*’ He concludes that it is an implicature because it is not part of the entailment of *actually*.⁹

Conventional implicature has no relationship to any principles or maxims like its counterpart, conversational implicature. It is derived from what is said and it is literal meaning of what is said. In other words, conventional implicature can be regarded as explicit meaning of utterance

⁹ Peter Grundy, *Doing Pragmatics*, (London: Arnold, 2000).

or speech or writing used by language users. Levinson defines conventional implicature as ‘non-truth-conditional inference that are not derived from superordinate pragmatic principles like the maxims, but are simply attached by convention to particular lexical items or expression (1983: 127)’¹⁰. Consequently, the understanding of the meaning is no more than just based on the straight meaning of words.

2. Conversational Implicature

The notion of conversational implicature is closely related to the presence of general principle, which is proposed by Grice as a set of rule of maxims which is normally speaker and hearer will act upon during their talk, and context bound in which the conversation takes place. Conversational implicature apparently can be understood as what a hearer can interpret from what literally speaker says since they share same knowledge of context bound that what speaker says does mean so even though it does not merely appear in the speech. This kind of phenomena possibly can occur when both speaker and hearer realize that they should be cooperative in communication.

Conversational implicature is a more complex version of implicature. The distinction between conventional implicature and conversational implicature is not more than that conversational implicature takes more concerns in study than conventional one.

¹⁰ Peter Grundy, *Doing Pragmatics*, (London: Arnold, 2000), 84.

Yule (1983) states, ‘much greater interest to discourse analysis is the notion of conversational implicature which is derived from a general principle of conversation plus a number of maxims which speakers will normally obey.’¹¹ While Grundy (2000) states that ‘an implicature is the result of an addressee drawing an inductive inference as to the likeliest meaning in the given context’¹², it can be drawn that conversational implicature might be the genuine definition of implicature itself. Therefore, from the deliberation above, conversational implicature is something more than conventional or literal meaning of words or utterances since it engages the presence of principle and a number of maxims.

The concept of the general principle is labeled as Cooperative Principle by Grice and described in detail in the following term: “Makes 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.”¹³

In addition to the Cooperative Principle, Grice also proposes the four maxims based on the principle he argues that takes a part in determining conversational implicature. Cooperative principle and the maxims is regarded as a set of keys to interpret the conversational implicature. Summed up from Grice (1975, 26-27), the maxims are as follows:

a. Quantity:

¹¹ Gillian B and George Yule, *Discourse Analysis*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

¹² Peter Grundy, *Doing Pragmatics*, (London: Arnold, 2000).

¹³ H. P. Grice, *Logic and Conversation*, (United States: Harvard University Press, 1991), 26.

- 1) Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purpose of the exchange).
 - 2) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.
- b. 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. Relation: Be relevant.
- d. Manner: Be perspicuous.
- 1) Avoid obscurity of expression.
 - 2) Avoid ambiguity.
 - 3) Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
 - 4) Be orderly.

In accordance with this notion, Borg (2008) defines conversational implicature in general as ‘are those propositions which a hearer is required to assume in order to preserve her view of the speaker as a cooperative partner in communication’¹⁴. It shows that cooperative principle always copes with the conversational implicature.

¹⁴ Emma Borg, “On Three Theories of Implicature: Default Theory, Relevance Theory and Minimalism”. Versions of this paper were presented at a workshop on minimal semantics at the University of Valladolid, Spain, the 9th International Pragmatics Association conference in Italy, 2008.

Levinson (2000) draws an explanation of how conversational implicature can be derived based on his abbreviation from Grice that ‘by saying p, utterer U conversationally implicates q if and only if:

- (i) U is presumed to be following the maxims
- (ii) The supposition of q is required to maintain (i)
- (iii) U thinks the recipient will realize (ii)¹⁵

Borrowing Grundy’s (2000) example, this illustration below will make sense of this deliberation. The contextual premise is B rushes into the kitchen to grab a barrel full of biscuit after she comes home from school and the A asks her:

A: *Why you didn’t eat you school dinner?*

B: *It’s the taste.*

B will conversationally implicate the supposition that ‘her school dinner does not taste good’ if and only if:

- (i) B is presumed to be following the maxims
- (ii) The supposition ‘her school dinner does not taste good’ is required to maintain (i)
- (iii) B thinks that A will realize (ii)

¹⁵ Stephen C. Levinson, *Presumptive Meaning: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature Language, Speech, and Communication*, (London: MIT Press, 2000), 15.

By saying 'It's the taste', B tries to tell the reason why she did not eat her school dinner (she observes the maxims and does try to full if the cooperative principle by saying it which she thinks will be realized by A). When A realizes this circumstance, A will realize that B tries to be cooperative in the talk and A draws inference from 'It's the taste' that B does not like her school dinner or it tastes no good. This drawing interpretation cannot be separated from the contextual premises stated before.

Thus, conversational implicature cannot be separated from the notion of cooperative principle and four conversational maxims in which context engages to determine the interpretation of any utterances which are considered as conversational implicature. The example of '*It's the taste*', likely an example of one of types of conversational implicature, simply emphasizes the presence of conversational implicature where context significantly influences to interpret what meaning brought by the expression. Potts (2012) states 'a conversational implicature is an inference that the hearer is compelled to make if he is going to continue to maintain that the speaker is cooperative'¹⁶

In addition, if the context changes into very different occasion, the interpretation will be different too. Context is another key to understand conversational implicature besides cooperative principles and the maxims. Nevertheless, conversational implicature is divided into generalized

¹⁶ Chris Potts, *Conversational Implicature: an overview*, (Stanford: Ling236, 2012), 3)

conversational implicature (GCI) and particularized conversational implicature (PCI) based on the consideration of any context bound influence.

a. Generalized Conversational Implicature

Generalized conversational implicature is the meaning that is regardlessly drawback of the context. It means that certain utterances will always be regarded as it is no matter what the context. However the context changes, generalized conversational implicature will not change. ‘Generalized conversational implicatures arise irrespective of the context in which they occur.’¹⁷

Grundy (2000) makes use of an example to explain that context does not bound generalized conversational implicature with assertion ‘*Some people believe in God.*’ In any occasion when this kind of assertion is uttered, the implicature that arises is that ‘*not everyone does*’. The implicature ‘*not all*’ might be always drawn from ‘*some*’ in any contextual premise.

In addition, this example will give rise same generalized conversational implicature as what deliberated above. ‘*Some students have finished their assignment*’, from which it is drawn ‘*that not all students have finished the work*’ no matter what the context. It is considered that ‘*some*’ derives inference ‘*not all*’, but it is regarded as generalized conversational implicature rather than an entailment. This

¹⁷ Peter Grundy, *Doing Pragmatics*, (London: Arnold, 2000), 81.

kind of implicature result from the quantity maxim which deals with how much information contributed by speaker is as required as it expected.

Dealing with the notion of generalized conversational implicature, Grice (1975) considers '*X is meeting a woman this evening*' as a sort of example. Someone who says that utterance must be in capability to assume that the woman in the topic is unknown to his counterpart. That the identity of the woman that X is meeting is unknown is the generalized conversational implicature derived from the indefinite noun phrase which is regarded as undefined to the hearer since the woman is likely not X's wife, mother, aunt or sister or even a woman he knew before.

Additionally, someone who says '*Mary Ann can eat ten big pieces of apple pie in one minute*' will be probably regarded as an utterance that conversationally implies Mary Ann can eat not less than ten. This implicature arises as the result of quantity maxim in which the speaker observes.

Generalized conversational implicature has no deal with any understanding which is most relevant context of an utterance because it derives solely from the maxims, usually from the maxims of Quantity and Manner. Geurts (2010) deliberates an example which involves the maxim of Manner in defining conversational implicature, an example

which is closely to the characteristic of generalized conversational implicature.

Example: *Miss X produced a series of sounds that corresponded closely with the score of "Home sweet home".*¹⁸

The utterance above can be understood by merely drawing interpretation from its literal meaning, context bound is far apart needed to understand what it means. The implicature that can be drawn from the utterance is Miss X did not sing well. Therefore, the speaker uses unusual way 'produced a series of sounds' that instructs the notion of 'sing' instead of simply using word 'sing' since the speaker predicts that 'sing' is inappropriate to say about what Miss X did. Based on the way the speaker saying, he uses such peculiar manner to attribute his intention to his audience. If he was sure enough that Miss X sang badly, he could say so. But instead of frontally saying that, the speaker chooses to considerably use more wordy expression. It can be concluded that the utterance attaches to generalized conversational implicature by maxim of Manner.

b. Particularized Conversational Implicature

Particularized conversational implicature (PCI) acts differently from GCI since it depends on what context in which the utterance occurs. If the context influences the interpretation of utterance, like in the

¹⁸ Bart Geurts, *Quantity Implicature*, (USA: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 13.

utterance '*It's the taste*' above, it is considered as particularized conversational implicature.

The context determines how utterance interpreted. In this situation, '*It's the taste*' is dealing with what context that is relevant to draw an understanding about the utterance. Different implicature will be drawn when different context takes a part. If '*It's the taste*' is uttered by an actor in a food or beverage advertisement, then it will be logically accepted that the actor means that the products taste good and deserve to try. Meanwhile, the implicature of this utterance derives extremely different meaning when it is said by someone who chooses to have dinner at home instead of her school dinner. The audience will draw an interpretation that the reason why she did not eat her dinner school is the taste of the dinner is not good. Thus, with two different contexts, an utterance can derive very different implicature.

Due to particular features of context, particularized conversational implicature can be drawn. In the case of '*It's the taste*', the audience can derive what the speaker means even though the utterance inadequately informs and tends to be an obscured expression. It shows that this utterance flouts two maxims, Quantity and Manner.

Moreover, the maxim of Relation is observed to understand and make interpretation over the expression. Since the context change will influence how it is interpreted, the relation of the utterance and its context is the notion of maxim that should be noticed to gain proper and

appropriate understanding about the utterance. ‘Particularized conversational implicatures are inference that we need to draw if we are to understand how an utterance is relevant in some context.’¹⁹

In addition, the example of sentences from Grice (1975) below will deliberate how particularized conversational implicature can be perceived.

A: *Smith doesn't seem to have a girlfriend these days.*

B: *He has been paying a lot of visits to New York lately.*

Apparently, B gives obscured information. It implicates that Smith has a girlfriend in New York. It shows that by saying that utterance, B realize that he intends to be relevant to A's statement but instead of merely saying ‘*Smith has one in New York*’, B employ that such prolix utterance that encodes the concept that Smith has girlfriend lately. In addition, assuming that B avoids giving wrong information, he rather uses that utterance than bluntly says ‘*Smith does have a girl now*’. From this deliberation, it can be concluded that B's utterance is particularized conversationally implicate ‘Smith has girlfriend in New York’ by which the maxim of relation and quality are observed but quantity and manner is flouted.

¹⁹ Peter Grundy, *Doing Pragmatics*, (London: Arnold, 2000), 82.

D. Cooperative Principle

Cooperative Principle is a set of rule in which people in a talk will try to notice. People are tend to be cooperative when they communicate in order to make others understand and obtain what they want to inform. Grice (1975) observed this notion and reinforced his remark by proposing a general principle and a number of maxims that are generally conformed by speakers in the communication. The general norm that is proposed by Grice is marked as Cooperative Principle which is stated below:

*'Makes 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'*²⁰

As a result, a speaker is expected to give sufficient information (not less, not more) and tell the truth which is relevant to the context and the audience expectation and in a transparently clear manner. According to this notion, a number of maxims follows to scrutinize the issue of implicature. Those maxims are maxim of quantity, quality, relation and manner.

1. Maxim of quantity

Based on the first point of Cooperative Principle (make your conversational such as is required), the maxim of quantity is emphasized.

Grice (1975) defined the maxim of quantity into two points:

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

²⁰ H. P. Grice, *Logic and Conversation*, (United States: Harvard University Press, 1991), 26.

- b. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required

If a speaker observes this maxim, when someone ask her to get him a pencil, she will not give him two pencils as what her counterpart expected. An illustration presented in conversation below will explain the notion of maxim of quantity clearer.

A: Have you finished your homework?

B: It's a hectic day, though. I had to pick up Jim from airport after school then make sure that I didn't forget to pick up Mom too in the supermarket. Mom's yearning of Jim and his homesickness looked like a reason why I prepared for dinner.

A apparently asks a clear and specific question to B and expects proper answer from her. Meanwhile, B implies that she has not finished her homework yet and might has no time to make it by saying those wordy expressions instead of answering A's question with '*No, I have not*' which should be regarded to be the expected and enough answer if B observed the maxim of quantity. This notion gives evidence that people might tend to give over informed contribution in their talk due to certain intention. It can be concluded that the utterance of B derives implicature due to the flouted maxim of quantity and manner (due to its prolix expression).

2. Maxim of quality

The notion of maxim of quality obliges a speaker to be truthful with his saying and capable to show the evidence of his speech. It means that to be cooperative, a speaker should give true and tenable information in the communication. The maxim of quality is formalized as below:

- a. Do not say what you believe to be false
- b. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence

A speaker is expected to tell the truth rather than be liable for what he says. He is required to be cooperative by which he possibly has sufficient proof that what he says is true due to the context and audience expectation. It can be illustrated as like when a person is asking me to hand him a discourse analysis book, I am cooperatively expected to give him one not a sociolinguistic book. This example of sentence will illustrate that maxim of quality roles in deriving implicature.

X: Discourse analysis is a very broad major of study.

If the speaker utters so, then it implicates that he is sure that he can prove that his statement is true and will give additional information explaining the reasoning information about how he defines discourse analysis scope of study which seemingly well-founded to be universally accepted as true statement by people who master discourse analysis. In conclusion, to observe maxim of quality a speaker or writer should consider whether his contribution is true and provable due to the context.

Grice examples some notions in which maxim of quality is flouted. When speech or writing employs a sort of figure of speech below, it is regarded to flout maxim of quality.

1) Irony is a statement in which the meaning that a speaker implies differs sharply from the meaning that is ostensibly expressed.²¹

When a speaker utters a statement in which irony is employed, the maxim of quality is flouted though. For example: The orange taste sugary, it makes my tongue wrinkled. The speaker is flouting the maxim of quality by employing such irony, uttering that the orange is sweet but then giving follow-up information that encodes the concept of sour orange.

2) Metaphor is an expression which describe a person or object in a literary way by referring to something that is considered to have similar characteristics to the person or object you are trying to describe.²² For example: You are a sky full of stars. This utterance implicate that the person that is described likely has similarity by ‘a sky full of stars’ which is well-founded to be something beautiful. But instead of merely saying ‘You are beautiful’, the speaker flouts the maxim of quality by uttering his intention metaphorically.

²¹ M. H. Abrams, *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, (USA: Earl McPeck, 1999), 135.

²² A. S. Hornby, *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

- 3) Meiosis is closely similar to irony but different in some way. It is a kind of expression in which the utterance understates the real condition. Likewise, it is closely to be the opponent of hyperbole. For example, Grice examples a contextual premise followed by the utterance consists of meiosis: Of a man known to have broken up all the furniture, one says *He was a little intoxicated*.²³ In fact, he might be not only 'a little' intoxicated but also very mad. But the speaker understates it by uttering that expression.
- 4) Hyperbole is bold overstatement, or the extravagant exaggeration of fact or of possibility.²⁴ For example: Sally's beauty cannot be compared with a thousand queens in the universe. That kind of expression seemingly sounds extravagantly in describing someone. The fact is exaggerated by uttering words 'cannot be compared with a thousand queens in the universe'. It might be unlikely possible for the speaker to give sufficient evidence to make his utterance well-founded as well. As the result, an implicature that can be drawn from the utterance is Sally is very beautiful. Thus, this notion proves that maxim of quality is flouted to derive the implicature.

²³ H. P. Grice, *Logic and Conversation*, (United States: Harvard University Press, 1991), 34.

²⁴ M. H. Abrams, *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, (USA: Earl McPeck, 1999), 120.

3. Maxim of relation

Maxim of relation is explained in short term 'Be relevant' by Grice. Furthermore, a speaker is required to give relevant information due to the context of conversation or communication to be assumed that he is cooperative to his counterpart. He is expected by the listener or reader to give pertinent information. Grice illustrates this notion as: 'if I am mixing ingredients for a cake, I do not expect to be handed a good book, or even an oven cloth (though this might be an appropriate contribution at a later stage).²⁵

4. Maxim of manner

Maxim of manner deals with how the utterance is said. It is proposed by Grice in a short supermaxim 'Be perspicuous' in which the four maxims are explained in details:

- a. Avoid obscurity of expression
- b. Avoid ambiguity
- c. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)
- d. Be orderly

It explains that how speaker should express his contribution into the conversation is avoidable from obscurity of expression and ambiguity. It should be uttered briefly and orderly as well. For example:

²⁵ H. P. Grice, *Logic and Conversation*, (United States: Harvard University Press, 1991), 28.

A: Have you finished your homework?

B: It's a hectic day, though. I had to pick up Jim from airport after school then make sure that I didn't forget to pick up Mom too in the supermarket. Mom's yearning of Jim and his homesickness looked like a reason why I prepared for dinner.

Instead of uttering concise answer, B chooses not to be brief but derive implicature by expressing how her answer encodes information that might be suitable to answer A's question. This notion proves that maxim of manner is flouted to draw implicature.

Based on the notion of Cooperative Principle and maxims engagement in implicature derivation, it can be concluded that participants of communication both in spoken and written form might act differently in each occasion toward the notion of being cooperative in the exchange. Paltridge (2006:65) states 'a speaker may also infringe a maxim when they fail to observe a maxim with no intention to deceive, such as where a speaker does not have the linguistic capacity to answer a question. A speaker may also decide to opt out of a maxim such as where a speaker may, for ethical or legal reasons, refuse to say something that breaches a confidentiality agreement they have with someone, or is likely to incriminate them in some way (Thomas 1995; Cutting 2002)'.

E. Flouting and Hedging maxims

In the universe of Grice's implicature theory, the term of maxims is frequently related to flouting and hedging. Flouting and hedging are two notions that indicate a certain speaker does not obey at least one maxim in his utterance. When a speaker puts up with the maxims, it means that the implicature arise since the maxims are fulfilled. It is like the hearer or reader regards that the speaker completes and obeys the cooperative principle. But sometimes, in the real communication, especially in such a kind of literary work, the cooperative principle is not always abided. The maxims of conversation can be flouted or hedged. Furthermore, these two notions should be explained clearly to differentiate the maxims position in the talk.

1. Flouting maxims

Flouting maxims can be understood as the speaker's attempt to state what he means by disobeying at least one maxim in his utterance. It has been discussed in part Cooperative Principle about several examples that shows how each maxim is flouted. Grundy (2000) says that 'whenever a maxim is flouted there must be an implicature to save the utterance from simply appearing to be a faulty contribution to a conversation'²⁶. It means that even though one or two maxims are flouted from which the implicature can arise to save to utterance from being wrong-founded toward the listener or reader. Flouting maxims is not a wrong action but it is more like dynamic

²⁶ Peter Grundy, *Doing Pragmatics*, (London: Arnold, 2000), 76.

consequences that a speaker is not subjected to do falsity but rather peculiarly making the utterance more interesting in the talk.

One of example of flouting maxim is represented by maxim of quality which often faces various circumstances as like a metaphor. For instance as what has been mentioned above in maxim of quality section; ‘You are a sky full of stars’. This utterance implicate that the person that is described likely has similarity by ‘a sky full of stars’ which is well-founded to be something beautiful. But instead of merely saying ‘You are beautiful’, the speaker flouts the maxim of quality by uttering his intention metaphorically.

Hence, it can be summarily concluded that ‘flouting a maxim is a particularly salient way of getting an addressee to draw an inference and hence recover an implicature’.²⁷

2. Hedging maxims

Hedging maxims is the term to define the speaker’s attempt to show his assertions to inform his audience of the extent to which they are abiding by the maxims. Hedging maxims can be regarded as speaker’s comment on what he conveys rather than what he implies. Meanwhile, the hedges can be in the form of phrases, clause or sentence. For instance, Grundy (2000) made an example to explain the hedging maxims, using a bald statement from which it will be added by the examples of hedges.

Sentence ‘Smoking damages your health’ is regarded as hesitantly used since it is too bald. But people will rather say utterances like ‘All I

²⁷ Peter Grundy, *Doing Pragmatics*, (London: Arnold, 2000), 78.

know is smoking damages your health' or something like 'They say smoking damages your health'. Of course it makes sense that it draws different implicature on the audience's mind by adding intensifiers or comments like 'All I know' and 'They say'. By applying such comment like 'All I know' and 'They say', the speaker is considered making use of hedging maxims.

The speaker who says 'All I know is smoking...' concurrently advises the addressee that the quantity of information being conveyed about smoking is limited. Thus, the maxim of quantity is hedged here. Another different maxim that is hedged is maxim of quality if the speaker uses comment 'They say', it seems like the speaker shows his lack of sureness of what he conveyed and might not be as understandable as would normally expected. It seems that the speaker is lack of adequate evidence about this information. If he has no doubt or worries lacking sufficient evidence, he is normally expected to say something like 'I am sure smoking damages your health'.

Grundy (2000) said that 'the hedges and intensifiers are more comment on the extent to which the speaker is abiding by the maxims which guide our conversational contribution than a part of what is said or conveyed.'²⁸

²⁸ Peter Grundy, *Doing Pragmatics*, (London: Arnold, 2000), 79.

F. The Fault in Our Stars

The Fault in Our Stars, is a young-adult novel authored by John Green and first published by Dutton Books, an imprint of Penguin Group (USA) Inc. in 2012. This novel consists of 25 chapters and has 313 pages thickness. *The Fault in Our Stars* has been published in several language versions such as Dutch, German, Spanish, French, Swedish, Danish, Icelandic, Hebrew, Chinese, Portuguese and Bahasa Indonesia. Indonesian version of this book was published by Qanita Publishing, Mizan Pustaka in 2012. *The Fault in Our Stars*, also known as TFiOS, is intended for the readers from 16-24 years old since the genre of this novel is young-adult.

This novel tells a tragic-romance story about two teenagers suffering for cancer who find the meaning of love and life each other since they met. Hazel Grace Lancaster (main character) who is suffering thyroid cancer in her lungs met Augustus Waters (secondary main character), a boy a little older than Hazel who lost a quarter of his leg because of osteosarcoma in the occasion of Support Group meeting (a group in which several cancer survivors meet to share their cancer fighting survival stories). They had in common since the day they met in that bored support group and got closer relationship since they shared each other about books they read until finally they fell in love each other.

Hazel who is an attractive girl – although she does not admit it – idolizes the book *An Imperial Affliction* written by a man named Peter Van Houten and has high willingness to meet Peter to ask him about the book endings which is mid-sentence

ended. She tells Augustus everything about the book even though she is uncertain to do it because she rarely shares anything with other people especially about her favorite book. Immediately, Augustus got interested too in that book and they are involved each other in any discussion about the book then soon they become good friends.

Surprisingly, Augustus tells Hazel that he e-mails successfully to Peter van Houten via his assistant Lidwijn and tells to Peter everything about Hazel Grace. About her courage to meet him and her curiosity toward the ending of his book. They unintentionally manage a plan to go to Amsterdam if any condition sustaining them.

When Isaac (Hazel's and Augustus's friend from support group) loses his eyes for a cancer and loses his girl friend Monica, Hazel and Augustus cannot do nothing for Isaac but being there for him. Hazel and Augustus soon see that Isaac's losing reminds them about what they want to do for each other.

So as Augustus still has his wish (special wish for dying child given by a kind of wish granting foundation for survivors of any serious illness), he wants to use his wish to take Hazel to Amsterdam to meet Peter Van Houten and make Hazel's dream comes true; knowing the very ending of the novel *An Imperial Affliction*. After all of necessary medical treatments and any details about it accomplished, Hazel and Augustus, accompanied by Hazel's mother are ready to fly to Amsterdam.

Hazel and Augustus finally meet Peter Van Houten in his house. However, the expectation is far from the reality. Hazel thinks that Peter will be such a nice guy like a nice writer she ever knew but in fact Peter is a kind of rude and lunatic drunk rather than a nice man who wrote that Hazel's favorite book. But the worse is Peter does not answer any single thing from Hazel's questions. It was so upsetting and irritating for Hazel Grace that they have flown so far from America to Dutch just for meeting a mad guy who is conceived as amazing writer by Hazel. She feels so sorry to Augustus that his wish is just spent on disappointing reader-writer's meeting. But at least, Ligwijn offers a brief tour around Amsterdam to Hazel and Augustus to go to Anna Frank's house as an apology and her regrets about Peter's rude attitude.

Hazel and Augustus have very nice days in Amsterdam together. They have showed their feeling each other and confess that they are both falling in love. Under the illness condition they can find each other and making time together. They soon go back to Indianapolis after a unsatisfying meet with Peter Van Houten. However, suddenly a calamity strikes; Augustus's cancer is back and his in a horrendous condition. Everyone is so shocked knowing about Augustus's cancer, at most Hazel is. At the first time Hazel thinks that she is the one who really dying and will die before anyone but now she has to figure it out about a boy she loves who probably cannot stay a little longer with her. Augustus died soon after Hazel and Isaac reading eulogies dedicated for Augustus and Hazel is drowning in a deep heartbreak.

The story ends with Augustus's funeral. There surprisingly for, Peter Van Houten show up in Augustus's funeral. He tells Hazel about Augustus writing her an eulogy before he died. In that eulogy, Augustus tells how much precious Hazel Grace to him and how much he thanks for he can meet a girl like Hazel. Augustus hopes, in the eulogy, that Hazel could live a little longer and become happy with her choice to live a little longer and do everything she can do and make a life.

TFiOS has good reputation as a literary work. It has several honorable awards since the publishing date and attracts a lot of attention from readers all around the world. It is awarded as #1 New York Times Bestseller, #1 Wall Street Journal Bestseller, #9 The Bookseller (UK) Bestseller, #1 Indiebound Bestseller, New York Times Book Review Editor's Choice. This John Green's novel also gets some appreciation to be starred reviews from several book review website, those are Booklist, SLJ, Publisher's Weekly, Horn Book, and Kirkus, a sort of eligible websites of book reviews.²⁹

A lot of readers have read this novel and a lot of them appreciate it. The Goodreads.com, a popular book club website among readers around the world, awarded 'The Fault in Our Stars' to be The Best Young Adult Fiction Goodreads Choice Awards 2012 in which readers on their own choose what novel to award.³⁰ It just takes 75 weeks on USA TODAY's Best-Selling Books list, reaching No. 4 in

²⁹ John Green, "The Fault in Our Stars", *John Green Books*, www.johngreenbooks.com, retrieved on 18 Dec 2013.

³⁰ "Best Books 2012", *Goodreads*, www.goodreads.com, retrieved on 28 March 2014.

Bob Minzesheimer's four-star review, he calls it a "pitch-perfect, elegiac comedy" that's "alternately grim and sweet."³¹

Moreover, this novel gets some admiration praises a lot of starred reviews. One of them, Kirkus review praises *The Fault in Our Stars* that "Green's signature style shines: His carefully structured dialogue and razor-sharp characters brim with genuine intellect, humor and desire."³²

Appreciation and admiration toward TFiOS are getting higher after John Green finally deals with Century FOX for a movie adaption based on his *The Fault in Our Stars*. The bestselling novel is adapted into a cinema with the same title by 20th Century FOX and will be released on June 6th 2014 in USA and forthcoming to other cities around the world. The movie is starring some young actresses and actors, those are Shailene Woodley as Hazel Grace, Ansel Elgot as Augustus Waters and senior well-known actor, William Dafoe roles as Peter Van Houten. Los Angeles Times said it just a day after the movie trailer video is uploaded officially in Century FOX's Youtube channel and the book has reached the number one Amazon's bestseller list. Thus, it proves that the interest is raising among readers and attracting new readers as well. High appreciation for John Green's *The Fault in Our Stars* is definitely causal reason of how literary work can affect people. Showing more than just entertainment literary work, this novel represents that language purpose, indeed, has more than what it seems.

³¹ Lindsay Deutsch, "The Fault in Our Stars' movie gets a release date", *USA Today*, <http://www.usatoday.com/>, 8 Oct 2013, retrieved on 28 March 2014.

³² "The Fault in Our Stars", *Kirkus*, <https://www.kirkusreviews.com/>, 15 Jan 2012, retrieved on 28 March 2014.

G. Previous Studies

Moreover, some earlier researchers also conducted research in the area of implicature study in written literary works. They contribute knowledge in pragmatics study especially in implicature of literary works in distinctive perspective and objects as the following. Harizka (2010) did analysis the implicature in the Dan Brown's novel *The Da Vinci Code* based on the Gricean Maxims. She focused on the implicature analysis in the direct speech in some of the chapters of the novel. She found implicatures in the utterances in the novel and concluded that each of them distinguished each other in the meaning.

Kustantini (2010) focused on the analysis of implicature found in epigraph of book *Chicken Soup for the Soul*. Her focal point was the implicature analyzing based on Grice's theory in the epigraph of the book, finding two types of implicature (conventional and conversational implicature) which the conversational implicature stated two sub-types of particularized and generalized conversational implicature.

Based on the accounts above, the researcher is concerned on scrutinizing the implicatures found in John Green's novel 'The Fault in Our Stars' by applying Grice's implicature theory.