

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents the review of related literature; it consists of discourse, discourse analysis, Implicature, Conversational Implicature, Gricean Theories of Conversational Implicature, Generalized conversational implicature, Particularized conversational implicature, Conventional Implicature, Scalar implicature, The Politeness Principle and Maxim.

A. Discourse

A Discourse study is the discipline devoted to the investigation of the relation between form and function in verbal communication.⁶ Verbal communication is presented as the performance of acts which must have some relevance for partners involved in it. Discourse in communication, focuses on discourse as part of the situation in which people communicate. Discourse is no discourse at all without sender and receiver. Therefore, discourse can not be studied adequately without the discourse situation being taken into account.

Another meaning conceives discourse as ‘language above the sentence or above the clause and would lend itself to the analysis of text structure and pragmatics. Discourse can also be used to refer to particular contexts of language use, and in this sense it becomes similar to concepts like genre or text type. For example, we can conceptualize political discourse (the sort of language used in political contexts) or media discourse (language use in the

⁶Jenrenkema. *Discourse Studies an Introductory Text Book*. (Philadelphia: John Bejamins publishing Company, 1993)p.1

media). In addition, some writers have conceived of discourse as related to particular topics, such as an environmental discourse or colonial discourse (which may occur in many different genres). Such labels sometimes suggest a particular attitude towards a topic (e.g. people engaging in environmental discourse would generally be expected to be concerned with protecting the environment rather than wasting resources). Related to this, Foucault defines discourse more ideologically as ‘practices which systematically form the objects of which they speak’.⁷ According to Harris, connected discourse occurs within a particular situation whether of a person speaking, or a conversation, or someone sitting down occasionally over period of months to write particular kind of a book in a particular literary or scientific tradition.⁸ Thus, discourse not only share particular meanings, they also have a characteristic linguistic features associated with them. These meaning are, and how they are realized in language, is of central interest to the area of discourse analysis.

B. Discourse Analysis

Discourse Analysis is concerned with the study of the relationship between language and the context in which it is used.⁹ Discourse Analysis is a term used to describe a range of research approaches that focus on the use of language. There are many different types of discourse analysis such as

⁷ Paul Baker. *Key Term in Discourse Analysis*. (New York: British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data, 2011)p. 81

⁸ Brian Paltridge, *An Introduction Discourse Analysis*. (New York: British Library, 2006)p.2

⁹ Michael Mc Carthy. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teacher*. (Uk: Cambridge University Press, 1991)p. 5

conversation analysis, discursive psychology, critical discourse analysis and Foucauldian discourse analysis. Each of these has its own assumptions, emphasis and methods but the key overlapping interest is in the way meaning is constructed in communication. Discourse analysis has been used to understand a wide range of texts including natural speech, professional documentation, political rhetoric, interview or focus group material, internet communication, journals and broadcast media.¹⁰

Language aspect that used by people in the area of discourse analysis are also discussed in the area of pragmatics. Pragmatics is concerned with how the interpretation of language depends on knowledge of the world. Pragmatics is interested in what people mean by what they say, rather than what words in their most literal sense might mean by themselves. A further key notion in pragmatics which implication for both the production and interpretation of discourse is the concept of conversational implicature.¹¹

¹⁰ Dr Eamon Fulcher, "What is Discourse Analysis", <http://www.cprjournal.com/documents/discourseAnalysis.pdf>, 18December 2013.

¹¹ Brian Paltridge, *An Introduction Discourse Analysis*. (New York: British Library, 2006)p.70

C. Implicature

Implicature is information which is implied in a statement but cannot be derived from applying logical inferencing techniques. An implicature is what is suggested but not formally expressed. Instead, the reader or hearer must either understand that part of the statement has a conventionalized, special meaning or take context into account in order to decode the implicature.¹² Unlike entailments and presuppositions, implicatures are not tied to the particular words and phrases in an utterance but arise instead from contextual factors and the understanding that conventions are observed in conversation. The theory of conversational implicatures is attributed to Paul Herbert Grice, who observed that in conversations what is meant often goes beyond what is said and that this additional meaning is inferred and predictable.

1. Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature refers to the interference a hearer make about a speaker's intended meaning that arises from they use of the literal meaning of what the speaker said, the conversational principle and it's maxims. As Thomas explains, an implicature is generated intentionally by the speaker and may (or may not) be understood by the hearer. Interference, on other hand, is produced by a hearer on the basis of certain evidence and may not, in fact, be the same as what a speaker intends. To

¹² Paul Baker. *Key Terms in Discourse Analysis*. (New York: British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data, 2011)p. 60

calculate an Implicature, Grice argues, hearers draw on the conventional meaning of words, the co-operative principle and its maxims. The linguistics and non-linguistics context of the utterances, items of background knowledge and the fact that all of these are available to both participants and they both assume this to be the case. Given this process, implicature can be created in one of three ways. A maxim can be followed in a straightforward way and the hearer implicates what the speakers intends.¹³

As an illustration of what Grice was talking about, consider in this sentence in (1).

(1) John ate some of the cookies

The sentence in (1) expresses the proposition that John ate a portion of the cookies and is true just in case it corresponds to the outside world. Intuitively, all of the cookies still constitute a portion of the cookies. So the sentence in (1) is true even if in the outside world John ate all of the cookies. However, something interesting happens when this sentence is uttered in a conversation like (2).

(2) A: “John ate some of the cookies”

B: “I figured he would. How many are left?”

It is clear from (2) that A conveys the literal meaning of the sentence in (1), i.e., its semantic content. It is equally clear that A implies—or at least B infers

¹³ Brian Paltridge, *An Introduction Discourse Analysis*. (New York: British Library, 2006)p. 70

According to Grice there is a general cooperative principle between speakers and hearers which controls or guides the way they speak. The cooperative principle consists of four maxims with their sub maxims. The four maxims are: the maxim of quantity which has the principles of “Make your contribution as informative as required” (for the current purposes of exchange) and “Do not make your contribution more informative than is required”, the maxim of quality which has the principles of “Try to make your contribution one that is true” and “Do not say what you believe to be false” or “Do not say that for which you lack evidence”, the maxim of relation which has the principle of “Be relevant” and the last one, the maxim of manner with its principle “be perspicuous” “Avoid obscurity of expression”, “Avoid ambiguity”, “Be brief” and “Be orderly”. It is important to recognize these maxims as unstated assumptions we have in conversations. We assume that people are normally going to provide an appropriate amount of information and they are telling the truth, being relevant and trying to be as clear as they can. These rules according which people are expected to behave when communicating with one another are frequently flouted or violated. And that is the factor which conversational implicature results from. It occurs when people do not observe the conversational maxims, it does not matter which one or how many of them.¹⁴

¹⁴ Paul Grice. *Logic and Conversation*. London. (Oxford University Press, 1975)p. 45

2. Generalized conversational implicature

Grice describe two kinds of conversational implicature. He distinction between what he termed ‘generalized’ and what he termed ‘particularized’ conversational implicature. Generalized conversational implicature arise irrespective of the context in which they occur. The hearer does not need a special context to understand the conversational implicature that produced by speaker. So examples like:¹⁵

- Some people believe in God. [implicature: not all], in fact everyone does.
- I’ve got £ 100 to last me till the end of the month. [implicature: not more], in fact I’ve got £ 200

From the case of generalized conversational implicature above, the issue is not what the most relevant way to take *some* and £ 100, the same inferences (not all; not more) will always be drawn whatever the particular context. However, the sentence of *Some people believe in God*, might also give rise to a whole range of other implicature which on depend on the context. Because these implicatures is context-free Grice called them “generalized conversational implicature”.

¹⁵ Peter Grundy. *Doing Pragmatics*. (New York. Oxford University Press, 2000)p. 115

3. Particularized conversational implicature

Particularized conversational implicature derived from a particular context, rather than from the use of the word alone. These result from the maxim of relation. That is, the speaker assumes the hearer will search for the relevance of what they are saying and derive an intended meaning. The conversation can be categorized as a conversational implicature because there is no relation between what is said by the speaker to the hearer and this conversational implicature can be included as particularized conversational implicature because it needs a special context to understand what they are talking about and to make an inference For example in: ¹⁶

A : you're out of coffee

B : don't worry there's a shop on the corner

A derives from B's answer that they will be able to buy coffee for the shop on the corner. Most implicatures, in fact, are particularized conversational implicature.

4. Maxim

Conversational implicature is triggered by "certain general features of discourse" rather than by the conventional meaning of a specific word. These features are the following: linguistic exchanges are governed by the cooperative principle, the content of which is detailed in the four maxims of conversation and their submaxims; when one of the participants of the exchange seems not to follow the Cooperative Principle, his or her partners

¹⁶ Brian Paltridge, *Discourse Analysis An Introduction*.(New York: British Library, 2006)p. 71

will nevertheless assume that, contrary to appearances, the principle is observed at some deeper level.

The principle, the maxims and their submaxims are formulated as follows:¹⁷

The Cooperative Principle_(Grice): Make 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.

The Maxims of Conversation_(Grice): Maxim Quality: Try to make your contribution one that is true. For example “Do not say what you believe to be false”, “Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence”. Maxim Quantity: for example “Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange)”, “Do not make your contribution more informative than is required”. Maxim Relation: Be relevant. Maxim Manner: Be perspicuous. For example Avoid obscurity of expression, Avoid ambiguity, be brief, and be orderly.

Here are some examples of conversational implicatures.

a. The Maxim of Quality

- 1) John has two PhD's

I believe John has two PhD's, and have adequate evidence that he has.

- 2) Does your farm contain 400 acres?

I don't know that your farm does contain 400 acres, and I want to know if it does

¹⁷ Herbert Paul Grice, *Logic and conversation. In Studies in the way of words.* (New York. Harvard University Press, 1989)p. 47

In those sentences, what is literally said does not contain a statement of belief in the proposition or a statement of evidence backing it up. So at a literal level, the speaker does not seem to be observing the maxim of quality. However, the addressee assumes the speaker is at a deeper level. This assumption triggers the implicature, which is a statement of belief/evidence. Quantity implicatures are perhaps the most systematic of the lot. They typically arise because a less informative word or phrase is used when a more informative one could have been used, but wasn't.

b. The Maxim of Quantity

- 1) Nigel has fourteen children

Nigel has no more than fourteen children

- 2) The flag is white

The flag is only white

- 3) A: How did Harry fare in court today?

B: Oh, he got a fine

He got no more than a fine

In those sentences, by using the less informative word or phrase, the speaker does not seem to be observing the maxim of quantity in what he has said. But the addressee still assumes that the maxims are being observed. Therefore, the addressee infers that the speaker knows the sentence containing the more informative word is false. So in those sentence above, the addressee infers that the speaker knows that Nigel does not have 15 children, Nigel does not have 16 children,etc. otherwise the speaker would have said so. All these negative statements taken together amount to Nigel has no more than 14 children. In

second sentence, the addressee infers that the speaker knows that the flag is not blue, the flag is not red, the flag is not pink, etc., otherwise he would have said so. Again, taken together this amounts to the flag is only white. In the last sentences, the addressee infers that the speaker knows that Harry did not get jail time, Harry did not get the death sentence, Harry did not get prosecuted, etc., otherwise the speaker would have said so. Taken together, these statements amount to Harry got no more than a fine. As you can see, the reason is the same for all of these. Once the implicature and what is said are taken together, they satisfy the maxim of quantity. The maxim of relation is perhaps the hardest maxim to single out because it figures into almost every utterance. Relevance is often assumed and left unspoken.

c. The Maxim of Relation

1) Pass the salt

Pass the salt now

2) A: Can you tell me the time?

B: Well, the milkman has come

The time now is after the time the milkman arrived

In first sentences, the utterance is in the imperative so it has no contrast between present and past tense. The speaker has made a request but has not signaled when he wishes the salt. On a literal level, the speaker is not observing the maxim of relation but the addressee assumes that on a deeper level he is. The addressee infers that the request is related to the here and now. The implicature is therefore pass the salt now. In second sentences, A asks the time. B's reply is not literally relevant to the question. A assumes he is

cooperating and being relevant. A infers that B is relating the time at which the milkman came to the current time. The implicature is thus that the time now is after the time the milkman arrived. [Please don't assume this is the only implicature—there is nothing to prevent one utterance from resulting in several implicatures.]

Lastly, manner implicatures have to do with the form of the utterance. The maxim of manner requires that an utterance be perspicuous. When the speaker does not observe this maxim, his utterance is obscure or ambiguous or disorderly and this is intended to convey an implicit meaning.

d. The Maxim of Manner

A: How do I get into your apartment?

B: Walk up to the front door, turn the door handles clockwise as far as it will go, and then pull gently towards you.

Pay particular attention and care to each step of the instructions I've given you

In those sentences, A asks a question and B's literal reply is complicated. At the literal level, B does not appear to be observing the maxim of manner—a simple reply like open the front door would have sufficed. But A assumes that B is being cooperative and following the maxim of manner. B could have just said open the front door but he didn't, so the added detail must be necessary. In other words, B was being as perspicuous as he could be. And so A infers that B's elaborate details are somehow important.

5. Flouting maxims

In a conversation, the speaker may do one of four things with regards to the cooperative principle and the maxims. These are:¹⁸

- a. The speaker may observe the maxims—this is the default assumption.
- b. The speaker may opt out of a maxim by using a phrase that eliminates or mitigates the effect of the maxims and signals this to the addressee—this phrase is called a hedge.
- c. The speaker may flout a maxim, to the full knowledge of the addressee
- d. The speaker may violate a maxim, e.g., lie.

There is another way in which the speaker can signal to the addressee that he is going to ignore a maxim. It is called a flout and it too carries a conversational implicature, sometimes called a conversational implicature. Flouting a maxim is typically done by uttering something absurdly false, wholly uninformative, completely irrelevant, or abstruse so that the addressee understands the speaker is implying something entirely different. This is how metaphors get resolved.

A speaker who makes it clear that they are not following the conversational maxims is said to be flouting the maxims and this too gives rise to an implicature. That is, the addressee understands the speaker flouted the maxims for a reason and infers further meaning from this breach of convention.

¹⁸ Herbert Paul Grice, *Logic and conversation. In Studies in the way of words.* (New York. Harvard University Press, 1989)p. 49

Here are some examples

1) Flouting Quality

A: What if the USSR blockades the Gulf and all the oil?

B: Oh come now, Britain rules the seas![sarcasm]

There is nothing Britain can do about it

2) Flouting Quantity

War is War

Terrible things happen in war. That's it's nature and there's no use lamenting that tragedy.

Either John will come or he won't

I don't care whether or not John comes

3) Flouting Relation

A: (Letter of Recommendation) What qualities does John have for this position?

B: John has nice handwriting.

John is not qualified for the job

4) Flouting Manner

The Corner of John's lips turned slightly upwards

John did not exactly smile

Miss Singer produced a series of sounds corresponding closely to an aria from Rigoletto

Miss singer did not perform well.

Conclusion

Discourse Analysis is concerned with the study of the relationship between language and the context in which it is used. Language aspect that used by people in the area of discourse analysis are also discussed in the area pragmatics. Pragmatics is concerned with how the interpretation of language depends on knowledge of the world. Pragmatics is interested in what people mean by what they say, rather than what words in their most literal sense might mean by themselves. A further key notion in pragmatics which implication for both the production and interpretation of discourse is the concept of conversational implicature. Conversational implicature refers to the inference a hearer make about a speaker's intended meaning that arises from they use of the literal meaning of what the speaker said, the conversational principle and it's maxims.

According to Grice there is a general cooperative principle between speakers and hearers which controls or guides the way they speak. The cooperative principle consists of four maxims with their sub maxims. The four maxims are: the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relation and the maxim of manner. There are two types of conversational implicature, generalized and particularized conversational implicature. The speaker may observe the maxims—this is the default assumption.

- a. The speaker may opt out of a maxim by using a phrase that eliminates or mitigates the effect of the maxims and signals this to the addressee—this phrase is called a hedge.
- b. The speaker may flout a maxim, to the full knowledge of the addressee
- c. The speaker may violate a maxim, e.g., lie.