

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter consists of overview of the general theories and concepts of Pragmatics, Implicature, Cooperative Principle, Context, Ice Age 4 Movie, and Previous Studies.

2.1 Pragmatics

There are some linguists' interpretation about pragmatics but basically they proposed the same idea that pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said. Yule (2010, p. 128) defines pragmatics as the study of "invisible" meaning, or how we recognize what is meant even when it isn't actually said or written. In order for that to happen, speakers (or writers) must be able to depend on a lot of shared assumptions and expectations when they try to communicate. The investigation of those assumptions and expectations provides us with some insights into how more is always being communicated than is said.

Grundy (2000, p. 16) explains that pragmatics is about the notions of appropriacy and relevance on the other hand, and our liking for non-literal and indirect meaning on the other. There is a crucial relationship between what we say and the context in which it is relevant. This is made possible to some degree by the indeterminacy of language and the role of inference in language

understanding. Frequently, speakers use language reflexively to indicate how they want what they say to be understood.

2.2 Implicature

Mey (2001, p. 45) describes that the word 'implicature' is derived from the verb 'to imply', as is its cognate 'implication'. Originally, 'to imply' means 'to fold something into something else'; hence, that which is implied is 'folded in', and has to be 'unfolded' in order to be understood. A conversational implicature is something which is implied in conversation that is something which is left implicit in actual language use.

Yule (2010 p. 148) states that implicature is an additional meaning conveyed by a speaker adhering to the co-operative principle. When we try to analyze how hedges work, we usually talk about speakers implying something that is not said. Similarly, in considering what a speaker means by *a sandwich is a sandwich*, we decide that he is implying that the sandwich is not worth talking about. With the co-operative principle and the maxims as guides, we can start to work out how people actually decide that someone is 'implying' something in conversation.

In addition, the related term that is attached to implicature is entailment. The differences are in the meaning of utterance occurs. As for example there is an utterance which is uttered by the speaker, then what its sentence meaning belongs to entailment while the speaker meaning belongs to implicature. Hence, implicature is a meaning which is not directly stated and it presents on every

occasion when an expression occurs. When people try to imply a meaning, it is not a simply statement about what is actually meant, there is something more than what is said. To deliver the hidden meaning, people tend to say it in another way rather than to declare it directly. The concept of implicature is firstly stated by Grice who is an English philosopher. Implicature is divided into two kinds, that is conversational implicature and conventional implicature.

2.2.1 Conversational Implicature

Mey (2009, p. 365) explains “conversational implicatures come about by the exploitation (apparent flouting) or observation of the cooperative principle (CP) and a set of maxims”. Grice (1989, cited in Mey 2009, p. 365) defines the cooperative principle is about how to 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. According to Yule (1996, p. 40), “the basic assumption in conversation is that, unless otherwise indicated, the participants are adhering to the cooperative principle and the maxims.”

For example:

[a] Charlene : *I hope you brought the bread and the cheese.*

Dexter : *Ah I brought the bread.*

From the extract above, Dexter does not mention the cheese, he states it implicitly by giving the irrelevant answer. If in that case he brought the cheese, he would mention it. However, both speaker and hearer know what they are talking about because Dexter’s answer conveys more than what he says.

Yule (1996, p.40) says that it is important to know the speaker communicates via implicatures while the listener recognizes the communicated meanings via inference. It is important to note that it is speaker who communicates meaning via implicatures.

2.2.1.1 Generalized Conversational Implicature

Yule (1996, p.27) defines “Generalized conversational implicature is when there is no special knowledge which is required to catch the additional conveyed meaning”.

Example: a. Doobie : *Did you invite Bella and Cathy?*

b. Mary : *I invited Bella.*

In the extract above, there is no special background knowledge of the context of the utterance is required in order to make the necessary inferences. We can notice that the process of interpreting the implicature is just the same with conversational implicature

A number of other generalized conversational implicatures are commonly communicated on the basis of a scale of values and are consequently known as scalar implicatures.

2.2.1.1.1 Scalar Implicature

Yule (1996, p.41) explains that certain information is always communicated by choosing a word which expresses one value from a scale of values. This is particularly obvious in terms for expressing quantity, as

shown in the scales in (a), where terms are listed from the higher to the lowest value.

- (a) <all, most, many, some, few>
<always, often, sometimes>

When producing an utterance, a speaker selects the word from the scale which is the most informative and truthful (quantity and quality) in the circumstances, as in (b)

- (b) *I'm studying linguistics and I've completed some of the required courses.*

The meaning of choosing 'some' in (b) is not all. The word 'some' here as a measurement that the speaker doing 'some' and 'not all'.

Yule (1996, p. 41) defines that the basis of scalar implicature is that, when any form in a scale is asserted, the negative of all forms higher on the scale is implicated.

2.2.1.1.2 Indefinite

Another type of generalized conversational implicature is related to indefinite article "a/an", it is distinguished by Grice (1975, cited in Yule 1996, p. 41).

- a) *James was meeting a girl yesterday.*

The example above implicates that "a girl" is not James' wife, girlfriend, sister, or mother. That is why "a girl" is unidentifiable person. Another

common example in English is any phrase with an indefinite article, for example:

b) *I was sitting in a garden one day. A child looked over the fence*

The implicature in 'b', that the garden and the child mentioned are not the speaker's, are calculated on the principle that if the speaker was capable of being more specific (i.e. more informative, following the quantity of maxim), then he or she would have said 'my garden' and 'my child'.

2.2.1.2 Particularized Conversational Implicature

Most of the time, our conversations take place in very specific contexts in which locally recognized inferences are assumed, it is asserted by Yule (1996, p.42). Such inferences are required to work out the conveyed meanings which result from particularized conversational implicatures

[a] *Rick : Hey, coming to wild party tonight?*

Tom : My parents are visiting.

The question proposed by Rick above is a Yes-No question which means it only needs an answer whether 'Yes' or 'No'. Tom's answer gives more than what is meant. Tom will not be able to come to wild party because his parents are coming by and he has to give the time to them.

Because they are by far the most common, particularized conversational implicatures are typically just called implicatures.

In addition to these fairly prosaic examples of implicatures, there are other more entertaining examples, as in [d].

[d] Bert : Do you like ice-cream?

Ernie : Do chickens have lips?

The same meaning as Ernie's answer is 'No' or 'Of course not'. Bert must notice that Ernie is being cooperative by stating that kind of answer instead of 'Yes' or 'No'.

2.2.2 Conventional Implicature

Conventional implicature is independent of the cooperative principle and its four maxims. This statement is supported by Yule (1996, p. 45) 'conventional implicatures are not based on the cooperative principle or the maxims. They don't have to occur in conversation, and they don't depend on special context for their interpretation.'

Yule (1996, p. 45) states not unlike lexical presuppositions, conventional implicatures are associated with specific words and result in additional conveyed meanings when those words are used. The English conjunction 'but' is one of these words. The interpretation of any utterance of the type p but q will be based on conjunction p & q plus an implicature of 'contrast' between the information in p and the information in q . In [a], the fact that 'Marry suggested black' ($=p$) is contrasted, via the conventional implicature of 'but', with my choosing white ($=q$).

[a] > *Marry suggested black, but I chose white*

> p & q ($+>$ p is in contrast to q)

Other English words such as ‘even’ and ‘yet’ also have conventional implicatures.

[c] *Even John came to the party. He even helped the tidy up afterwards.*

Yule (1996, p. 46) describes that when ‘even’ is included in any sentence describing an event, there is an implicature of ‘contrary to expectation’. In [c] tells that there are two events which are first is ‘John is coming’ and second is ‘John is helping’. The use of the word ‘even’ here shows that there are unexpected interpretations of those events.

The conventional implicature of ‘yet’ is that the present situation is expected to be different, or perhaps the opposite, at a later time. In uttering the statement in [d], the speaker produces an implicature that she expects the statement ‘Dennis is here’ to be true later, as indicated in the extract below:

[d] *Dennis is not here yet.* >> ‘Dennis is here’ is expected to be true later.

Yule (1996, p. 46) defines that it may be possible to treat the so-called different ‘meanings’ of ‘and’ in English as instances of conventional implicature in different structures. When two statements containing static information are joined by ‘and’ as in [a], the implicature is simply ‘in addition’ or ‘plus’. When the two statements contain dynamic, action-related information, as in [b], the implicature of ‘and’ is ‘and then’ indicating sequence.

- a. *Yesterday, Marry was happy and ready to work.*
 b. *She put her clothes and left the house.*

Because of the different implicatures, the two parts of a can be reversed with little difference in meaning, but there is a big change in meaning if the two parts of b are reversed.

For many linguists, the notion of 'implicature' is one of the central concepts in pragmatics. An implicature is certainly a prime example of more being communicated than is said Yule (1996, p. 46).

2.3 Cooperative Principle

In social science generally and linguistics specifically, the cooperative principle describes how people interact with one another. As phrased by Grice (1989, cited in Mey, 2009, p. 569), it states, "Make your contribution such as it is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." From the perspective proposed by Grice, it can be concluded that the speaker and the hearer must be cooperated in communication. It is about how people behave in communication. However, According to Grice's theory, a cooperative speaker can intentionally disobey a maxim, as long as s/he or the context provides enough indicators for the hearer to notice it. This is called flouting a maxim, and it is used to indirectly convey information (e.g. using sarcasm or irony). 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.

Example: A: Can I have John's number?

B: Yes

Despite her positive answer, we find B's answer is weird because B gives less information than is required. In a case such as this, one might infer that B does not have the number with her and will supply it later. B may implicate 'actually you cannot have it'.

For the deeper explanation, the followings are the examples of cooperative principle of four maxims and examples of flouting four maxims:

1. Maxim of Quantity

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

Example: A: Do you have time?

B: Yes, it is 9.30

Given the purpose of the conversation, the man contributes only as much as information required.

Flouting the Maxim of Quantity

When the speaker is saying more than is required, he is flouting the maxim of quantity.

Example: A: "Do you know where the canteen is?"

B: "It is behind the principal office, I was there just now."

B is saying more than he was asked. He gave additional information to A while A was not asking about where B was.

2. Maxim of Quality

Try to make your contribution one that is true

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

Example: A: Jim, do you know where the Big Ben Clock Tower is?

B: It's in London.

Jim does not contribute what he believes to be false and to be unsubstantiated.

Flouting the Maxim of Quality

The situation is when the speaker contributes something that is believed to be false or lack of evidence.

Example: *late in Christmas Eve 1993 an ambulance is sent to pick up a man who has collapsed in Newcastle city centre. The man is drunk and vomits all over the ambulanceman who goes to help him. The ambulanceman says: "Great, that's really great! That's made my Christmas!"*

This is the flouting of quality maxim because the ambulanceman was saying 'great' when he had a man vomited on him. The word 'great' here is applied because the ambulanceman was really sick with the condition. The word 'great' is not supposed to be used in a bad condition.

3. Maxim of Relevance

a. Speakers' contributions should relate clearly to the purpose of the exchange

b. Be relevant

Example: A: How do you like your steak cooked?

B: Medium rare, please.

The woman contributes what is relevant for the purpose of conversation.

Flouting the Maxim of Relevance

A speaker is considered to flout the maxim of relevance is when s/he says something which is not related to the purpose of exchange.

Example: A: "Where is John?"

B: "He is sick."

The question proposed by A was about the position of John or where John was, not what happened to John. Thus, B's answer was supposed to be relevant with A's question.

4. Maxim of Manner

a. Avoid obscurity of expression

b. Avoid ambiguity

c. Be brief

d. Be orderly

Example: A: Maria went to the restaurant and ate steak.

Maria obeys the fourth maxim of manner “be orderly”.

They are called as the *Gricean maxims*, describing specific rational principles observed by people who obey the cooperative principle; these principles enable effective communication.

Flouting the Maxim of Manner

The situation is when the speaker is being obscure, or stating words not in order, or being talkative.

Example: A: “*Do you love me?*”

B: “*Do chickens have lips?*”

From the extract above, B was asked whether he loved A or not.

However, B was saying something that gives hint to the answer. B was asking A back whether chickens have lips or not. This simply says that B does not love A. B is flouting the maxim of manner by being obscure.

2.4 Context

One of the central focuses of research on language over the last several decades has been the relation between language and context. The focus on context, as both a constraining factor and a product of discourse, has led to increasingly fine-grained approaches to speech, since it is primarily in the formation of spoken or written utterances that language and context are articulated, this explanation states by Mey (2009, p. 119).

In interpreting the intended meaning of some utterances in conversation, we have to know and notice in what context the conversation occurs. A word cannot be merely intended as one meaning. It can be different if it is used in other context. For example the word 'bank' cannot always be interpreted as a place where people can save their money, but it can give different meaning when it is used in different context such as the bank of the river.

2.5 Ice Age 4 Movie

As stated in Wikipedia (2012, para. 1) *Ice Age: Continental Drift*, also known internationally as *Ice Age 4: Continental Drift* or simply as *Ice Age 4*, is a 2012 American 3D computer-animated comedy adventure film directed by Steve Martino and Mike Thurmeier. It was written by Jason Fuchs and Michael Berg, and features the voices of Ray Romano, John Leguizamo, Denis Leary, Wanda Sykes, Queen Latifah and Jennifer Lopez.

The plot is illustrated in Wikipedia (2012, para. 4) as, scrat inadvertently causes the break up of Pangaea. Meanwhile Manny and Ellie must deal with the trials and tribulations of their daughter Peaches, now a teenager desiring to fit in with her peers. Ellie is fine about that, but Manny becomes extremely over-protective. Peaches' only friend is Louis, a molehog, tries to protect her as she tries to approach a mammoth named Ethan whom she has a crush on. Sid's family returns, only long enough to drop off the elderly Granny before abandoning them both again. When Manny catches Peaches sneaking off to meet Ethan, they argue and fallout. Shortly afterward, a continental break-up separates Manny from the

herd. Meanwhile a giant land shift encroaches on Ellie, Peaches, and those remaining on land, causing them make their way toward the land bridge.

The main characters in “Ice Age 4” are:



Figure 2.1 Manny

- a. Manny** : Manny is a strong mammoth. He can be very serious and emotional, but is otherwise caring and friendly. He is so protective to his wife Ellie and daughter Peaches. When other characters refer to him as fat, he would often deny it saying that his fur is what makes him look big and poofy.



Figure 2.2 Sid

b. Sid : Sidney is known more commonly as Sid is a ground sloth portrayed as clumsy, annoying, slow-moving, unintelligent, fast-talking and unattractive member with a good heart. Sid once lived in a tree with other sloths that always wanted to leave Sid behind. He is not the most perceptive creature to live in the ice age, but becomes more considerate and thoughtful of others.



Figure 2.3 Diego

c. Diego : Diego is a tiger who has somewhat sarcastic personality, although it is not intended as malicious. He meet a group of animal pirates, and among them was a female saber named Shira that caught Diego's eye. In time, Diego convinced Shira to leave her pirate crew-mates behind and join Diego's.

2.6 Previous Studies

The study of implicature has been done by many researchers but there are two studies that inspire the writer in conducting her research. They are "Analysis of Implicature using Relevance Theory in On-line Conversation on Yahoo

Messenger” done by Wulansari (2012) and “Conversational Implicature Analysis of Cigarette Advertisement Slogans” by Christiningrum (2010).

Wulansari (2012) analyzed implicature using Relevance Theory in On-line conversation on Yahoo Messenger. She found that implicatures could come in on-line conversation. Besides, in Relevance Theory the implicatures can be interpreted by considering contextual effects that are derived from background knowledge or any information stored in the participants’ memory or cognitions and its context.

Christiningrum (2010) also dealt with implicature on cigarette slogans. She used Grice’s theory on the types of conversational implicature found in cigarette advertisement slogan. She found that every utterance in a cigarette advertisement slogan has both generalized and particularized implicature.

Both of the previous studies above help the writer to conduct her study because their studies and the writer’s study have several similarities. Both of them used Grice’s theory about implicature and conversational implicature. The writer also uses Grice’s theory to support her study about implicature. Meanwhile, there are also the differences between the writer’s study and the two previous studies by Wulansari, and Christiningrum. The differences are the writer uses the object from conversation found in *Ice Age 4* movie, but Wulansari and Christiningrum did not take movie script as their objects. Wulansari’s object was the on-line conversation and Christiningrum used the cigarette advertisement slogans as her object.

Those previous studies give the writer some inspiration and references related to the theory of implicature by some experts that the writer has not previously known yet.

