CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter the writer reviews the literature that related with this thesis, namely implicature, relevance theory, and previous studies.

2.1 Pragmatics

Linguists have many interpretations in defining pragmatics, but all of them agree that pragmatics is a study about the meaning based on context. According to Levinson (1983, p. 3), pragmatics is the study of the relationship between language and context, which is the basis in understanding the meaning of language.

Cook (1989) simplifies Levinson's theory by saying that pragmatics is the discipline which studies the knowledge and procedures which enable people to understand each other's words.

Based on definition above, the writer can conclude that pragmatics is a branch of linguistics which studies about hidden meaning. It can be understood if we know the context and it can be interpreted by a listener or reader. For example, if we see a sentence "WET PAINT", it is not only a statement but a warning for people to not touch the object. It means that through Pragmatics, people can understand what the message actually behind utterances, because it is often that what is stated by the participants in conversation reflected certain meaning. Therefore, pragmatics is the study of the relationship between language and context that is relevant to grammar.

2.2 Implicature

In communication, an utterance can be divided according to its meaning into explicatures and implicatures. According to Grundy (2000, p.105) implicature is "an inference which provides the addressee with the most relevant interpretation of the utterance". The original utterance differs from the logical form, thus it is also called as new logical form. Grice (1975, p.45) proposed a theory called Cooperative Principle which is meaning which is conveyed without being said. He used maxim as parameter to provide further explanation for implicit meaning. An utterance can not be deliver properly if they violated one of four maxims; quantity, quality, relation, manner. Sperber and Wilson (1995, p.194) also states that implicature is "a contextual assumption or implication which the speaker, intending her utterance to be manifestly relevant, manifestly intended to make manifest to the hearer". They also define two kinds of implicature, namely implicated premises and implicated conclusion. Implicated premises "must be supplied by the hearer, who must either retrieve them from memory or construct them by developing assumption schemas retrieve from memory". Implicated conclusion "are deduce from the explicatures of the utterance and the context". Sperber and Wilson (1995, p.194) propose example of those kinds of implicature:

a. Peter: would you drive a Mercedes?

b. Mary: I would not drive any expensive car.

From the example above it can be identify as follows:

Implicated premise: a Mercedes is an expensive car

Implicated conclusion: Mary would not drive a Mercedes

While Grice (1989) compose two kinds of implicature:

1. Conventional implicatures, that convey the same extra meaning regardless of context and which are always lexicalize;

2. Conversational implicatures, which convey different meanings according to different context.

This study focuses on the implicature derives from the perspective of Relevance Theory proposed by Sperber and Wilson (1995).

2.3 Relevance Theory

Sperber and Wilson (1995) argue that a single principle of relevance is sufficient to explain the process of utterance understanding. They also do not satisfy with the probabilistic nature of Gricean implicature. They want a theory which goes beyond the probabilistic and enables addressees to be sure that they have recovered the most relevant of a potentially infinite set of inferences. Based on relevance theory, an addresser provides evidence of their intention to convey a certain meaning which is inferred by the addressee in the basis of the evidence provided. As a result, an utterance is linguistically coded evidence.

There are two principles of relevance according to Sperber and Wilson (1995, p.260):

1. Cognitive principle of relevance: human cognition tends to be geared to the maximization of relevance.

2. Communicative Principle of Relevance: every act of ostensive communication communicates a presumption of its own optimal relevance.

Thus the addressee who receives the addresser information expects presumption of optimal relevance. Then the addressee starts inferring in order to get the interpretation of the maximal relevance. To achieve an optimum communication cognitive ability is needed to stores the knowledge for communication.

To explain the process, there are two main cores in Relevance Theory: (1) cognitive principle of relevance and (2) communicative principle of relevance.

2.3.1 Cognitive Principle of Relevance

The point of this study is when people communicate with each other: both addressee and addresser must give valid information and followed with evidence. In other word they may not lie when they communicate. In line with this statement Grice (1989) proposed the theory of cooperative principle which is called as four maxims to figure out the additional conveyed meaning of given implicature. Those theory states "make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occur, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Grundy, 2000, p.74).

Grice theory of four maxims must be followed in order to achieve effective communication, and those four maxims are maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of manner, maxim of relevance.

Meanwhile Sperber and Wilson (1995) suggest a theory which covers Grice's theory of maxims (1989) which called Relevance Theory. In relevance theory it is possible for people to do not follow the maxims theory to achieve effective communication as Grice suggest, because people should be able to understand the relevance due to its occurrence frequency, people sometimes have

intended meaning that stated implicitly. Hence, no matter what maxim are disobeyed in an utterance, the effective communication will be achieved.

Furthermore Sperber and Wilson (1995) state "in relevance, any external stimulus or internal representation which provide an input (a sight, a sound, an utterance, a memory) to cognitive processes may be relevance to an individual at sometimes". In other word relevance is not only utterances and other observable phenomena, but thought, memories and conclusions of inferences.

2.3.2 Communicative Principle of Relevance

One of the concerns in relevance theory is ostensive communication that is intentional communication which an addressee capable to understand an addresser thought. Realize that human brain capacity to receive information efficiently, addresser capable to produce an utterance which has possibility to attract his addressee's attention, to recall prior experiences and point an intended conclusion is called ostensive stimulus. Ostensive stimulus is an input that enables an addressee to efficiently process information.

Ostensive stimulus is believed to optimally relevant to an addressee if: (1) it is relevant enough to be worth the addressee's processing effort; (2) it is the most relevant one if it is match with the speaker's ability and references. The item (1) means that a stimulus is relevant enough if the addresser consider that the stimulus worth processing or not. For example is when addresser say *it is Friday night* without any emphasize nor gesture, the addressee would may think that the addresser just tell about what day is it, if the addresser deliberately gaze meaningfully and has strong emphasize the addressee would have conclusion that

it is Friday night and do not have any date. The item (2) means that in order to be easily understood, the addresser will choose the most convenient strategies in delivering inputs.

It is evident that explicitly communicated content of utterances tend to go beyond what is linguistically encoded. It means that what is said is frequently different from what is meant. The hearer's task is to hypothesize the speaker's meaning. Relevance theory believes that elaborating the explicit content and recovering the implicit message are equally important. In more detailed description, Sperber and Wilson (1995), provide the comprehension process in human communication:

a. Constructing an appropriate hypothesis about explicit (in Relevance Theory it is called Explicature) content by determining of deictic expression, disambiguation of ambiguous words or phrases, or enriching original utterances;

b. Constructing an appropriate hypothesis about intended contextual assumptions (in Relevance Theory it is called implicated premises);

c. Constructing an appropriate hypothesis about intended contextual implication (in Relevance Theory it is called implicated conclusions)

2.3.2.1 Explicature

Explicature is an enrichment of original utterance by determining the deictic expression and removing ambiguous words. According to Grundy (2000) explicature is mainly motivated by an indeterminacy of language. An utterance can be elaborated by determining referents of deictic expressions in it. the

example is I → Megamind; you → Roxanne Ritchi; it → the music, and many others. Changing ambiguous terms into non ambiguous ones is another way to determine the explicit content of an utterance, such as the sentence reading my book → might be either reading my writing ir reading the book of mine. Consider an example from Sperber and Wilson (1995, p.194).

1. *Peter: would you drive a Mercedes?*
Mary: I wouldn't drive any expensive car.

The explicatures of Mary's response can be seen below:

Mary would not drive expensive car.

The utterance is explicated by referent resolution; the deictic expression I in the short dialogue above is changed into Mary. That example is considered as basic level explicature. Mary's utterance may be intended as a promise as seen below

Mary promises that she will never drive any expensive car

As we seen the example above is higher level explicature which has characteristic containing speech act descriptors like promise and other attitudinal ones such regret or be pleased.

2.3.2.2 Implicated Premises and Implicated Conclusions

Implicature are divided into implicated premises and implicated conclusion. Sperber and Wilson (1995) define implicated premises are a subset of the contextual assumptions used in processing the utterance, while implicated conclusions are a subset of its contextual implications.

Mary's answer in dialogue 1 above given by Sperber and Wilson does not directly answer Peter question. It stimulates Peter to activate his memory retrieval

mechanism. His memory concerning expensive cars automatically comes up. He might retrieve the names of expensive cars that called implicated premises;

> *A Mercedes is an expensive car.*
> *A Porsche is an expensive car.*
> *A Ferrari is an expensive car.*

If Mary's answer is processed, it would yield an implicated conclusion below

> *Mary would not drive a Mercedes.*

Or Peter has another premise as below

> *People who refuse to drive expensive cars disapprove of display of wealth.*

This premise brings about the occurrence of conclusion as in

> *Mary disapproves of displays of wealth*

2.4 Context

Context is a sentence or phrase in which a word appears in certain circumstance in which an event happens in the use of language. When we use a language, the environments, circumstances and contexts are important aspects, which must be referred (Brown and Yule, 1983, p. 25). It means that context is on the particular occasion, contexts and that speakers are related each others.

Moreover, in speech, meaning of the word is not made by language alone. The meaning of the sentence is right when we know the speaker is and who hearer is, that is why we should know the context.

According to Schifrin (1994, p. 364), context is thus a world filled with people producing utterances: People who have social, cultural, and personal identities, knowledge, beliefs, goals and wants, and who interact with one another in various socially and culturally defined situations.

Context consists of various factors, not all of which always appear at once in a given situation. According to Cook (1982), context includes of:

1. *Substance* or the physical material which carries or relays text;

2. *Music* and *Pictures*;

3. *Paralanguage* or meaningful behavior accompanying language, such as voice quality, gestures, facial expressions and touch (in speech) and choice of typeface and letter sizes (in writing);

4. *Situation* or the properties and relations of objects and people in the vicinity of the text, as perceived by the participants;

5. *Co – text* or text which precedes or follows that under analysis, and which participants judge to belong to the same discourse;

6. *Intertext* or text which the participants feel as belonging to other discourse which they connect with the text under consideration and affects their interpretation;

7. *Participants* which described as senders, addressers, addressees and receivers; and

8. *Function* or what the text is intended to do by the sender and addressers, or perceived to do by the receivers and addressees.

In addition, to understand the context of situation, the writer focused on Cook's (1982) theory about context to help analyze the movie because this theory covers all definition about context.

2.5 Summary of Megamind Movie

The summary of Megamind Movie started with Megamind as a super-intelligent alien and the super-villain of Metro City. He continually battles - and loses - against his nemesis, Metro Man, a rivalry that has extended since the two arrived on Earth as infants.

On the day of dedication of a museum in Metro Man's honor, Megamind escapes from jail, rejoins his sidekick Minion, and kidnaps reporter Roxanne Ritchi to lure Metro Man into a copper-lined observatory. Inside, Metro Man weakens because copper drains his powers and is killed by a death ray that Megamind fires at the observatory from an orbiting satellite. Megamind revels in his victory, but this is short-lived as without a nemesis, his villainy has no purpose.

While saying good-bye to Metro Man's statue and attempting to destroy the Metro Man museum because it brings back too many painful memories, Megamind uses a holographic disguise of the curator, Bernard, after Roxanne hears his voice. She unwittingly gives him the idea of creating a serum containing Metro Man's DNA to inject in a worthy target, thus creating a new superhero for Megamind to fight. Later, as Megamind finishes the serum in his lair and locates a worthy target, Roxanne sneaks into the lair, and in the resulting chaos, Megamind injects the serum into Roxanne's dimwitted camera man, Hal. Megamind disguises himself as Hal's "space dad" to groom the new hero into shape to fight Megamind in a few days. Hal takes the superhero alias of "Tighten," a result of mishearing Megamind's suggestion of Titan. During this, Megamind, in the Bernard disguise,

continues to see Roxanne and becomes close to her, unaware that Hal also has romantic feelings for her. Minion expresses discontent at Megamind's lack of villainy and they break their friendship when Minion finds out he has fallen for Roxanne.

On the night before the battle, while dining with Roxanne, and gaining their first kiss together, the holographic disguise fails revealing his identity, and Roxanne angrily rejects him in the rain upon finding out Megamind's true feelings towards her, dismissing the idea that they could ever be together. Furthermore, he loses track of his invisible car that has the anti-serum to restore Hal to normal. Heartbroken, he vows to fight Hal the next day, but Hal does not show up at the appointed time. Megamind finds a bitter and equally heart-broken Hal (who witnessed Roxanne and "Bernard" having dinner) having used his powers for ill-gotten gains. Megamind is horrified at this change and attempts to convince Hal to be a "hero" by revealing how he has manipulated Hal by revealing his space dad and Bernard disguises. Hal realizes he has been toyed with and battles Megamind. When defeated, Megamind is shocked to learn that Hal actually wants to kill him and tries to escape. Megamind attempts to capture Hal in a copper-lined trap, but it fails to weaken Hal, which confuses him, and the villain is forced to flee Metro City, while Hal begins to threaten the city with his powers.

Megamind meets with Roxanne who takes him to Metro Man's secret lair, which happens to be the schoolhouse both Megamind and Metro Man attended in their childhood, and the two are surprised to find Metro Man there. The former hero explains that on the fateful day, he had an epiphany and pretended to have a

weakness for copper and be killed as to forgo the superhero career and become a musician. He refuses to help stop Hal. Roxanne tries to convince Megamind that he could be the hero, but Megamind has resigned himself to be the villain and turns himself in at prison. When Hal kidnaps Roxanne and threatens her life if Megamind does not fight him, Megamind has a change of heart and requests the warden to let him go, surprised to find the warden is Minion in disguise, having returned to help out.

Megamind rescues Roxanne, but is defeated after Metro Tower's pinnacle thrown by Hal pierces his chest. But Metro Man shows up and chases Hal away. While dying, Megamind reveals he is actually Minion in holographic disguise (and only his armor is destroyed) and Metro Man is actually Megamind. Tighten runs away, but upon realizing "Metro Man" said Metro City in Megamind's trademark way which sounds similar to monstrosity, comes back after Roxanne turned Megamind back to his original form. In the fray, Megamind discovers his misplaced invisible car. He grabs the Antidote and heroically defuses the serum out of Hal with it, reverting the Tighten to a normal man. Hal is taken away to jail while Roxanne convinces Metro City's citizens that Megamind chose to be their hero. Later, Megamind and Roxanne's relationship has become close, and the city welcomes Megamind as their new protector, while a disguised Metro Man, hidden in the crowd with his grown beard, quietly congratulates him.

2.6 Previous Studies

The purpose of this research is to describe and identify the implicature used by the main character in Megamind movie. The researcher uses two other

studies to get other perspectives about implicature and to help the researcher doing his work.

The first study is done by Nanda Budiono (2012) which entitled *An Implicature Analysis on the Main Character's Utterances in Cars 2 Movie*. This study is aimed to find out the implicature of Mater's utterances which are misunderstood by other characters in the movie *Cars 2* and how the implicature is conveyed using relevance theory. Through that study he found the misunderstanding occur because the utterance are contrastively relevant to hearer's existing assumption. The responds given by other character indicated that even those utterances are misunderstood, it was somehow relevant. This study shows the contextual effect of misunderstood utterances is contrasted and eliminated hearer's existing assumption. The misunderstandings occur because speaker and hearer do not share the same context which leads them to different understanding of relevance.

The second study is conducted by Herlin Vidyasari (2011) which entitled *Pragmatic Study on Relevance Applied in Ebes Ngalam Column of Malang Post*. This study has aim to analyzed the relevance of *Ebes Ngalam* column derives through explicature, higher level explicature and implicature. She found 55 utterances that can be analyze in terms of explicature, higher level explicature, and implicature. Explicature facilitates the readers with manifest information about the phenomenon being discussed. Deriving the relevance of *Ebes Ngalam* through higher level explicature requires knowledge about the speaker's character.

But it can be also shown directly trough lexical choices of the speakers and mood of the verb.

In this study, the researcher uses the same theory as Budiono's study which uses relevance theory to conduct the research. Yet, Budiono's study focused on main characters misunderstanding utterance while the researcher uses all main characters' implicated utterances. Furthermore, the study conducted by Vidyasari uses higher level explicature to analyze however this research focuses on the implicated premises and conclusions.