CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, the writer reviews some theories which are related to this study. This review is very important because it is used as the basic of the analysis of the study. This chapter discusses the explanation of the theories connected with implicature. There are some theories used to analyze the data. They are implicature, conversational implicature, type of conversational implicature (that include of generalized and particularized conversational implicature) and speech act. The following are the explanation.

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a part of linguistic that learning about the relationship between context and meaning. The science of pragmatic is learning about how the convey of meaning not only depends on linguistic knowledge from the speaker and the listener, but also from the narattive context, and implied purpose of the speaker. Yule (1996: 3) states that pragmatic is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker and interpreted by a listener. Consequently, more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterance than what the words or phrases in those utterance might mean by themselves. Levinson also defines of pragmatics that is the study of those relations between language and context that grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language (1983:9). So, this studies explain about concluded what the purpose is spoken by the speaker to be understood by the listener. Pragmatics have some branch, they are speech act theory, conversational implicature, talk in interaction, presupposition, cooperative principle and etc. In this case, pragmatics explains about how language users are able to overcome apparent changing of uttarance. The researcher take one of pragmatic branch as theory to analyze this study and only focus on the utterance that include of implicature and type of conversational implicature.

2.1.1 Implicature

Implicature is one of the concept of pragmatics that most protruding. The word implicature is derived from the verb "to imply". Imply means that when we are communicate, we want to express our idea or feeling, but without saying it directly. Mey state that to imply means to fold something into something else (from the Latin verb *plicare* to fold) hence, that which is implied is folded in, and has to be unfolded in order to be understood (2001:45). Implicature itself means that a language phenomena that explain about the different that happend in conversation, such as what speaker said unsuitable with what will be applied by listener. Gazdar defined implicature that is an implicature is a proposition that is implied by the utterance of a sentence in a context even thought that proposition is not part of nor an entailment of what was actually said (1979: 38).

Therefor, implicature is a form of speech that implies something and different with the actually spoken. So, implicature is the purpose, desire or expressions of hidden heart. The term implicature is used by Grice (1975) to account for what a speaker can implay, suggest, or mean as distinct from what the speaker literary (Brown, Gillian and Yule:31). Thomas in Plaritdge explain an

implicature is generated intentional by the speaker and may (or may not be understood by the hearer (2006:70). In other hand, sometimes hearer do not undersatand about the discussed by speaker. furthermore, the hearer must understand the speaker said and interpret the speaker implied. In the below is one example of implicature.

Example:

Rendi: Do you want to come to the rani's home? Joko: I'm finish homework today.

In example above, Joko is not actually answering the question of Rendi. He does not actually say Yes or Not he will go to the rani's home with Rendi. The implicature of his response is that, Joko is not coming. Joko has conveyed a meaning, intentionally, without explicitly stating it.

Grice distinguishes between two types of implicatures, they are conventional implicature and conversational implicature. Yule (1996: 227) states that *Conversational implicatures* is pragmatic implication that implied in a conversation. *Conventional implicatures* is implicature obtained directly from the meaning of the word not from the conversation principle.

In this research, the researcher focused in type of conversational implicature. So, the researcher more explain in conversational implicature, but the researcher bit explain about definition of conventational implicature. Below the reseracher would like to explained type of conversational implicature. Before that, the resercher explain first conversational implicature.

2.1.1.1 Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature is pragmatic implications contained in the conversation that appear as a result of violation of the conversation principle. Yule (1969: 227) states that conversational implicature an additional unstated meaning that has to be assumed in order to maintain the cooperative principle. Conversational implicature it is a proposition or statement, namely what might be interpreted, implied or intended by the speaker, which is different from what was actually said by the speaker in a conversation (Gazdar 1979: 38). Mey state that one could say that conversational implicature concerns the way we understand an utterance in conversation in accordance with what we expect to hear (2001:46). Thus, when speaker ask a question, a response from the hearer it doesnot appropriate with the intended by speaker make.

In the below is an example of utterance in a conversation that contain an conversational implicature.

- *A:* Your mobile phone is new. Why you do not buy iPhone?
- B: The price is more expensive.

Implied meaning in B's utterance state that mobile phone that bought by A is cheap while the price of iPhone is more expensive than mobile phone that bought by A. B's statement not say No or say Yes, B only say the price is more expensive means that B's statement do not want to buy the mobile phone is expensive but is cheap.

Grice introduces a distinction between two of spesific types in conversational implicature: Generalized Implicature and Particularized Implicatures

2.1.1.1.1 Generalized Conversational Implicature

Generalized Conversational Implicature is when no special knowledge is required in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning. Levinson (1983: 126) defines Generalized conversational implicatures occur without reference to any particular features of the context. Appearance of generalized conversational implicature in conversation do not need special context. In other words, special background knowledge or inferences are not required in calculating the additional conveyed meaning. Grice (1989:37) states that this type of implicature is characterized by the application of a certain form of words in an utterance (in the absence of special circumstances) would normally carry such implicature. For example:

Aqilah walked into a house today and saw a flower.

The expression implies of the Aqilah's utterance above state that the house is not Aqila's house.

Anathor example that include of generalized conversational implicature as following:

David : Did you invite Bella and Riko in your party tonight? Lenita : I inveted Bella.

From the utterance of David and Lenita there is no special context of the Lenita's statement. Yet, when David ask to Lenita about whether Lenita invite Bella and Riko in her party. Lenita only say if she invite Bella, she does not say invite Riko also. It means that Lenita does not invite Riko, she only invite Bella. When no special knowledge is requares in the context to calculate conveyed meaning, it is called *generalized conversational implicature*.

2.1.1.1.2 Particularized Implicature

Paltridge (2006:70) state that particularized conversational implicatures, however are derived from a particular context, rather than from the use of the words 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. Yule (1996: 234) states that particularized conversational implicature an additional unstated meaning that depends on special or local knowledge. Particularized conversational implicature is an implicature where some assumed knowledge is required in very specific contexts during a conversation. Futhermore, in this case particularized conversational implicature is a implicature that appearance requires a special context.

For example:

Ana : Hey, coming to the willy's party tonight? Samuel: My parents are visiting

From these utterance above, where Samuel's respon does not appropriate with Ana's question. Samuel does not say Yes or No, moreover he say if his parent came to visiting him. In order to make relevant between Ana's question with samuel's respon, Samuel must say to Ana "No, I can not came to the willy's party to night because my parent come to visiting me. Samuel will be spending that evening with his parents, and time spent with parents is quiet and consequently Ana not at party. In short the implicature that rely much on the special context, it is can be classified into particularized conversational implicatures.

2.1.2 Speech act

Speech act theory was developed by philosopher John Austin in an effort to explain how particular utterances operate within natural language. Yule state that speech act an action performed by the use of an utterance to communicate (1996: 239).Thus, can conclude that the speech act has psikologis function and social function when we are communicating. Beside that, speech act have function as a means to do something through the actions that said through orally.According to the book of "The Study of Language by Yule (2010: 133) the term of speech act is to describe action such as requesting, commanding, questioning, or informing. Speech act as the action performed by a speaker with an utterance. If you say I will be there at six, you are not just speaking, you seem to be performing the speech act of promising. Theory of speech act explain how this done. When you want to say toward someone if "in the closet there is a sheepdog". You not only say something but you warn also (Fromkin, Robert and Hyams, 2009:215).

Speech act in linguistic is an utterance that has performative function in language and communication. Utterances produced in the process of communication consist of some different functions. They cannot only be seen structurally, but other possible functional uses of language are also involved. Therefore, Searle (1976) state that there are just five basic kinds of action that one can perform in speaking, by means of the following five types of utterance.

2.1.2.1 Representative

Representative is speech acts that commit a speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition and to the truth of something. Yule (1996:92) also state that representative is kind of speech act that state what the speaker believes to be the case or not. (eg: critisizing, asserting, informing, claiming, reporting.

For example:

- a. The materials for learning today is about language phenomena in pragmatic .
- b. Today the weather is sunny

The A's statement above include of Representative which is informing. While the B's statement which is asserting. In using representative, the speaker makes words fit the world (true statement).

2.1.2.2 Directive

Directive is a speech acts that are to cause the hearer to take a particular action, or when the speaker expects the listener to do something as a response. Putrayasa (2014:91) state that directives which are attempts of the speaker to encourage the hearer to do something. Such us ordering, commanding, requesting, and etc.

For example:

- a. Rani: Could you lend me a pen, please?
- b. Fera: Close the window!

The Rani's utterance above include of Directive which is requesting, while in Fera's utterance is commanding. In using directive speaker trying to adjust the world with word (through listener)

2.1.2.3 Commissive

Commissive is speech acts that commit a speaker to some future action. Yule (1996: 94) define that commissiveare those kinds of speech acts that speakers use to commit themselves to some future action. Commissive express what the intended by speaker. They are promise, threats, refusing, vowing etc. For example:

- a. I promise, I will came back tomorrow
- b. I don't want to do things that you command

In example above that include of Commissive but different purpose. the A's utterance is about promise and B is about refusing. In using commissive, speaker trying to adjust world with word (through speaker).

2.1.2.4 Expressives

Expressives is speech acts that express the speaker's attitudes and emotions towards the proposition. In the pragmatic's book Yule state that expressives are those kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker feels (1996:93). Expressive is to express the psychological state about affairs. Express our psychological states like pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, sadness, and joyfull, thanksfull, greating apologizing, praise, etc.

For example:

Excellent idea!

The expression above which is praise. In using expressive, speaker adjust words with the world (with our fealling)

2.1.2.5 Declarative

Speech acts that change the reality in accord with the proposition of the declaration. This speech about the someone that would pronouncing someone husband and wife.Declaration are those kinds of speech acts that change the world via their uttarance (Yule,1996: 92).

For example:

Priest : I know pronounce you husband and wife.

In using declaration speaker changes the world with the our utterance.

The process of conveying message in communication can be in form anything, either verbal nor implied. When speaker conveys the message through the verbal it means that the speaker convey the message is directly. Yet, when the speaker convey the message through the implied means that the speaker convey the message is indirectly or through the implied meaning. Both of them either verbal nor implied have purpose behind the something uttered.

