CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL BASES

This chapter presents the discussion of pragmatic, context, and implicature.

2.1 Pragmatic

Communication will be successfully and clearly depends on not only knowing the meaning of words in an utterance, but also knowing what speakers mean by their utterances. The study of speaker meaning is called pragmatics (Yule, 2010:127). Further, Yule (1996:3) said pragmatics explores how listeners can make inferences about what is said in order to arrive at an interpretation of the speaker's intended meaning. In other words, work in pragmatics has been related between language and context in which speech occur; so that, there are other aspects of meaning that depend more on context and the communicative intentions of speakers. For example, how the sentence *It's cold in here* comes to be interpreted as *"Close the window."* Thus, pragmatics can be understood as the study of how context affects meaning.

2.2 Context

Certainly, pragmatics is concerned with understanding of language in context. Two kinds of contexts are *linguistic* context and *situational* context. Linguistic context, also known as co-text (Yule, 2010:129), relates to the discourse (text or talk) that precedes the phrase or sentence to be interpreted (Fromkin, et.al., 2011:207). The surrounding of co-text has effected on what we

think about the word probably means, such as the word *pen*, as a homonym, a single form with more than one meaning even have the same spelling and same pronunciation. Through linguistic context, we know which meaning is intended in a particular sentence. If the word *pen* is used in a sentence together with words like *books* or *signature*, absolutely we are easy deciding which type of *pen* is meant, that is refers to a writing instrument which uses ink. However, if someone says that *my cows are in a pen*, we will know from the linguistic context which type of *pen* is intended, that is refers to an enclosed area. Thus, interpreting the discourse exactly, we must know certain linguistic context, which is involved in sentence.

Situational context is nonlinguistic in the environment of the speaker which a sentence or discourse happens. It is the context that allows speakers to interpret questions like *Can you pass the salt?*. We do not normally use this structure associated with the function of question, but in this case with the function of a request. Generally, we know how to interpret words based on physical context. In other words, situational context is includes the physical environment, the social milieu, the subject of conversation, the time of day, and so forth (Fromkin, et.al., 2011:207). Under appropriate circumstances, context influences the way of language is interpreted. As the example before, if we see the word *pen* on different things or different location, it will influence our interpretation. In conclusion, the two kinds of contexts, linguistic and situational, exactly affect meaning, in which listener tries to understand what the speaker intended to convey.

2.3 Implicature

The term of 'implicature' is first described by the English language philosopher Herbert Paul Grice, which refers to speakers when implied something is differ from literally says (Brown and Yule, 1988: 31). Further, another linguist, Yule (2010:148) said that implicature described as what the speaker said is different of what the speaker is actually meant. In other words, speaker intends to communicate something, which is more than the word is said (Yule, 1996:35). In conclusion, implicature is when the speakers conveyed meaning without explicitly stating it and it is like a relation between what people say and what they actually mean in a conversation, then the listener make an inference based on not only an utterance, but also assumptions about what the speaker is trying to achieve (Fromkin, et. al., 2011: 582). Consider the following dialog:

> A: Are you going to my wedding party? B: I have to study

B means that she is not going to my wedding party. However, she uttered the sentence does not mean that she is not going to my wedding party, because she did not *state* that she is not going. Considering this case, Grice introduced the *implicature*, in which what the speaker said is actually distinct from what the speaker meant or implied. However, according to Searle in Mey (2009:375), implicature is named an *indirect speech act, because* leads the hearer from the 'literal' illocution to the intended illocution. Thus, B performed speech act (meaning that she is not going) *by* performing another (saying that she has to study) (Davis, 2014, http://plato.stanford.edu). Often what we say is not literally what we mean, such as we say "It's cold in here" to convey "Shut the window," or "Turn up the heat," or "Let's leave," or there are possible the other inference, well known as implicature, so that the utterances is depend on the real-world situation at the time of speaking. Because, in conversation we sometimes infer or conclude based not only on what was said, but also on assumptions about what the speaker is trying to achieve. As a result, different people will reach different conclusions about the same utterance.

The way of the speakers implied the implicature are sometimes directly or indirectly, in which both of them include in the concept of speech act. In very general terms, we can define a speech act as the action performed by a speaker with an utterance. If you say, "I'll be there at six," you are not just speaking, you seem to be performing the speech act of "promising." By this way, we consider how the speaker intends us to "take" (or "interpret the function of") what is said (Yule, 2010:133).

Most of the world's languages have three basic sentence types: declarative, interrogative, and imperative (Mey, 2009:1004). The declarative is used for making announcements or declarations, stating conclusions, making claims, telling stories, and so on. The interrogative is used to gain information; it asks for a verbal response from the addressee. The imperative is used for making requests, giving orders or advice, making suggestions, and the like; its use is meant to influence the course of (future) events (Mey, 2009:1014).

The three sentence types are typically associated with the three basic illocutionary forces or communicative function, namely, asserting/ stating, asking/questioning, and ordering/requesting. (Mey, 2009:1005).

1.	a. She eats an apple.	declarative/statement
	b. Does she eat an apple?	interrogative/question
	c. Give me her apple!	imperative/command

In the case of a direct match between a sentence type and an illocutionary force, we have a direct speech act. On the other hand, whenever the relationship between structure and its function is indirectly, we are dealing with an indirect speech act. Moreover, an interrogative used to ask a question is a direct speech act (as in 1b), but an interrogative used to inquire about a capability (could, can) or willingness (would) in order to elicit information (2a) or to make a request (2b, 2c) represents an indirect speech act (Mey, 2009:1014).

a. Could you tell me whether she's eating an apple?b. Can you give me the salt, please?c. Would you give me your suitcase, Madam?

According to Grice in Mey (2009:365) conversational implicatures come about by the exploitation (apparent flouting) or observation of the Conversational Principles (CP) and a set of maxims, because each speaker has different ways to convey their intended meaning in conversation, whether they observe or blatantly exploit the conversational cooperation or maxims. As recited in Barber and Robert (2010:421) that the conversational maxims may be either observed or breached and in both cases implicatures may arise. Thus, the generated of implicature is crucially connected to the workings of an overall CP and a set of conversational maxims (Mey, 2009:569). In other words, CP explains how utterances convey indirect messages (implicature) (Sobhani and Saghebi, 2014:92) and clearly, they figure prominently in the derivation of an implicature. The basic idea of such a derivation is illustrated in the following example:

A: Is Hasan there? B: There is a black limousine in front of play yard.

Literally, B is like break the maxim of relation. For what does a black limousine have to do with Hasan? However, A was remembering that Hasan drives a black limousine, A can figure out that Hasan in front of play yard, so that A has made use of the assumption that B's answer has been relevant with A's question. Thus, the implicature, derived from the assumption that speaker B is adhering to the CP, is that the black limousine is not only in front of play yard, but also someone who searched by A. Therefore, the implicature makes potentially good reply and it must be noted that, we have to remain that in order to arrive at implicature, we must understand certain fact about the world (Brown and Yule, 1988:32), that the black limousine is a car which driven by Hasan at that time. Thus, relate with what Yule said (1996:40) that speaker who communicate meaning via implicature, then listener will recognize the communicated meaning via inference, which it will keep the assumption of being cooperative. Implicatures are inferences, which derive both from what has been said and from the existence of these underlying co-operative principles. This certainly concern with meaning and issues of function: what are people actually trying to do with language when they communicate (Forrester, 1996:52).

The contributions of Grice's principle are quantity maxim, relation maxim, manner maxim, and quality maxim:

Maxim of Quantity

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

2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required. Maxim of 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.

Maxim of Relevance

Be relevant.

Maxim of Manner

Be perspicuous.

- 1. Avoid obscurity of expression
- 2. Avoid ambiguity
- 3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)
- 4. Be orderly.

All of the participants of conversation must follow the four conversational maxims in order to get successfully in conversation or the communication will be efficient and cooperative. Furthermore, if all of the maxims are being observed, there will be no additional meaning added to the conversation. These maxims may be demonstrated in the following exchange:

A: Do you know where I can get water mineral? Because the sun light makes me so thirsty B: You can get water mineral at the cafe right on behind this building

Let us assume that B is sincere and knowledgeable, and A finds the cafe right away based upon B's advice. It is the case then that B's response to A's question follows the maxims completely, giving exactly the right amount of information (quantity), information for which B has the required evidence (quality), information that is directly connected to A's question (relevance), and information given in a fashion effectively and efficiently understood (manner).

Furthermore, implicature itself serves a variety of goals beyond communication, such as maintaining good social relations, misleading without lying, speaking style, and making verbal efficiency. In other situation, if one utterence, which contain of implicature, probably appears more maxims whether it must be observe or non observe maxim, as the example follows:

Fahmi : How is the taste of sausage roll? Itsna : Sausage roll is sausage roll (laughter)

Quite naturally, Fahmi asked the taste of sausage roll, but Itsna reply appears to have no communicative since she states something obvious and doesn't seem "as informative as is required." However, actually she has essentially communicated that she had implied meaning that sausage roll is not worth talking about. Whilst, the laughter following her statement clearly indicates that she had recognized her violation of the Quantity Maxim and understood the meaning of what she was saying. Because her answer was incomplete, she violated the maxim of quantity, but by violating this maxim, she absolutely made her contribution unclear as well. It mean that she also violated both the maxims of quantity and manner simultaneously.

Those Maxims are a set of guidelines that speakers normally adhere, but sometimes ignore. However, when speakers ignore one of the Grice's Maxims, there is usually a reason why they do so (Traxler, 2012:307). They are might be blatantly broken, because according to Grice people do not always follow maxims as they communicate, if it was happen, the floating bears more information than if people were obeyed (Darighgoftar and Ghaffari, 2012:271). In other words, Grice never intended his use of the word 'cooperation' to indicate an ideal view of communication (Barber and Robert, 2010:100). Thus, there is possibility for the non-fulfillment of a maxim for the purpose of implicating information (implicature), consequently apparent uncooperative response, such as the following example:

A: Wow. . The sun light makes me so thirsty B: There is a cafe right on behind this building

At first we may claim that B appears to break the maxim of relation, because for what cafe have to do with thirsty. Since people are aware that cafe sells water, it is not long before A realizes that B has not broken the maxim of relation at all. B's point is directly relevant. B is being cooperative and A assumes B is following the maxims and would thus not mention the cafe unless it had water.

