CHAPTER II

THEORITICAL REVIEW

This chapter describes and explains the theoretical review of the research. This theory regards the conversational implicature, maxim of manner, presupposition, and inference.

1.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a study of language meaning that is influenced by either the internal factor or external factor. According to Verschueren in Trigia (2006:8), pragmatics is the study of language use, or, to employ a statement more complicated phrasing, the study of linguistic phenomena from the point of view of their usage properties and processes. Thus, pragmatics is the study of language usage. Oral and written texts are the example of the language usage. Oral is language produced realized the speech while written text is language produced realized the text. We can analyze the meaning of the oral text or written text based on the assumption that exists in the context or even beyond the context. Generally, both oral text and written text can be produced from statement and conversation.

1.2 Conversation

Interrelationship conversation is an activity that is conducted by two elements. They are speaker and hearer. Based on Richard and Schmidt in Trigia (2006:11), conversation is seen as an activity which is directed to social goals, (e.g the establishment of roles, presentation of self) as well as the linguistic goals (communication of meaning). Usually, conversation is conducted by two persons or more in order to reach the interrelationship between the speaker and the hearer about the topic of the conversation.

Generally, there are several maxims in the conversation. They are maxim of co-operative principle, maxim of politeness, and maxim of relevance. The aim of those maxims is to maintain the conversation so that the message of the conversation can be delivered well without giving the trouble to the speaker or the hearer in understanding the message of the conversation.

Actually, there is a conversation that can not be delivered well by the speaker so that it makes the hearer or reader get confused to catch the message of the conversation. Besides, there is also a conversation that can not be delivered well by the speaker, but the speaker or the hearer understands the message of the conversation. Those cases can be analyzed by looking the context of situation of the conversation. Saddock in Brown and Yule (1984:35) expressed the implications of taking context into account well.

> There is, then, a serious methodological problem that confronts the advocate of linguistic pragmatics. Given some aspects of what a sentence conveys in a particular context, is that aspect part of what the sentence conveys in virtue of its meaning … or should it be 'worked out' on the basis of Gricean principles from the rest of the meaning of the sentence and relevant facts of the context of utterance?

Besides context of situation, we can analyze conversation based on the features of context of situation. According to Lewis in Brown and Yule (1983:41), there are several features of context of situation, those are:

1. Possible-world is the word that express the possibility
2. Time tells about when the event happened
3. Place describes where the event happened
4. Speaker is person who becomes a subject in the event
5. Audience is person who hears or the participant of the event
6. Indicated object is like reference in the previous or the next utterance
7. Previous discourse is word or phrase that is mentioned before and mentioned again with determine by using determiner
8. Assignment is the sequence activity and the command utterance that must be done in next activity

1.2.1 Conversational Implicature

According to Grice in Brown and Yule (1983:31), implicature is the term used to account for what the speaker can imply, suggest, or mean, as distinct from what the speaker literally says. Grice in Levinson (1983:126) also distinguished the kinds of conversational implicature on another dimension – generalized conversational and particularized conversational. Generalized conversational implicature is a conversation that there is no particular context

or special scenario being necessary, while particular conversational implicature is a conversation that requires such specific context.

1.2.1.1 Co-operative Principle

Generally, conversational implicature appears when the conversation is breaking the law of co-operative principle. Grice in Levinson (1983:101) stated:

> Co-operative principle is used to make your 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.

1. The maxim of quality
   Try to make your contribution one that is true, specifically:
   i. Do not say what you believe to be false
   ii. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence
2. The maxim of quantity
   i. Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purpose of the exchange
   ii. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required
3. The maxim of relevance
   Make your contributions relevant
4. The maxim of manner
   Be perspicuous, and specifically:
   i. Avoid obscurity
   ii. Avoid ambiguity
   iii. Be brief
   iv. Be orderly

Since the topic of this research is the analysis of maxim of manner, the writer only focuses on the maxim of manner.

a. Maxim of Manner

According to Grice in Lian-Hee and Cheung (2009:3), maxim of manner is one of the co-operative principles that requires being

perspicuous including avoiding obscurity, avoiding ambiguity, being brief, and being orderly.

1) Obscurity

Obscurity is something that is hard to understand.

Example:

A: Do you want to try it again?

B: Girl can dream.

B's contribution fails to answer A's question. A asks B whether B wants to try it (something) again or not, but B answers *girl can dream*. It seems that B makes violation to the maxim of relevance because the answer of B is not relevance with A's question.

However, we have to analyze another reference in the utterance *a girl can dream.* B's answer is obscure because B did not explain the comprehensive utterance by only saying *a girl can dream.* The reader or hearer will get confused with B's response because it is hard to understand. Based on that text, it is assumed that B has tried, at least once, to gain something, but B fails. B answered that *a girl can dream*; it can imply that a girl can keep dreaming to gain her pretension, so B will keep the pretension as B keep her/his dream as long as B can gain that.

2) Ambiguity

Ambiguity is utterance that consists of more than one meaning.

Example:

A: What does Jane ask to Mira?

B: Jane asks Mira to bring a photo of *her*.

B's response is ambiguous. The reader will mix up with the phrase 'a photo of *her*' because the word *her* consists of two meanings. The reader confused whether *her* refers to Jane or Mira.

3) Brief

Brief is utterance that is delivered briefly or avoiding the prolixity.

Example:

A: Do you like fifties music?

B: Yes, I like fifties music.

B's contribution is brief answer. A asks whether B likes fifties music or not, so the need answer is *yes* or *no*. B does not need to explain how fifties music are.

4) Orderly

Orderly is utterance that is delivered orderly or arranged in order.

Example:

S1: Marry took a bath.

S2: Marry wore a beautiful dress.

A: What did Marry do this morning?

B: Marry took a bath and then wore a beautiful dress.

B's response is an orderly answer. B says that Barry took a bath first and then wore a beautiful dress. It is an illogical statement if Marry wore a beautiful dress first and then took a bath, because usually we take a bath in undress condition. Thus the logical statement is the same as what B does; Marry took a bath and then wore a beautiful dress.

Another example:

A: How is your cousin like?

B: My cousin is really cute. He has slant-eyed, same as his father. His father has beautiful slant-eyed and white skin. Besides, my cousin also is a naughty boy.

Look at B's utterance, there is disorder statement. A asks about how B's cousin is. B answers by saying disorder one. First, B says physical appearance of his cousin. Second, B says about his cousin's father. The last, B says about his cousin behavior.

1.2.2 Presupposition

Stalnaker in Brown and Yule (1983:29) argued that presupposition is what is taken by the speaker to be the common ground of the participants in the conversation. Besides that, Keenan in Brown and Yule (1983:29) describes that if A sentence S logically presupposes a sentence S' just in case S logically implies S' negation of S, ~ S, also logically implies S'.

i.e

I want to do it again.

Presupposition : I have done already, at least once.

(-) I don't want to do it again

Presupposition : I have done already, at least once.

Hence, presupposition is an implicit assumption about the background belief relating to the utterance.

1.2.3 Inference

Inference is the conclusion of something. According to Levinson (1983:103-104),

> Such inferences are, by definition, conversational implicature, where the term *implicature* is intended to contrast with terms like *logical implication*, *entailment* and *logical consequence* which are generally used to refer to inferences that derived solely from logical or semantic contents. For implicature are not semantic inferences, but rather inferences based on both the content of what has been said and some specific assumptions about the co-operative nature of ordinary verbal interaction.

Thus, the inference can be derived from the specific assumption taken from the presupposition of the utterances.

Example:

A: Do you like ice cream?

B: **Ice cream is really delicious. Strawberry is more delicious than chocolate**.

Presupposition:

1. B likes ice cream
2. Ice cream is delicious
3. Strawberry ice cream is delicious
4. Chocolate ice cream is delicious
5. Strawberry ice cream is more delicious than chocolate ice cream
6. B likes strawberry ice cream
7. B maybe likes chocolate ice cream

The inference of B's utterance is B likes strawberry ice cream.