

IMPLICATURE IN THE STUDY OF PRAGMATICS

Latif Amrullah

IAIN Tulungagung, East Java

amrullah.latif@gmail.com

Abstract: In communication, people cannot be separated from conversations where actually there is something to be implied on. The existence of implicature, however, is hardly needed as a tool to bond the interlocutors. Implicature is divided into two, i.e. conventional implicature and conversational implicature. To understand the implicature, the instruments such as speech events, reference, cultural background and daily experience are used.

Keywords: *implicature, conventional, conversational, instruments*

People cannot be separated from communication with others, such as talking, chatting or gossiping. In speaking with others, every form of speech actually implies something to be communicated. The implicature is a proposition that commonly hide behind the speech produced, and is not direct part of that speech (Parker, 1962: 21; Wijana, 1996: 37). In that case, what is said is different from what is implied. Hence, Wright (1975:379) proposed that what is meant is not what is said.

The differences between the speech and the implicature sometimes make the speaker difficult to understand the meaning of a speech. Generally, however, the interlocutors have shared experiences and knowledge, therefore the conversation can run smoothly without any obstacles. The example of conversational implicature can be found in this case. In one of a university, there was a lecture who was giving an explanation in front of the class without using microphone. While explaining the materials, suddenly the lecture said, "With abundance of students in this class, I could only speak for about 30 minutes". The speech does not merely inform the inability of the lecture to speak in front of the class for a long time, but it implies an imperative that there will be someone who does something to solve the problem. For example, one of the students will ask the officer on duty to provide microphone in the class. Grice (via Nababan, 1987: 30) explains that the meaning of implicature as it is stated above called meaning non-natural, which then it is used as the base of conversational implicature.

Based on Levinson, the problem of conversational implicature is the most crucial one in the study of pragmatics. It happens because the problem of conversational implicature is directly related to practical usage of language, both verbal and non-verbal (Edmondson, 1981: 38). Based on the explanation above,

this paper tends to trace and assess the conversational implicature theoretically as it is written by Grice (1975). It is expected that this paper will enrich the development of pragmatics and provide information for the reader.

THE CONCEPT OF IMPLICATURE

The main concept that highlights pragmatics as a branch of linguistics is the concept of conversational implicature (Levinson, 1991: 97). The conversational implicature was at first proposed by the philosopher Paul Grice in a lecture at Harvard University in 1967. An article called "Logic and Conversation" was proposed to solve the problems of language meaning which cannot be explained by any theories general linguistics (Grice, 1975: 41).

Usually every utterances is considered to have a specific meaning. That meaning of the speech is referred to as implicatum by Grice (1975: 44), which then is formulated with the term non-natural meaning. While the indications are referred to as implicature. Nominally, this term has a relationship with the word implication which means intention, understanding or involvement (Echols and Hassan, 1999: 313). In the study of pragmatics and discourse, implication means something involved in the conversation. In addition, Kridalaksana (2011: 91) explains that implicature is what logically the conclusion of a speech, as well as the shared background of knowing between the speaker and the hearer in a given context.

Therefore, implicature shows the differences between what is said from what is meant. However, these differences do not become a problem in the conversation because the interlocutors have already understood each other. Thus, implicature does not need to be expressed explicitly (Wijana, 1996: 68). To have a better understanding of this, the followings are examples of speech where the differences happened.

- (1) A: What time is it?
B: The newspaper has not arrived yet.

Structural-conventionally, both sentences seem unrelated. However, actually there are extralinguistic factors involved in reconstructing the sentences. If the sentences are extended, it will be like the following.

- (2) A: (could you tell me) what time is it (as it is shown in the watch, and if you could please tell me).
B: (I don't know exactly what time it is now, but I can tell you a habit where you can guess what time it is, that is) the newspaper (commonly delivered) has not arrived yet.

In the conversation above, the information of answer required is not given directly and completely in the dialogue (1), but the statement given in (2) can be understood by the asking person. Hence, the speaker (2) can only guess about what time the newspaper comes. This guessing should be based on the context, which includes the issues, interlocutors and their background (Nadar, 2009: 60). The difference between (1) and (2) is quite large and cannot be explained by using conventional theory of semantics. To solve these problems we need a system, and the concept of conversational implicature is the solution.

According to Brown and Yule (1983: 27), implicature is the elements outside of the text. If it is returned to the initial concept, it can be understood that the relationship between the two prepositions - speech and the implication – is not an absolute consequence (Parker, 1986: 21). The absence of such a relationship can actually connect conversational act so that the conversation can run smoothly and succeed effectively.

Based on the concept explained previously, implicature can be defined with the following characteristics: (1) the implication is not stated directly, (2) does not have any absolute relationship with utterances realized, (3) includes extralinguistic elements, (4) is open interpretation, and (5) occurs due to obedience or disobedience to the cooperative principles in the conversation.

TYPES OF IMPLICATURE

Implicature consists of two types: conventional implicature and conversational implicature (Grice, 1975: 44). The differences between them are explained further by Lyons (1995: 272).

The difference between them is that the former depend on something other than what is truth-conditional in the conventional use, or meaning, or particular forms and expressions, whereas the later derived from a set of more general principles which regulate the proper conduct of conversation.

Conventional implicature associated with the usage and general meaning, whereas conversational implicature refers to the general principles of the substitutions correctly. Explanation of the two types of implicatures will be described below.

Conventional Implicature

Conventional implicature is the implication which is general and conventional. In general, everyone has known and understood the meaning or implications of a case. Understanding the implications conventionally supposes the listener or reader to have experience and general knowledge. Consider the following example.

- (3)a. John is handsome but he rides CD 70.
- b. John is handsome.
- c. John rides CD 70.
- d. There is a contradiction between (b) and (c).

On this third examples, (a) contains two basic statements as in (b) and (c), and higher comments is on (d). Sentence (a) contains a contradiction because Joni has a handsome and charming face, while CD 70 is identical to an old and ugly motorcycle, so the conjunction used is the word 'but'. This is what has been suggested by Grice related to the basic statement in a sentence, which can use conjunctions such as: moreover, but, therefor, on the other hand, or so. For this reason, in general, conventional is distinguished based on the content which is descriptive (only affect the value of truth only) and is also indicative that produce implicature (Carston, 2002: 107-108).

Conventional implicature is not temporary which means it has more durable meaning. A lexem contained in an utterance can be recognized its implication because the meaning which is "old" and already known in general. Here is an example.

- (4) Spain's midfielder Xavi Hernández was so satisfied with his team's success in winning Euro Cup 2012 final after beating Italy 4-0 in NSK Olimpijs'kyj Stadium, Kiev, Monday (2/7).

It is important to note the implication of "beat" and "Italy". The first lexem means defeating, not beating like what is meant by using a paddle or wood, and lexem "Italy" is as one of the football team competing in the football tournament, not the name of a state government. Meaning and information can be confirmed truly because in general people know that Xavi is a football player from Spain in which the country participates in the Euro 2012 Championship, and he's not recognized as any other sportsman. The word "Italy" is also not a country in the sense of government or an individual, but a team of Italian football who follow the tournament.

Conventional implicature is not much studied by experts of pragmatics because it is not so interesting (Brown and Yule, 1983: 31). This is due to the implications contained tend to be firm and do not have much meaning. Type of implicature which is considered more attractive and very important in the study of pragmatic is conversational implicature. The study of conversational implicature will help in opening and extending the development of pragmatic.

Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature appears in conversation act. Therefore, the nature of implicature is temporary and non-conventional directly with utterance spoken (Levinson, 1991: 117). Implicature is a combination of language with situation where the same speech in different situations may not produce implicature, or it may also suggest implicature (Black, 2006: 25).

According to Grice (1975: 45) there is a set of assumptions that cover and regulate the activities of the conversation as a speech act. According to Grice's analysis, a set of assumptions that guide someone in conversation is cooperative principles. In carrying out cooperative principles in the conversation, each speaker must obey the four maxims of conversation, namely: (1) maxim of quantity, (2) maxim of quality, (3) maxim of relevance, (4) maxim of manner (Parker, 1986: 23).

Cooperative principles explained in the four maxims are the rule. Therefore, normatively every conversation must obey them so that communication can proceed smoothly. In summary, cooperative principles of conversation act can be formulated by Nababan (1987: 31) as follows:

"Buatlah sumbangan percakapan anda sedemikian rupa sebagaimana diharapkan, pada tingkat percakapan yang bersangkutan, oleh tujuan percakapan yang diketahui atau oleh arah percakapan yang sedang anda ikuti."

But sometimes the principles are not always to be obeyed. So that in a conversation, there are found violations of such cooperative principles. Violation of this principles do not mean the failure in the conversation. These violations may actually be intended by the speaker to obtain the speech implicature effect of what was said, for example, to lie, fun, or joke. The example of conversational implicature is as shown below taken from Bahasa Indonesia.

(5) A: (*Saya mau ke belakang*) *Ada kamar kecil di sini?*

B: *Ada, kan memang semua kamarnya kecil-kecil.*

(6) A: (*Saya mau ke belakang*) *Permisi pak, mau minta ijin ke belakang sebentar.*

B: *Belakang sekolah atau belakang kelas?*

(7) A: (*Saya merasa lapar*) *Ada warung di sekitar sini?*

B: *Ada di ujung jalan sana.*

Cooperative principles are violated in conversation example (5) and (6), whereas in the example (7) there is no violation. Example (5) violates the maxim of quality because the answer B does not give a true information. Example (6) violates the maxim of quantity because the actually A only requires an approval answer of B, but instead B says a statement more than what is expected by A. While the sample (7) has complied the maxim of quality by providing true answer.

FUNCTIONS AND INSTRUMENTS TO UNDERSTAND IMPLICATURE

Functions of Implicature

According to Levinson (1991: 97-100), the concept of implicature in the study of pragmatics has four functions at least: (1) possibility of obtaining functional explanation that significant to the language realization which is not covered by descriptive linguistics theory, (2) giving a firm and explicit explanation about its possibility that language user can grasp the messages although what is spoken differs from what is meant, (3) can simplify the semantic explanation from the difference relations among clauses despite the clauses were associated with the same words structure, and (4) can explain the variety of linguistic indications which is unrelated or even contradictory.

Instruments to Understand Implicature

By having no semantic relationship between the speech with something that implies, it can be assumed that a speech will be interpreted by various implicatures. If it is not understood, speaker can make mistakes in capturing implicature communicated to him/her. Consider the following dialogue between the Sunan Kudus with Raden Arya Penangsang (Pranowo, 1999: 5)

(8) Sunan Kudus: *Rangkakna, Ngger! Enggal Rangkakna culikamu!*

'Masukkan Nak! Cepat masukkan kerismu!

Penangsang : (*Memasukkan kembali keris ke warangka-nya, dan tidak jadi membunuh Hadiwijaya, sambil berujar*)
Paman meniko kados pundi ta? 'Paman itu bagaimana?'

Sunan Kudus: *Oh Penangsang, Penangsang. Dadi wong kok bodhone kaya ngono. Wong gari mak jus wae kok keris malah dilebokke maneh!*

'Oh Penangsang, Penangsang. Jadi orang kok bodohnya seperti itu. Tinggal menusuk saja kok keris malah dimasukkan lagi!'

Dialogue (8) shows that both locutionary and illocutionary acts are the same, that is an imperative form. However the implicature differs from that illocutionary. This utterance can only be understood its implicature if the hearer has other information beyond the linguistic knowledge. It means that context is very influential in understanding the meaning of an utterance. In this dialogue, Aryo Penangsang does not understand the implicature of Sunan Kudus' speech "*Enggal rangkakna culikamu*" (put inside your kris soon). The word "*rangkakna*" means the kris is asked to be stabbed immediately into Hadiwijaya's body, not inserted into the "*warangka*" (sheath).

A speaker who feels that his/her utterance's implicature cannot be understood soon by hearer, in general he/she will cancel the utterance (Stubbs, 1983: 210), and will try to obey the cooperative principles in conversation. In Javanese society, it is known a concept of speaking called "nglulu" (speech which implies otherwise/irony). If the hearer does not immediately understand the utterance, usually the speaker will soon revise their utterance. He will re-use an utterance in accordance with the cooperative principles. Consider the following example of this dialogue.

(9) Bapak : Mengko muleh bengi maneh ta, e? '*Nanti pulang malam lagi kan, nak?*'

Anak : Nggih pak, kados padatan. '*Iya pak, seperti biasa.*'

Bapak : (Jengkel karena implikaturnya tidak dipahami, dia segeramengubah tuturannya) Yen mengko muleh bengi maneh, ora tak bukakke lawang. Ora usah muleh sisan wae. Ngerti, ojo muleh bengi neh. '*Kalau nanti pulang malam lagi, tidak aku bukakan pintu. Tidak perlu pulang sekalian saja. Mengerti, jangan pulang malam lagi.*'

To understand the utterances, the hearer is required to push all of skills and knowledge, such as world knowledge, cultural background, the ability to think referentially, presupposition, speech acts situations, cooperative principles, and the experience in general (Pranowo, 1995: 5). If those instruments have mutually owned, then the conversation containing implicature will run smoothly. Consider the following dialogue.

(10) A: Eh, Bambang mau datang sekarang nih.

(Bambang will come soon)

B: Wah, rokoknya harus disimpan dulu.

(Keep out the cigars!)

Regarding Bambang's habit who likes smoking but always asks one to his friends, B understands the implicature meant by A. By using the cooperative principles and the previous experiences, B consciously and immediately saves the cigarettes (perlocution) so that Bambang does not request any. Overall, implicature is easily grasped and understood when each speakers has an instrument in understanding the implications.

CONCLUSION

Conversational implicature is regarded as an important issue and the most fundamental aspect in the study of pragmatics. It happens because the presence of implicature actually needed to connect the communication and explain the language facts which are not covered by the theories of structural linguistics. In addition, an indication of success in conversation is the ability to grasp and understand the implications of that utterance. The existence of different types of implicature shows how intricate and complex an utterance is. To understand conversational implicature, it is needed to have experiences and knowledge about the situation of the speech act. Therefore, it can be said that implicature can be easily understood if the speakers have shared experiences and knowledge in the conversation involved.

REFERENCES

- Black, Elizabeth. 2006. *Pragmatic Stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Brown, Gillian and George Yule. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Carston, Robyn. 2002. *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Echols, and Hasan Shadily. 1999. *Kamus Inggris-Indonesia*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Edmondson, Willis. 1981. *Spoken Discourse*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Grice, H Paul. 1975. "Logic and Conversation" in Cole and JL Morgan, Syntax and Semantics Vol. 3: Speech Act. New York: Academy Press.
- Kridalaksana, Harimurti. 2011. *Kamus Linguistik*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1991. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Lyons, John. 1993. *Linguistics Semantics An Introduction*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Nababan, PWJ. 1987. *Ilmu Pragmatik: Teori dan Penerapannya*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- Nadar. 2009. *Pragmatik dan Penelitian Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Parker, Frank. 1986. *Linguistics for Non Linguist*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Pranowo. 1999. "Memahami Sasmita dalam bahasa Jawa". Makalah Presentasi IKIP Yogyakarta.
- Stubbs, Michael. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Wijana, I Dewa Putu. 1996. *Dasar-dasar Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset
- Wright, Richard A. 1975. "Meaning non-natural and Conversational Implicature", Cole and Morgan. Syntax and Semantics Vol. 3: Speech Act. New York: Academi Press.