CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter will explore some review of underlying theory used for analyzing the data and also review of related study to the topic of this research. Review of underlying theory includes all the fundamental theories that underline this study which is the theory of pragmatics in general and Grice’s theory of implicatures.

2.1 Concept of Pragmatics

In linguistic study, pragmatics is dealing with semantic study whether both of them is study about meaning. As Rahardi (2005, p. 50) stated that pragmatics determines externally (out part of sentence) the meaning of language while semantic determines internally (in part of sentence) the meaning of language. Visibly explained by Parker (as cited in Rahardi, 2005, p. 49) Pragmatics is distinct from grammar, which is the study of the internal structure of language. Pragmatics is the study of how language is used to communicate. In other words, in communication there are some aspects of language which is not only explored by the sentence but in more particular ways.

Moreover, Mey (2001, p. 24) said that pragmatics is related to the context of society in using their language in communication. While, Yule (2006, p.112) state that ‘the study of what speakers mean, or speaker meaning, is called pragmatics’ So that, from some of these description the writer is capable to sum up that pragmatics is one of the study about meaning in language process that used to communicate between the societies. Its sense acquire as hearers inferences in understanding or
interpret what the speaker intend. Relates to this rules, it can be said that conversation need more contributions to interpreting each utterances between speaker and hearer to acquire suitable communication.

2.2 Conversational Analysis

This theory is presented by Yule (2006, p. 128) in his book *the study of language*. He describes Conversational Analysis (as forth CA) and preferences structure. Conversation is mainly about talking. The term “Conversational Analysis” is to represent any study of people talking together, oral communication, or language use. Mazeland (as cited in Mey 2009, p. 132) explained that this method is used to when people organize social action through talk by examining recordings of real-life interaction or transcript of interaction.

In other word, CA has made important contribution to the understanding of utterance meaning by showing how a large proportion of the situated significance of utterance can be traced to their surrounding sequential environments.

2.3 Implicature

Before discussing Grice’s theory of conversational implicature, I would like to examine his notion of implicature. In social live, people need interact with other people to share and express their idea and their feeling or anything. In this interaction they usually exchange meanings and intention so that they need communicate to interpret what someone or speaker means and intend in their utterances in order to socialize with other people well. The meaning in utterance is sometimes directly stated explicitly but sometime it is not. The implicit expression provides proposition
which has not expressed explicitly in the utterances. The implicit proposition of utterances is called by Grice as implicature.

The word ‘implicature’ is derived from the verb ‘to imply’ means to told something into something else. In other word it can be said ‘indirect’ or saying A through B. As Yule (2006, p. 131) describe in working out a conversational implicature can be seen in more than sentence meaning or called an additional convey meaning. Meanwhile, Searle (1975, p. 60) in article about speech act describe imply meaning as indirect speech act which is called illocutionary act. While according to Leech (1983, p. 215) draws meaning through content descriptive which is divide into locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary. Therefore, from some theories above, the researcher concluded that implicature can be defined as something meant, implied, or suggested distinct from what is said. Also implicature can be part of sentence meaning or dependent on conversational context.

The relationships between speakers meaning obviously can be seen in Grice typology. It represented schematically as follows:
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Figure 1. Grice typology of speaker meaning (adopted from Mey, 2009)

By observed the typology above, Grice clearly illustrate how people in their communication explore the meaning. He divided into two; what is said and what is
implicated means implicature. In implicature Grice divide into two then; conventional and conversational implicature. Conventional implicature is largely generated by the standing meaning of certain linguistic expressions while conversational implicature beside the ‘most widely accepted’ type of implicature (as stated by Meibauer in Mey, 2009), it is depend on features of the conversational situation or context and not just on the conventional meanings of the words used. Focus on conversational implicature; it is visibly explain in followed topic then.

2.3.1 Grice theory of Conversational Implicature

Grice in *logic and conversation* had explained conversational implicature is differ from conventional; meaning through a specific word such as ‘but’ or ‘therefore’. Conversational implicature is triggered by certain general features of discourse. As Meyer (2009, p. 58) said “conversational implicatures definitely result when an utterance is judged as not being truthful.” Here Meyer in his theory gave an explanation of one example of Grice’s maxim (in this case is maxim of quality). He stated that a conversational implicatures will surely appear when an utterance is not truth or violates maxim of quality.

Then Ariel (2008:11) argued “conversational implicatures are often generated when the encoded meaning seems to violate some Gricean maxim.” Ariel believed that when an utterance breaks some Gricean maxim, a conversational implicatures will be generated.

Furthermore, Grice in Geurts (2010, p.12) stated “a conversational implicature is what has to be supposed in order to preserve the supposition that the cooperative
principle is being observed”. In this theory, Grice’s claimed that a conversational implicatures has a relationship with a thing that he called cooperative principle.

Related with some description above Grice (1975, p. 49) explained how to characterize the notion of conversational implicature:

“A man who, by (in, when) saying (or making as if to say) that p has implicated that q, may be said to have conversationally implicated that q, PROVIDED THAT (1) He is to be presumed to be observing the conversational maxims, or at least the cooperative principle; (2) The supposition that he is aware that, or thinks that, q is required in order to make his saying or making as if to say p (or doing so in THOSE terms) consistent with this presumption; and (3) The speaker thinks (and would expect the hearer to think that the speaker thinks) that it is within the competence of the hearer to work out, or grasp intuitively, that the supposition mentioned in (2) Is required.”

By observing the Grice characterizing the notion of conversational implicature above, I capable to sum up that in working out an utterance is known as conversational implicature, it observed minimally: (i) the cooperative principle and its maxim; (ii) the context, linguistic or otherwise, of the utterances; (iii) other items of background knowledge; and (iv) the fact (or supposed fact) that all relevant items falling under the previous heading are available to both participant (speaker and hearer) know or assume this to be the case.
2.3.2 Specific Description of Working Out Conversational Implicature

In general pattern for working out of a conversational implicature, Grice draws as follow: ‘he has said that \( p \); there is no reason to suppose that he is not observing the maxims, or at least the CP; he could not be doing this unless he tough that \( q \); he knows (and knows that I know that he knows) that I can see that the supposition that he thinks that \( q \) is required; he has done nothing to stop me thinking that \( q \); he intends me to think, or is at least willing to allow me to think, that \( q \); and so he has implicated that \( q \).’

Furthermore, in the way of these conversational implicature are present, Grice divide into three groups. They are explained as follow:

*Group A: in which no maxim is violated, or at least in which it is not clear that any maxim is violated.*

Example:

(1) A is standing by an obviously immobilized car and is approached by B.

   A: I’m out of petrol

   B: **there is a garage round the corner.**

   *Interpretation:*

   B would be infringing the maxim ‘be relevant’ unless he think, or thinks it possible, that the garage is open, and has petrol to sell; so he implicates that the garage is, or at least may be open, etc.

(2) A: Smith doesn’t seem to have a girlfriend these days.

   B: **he has been paying a lot of visits to New York lately.**
Interpretation:

B implicates that Smith has, or may have a girlfriend in New York.

Both cases above illustrate that the speaker implicates that which he must be assumed to believe in order to preserve the assumption that he is observing the maxim of relation.

*Group B: in which a maxim is violated, but its violation is to be explained by the supposition of a clash with another maxim.*

(1) A is planning with B an itinerary for a holiday in France. Both know that A wants to see his friend C, if to do so would not involve too great a prolongation of his journey:

A: Where does C live?

B: **Somewhere** in the South of France.

Interpretation:

There is no reason to suppose that B is opting out; his answer is, as he well knows, less informative than is required to meet A’s needs. This infringement of the first maxim of quantity can be explained only by the supposition that B is aware that to be more informative would be to say something that infringed the maxim of Quality, ‘don’t say what you lack adequate evidence for’, so B implicates that he does not know in which town C lives.
Group C: involve exploitation, that is, a procedure by which a maxim is flouted for the purpose of getting in a conversational implicature by means of something of the nature of a figure of speech.

(1) A flouting of the first maxim of Quantity

Example: **war is war** (they are, of course, informative at the level of what is implicated.

(2) In which the first maxim of Quality is flouted: irony, metaphor, meiosis, and hyperbole (figure of speech).

Example: **you are the cream in my coffee** (metaphor)

(3) In which an implicature is achieved by real.

Example:

A: Mrs. **X is an old bag.**

B: The weather has been quite delightful this summer, isn’t it? (Implies that A has committed a social gaffe. A’s remarks should not be discussed.

(4) In which various maxims falling under the super maxim ‘Be perspicuous’ are flouted: ambiguity, obscurity and failure to be brief.

Example:

**X is meeting a woman this evening** (failure to be brief)

when someone using the form of expression *a/an X*, implicates that the *X* does not belong to or is not otherwise closely connected with some identifiable person, the implicature is present because the speaker has failed to be specific in a way in which
he might have been expected to be specific, ‘with the consequence that it is likely to be assumed that he is not in a position to be specific’ (Grice, 1975, p. 56).

2.4 Types of Conversational Implicature

2.4.1 Generalized Conversational Implicature (GCI)

Grice (1975) as cited in Bottyán introduces a distinction between two types of conversational implicatures: generalized and particularized implicatures. A particularized implicature is an implicature “carried by saying that \( p \) on a particular occasion in virtue of a special feature of the context”. On the contrary, generalized conversational implicatures are implicature that are normally carried by saying that \( p \).

As an example of generalized conversational implicature, Grice suggests the use of \( a/an \ X \), which carries the implicature that \( X \) is only remotely related in a certain way to some person indicated by the context. When someone says “John is meeting a woman this evening”, he certainly means that is, conversationally implicates +>`“The woman John is meeting this evening is not his mother, his sister or his wife”.

Other linguist, Peccei (1999, p.38) in his book entitled Pragmatics Language Workbooks distinct generalized implicature be drawn with very little ‘inside’ knowledge. As the example, the writer present a conversation adopted from Carston:

A: Did the children’s summer camp go well?

B: Some of them got stomach flu.

Conversation above can be interpreted or implicates +>`“not all the children got stomach flu” it is usually called as scalar implicature.
From the description above, it can be concluding that the criterions of generalized conversational implicature are: (1) without special knowledge to calculate the additional conveyed meaning, (e.g. A: do you invite Bella and Cathy? B: I invite Bella, it implicates +> B didn’t invite Cathy, (2) phrase within definite article type a/an X +> Not speaker’s X (e.g. I come into a house implicates +> not my house), (3) scalar implicature (some implicates +> not all).

### 2.4.2 Particularized Conversational Implicature

Some assumed knowledge which is required in very specific context during conversation is called particularized conversational implicature. As an illustration, consider an example where Lara’s response does not appear on the surface to adhere to relevance. It is simply relevant answer would be ‘yes’ or ‘no’.

Carol: *Are you coming to the party tonight?*

Lara: *I’ve got an exam tomorrow.*

(Taken from Yule, 2006, p. 131)

In order to make Lara’s response relevant, Carol has to draw on some assumed knowledge that Lara will be spending that evening with his parents, consequently he is not at party.

Other example is present where the response initially appears to flout relevance.

Ayu: *do you want ice-cream?*

Nita: *is the chocolate?*

Nita response does not provide a yes or no answer. Ayu must assume that Nita is being cooperative, so she considers Nita’s questions and clearly the answer is ‘yes’.
So the answer is known, but the nature of Nita’s response also implicate that the answer to the question is obviously yes. An additional conveyed meaning in such a case is that, because the answer is obvious, the question did not need to be asked. Based on some description above, the writer is capable sum up that the criterion of particularized conversational implicature is conversational implicature that its meaning is out part of the utterance, so that hearer should need knowledge more to interpret what speaker mean. In other word, particularized conversational implicature is the inferences of hearer which only can be work out or interpreted while drawing totally on the specific context of the utterance.

2.5 Relevance of The Study

To give an evidence of originality of this research, the researcher present some previous studies that has been conducted in the different study on the pragmatic analysis. First one is conducted by Listiani (2011), entitled “Analysis of Conversational Implicature in Pariah Movie Episode of Smallville Serial Movie”. This research is designed to find out conversational implicature and the violation of the co-operative principle which appears in the ‘Pariah’ episode of Smallville serial movie. The result shows that conversational implicature in ‘Pariah’ movie mostly violated the Quality Maxim.

Secondly, conversational implicature research also investigated by Dian Agustianingsih (2010) entitled “Implicature Analysis: Humor in Opera Van Java”. In this research is focus on Joke implicature analysis by applying the understanding about Grice implicature; Generalized and Particularized Conversational Implicature.
Then, through this analysis it is founded shows that Generalized Implicatures that used when the information being conveyed is clear, complete, and using general words. It can be understood without deriving in a special context. It means that the intended information can be understood without knowing the whole conversation. Whether Particularized implicatures are used when the information are unclear, incomplete, and using a specific word. Listener should consider the context, which carries it in order to understand the intended message.

The similarity of these studies and my research is the field of study that is Pragmatics especially implicature analysis. Then, the differences are Listiani’s study researched about implicature in cooperative principle that violated maxim, while Dian analyzed conversational implicature that characterized Joke implicature in utterances. Whereas, in my research will analyze conversational implicatures in movie study especially in “From Paris with Love” that is an action movie.

2.6 Brief Synopsis of “From Paris with Love”

The film opens up with James Reese (Jonathan Rhys Meyers), an ambassadorial aide and undercover operative for the U.S., driving to work. He goes to work, gets a call and changes the plates on an operative’s car. It’s clear he’s pretty low and the ladder, but his boss gives him the opportunity to move up the ranks. Reese plays chess with his Ambassadorial Employer and then goes and plants a bug in the French Prime Minister’s office. He stumbles several times trying to plant the bug, but eventually staples it under the Prime Minister’s desk. His performance earns him a promotion and he is given a partner.
At his apartment, Reese’s girlfriend, Caroline (Kasia Smutniak) proposes to him, since she felt he would never propose if she didn’t ask first. She gives him her father’s ring and takes him upstairs to have dinner. As they prepare to eat, Reese is called by his boss and told that his new partner was detained by the Parisian customs. Reese leaves Caroline to go and bail out his partner.

Charlie Wax (John Travolta) is being detained because he wants to bring his White Snake Energy drinks into the country, but customs has a zero tolerance policy for liquids. Reese is surprised by his new partner, but asks him if it’s necessary to bring the liquids. Charlie rants about how the French are all high and mighty and continues to toy with the guards. Reese puts a Diplomatic Mail Stamp on Charlie’s bag and Charlie smugly tells the guards “I win.”

In the car, Charlie and Reese talk and Charlie opens his cans to get the parts of his custom gun together. Reese asks why he smuggled a gun into the country when he could easily get Charlie whatever weapon he needs. Charlie tells him that it is his favorite gun and then tells him to take him to a specific Chinese restaurant. At the restaurant, Charlie and Reese argue over the authenticity of the Chinese food they are eating when Charlie calls the waiter over. He pulls a gun on him and demands cocaine.

Finally, At the Ambassador’s office, Reese attempts to get in with his key card but it has already been used: Caroline is hiding in the building as an Arabic dancer. The Ambassador gets Reese into the building but is confused as to why he brought a gun. He enters the building and begins searching for Caroline. He finds her in the
center and pulls his gun on her as the guards in the room pull their guns on him. When Caroline takes off her shroud and reveals her bomb, it comes down to her and Reese. Reese questions her and asks if any of it was real. He tells her he loves her, hoping that she will abort the mission. She makes a move to set off the bomb and Reese shoots her in the head. Charlie catches her body, preventing the explosion and saving everyone. The duo part ways at the airport: Charlie asks Reese to be his permanent partner and as Charlie prepares to leave, the two play a game of chess. Retrieved from http://www.themoviespoiler.com/Spoilers/frompariswithlove.html.