

ISBN 978-602-8474-19-1



EIGHTH CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH STUDIES (CONEST 8)



Jakarta, 1 - 2 December 2011

PUSAT KAJIAN BAHASA DAN BUDAYA
UNIVERSITAS KATOLIK INDONESIA ATMA JAYA
JALAN JENDERAL SUDIRMAN 51
JAKARTA 12930

IMPLICATURE AND COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLES IN L. A. HILL'S STORIES:
a pragmatic analysis

Besin Gaspar

gasparbesin@ubaya.ac.id

University of Surabaya Politeknik Ubaya

INTRODUCTION

Pragmatics deals with meaning in context, especially speaker meaning (Leech, 1983; Levinson, 1983; Mely, 1993; Cutting, 2002). To understand the speaker meaning, the hearer should have the pragmatic competence, that is, the ability to understand what is meant by the speaker. It is not easy to figure out the speaker meaning because in daily communication, people do not say what they mean to say. They mean one thing but say something else which is known as implicature. The failure of the hearer to understand the speaker meaning will lead to misunderstanding and miscommunication.

This paper is trying to analyze the implicature and the cooperative principles in L.A. Hill's stories. L.A. Hill's stories are famous and widely used in reading comprehension classes for the students of ESL or EFL. Although the level of vocabulary and the patterns used in the stories are simplified to adjust them to the level of proficiency of the students, the stories still reflect the freshness of originality. One thing that makes those stories interesting is that they are very humorous. Therefore, these stories are interesting to analyze from pragmatic point of view. The main question is what makes those stories humorous. Since there are so many Hill's stories, a selection has to be made and it follows that there are only two stories which will be analyzed here and they are taken from *Advanced Steps to Understanding* (1980). The two stories are those in Unit 11 (page 24) and Unit 21 (page 44).

AN OVERVIEW OF IMPLICATURE AND COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLES

Implicature

Implicature is one of the main topics in pragmatics because pragmatics deals with the study of meaning in relation to speech situation (Leech, 1983: 1). Implicature, according to Mely (1993: 99-100), comes from the word 'to imply' which means 'to fold something into something else in order to be understood'. The noun form is 'implicature'. Grice (1975) distinguishes 'to imply' and 'to implicate'. The noun implicature derives from 'to implicate' which means something that is implied. To put it in another way, to imply means to mean something by saying something else. According to Grice (Wijana, 1997), an utterance can imply a proposition which is not part of that utterance. The proposition which is implied is called implicature. The relationship between the implicature and the utterance is not a necessary consequence. Mely (1993) is right when he says that "logic and everyday life does not always look at things in the same way". What a speaker means is determined by the speaker's intention. According to Searle (1969: 17-18), the speaker's utterance may have two different meanings. First, a speaker can say something and mean it. Or he/she can say one thing and mean something else (primary illocutionary act).

Cooperative Principles

Grice states that in order to carry out the cooperative principles, every speaker should obey the four conversational maxims, that is, maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner. (Brown and Yule, 1983: 31-32; Leech, 1983: 119-154; Wijana, 1996: 42-50; Levinson, 1983: 100-101). These maxims can be summarized as follows:

- Maxim of quantity : Make your contribution as informative as is required.
Do not make your contribution more informative than required.
- Maxim of quality : Do not say what you believe to be false.
- Maxim of relevance : Make your contribution relevant.
- Maxim of manner : Be brief. Be orderly. Avoid ambiguity.