

IMPLICATURES IN CHARACTERS' SPEECH IN *PRIDE AND PREJUDICE* MOVIE

Desak Putu Eka Pratiwi
desak.eka.pratiwi@gmail.com
Mahasaraswati Denpasar University

ABSTRACT

People use spoken language in delivering their purposes. However, their utterances usually have wider meaning than their literal meaning. This is mostly influenced by the context when the speech occurred and the intention of the speaker. This research is aimed at identifying implicatures used by characters in *Pride and Prejudice* movie in their conversation. The term of 'implicature' is used to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean, as distinct from what the speaker literally says. Every utterance said by people does not consist only of a word with its literal meaning but also an intended meaning inside it. People's intended meaning is mostly tied with the context of time when the utterance is uttered by the speaker. This situation makes each person or the hearer possibly have a different interpretation. Therefore, it is important to study language use. In conducting research, the researcher used descriptive qualitative method to identify and describe the implicatures. Observation method was used to collect the data by watching the movie repeatedly and taking notes the dialogues which have implicatures. Then the selected data were analysed by using relevant theory about implicature. The finding shows that there are three types of implicatures in the character's speech in *Pride and Prejudice* movie, i.e. (a) conventional implicatures in which the utterances can be automatically interpreted by the words literally said; (b) generalized conversational implicatures in which no special knowledge is required in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning; and (c) particularized conversational implicature in which specific context is required to make an inference to reach the conveyed meaning.

Keywords: *conversation, implicature, conventional, generalized, particularized*

ABSTRAK

*Orang-orang menggunakan bahasa lisan dalam menyampaikan tujuan mereka. Namun, ucapan mereka biasanya memiliki makna yang lebih luas daripada makna harfiahnya. Ini sebagian besar dipengaruhi oleh konteks ketika pidato terjadi dan niat pembicara. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi implikatur yang digunakan oleh karakter dalam film *Pride and Prejudice* dalam percakapan mereka. Istilah 'implikatur' digunakan untuk menjelaskan apa yang disiratkan, disarankan, atau diartikan oleh pembicara, berbeda dari apa yang secara harfiah dikatakan oleh pembicara. Setiap ucapan yang diucapkan oleh orang-orang tidak hanya terdiri dari sebuah kata dengan makna literalnya tetapi juga makna yang dimaksudkan di dalamnya. Makna yang dimaksudkan orang sebagian besar terikat dengan konteks waktu ketika ucapan itu diucapkan oleh pembicara. Situasi ini membuat setiap orang atau pendengar mungkin memiliki interpretasi yang berbeda. Karena itu, penting untuk mempelajari penggunaan bahasa. Dalam melakukan penelitian, peneliti menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif untuk mengidentifikasi dan menggambarkan implikasinya. Metode*

*observasi digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data dengan menonton film berulang kali dan mencatat dialog yang memiliki implikasi. Kemudian data yang dipilih dianalisis dengan menggunakan teori yang relevan tentang implikatur. Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa ada tiga jenis implikatur dalam pidato karakter dalam film *Pride and Prejudice*, yaitu (a) implikatur konvensional di mana ucapan dapat diinterpretasikan secara otomatis oleh kata-kata yang diucapkan secara harfiah; (B) implikatur percakapan umum di mana tidak ada pengetahuan khusus diperlukan dalam konteks untuk menghitung makna yang disampaikan tambahan; dan (c) implikatur percakapan khusus di mana konteks spesifik diperlukan untuk membuat kesimpulan untuk mencapai makna yang disampaikan.*

Kata kunci: percakapan, implikatur, konvensional, percakapan umum, percakapan khusus

I. INTRODUCTION

Language is used as primary means of communication. It consists of words and grammatical patterns which used to convey meaning of people utterances in particular communication context. People utterances have literal and non-literal meaning. To make a conversation effective and communicative, people need to know these two meanings embedded in people's utterances which depend on the context situation.

According to Levinson (1983: 9), "Pragmatics is the study of those relationships between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded, in the structure of language". Yule (1996: 3) also states four areas that pragmatics is concerned with. First, Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning.^[1] This approach is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). Second, Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning. This type of study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said. Third, Pragmatics is the study of how more meaning are communicated than what is said. It explores how listeners can make inferences about what is said in order to arrive at an interpretation of the speaker's intended meaning.^[2] Forth, Pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance. The approach answers the perspective of what determines the choice

between the said and the unsaid in which the said and the unsaid are tied to the notion of distance.

Communication is conducted by people using language with particular purposes. People have intention in their utterances that are sometimes left implicitly said. Since what people mean in their utterances is left implicit, it requires the hearers to know deeply about the speaker's utterances to get their message. Something left implicit or the unsaid information in a conversation is called implicature (Levinson, 1983: 111).

What a speaker intends to communicate in a conversation is characteristically far richer than what she directly expresses. Grundy (2008: 92) states that implicature is a meaning that is conveyed but not explicitly stated. To know the intended meaning of the speaker's utterances, the hearer must do a deep interpretation since the speaker's utterances usually have more than a literal meaning. People usually implicitly say their intention. Their utterances usually have wider meaning than their literal meaning which depend on the context. A speaker may say, "The weather is very nice", as an invitation to someone to have a picnic or go to the beach, depending on the context.

The phenomenon does not only occur in real life but also occur in movies since they are a reflection of human's real life. *Pride & Prejudice* is a British American romantic drama directed by Joe Wright and based on Jane Austen's 1813

novel. Keira Knightley stars in the lead role of Elizabeth Bennet, while Matthew Macfadyen plays her romantic interest Mr. Darcy. It is chosen as the data source since the researcher is interested with the story in which depicts five sisters from an English family of landed gentry as they deal with issues of marriage, morality and misconceptions. To solve their problem, the characters apply various types of implicature which have hidden meaning. This phenomenon is very interesting to analyze.

II. METHOD

The data of this research were taken from the utterances produced by the characters in the movie entitled “*Pride and Prejudice*”. In collecting the data, the researcher conducted several steps as: a) finding out the movie and the script by downloading it from the internet; b) watching and listening to the conversation repeatedly; c) reading the transcript of the movie then used note-taking technique in documenting the data; d) classifying the utterances based on types of implicature. The collected data then analyzed by using qualitative method. The analysis is presented in informal method.

III. DISCUSSION

In short, implicature is the speaker’s intended meaning which is left implicit and distinct with what the speaker literally said. Implicature is divided into two kinds, they are *conventional implicature* and *conversational implicature*. Conversational implicature consists of *generalized conversational implicature* and *particularized conversational implicature*. The discussion will be presented based on the kinds of implicature found in the data.

3.1 Conventional Implicature

Conventional implicature does not occur in conversations and does not depend on special contexts for its interpretation.

Conventional implicatures are associated with specific words and result in additional conveyed meanings when those words are used (Yule, 1996: 45). The specific words are *but*, *even*, *therefore* and *yet* (to these we might add some uses of *for*). For example, the use of the word “but” as a conjunction that produces an implicature of “contrast”. The examples which taken from *Pride and Prejudice* movie can be seen as follows:

Data 1

Elizabeth : “And the person with the quizzical brow?”
Charlotte : “That is his good friend, Mr. Darcy”.
Elizabeth : (LAUGHING) “He looks miserable, poor soul”.
Charlotte : “Miserable, he may be, **but** poor, he most certainly is not. Tell me. £10,000 a year and he owns half of Derbyshire”.

The conversation happened when Elizabeth and Charlotte were at a ball. In the middle of the ball, Mr. Bingley came with his sister and also his best friend, Mr. Darcy. Elizabeth asked Charlotte who is the man who was coming with Mr. Bingley. Charlotte told her that he is Mr. Darcy. Elizabeth looked at him and laughed. She underestimated him by saying, “He looks miserable, poor soul”. However, Charlotte extremely did not agree with her since she knew that Mr. Darcy is not poor. In her utterance Charlotte used the word **but** to show “contrast”. She could agree that Mr. Darcy might look miserable, but financially he is not poor. She emphasized it by giving additional information and telling a fact that he earns £10,000 a year and owns half of Derbyshire.

Data 2

Elizabeth : “His name is Mr. Collins. He's the dreaded cousin.”
Charlotte : “Who's to inherit.”

- Elizabeth : “Indeed. Everything, apparently.”
 Mary : “**Even** my piano stool belongs to Mr. Collins”.
 Charlotte : “When?”
 Elizabeth : “He may turn us out of the house as soon as he pleases”.
 Charlotte : “But why?”
 Elizabeth : “Because the estate passes directly to him and not to us poor females”.

Elizabeth walked with her sister Mary and her friend Charlotte. Elizabeth talked with Charlotte about her cousin, Mr. Collins. Elizabeth and Mary do not like their cousin because he will inherit everything they have. It made them very upset since it is not fair that just because they are female they do not get any inheritance from their family. On the other hand, the estate passes directly to, Mr. Collins. They are afraid if Mr. Collins drove them out of their own house. Mary said, “Even my piano stool belongs to Mr. Collins”. It shows that they have no right for anything even for a piano stool. Mary used the word **even** which has conventional meaning. It shows a bad situation in which she cannot expect anything from him, even just for a small thing like a piano stool. In other words, it is impossible to get something more valuable if you even have no right for a piano stool.

Data 3

- Mr. Collins: “I may find a mistress for it and I have to inform you that the eldest Miss Bennet has captured my special attention”.
 Mrs. Bennet: “Oh, Mr. Collins, **unfortunately**, it is incumbent upon me to hint that the eldest Miss Bennet is very soon to be engaged”.

Mr. Collins came to Mrs. Bennet’s house in order to find a wife. He wants to

propose one of Mrs. Bennet’s daughters. He is interested with Jane, Mrs. Bennet oldest daughter, but she will be engaged soon. At that moment, Mr. Collins explicitly expressed his purpose to Mrs. Bennet. Mrs. Bennet felt sorry that she may disappoint him since her daughter had been purposed by another man. Mrs. Bennet used the word **unfortunately** which has conventional meaning. By hearing that word, the hearer obviously understand that it is not a good news. It produces an implicature of “contrast”. It shows that the fact is contradictory with Mr. Collins’ expectation.

3.2 Conversational Implicature

The meaning conveyed by speakers and recovered as a result of the hearers’ inferences is known as conversational implicature (Cutting, 2008: 35). Conversational implicature is divided into *generalized conversational implicature* and *particularized conversational implicature* which will be explain as follows.

3.2.1 Generalized Conversational Implicature

According to Yule (1996: 41), generalized conversational implicature is a conversational implicature which does not require special knowledge in the context to calculate additional conveyed meaning. For example:

- A: Did you buy cheese and bread?
 B: I buy bread.^[LSEP]

It means that the speaker B does not buy cheese and it can be understood although the speaker B does not give information about that. There is no special background knowledge of the implicature. Data which indicate the example of generalized conversational implicature in the *Pride and Prejudice* movie can be seen as follows.

Data 4

Jane : "Do you really believe he liked me, Lizzie?"
Elizabeth : "**Jane, he danced with you most of the night and stared at you for the rest of it.**"

Jane and Elizabeth talked about Mr. Bingley. Jane said that he is what a young man ought to be, he is sensible and good humored. Elizabeth agreed by saying that he is also handsome and conveniently rich. Jane was so curious and asked Elizabeth's opinion whether he likes her or not. Instead of answering that question by "yes" or "no", she said, "Jane, he danced with you most of the night and stared at you for the rest of it." It implicitly means "yes". It does not require special knowledge to understand that utterance. Elizabeth convinced Jane that Mr. Bingley likes her by reminding her that he danced with her in the ball most of the night and he stared at her all the time. It is enough to prove that Mr. Bingley likes her. This utterance is very convincing and even stronger than just a "yes" since it shows that the speaker telling a fact, not a personal judgment or assumption.

Data 5

Elizabeth : "My kind friends will not hear of me returning home until I am better. Do not be alarmed. Excepting a sore throat, a fever and a headache, there is nothing much wrong with me". (Reading a letter from Jane)
Elizabeth : "This is ridiculous."
Mr. Bennet : "Well, if Jane does die, it will be a comfort to know it was in pursuit of Mr. Bingley."
Mrs. Bennet : "**People do not die of colds.**"

Elizabeth read a letter from her sister, Jane, who was at Netherfield. Jane was invited to Mr. Bingley house and she went there alone on horseback. On her way, she caught in the rain and it made her sick. Elizabeth was so worried and wanted to go to Netherfield to see her sister. However, her parents were not so panic. Her mother said, "People do not die of colds". It means that it is not something big to worried about. It can be understood although Mrs. Bennet did not say it explicitly. Mrs. Bennet utterance is logic and convincing since it is obvious that colds do not cause people die. It is common knowledge and people do not need specific background to understand the implicature.

2). Particularized Conversational Implicature

Most conversations happen in very specific contexts in which inferences are needed. Such inferences are required to work out the conveyed meanings. An implicature that requires specific contexts to make an inference to reach the conveyed meaning is called particularized conversational implicature. This is shown in the example below:

James: "Have you tried using the Blackberry Messenger in your Android?"
Lily: "It is only Gingerbread."

Lily's answer clearly implicates that she cannot use the application of Blackberry Messenger in her Android smartphone. Specialized knowledge is needed to be able to understand the implicature of the utterance above. Knowledge about the minimum operating system Android platform for running applications Blackberry Messenger has already in operating system Android Ice Cream Sandwich or Jelly bean. However, because the operating system Android Lily still the old type Ginger Bread, so it is indirectly answered the James's question. Examples of particularized conversational implicature

are also found in the *Pride and Prejudice* movie which can be seen as follows.

Data 6

Mr. Collins : “After dinner I thought I might read to you all for an hour or two. I have with me **Fordyce's Sermons** which speak very eloquently on all matters moral. Are you familiar with **Fordyce's Sermons**, Miss Bennet?”

Miss Bennet : SILENT

Mr. Collins just arrived in Mr. Bennet's house and had dinner with Mr. Bennet's family. At the end of their conversation, Mr. Collins kindly said that he will read *Fordyce's Sermons* for Bennet's family. He asked Jane who sat next to him, “Are you familiar with *Fordyce's Sermons*, Miss Bennet?”. Jane did not answer Mr. Collins question and looked a bit shocked. She kept silent which could mean that she is not familiar with **Fordyce's Sermons** or she is not interested in listening to a sermon in the house. Jane and her family seemed not very interested with it and gave no response to Mr. Collins.

In this case, specialized knowledge is needed to be able to understand the implicature of Mr. Collins' utterance about *Fordyce's Sermons*. It is not familiar for some people who are not into a sermon. Knowledge about the content of the sermon and how it is relevant with Bennet's family is also needed to understand the implicature and to know why Bennet's family reacted in that way.

Data 7

Mr. Collins : “Perhaps you will do me the honor, Miss Elizabeth?”

Elizabeth : “I did not think you danced, Mr. Collins.”

Mr. Collins : “I do not think it incompatible with the **office of a clergyman** to indulge in such an innocent diversion.”

Mr. Collins met Elizabeth in a ball and asked her to dance with him. Elizabeth thought that Mr. Collins did not dance since he is a clergyman. Then Mr. Collins explained that it is not incompatible with the office of a clergyman. Elizabeth was confused and surprised when Mr. Collins asked her to dance with him since she was afraid if it will break the regulations of office of a clergyman. Mr. Collins utterance is categorized as particularized conversational implicature since he talked about the regulations of the **office of a clergyman**, which is not familiar for all people. The addressee needs specific knowledge to understand the implicature of the utterance above.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the three types of implicature are found in this movie. They are: (a) conventional implicature, (b) generalized conversational implicature, and (c) particularized conversational implicature. In conventional implicature, an utterance can be automatically interpreted by the words literally said, as seen in the use of the word “but” and “unfortunately” as a conjunction that produces an implicature of “contrast”. Generalized conversational implicatures arise without any particular context or special scenario being necessary. The characters in the movie tend to use this kind of implicature to state something which is obvious and factual in implicit way so that the interlocutors do not need special knowledge to understand the utterances. In addition, particularized conversational implicatures arise because some particular contexts or needs special knowledge to understand. It is found that as long as the participants know the limit of knowledge and the culture of the interlocutor, the process of communication does not meet any interruption. It is done to make the dialogue sounds more convincing and interesting. It is also because the movie

maker wants to show the uniqueness of the characters not only from their acting in the movie but also from the way they deliver

their utterances.

REFERENCES

- Cutting, J. 2008. *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. New York: Routledge.
- Grundy, P. 2008. *Doing Pragmatics*. London: Hodder Education.
- Horn, L.R. and G. Ward. 2006. *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publisher.
- Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman Publishing
- Levinson, S. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rukmanasari, Indah. 2012. *A Pragmatic Analysis of the Main Character's Speech Acts in Date Night Movie*. Thesis. Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta State University.
- Vikry, Muhamad. 2014. *An Analysis of Conversational Implicature in Iron Man 3*. Thesis. Jakarta: State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah.
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.