

THE IMPLICATURE IN THE PLAY *ZOOTOPIA*

Nurul Fatmawati
Nazila Nahrotun Nahdia
Sultan Agung Islamic University

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the implicature which is contained in a movie script entitled *Zootopia*. The writer tries to reveal the implied meaning in conversation in the movie. Also, the writer tries to divide the conversation into 4 maxims of implicature. In conversational implicature, there are 4 maxims which have to be understood to analyze the implied meaning in conversation. So the listener will know the implied meaning and the purpose of the speaker conveys the utterance. Those maxims are quantity, quality, relevance and manner. Those 4 maxims are contained in this movie script. But most of the conversation uses the maxim of relevance either break or follow the rule.

Keywords : *implicature, maxim, implied meaning, conversation*

Introduction

Communication has been the important thing in social life. Without communication, there will be no interaction among people. Communication is needed to convey message and information. Sometimes, the information and the message contain unrelevance, ambiguity, and obscurity. It can be intentional or unintentional depends on the speaker who conveys. In communication, the message or information which is conveyed do not have to follow the rule. It is flexible to communicate appropriate to the purpose of the speaker. Some speakers use ambiguity in conversation to make a joke or to have certain meaning. The ambiguity itself may have a certain meaning which the implied meaning of the speaker's saying is only known by the speaker itself. The implied meaning which is hidden in utterance is called implicature. Implicature is the meaning of utterance which is hidden in unconscious and not conveyed directly in conversation. So, when the speaker tries to convey information or message, as the listener needs to know what is the implied meaning of the speaker's message. The process of understanding the implied meaning happens in mind unconsciously.

This study will investigate the implicature in conversation in *Zootopia* movie's script to understand in depth about how to reveal the implied meaning. To reveal the implied meaning in conversation, it needs to study the 4 maxims which has been the rule of utterance. An utterance need to fulfill the 4 maxims to ignore ambiguity and misunderstanding in conversation. But, in some conversation, the speaker breaks the rule intentionally with the certain meaning. Therefore, as the listener needs to understand the 4 maxims to know the hidden meaning of the speaker. To know first of the maxims that the four maxims are quantity, quality,

relevance and manner. Each maxim has their own definition. Quantity, where one tries to be as informative as one possibly can, and gives as much information as is needed. Quality, where one tries to be truthful, and does not give information that is false or that is not supported by evidence. Relevance, where one tries to be relevant, and says things that are pertinent to the discussion. And manner, when one tries to be as clear, as brief, and as orderly as one can in what one says, and where one avoids obscurity and ambiguity. Furthermore, this research will investigate each maxim and the implied meaning in the conversation in the movie.

Underlying Theory

Implicature is a component of speaker meaning that constitutes an aspect of what is meant in a speaker's utterance without being part of what is said. What a speaker intends to communicate is characteristically far richer than what she directly expresses; linguistic meaning radically underdetermines the message conveyed and understood (Laurence R. Horn). The capacity of interlocutors to make sense of the utterances they exchange in spite of some missing elements, is that such elements are often implicated and such implicatures are made possible by cooperation between speaker and listener. Implicatures are invited inferences in which the inferred proposition bears no truth functional relationship to any utterance contained in the text: when "p" implicates that q, the falsity of q has no consequence on the truth value of p. So, for example:

(1) Loli is pretty, but intelligent.

Conveys by implicature that Loli, being pretty, is not likely to be intelligent, but is not false nor wholly unacceptable if this is false, since the truth functional conjunction of "Loli is pretty" and "Loli is intelligent" can well be true.

(2) A: Where's Bill?

B: There's a yellow VW outside Sue's house

B's contribution is a relevant answer to A's question only insofar as it licenses the inference that if Bill has a yellow VW, he may be in Sue's house (Levinson [11]: p. 102).

In the above exchange B has conversationally implicated that he wishes to decline A's offer. Grice's theory of conversational implicature seeks an explanation of this exchange and of the central role of cooperation within it.

The governing dictum is the Cooperative Principle: "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange" (Grice [1967]1989: 26). This general principle is instantiated by general maxims of conversation governing rational interchange (1989: 26–7). Grice (1975) developed four conversational maxims, which are subsumed under a general principle he called the Cooperative Principle:

A. QUALITY: Try to make your contribution one that is true.

1. Do not say what you believe to be false
 2. Do not say that for which you lack evidence
- B. QUANTITY: Speaker's contribution is as informative as required
1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes
Of the exchange)
 2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required
- C. RELEVANCE: Speaker's response is relevant with the topic of the conversation
- D. MANNER: Speaker's speak perspicuous and straightforwardly and clearly
1. Avoid obscurity of expression
 2. Avoid ambiguity
 3. Be brief (Avoid unnecessary prolixity)
 4. Be orderly

Note in particular that all maxims are not created equal. In short, these maxims specify what participants have to do in order to converse in a maximally efficient, rational, cooperative way that they should speak clearly, sincerely, relevantly with the context, while providing sufficient information. Following Grice himself: "The maxims do not seem to be coordinate. The maxim of Quality, enjoining the provision of contributions which are genuine rather than spurious (truthful rather than mendacious), does not seem to be just one among a number of recipes for producing contributions; it seems rather to spell out the difference between something's being, and (strictly speaking) failing to be, any kind of contribution at all. False information is not an inferior kind of information; it just is not information." (Grice 1989: 371)

Discussion

This section will discuss the selected conversation in the movie *Zootopia* to investigate the maxim and the implied meaning.

Judy : Hi, I'm Judy. Your new neighbor.
Neighbors : Yeah? We're loud.
Don't expect us to apologize for it.

In this conversation, it shows that Judy tries to introduce herself to the neighbors. She hopes that the neighbors will give nice introduction. But, the neighbors's answer is not like what Nick hopes. It seems that they do not care about Judy as the new neighbor. Instead, they apologize that they will be noisy neighbors.

From the conversation, Judy introduces herself. The neighbors answer should be introductory conversation. But, the neighbors's answer is apologizing. It shows that Judy and the neighbor conversation does not show relevance because

the neighbors's answer does not appropriate with the topic of what Judy says. It means that the conversation breaks the rule of the relevance maxim.

Nick : Hey, no kiss bye-bye for daddy?
Nick's friend : You kiss me tomorrow.
I'll bite your face off!

In this conversation, it shows that Nick tease his friend. Nick knows that his friend is not his son. He pretends to be his daddy to do his sly trick to sell pawpsicle ilegally. And his friend answers that if Nick kisses him, he will bite his face. And his friend says 'tomorrow', it means that before Nick has kissed him. And by his friend's answer 'i'll bite your face off', it means that he is angry and he does not like to be kissed. He assumes that Nick acts too much for the fake drama. It makes him disgusted.

From the conversation, Nick tries to tease his friend. By his utterance, he does not mean a thing, he just tease his friend. He knows that his friend is not going to give kiss bye. And Nick's friend's answer shows that he is angry of being teased. Both of them makes the relevant conversation because the conversation shows correlation. It means that the conversation follows the rule of maxim.

Chief Bogo : I will give you 48 hours.
Judy : Yes.
Chief Bogo : That's 2 days to find Emmitt Otterton.
But you strike out, you resign.

In this conversation, it shows that Chief Bogo gives Judy time to finish a case. The case has to be finished deals with the time. Over time will make Judy quit from her job. 48 hours, Chief Bogo means 2 days. The conversation shows correlation and Chief Bogo really explain the information as informative as it has to be. Like 48 hours means 2 days, which is the information is true and can be supported by evidence. It shows that the conversation follows the rule of maxim which is qualitative.

Judy : You sold Mr. Otterton that pawpsicle, right?
Do you know him?
Nick : I know everybody.

In this conversation, it shows that Judy tries to ask an information about someone may Nick knows. Nick has been sold his pawpsicle to Mr. Otterton. Judy hopes that Nick knows anything about Mr. Otterton. She asks whether Nick knows Mr. Otterton or not and he says he knows him but he says that he knows everybody not only Mr. Otterton. Actually, he means to answer that yes, he knows him.

From this conversation, it breaks the rule of maxim especially the quantity maxim. It shows that Nick gives too much informative answer to Judy. Judy just asks about Mr. Otterton but Nick answers not only Mr. Otterton but everybody he

knows. It should be only Mr. Otterton as the answer of Nick because Judy does not need anyone else to know about.

Nick : Give me the pen, please.

Judy : What was it you said?

Any moron can run a plate?

Gosh, if only there were moron around who were up to the task.

In this conversation, it shows that Nick asks to Judy to give him the pen that Judy brings. But, Judy's answer does not appropriate with the Nick's utterance. It does not show the relevance that actually Judy does not hear Nick when he speaks. She answers about anything else. It means that this conversation breaks the rule of maxim. And it breaks the relevance maxim. Because the relevance has to appropriate with the topic . And the Judy's answer is not relevant.

Judy : What? Whose car is it?

Nick : The most feared crime boss in Tundratown.

They call him Mr. Big, and he does not

Like me.

So we gotta go!

In this conversation, it shows that Judy wants to know about the owner of the car. She needs to know only the owner of the car and Nick answers that the car belongs to Mr. Big, the most feared crime boss in Tundratown. He also adds that Mr. Big does not like him. But, actually Judy does not need any information about how Mr. Big treats Nick. It means that Nick's answer is too much informative for Judy. It breaks the rule of maxim and it does not appropriate with the quantity maxim.

Nick : No, please!

What did I do wrong?

What did I do?

Nick's friend : If you thought we would ever trust a fox without muzzle?

You're even dumber than you look.

In this conversation, it shows that Nick wants them explain what he did wrong to them. He does not understand why they treat him bad. But, they do not explain it clearly. They gives ambiguous answer to Nick and make Nick confused. They should explain to Nick about what Nick did to them. It has to be clear as the Nick's utterance. It means that the conversation breaks the manner maxim. But, the implied meaning is that they do not like Nick because Nick is a fox and a fox must be sly and savage animal.

Judy : Clawhauser?

What are you doing?

Clawhauser : Uh, they thought it would be better if a predator such as myself wasn't the

First face that you see when you walk into ZPD.

In this conversation, it shows that Judy wants to know what Clawhauser is doing. Clawhauser's utterance does not answer what Judy questions. Clawhauser explains something else outside of the question. It means that the conversation does not show the relevance. But it is implied that Clawhauser is preparing to go from ZPD. The conversation breaks the rule of relevance maxim.

Conclusion

The literary work, play of conversation, in the movie *Zootopia* reflects the use implicature in the selected conversation of the characters within. This study found that there are many infractions of the maxim of relevance done in the selected conversation. The conversation does not show relevance because the answer does not appropriate with the topic of what the questions. It means that the conversation breaks the rule of the relevance maxim. Besides the infraction of the maxim of relevant, there are also infractions the maxim of quantity, quality, and manner. Quantity which is the speaker's contribution is as informative as required (for the current purposes of the exchange), and do not make the contribution more informative than is required. Quality which is to make the contribution one that is true, do not say what it believe to be false and for which the lack evidence. And the last is manner, which is the way the speaker's speak perspicuous and straightforwardly and clearly, and the speaker used containing both the ambiguous words, be brief or avoid unnecessary prolixity and orderly in communication.

Works Cited

- Francois Recanati. Article The Pragmatics of What is Said. Vol. 4 No. 4 Winter 1989. Web. <https://philpapers.org/archive/FRATPO-17.pdf>
- Janin Jafari. The Pragmatic Analysis of Wilde's Comedy: The Importance of Being Ernest Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 3, No. 12, pp. 2151-2156. Melbourne, Australia. Web. December 2013.
- Marina Sbisà. Presupposition, implicature and context in text understanding. Web. https://www2.units.it/sbisama/it/pres_implicit.pdf. Berlin 1999, pp. 324-338.