

THE IMPLICATURE IN *DILAN 1990*, A NOVEL BY PIDI BAIQ

Faradilla Mayanksari
Inok Tri Puji Rahayu
Sultan Agung Islamic University

Abstract

A dialogue or conversation is an important thing in the most of literary work. Authors use them to tell or illustrate their work. Especially is in the novel or short story. A dialogue or conversation can make the reader understand their work well. Every author has their characteristic on their writing. But most of them are always use one or some of the type of pragmatics. One of the type of pragmatic that usually used by an author is implicature. Like as in the *DILAN 1990* novel by Paid Baiq, some conversations are use implicature to deliver an implicit meaning. There are some dialogues which delivered by some characters have hidden meaning. And sometimes, it will make the readers will think twice to understand what is the meaning of that sentence. Implicature is the approach which uses to explain some hidden meaning in the dialogue or narration of *DILAN 1990* novel. This research focuses on the maxim of the dialogue and narration toward this novel to examine some hidden meaning that include in some part. This research use descriptive qualitative method and results the forms of implicature. They are maxim of relevant, quality, quantity and manner that used in the *DILAN 1990* novel.

Keywords: *dialogue, novel, implicature, hidden meaning, maxim*

Introduction

Implicature is one of the pragmatic theories which can find in the some character's utterances in the *DILAN 1990* novel. Some utterances in this novel are contain the maxim of implicature theory. And maxim is the term of implicature that elaborate a hidden meaning toward some utterances.

This research utilizes the qualitative descriptive research. One researcher emphasizes that "Qualitative research methods today are a diverse set, encompassing approaches such as empirical phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography, protocol analysis and discourse analysis." (Polkinghorne, 1983). This method is arranged by some data. And because of the some dialogue of this novel is analyzed by the term of implicature, so this journal is supported by secondary sources from pragmatic journal. The goal is to examine some conversation in the *DILAN 1990* novel dealing with the hidden meaning.

Authors always use some smart diction to get the reader's attention. A hidden meaning of utterances or conversations can be found by the maxims of implicature analysis. There are maxim of relevant, quantity, quality and manner. Maxim of relevant is the correlation between the first speakers to the second speaker. Sometimes, there are irrelevant responds from the second speaker as use

to deliver an implicit meaning toward the first speaker. Maxim of quantity is when the first speaker tries to convey some information as much as they can which needed by the second speakers. Maxim of quality means that when there is no an evident of the utterances which stated by the first speaker. And maxim of manner is when the speaker delivers some ambiguous or a rare diction to deliver their implicit meaning. And this research is use to learn about the maxims of implicature towards some utterances and conversation in the novel. With the purpose is to examine the implicit meaning from some characters.

Underlying Theory

One researcher states that “Conversational implicature is an additional unstated meaning that depends on special or local knowledge.” (Yule, 1996). On the other word, implicature is the way of an author conveys a hidden meaning. Sometimes, an author uses irrelevant or vice-versa word from the first speakers’ topic to convey another meaning. Meanwhile, the speaker who convey an implicit meaning with uncorrelated word with their topic, their implicit meaning should be can understand by the people whom they talk.

Example:

X: Do you love her?

Z: I love you.

This is the example of implicature. The object of X’s question is “her”. And the object of Z’s answer is X. It seems that Z tries to convey another meaning of him answers. X is so curious with the Z’s feeling. And she asks Z. But Z answer that Z loves X. It means that Z is not loves a girl who asked by X. So, Z answers the X question with another context that Z loves X.

The first scholar who conveys about implicature is Herbert Palu Grice at Harvard University in 1967. He also delivers the four term of Implicature. It calls as maxims. To Grice, conversational implicature is realized through the four maxims under general principle of conversation. (qtd. in Wang, 1164).

1. Maxim of relevant, this maxim is focus on the correlation between the first speaker’s topics to the second speaker’s topic. It means that in the conversation. There should be a correlation.

Example:

C: May I borrow your shoes?

D: So, will you let me go out with barefoot?

This is the irrelevant conversation. This is the term of violating toward the maxim of relevant. Because D’s answer has no correlation with the C asks. Actually, D wants to say that he doesn’t want to lend his shoes. He uses this sentence to convey it. But he delivers it with another word.

2. Maxim of Quality, this maxim is focus in the truth of the information. It means that the speaker who has information, they have to make their contribution one that is true. The speakers shouldn’t deliver something what they believe to be false.

Example:

C: I heard that the unique sounds of the Indonesian bus is go to international.

D: I think so. I also see the chainsmoker's tweet is also talks about that.

This conversation is show about the maxim of quality. The first speaker tries to say something based on what they heard. And the second speakers' tries to respond based on what they see. Both of those speakers try to deliver true information based on something that they get.

3. Maxim of Quantity, this maxim is focus on the speaker who wants to convey some information. They have to give information as much as the second speaker's want. It means that they have to give an enough informative, not too much or to less.

Example:

C: What do you know about football?

D: It just about players who tries to get a ball.

This is the example of violating toward the maxim of quantity. This is because when C asks something, D responds the C's asks with just a little information. It means that it will not be enough for the C. Because everybody knows about the D's respond. And C doesn't want just a little information like D's respond.

4. Maxim of manner, this maxim is focus on the how the speaker say something clearly. It means that they have to say something which avoids some obscurity of expression and ambiguity. They have to be brief and orderly.

Example:

C: Can I borrow your novel?

D: In my home.

This is the violation toward maxim of manner. This is because the D's responds is ambiguous. When C asks about D's novel, D said that in her home. What does it means of "in my home". Someone who knows about is just herself. It will be difficult for C. Because C can think that he cannot borrow it, it is because her home is so far from the campus. Or maybe, C can think that D will bring it on the next day. The respond of D is not clear enough. This is because she says something ambiguous.

Discussion

This part will discuss about some conversations in *DILAN 1990* novel which consist of the violation of maxim of implicature theory.

Dilan: Kamu tau, semua siswa itu sombong?

Milea: Kenapa?

Dilan: Siapa yang mau datang ke ruang BP nemui Suripto?

Milea: Siapa?

Dilan: Cuma aku (p. 35)

Conversation above between Dilan and Milea, Dilan tells Milea that, "all of the students in our school are selfish", Milea curious and asks "why", Dilan said that ,

“there is no one who wants to meet Mr. Suripto in BP’s room”, then Milea asks again, “who?”, Dilan says, “only me”. Dilan’s statement has implicit meaning when he said that he is the only one who wants to meet Mr. Suripto in BP’s room. BP’s room is the room where if there any student do bad thing then they will get warning from teacher. Dilan says in another words, means that Dilan is a bad student and he is proud to be like that.

It clears the conversation above violates the maxim of quantity. Milea may does not understand with the the first Dilan statement when he says that all of the students in their school are selfish. What the meaning of term “selfish” is disconcerting for Milea. Milea may has the other meaning with the term “selfish” which Dilan says before. The information what Dilan say is less than what Milea need and it takes time for Milea to understand what the hidden meaning of Dilan’s statement. Dilan does not to the point with what he wants to say, he deliberates say it to make Milea confused.

The maxim of manner also violated. Dilan’s statement does not answer Milea’s question when she asks who is Dilan’s mean by says “who else would come into BP’s room to meet Suripto?”. Dilan’s statement is very ambiguos by says that. He does not says to the point who is the “one” who he means. Milea needs more explanation to understand what Dilan statement is.

Milea: Tau dari mana aku disini?

Beni: Temenmu ngasih tau, memang kenapa kalau tau?

Milea: Gak apa-apa, nanya aja, kirain gak akan datang. (p. 91)

Milea is shocked when suddenly Beni comes to her. She is in Jakarta to support her school in quiz competition. She asks him ‘how come you know I am here?’, then Beni answers that ‘one of your friend who told me’. Beni disappointed that his arrival does not greeted by Milea and he asks ‘so what if I know?’, to hide her badmood, she answers with serene expression and says, ‘nothing, I think you may not come’ with her expression, Beni can conclude that the answer that actually Mileas is unhappy to meet him there.

Beni’s anwer is violated the maxim of quality. How can Beni meets Milea in a place that Milea never says before to him? And when he says that any of Milea’s friend who told him, then which one of her friend? Beni does not give his provement to Milea about the truth of his statement. How can Milea knows that Beni is honest?

Beside consist violates the maxim of quality, those statement also violates the maxim of manner. Milea’s statement is consist ambiguosly, when she says, ‘how can you know I’m here?’ it gives feeling to Beni that what is wrong if he knows that his girlfriend is in Jakarta?, and what is wrong if he wants to meet his own girlfriend?. Beni has right to meet Milea, because Milea is his girlfriend, and so does Milea. Milea does not give more explanation in her question about why she

asking like that. There an implicit meaning in her statement, because she does not want to meet Beni, although she realizes that Beni is still her boyfriend. That is why she says like state above.

Milea: Masih gerimis padahal

Revi: gak apa-apa, kecil kok (p. 111)

This conversation appears when Milea prevents her friends to go because it is raining outside, by says, 'it is still drizzling outside' she is standing beside Dilan, but Revi, one of her friends answer, 'it's okay, only small one'. Revi's answer may does not answer Milea's statement above. Because the contents inappropriate with the context in Milea's words. But it does not matter for her, because she knows full about the hidden meaning which are contains in Revi's statement.

The conversation above is violate the maxim of relevant. There is no correlation between Milea's statement and the answer of Revi. Milea may needs time to understand the situation that Revi's statement is very far away with Milea's statement. The term "kecil" or "little" by Revi is describing about the drizzle. The raining is just the drizzle that still can be hit and they do not worry will wetness.

It is also consist violates the maxim of manner. Revi's statement is ambiguos, because Milea may does not get the point what the meaning of "little". Milea also may wonders and confuses because Revi's statement does not answer Milea's statement. Revi also does not give more discussion about the term "little" which she said.

Beside both violated the maxim of relevant and manner, the conversation above also consist violates the maxim of quantity. The information which Revi said is very less and it may causes misunderstanding between Milea and Revi. Revi gives no information about the term "little" as her asnwer toward Milea's statement.

Kang Adi: Gak tau kenapa

Milea: Keren

Kang Adi: Ya, kita ini harus luwes, biar gak kaku, kalau perlu sedikit nakal (p. 160)

It can be seen the conversation above that Milea's answer is very short by saying "cool" for Kang Adi's statement, "I don't know why", and indicates that she is in an unhappy moment in these conversation. Kang Adi show off himself to Milea about his contribution as an activist student in his campus. From his statement, "yes, we should be smoothed, so, we don't seem rigid, even we need to be naughty" he wish to get achievement from Milea, but the fact is not. Milea is not feel up to answer Kang Adi's statement more than Kang Adi expected, because Milea knows full that Kang Adi only wants to show up himself and Milea does not like Kang Adi's way by saying these short answer to him.

By the conversation above is clearly violated the maxim of relevant. Kang Adi's statement by saying "yes, we should be smoothed,...", Milea does not ask Kang

Adi, she only answer “cool” above, then Kang Adi says irrelevant answer which Milea pays no attention to him. Milea may does not understand by Kang Adi statement.

It is also violated the maxim of manner. In the last statement of Kang Adi, he says, “... so, we don’t seem rigid, even we need to be a little bit naughty”. What the meaning of term “naughty” itself? Milea may feel ambiguos with Kang Adi’s statement. Who is Kang Adi’s mean by the term “naughty”? he himself or the people not only him? Or he just wants to suggest Milea to be a little bit naughty like what Kang Adi state.

Beside both violated the maxim of relevant and manner, it also consist violating the maxim of quantity. Why? Because Milea does not ask anything, but Kang Adi gives too much the information unneeded to her. Like state in the theory above that the definition of violating the maxim of quantity is that the speakers give too much information or less than needed.

Milea: *Akunya capek banget kang*

Kang Adi: *Iya, gak apa-apa*

Milea: *Kang Adi mau kemana abis ini?* (p. 189)

This conversation is the continuity of statement above between Kang Adi and Milea. That night, Milea is too lazy to have study with Kang Adi by saying, “I extremely tired”, then Kang Adi answers that, “it’s okay” but his answer is actually desperately disappointed because means that he has no chance to study both together with Milea tonight. Milea’s response in the last conversation by saying, “Where you want to go after this?”. Milea’s question actually contains a hidden meaning, something like expulsion and she hopes Kang Adi will understand by saying like that, because Milea is clearly does not like Kang Adi.

Those statement is clear enough categorized in violating maxim of manner. The exact statement is belong to Milea, “where you want to go after this?”, the term “after this” is ambiguous for Kang Adi. It seems that Milea shoos Kang Adi to hurry up to go home. Indeed, that the hidden meaning of Milea statement is to shoo Kang Adi from Milea’s home and asks him to go home by saying it in another word.

Conclusion

The literary work novel to *DILAN 1990* by Pidi Baiq contains the implicature in some selected conversations in selected pages which each of the conversation consists of violation. First is violated the maxim of relevant, that the conversation between speakers and hearers are irrelevant, means that their conversation is not appropriate each other. Move to the next is violated the maxim of quality which the speakers rarely give the evidence to make their statement strong, because they often utter something base on what the other one say or they still don’t know about the truth on their statement. The other violation is violated maxim of quantity which the speakers often give a bit information in their conversation, so

that the conversation is hung up by less information. The last is manner, manner is full of ambiguous words which the interlocutors found difficult to understand. This is because the speakers use the complicated words to convey their meaning.

REFERENCE

- Anna. *The Domain of Pragmatics*. 12 November 2003. Web. 21 December 2016.
- Bahrani. "International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW)". *FLOUTING MAXIMS IN PARTICULARIZED CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE*, 5 July, 2014. Web. 21 December 2016.
- Elliott, Robert and Ladislav Timulak. "A HANDBOOK OF RESEARCH METHODS FOR CLINICAL AND HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY". *Descriptive and interpretive approaches to qualitative research*, 7 January 2005. Web. 22 December 2016.
- 微软用户. "JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH". *Conversational Implicature in English Listening Comprehension*, 7 August 2011. Web. 21 December 2016.