

Conversational Implicature in the Wuthering Heights Movie (A Study in Pragmatic Approach)

Evi Endang Wijayanti and Dr. Nurhayati, M.Hum
English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University, Semarang

ABSTRAK

Studi ini disusun untuk mempelajari lebih mendalam tentang implikatur percakapan dalam bahasa lisan yang mengandung makna implisit dari suatu pernyataan. Topik yang diambil penulis adalah implikatur percakapan yang terkandung dalam ujaran pemeran utama dalam film “Wuthering Heights”, di mana ujaran yang diungkapkan oleh pemeran utamanya banyak yang mengandung makna implisit. Dengan demikian, penulis mempelajarinya yang dituangkan dalam bentuk final project berupa extended essay.

Penulis menggunakan pendekatan Pragmatik untuk menyusun dan mengolah data yang berupa ujaran-ujaran pemeran utama dalam film “Wuthering Heights” yang mengandung implikatur percakapan. Sementara metode studi yang digunakan adalah metode kualitatif dengan metode pengamatan SBLC (simak bebas libat cakap) sebagai metode pengumpulan data dan menggunakan teknik mencatat sebagai teknik lanjutannya. Sedangkan untuk metode analisis data, penulis menggunakan metode padan, dimana penulis mencoba memadankan teori yang digunakan dengan data yang dianalisis.

Berdasar hasil analisis data, dapat ditarik kesimpulan bahwa ada kepadanan antara teori Pragmatik yang digunakan untuk menganalisis data, sehingga rumusan masalah dalam studi ini dapat terjawab dengan hasil analisis. Selain itu, hasil studi juga menunjukkan bahwa sepuluh ujaran pemeran utama yang dikaji oleh penulis terbukti mengandung implikatur percakapan.

Kata kunci: ujaran, prinsip kerjasama, makna implisit, konteks

1. Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

In social interaction, spoken language is used by people as their communication way in a conversation. Sometimes, someone utters an utterance that is sounded very short or unclear in a conversation, but his/her listener can understand what he/she means. The case happens because the speaker and the listener have same knowledge of contexts influencing their conversation, so the speaker does not need to use complex clauses in every utterance to show his/her intention. He/she even expresses the intention implicitly in his/her utterances. The phenomenon of implicit meaning in a speaker's utterances also exists in a movie that shows social interaction. Some dialogs of the movie characters sometimes bear implicit meanings, they are sounded irrelevant, and results conversational implicature.

The phenomenon above is the background why the writer wants to analyze conversational implicature in spoken language that appears in some utterances of the main character of "Wuthering Heights" movie released in 2009 and directed by Coky Giedroyc because she wants to find the intended meaning of the implicature. It is almost same as two previous studies used by the writer of this study as her references discussing implicit meaning in a movie dialog. However, the two studies have no same data and contexts with this study. The first study entitled "Particularized Conversational Implicature in TV Series NCIS: SEASON 2" by Ade Kristanus Kaloeti discusses about

particularized conversational implicature in the main character's dialog. The second previous study is "Conversational Implicature Analysis on Sam Dawson's Utterances in I Am Sam Movie" by Dwi Ratih Nolaputri discussing about the main character of "I Am Sam" movie that has communication way which is different from the other characters because he has mental defect. The writer of this study is interested in the second previous study as her reference because there is a unique thing influencing someone's communication style. Sam Dawson in "I Am Sam" movie suffers mental defect influencing his communication style, while Heathcliff in "Wuthering Heights" movie is a stolid person because he is a foster child and the reason affects his communication style.

The topic of this study is conversational implicature of the main character's utterances of "Wuthering Heights" movie. Thus, the writer uses Pragmatics approach to analyze the data of this study. The writer also limits the scope of the study on Conversational Implicature, so the data is analyzed more effectively and precisely to show the intended meaning of the main character's utterances that contain conversational implicature. The writer takes only the main character's utterances because the utterances express the main character's intention as a stolid person who has been influenced by his social life condition. Hence, the writer of this study tries to find the answers of the following questions:

- 1) does the main character express his intention by using implicature?

2) what contexts are needed to interpret the implicature?

3) what is the intended meaning resulted from the implicature?

Furthermore, the writer of this study has a purpose to analyze what the factors or contexts influence in the main character's utterances that contain conversational implicature in order to find the intended meaning of the utterances containing conversational implicature.

1.2 Research Method

The writer of this study uses qualitative research method because she studies a phenomenon in language use where the data are analyzed in descriptive forms, not in numerical forms. Besides, some characteristics of this study are almost equal with the consideration of Emzir (2012:2) about qualitative research method characteristics, they are: 1) naturalistic, where the writer is the key to study the actual setting or contexts of the subject of this study; 2) descriptive data, the collected data are texts, not pictures or numeric; 3) process; where the writer is more focused on the process of this study than the results or study products; 4) inductive, the writer tends to use an inductive way to analyze the data; 5) meaning, the writer wants to find about the meaning of what she studies for.

In this study, the data are the main character's utterances containing conversational implicature. As the data are the main character's utterances containing conversational implicature, so the samples of this study are the main character's utterances that contain implicit meaning. The writer finds

ten samples as the data of the study because the samples violate maxims of the Cooperative Principle, but imply implicit meaning based on their context. For example, the dialogue bellow is one of sample of the study.

Catherine : Who are you?

Heathcliff : **You don't know me?**

The writer uses purposive sampling to take the collected data where she classifies the main character's utterances. Meanwhile, to classify whether the main character's utterances are implicature or not, the writer selects them based on the relevancy of the main character's utterance in answering or in giving a response to another character's utterance. By her first classifying, the data can be analyzed more in finding and discussion to prove whether the collected data contain conversational implicature or not. If the data show conversational implicature, so the writer can analyze them to find the intended meaning of each utterance.

This study belongs to library research because the source of this study is a movie entitled "Wuthering Heights" as a document. Thus, to collect the data from documented data source, the writer uses observation method, especially uses non-participant observation method because the writer does not play a role as a participant. Meanwhile, the writer uses note-taking technique to collect the data firstly. Moreover, the writer uses *metode padan* (identity method) to analyze the data because she wants to match whether the used theories (Cooperative Principle, Conversational Implicature, and

Context) are appropriate to analyze the data. Especially, the writer uses pragmatic identity method because the writer uses Pragmatics approach to analyze the data.

2. Theoretical Frameworks

The writer of this study uses the Cooperative Principle theory by Grice in Mey (1993:65) and Conversational Implicature by Bilmes in Mey (1993:99) to determine the level of relevance and sustainability of the dialogues. Meanwhile, to find the intended meaning of the main character's utterances containing conversational implicature, the writer tries to find the contexts influencing the main character's dialog by Context theory (Widdowson, 2007:20-6).

2.1 Cooperative Principle

Cooperative Principle is theory proposed by Grice in Levinson (1995:101) about how people use language. He assumed that there is four maxims that can be guide a conversation. Those maxims are formulated as guidelines for the efficient and effective use of language in conversation to further cooperative ends. Grice in Mey (1993: 65) showed the four maxims, they are: 1) the maxim of quantity (make your contribution as informative as required and do not make your contribution more informative than required); 2) the maxim of quality (do not say what you believe to be false and do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence); 3) the maxim of relation (make your contribution relevant); 4) the maxim of manner (avoid obscurity, avoid ambiguity, be brief,

and be orderly). However, if there is a violation of those maxims to show an implicit intention in a conversation, so it can be said as conversational implicature.

2.2 Conversational Implicature

Bilmes in Mey (1993: 99) said that conversational implicature is something which is implied in a conversation, that is, something which is left implicit in actual language use. Based on the statement, the writer concludes that an utterance violating cooperative principle to express another intention implicitly in a conversation, it can be called as conversational implicature. However, to find the real meaning of utterances containing conversational implicature, the writer needs Context theory.

2.3 Context

Widdowson (2007:19-20) said that context is the features of the situation that are taken as relevant. It is because context is not an external set of circumstances, but a selection of them internally represented in the mind. Besides that, the context can be the common knowledge of the two people concerned, which will have been established in their previous conversation.

3. Finding and Discussion

In a conversation, the implicit meaning arises when the speaker and the listener have same knowledge about contexts influencing their conversation. This will bring up a conversational implicature because it will bear an implicit meaning.

Some utterances of the main character in the movie result conversational implicature, so the writer gives the examples by the discussion below. According to Grice's theory in Mey (1993:65) about four maxims of cooperative principle, some of utterances expressed by the main character violate the principle. However, they cannot be classified simply as a violation of cooperative principle only, so the writer is interested in studying the case deeply to find the intended meaning of the main character's utterances that are seen as cooperative principle violation.

- 1) Topic : Catherine wondered who Heathcliff was

Catherine : Who are you?

Heathcliff : **You don't know me?**

The conversation above happened in Heathcliff's land when Catherine looked for moorgame's settle. Heathcliff guessed Catherine father's name, so Catherine asked who he was. However, according to the conversation above, Heathcliff did not answer the question directly. He even gave a question to her if she did not know him. According to Grice in Mey (1993:65), the conversation above would obey the cooperative principles if Heathcliff answered Catherine's question, but he did not. So, the writer thinks that Heathcliff's question resulted the relation maxim violation. In the context, however, Heathcliff's answer gave more than the relation maxim violation. It was because Heathcliff could guess Catherine

father's name, so Heathcliff had known Catherine's family. The "You don't know me?" question showed Heathcliff's astonishment because he assumed that Catherine had known about him. Thus, Heathcliff's answer through the "You don't know me?" question contained implicit information that Heathcliff's assumption about Catherine was wrong because Catherine had not known about him yet. According to the explanation above, the conversation obeyed the cooperative principle implicitly because the conversation can be shown as:

Catherine : Who are you?

Heathcliff : **You don't know me?** (I am the person that you must have known)

- 2) Topic : Heathcliff wanted Catherine to meet his son

Catherine : Know him? How could I?

Heathcliff : **Come to my house and see, child.**

Prior to the dialog above, Heathcliff told that Catherine had known his son, but Catherine assumed that she had never known his son yet, so she asked how she could know his son. Heathcliff did not give his answer, but he invited Catherine to come to his house. According to Cooperative Principle proposed by Grice in Mey (1993:65), Heathcliff should answer Catherine's question as much as she needed, but Heathcliff did not. He even invited Catherine to come to his house because he had more

intention than what he said. Catherine's question about how she could know about Heathcliff's son would be answered if she accepted Heathcliff's invitation because Catherine could meet Heathcliff's son who had known by her. Thus, Heathcliff's invitation not only regarded as the maxim of quantity violation because it contained implicit meaning that can be shown as:

Catherine : Know him? How could I?

Heathcliff: **Come to my house and see**, child. (Come to my house, so you can meet my son whom you have known)

3) Topic : Heathcliff denied Nelly's

guessing

Nelly : And this is how you take

your revenge? By warping

the next generation?

Is that

why you lured young Catherine here?

Heathcliff: **I just want her and Linton to get to know each other.** Where's the harm of it?

The conversation took place in Wuthering Heights where Catherine was invited by Heathcliff to see his son, Linton. It angered Nelly because in a long term, the Lintons and Heathcliff did not have a good relationship and Nelly knew about it. Besides that, Nelly's

master, Edgar Linton wanted to avoid his family from Heathcliff. As Nelly knew about the case, she had to help her master to keep his wills, including keeping the Lintons from Heathcliff's action. Consequently, she was distrustful of Heathcliff when he invited Catherine. She wanted to know whether Heathcliff wanted to take his revenge by showing Linton's identity to Catherine. Unfortunately, Heathcliff did not answer honestly, whereas Nelly's guessing was true. According to Grice in Mey (1993:65), a conversation should obey four maxims; one of them is the maxim of quality where the speaker should not say what he/she believe to be false. Nonetheless, Heathcliff denied his honest intention that he wanted to revenge directly, so he said untruth answer. Implicitly, he said that he wanted to destroy Edgar's wills.

Nelly : And this is how you take your revenge? By warping the next generation? Is that why you lured young Catherine here?

Heathcliff: **I just want her and Linton to get to know each other.** Where's the harm of it? (I want they know each other because Edgar concealed the fact from them)

4) Topic: Test-Drive a Horse

Mr. Earnshaw : He does look fine. Do you not think, Heathcliff?

Heathcliff : **There's no rush is there?**

The conversation happened when Mr. Earnshaw asked for Heathcliff's opinion about a horse that would be bought by Mr. Earnshaw. Heathcliff did not give his opinion directly. He even asked whether there was a rush or not. According to Coopretaiive Principle proposed by Grice in Mey (1993:65), Heathcliff's respond violated the maxim of relation because he did not give an appropriate answer that was as relevant as Mr. Earnshaw's question. In this context, however, "There's no rush is there?" was not only regarded as the relation maxim violation because it implicitly explained that Heathcliff was hesitant, so he wanted to test ride the horse, so he could comment about the horse or Mr. Earnshaw could conclude the answer based on the test result. The conversation can be shown as:

Mr. Earnshaw : He does look fine. Do you not think, Heathcliff?

Heathcliff : **There's no rush is there?** (I am not sure. I need a rush to test-ride the horse)

5) Topic: Heathcliff was annoyed with his life

Cathy : What are you doing here?

Heathcliff : **One day I will punish god.**

The conversation happened in a church after Heathcliff had a quarrel with Hindley. He was angry, so he went out of Wuthering Heights and went to a church that was near from Wuthering Heights. Cathy looked for him and found him inside the church. Cathy wondered what Heathcliff did inside the church with no other persons. Then, Heathcliff said that he would punish God. According to Grice in Mey (1993:65), Heathcliff should answer Cathy's question relevantly, but he did. He even said what he would do rather than said what he did inside the church.

Nonetheless, Heathcliff's answer cannot be seen as an irrelevant answer only, but also his answer gave more information than what it be heard. Implicitly, Heathcliff showed his feeling through "One day I will punish God" because in the context, Heathcliff was annoyed by Hindley who humiliated him. Hindley's action made him angry, but he could not avenge because he did not have a competence to do that. Then, he was annoyed for his fate and he blamed God for the case. Thus, his answer can be shown as:

Cathy : What are you doing here?

Heathcliff: **One day I will punish god.** (I'm here to complain God for my fate)

6) Topic: Heathcliff objected to welcome Cathy's guests

Nelly : Why don't you dress up smart before Cathy's guests arrive? Master says that everyone is welcome.

Heathcliff : **I do not think that** Cathy will welcome me.

Nelly wanted Heathcliff to prepare himself to welcome Cathy's guests because all of the Wuthering Heights members were welcome. However, Heathcliff supposed that he would not be welcome by Cathy because of their dispute. Here, Heathcliff expressed his untruth perception because he was hesitant to attend the occasion. Besides that, he supposed that the guests were the Lintons who was hated by him. According to Grice in Mey (1993:65), the maxim of quality had been violated by Heathcliff because he told untruth information. Besides that, Heathcliff's answer also contained conversational implicature because he implicitly expressed his disappointment.

- 7) Topic: Heathcliff felt stronger than Hindley

Cathy : Have you no fear of the consequences of fixing your dwelling with your ancient persecutor?

Heathcliff : **I think my strong head will keep me from danger. And your brother can hardly be made morally worse than he is already now, can he?**

Cathy wondered why Heathcliff could stay in Wuthering Heights with Hindley who had tortured him. Heathcliff thought that he was not afraid with Hindley because he had strength to face Hindley, furthermore Hindley did not have enough moral pride. Thus, according to Heathcliff statement, he gave not only 'no' answer but also further information as his affront for Cathy's brother. This case can result the quantity maxim violation because Heathcliff did not only give information as much as Cathy's required through his long answer. It can be shown as:

Cathy : Have you no fear of the consequences of fixing your dwelling with your ancient persecutor?

Heathcliff: **I think my strong head will keep me from danger. And your brother can hardly be made morally worse than he is already now, can he?** (I don't afraid with him)

- 8) Topic: Heathcliff wanted to meet Isabella

Cathy : I knew you would come in the end!

Heathcliff : **Is Miss Isabella at home?**

The conversation happened when Heathcliff came to Edgar's house to meet Isabella, but Cathy thought that Heathcliff came because of another reason. When Cathy said her guessing, Heathcliff broke her guessing

with a question. Here, Heathcliff violated the relation maxim to clarify his attendance and born conversational implicature because his statement contained implicit meaning that he wanted to arrest his interaction with Cathy. Thus, Heathcliff's answer cannot be seen as the maxim of relation violation only, but also it expressed his intention. Thus, Heathcliff's answer gave implicit meaning that had to be understood by Cathy. It can be shown as:

Cathy : I knew you would come in the end!

Heathcliff: **Is Miss Isabella at home?** (I come to meet Isabella, not you)

- 9) Topic: Heathcliff clarified that he had loved two girls

Isabella : Is this the place where you bring all your sweethearts?

Heathcliff : **Only Cathy before you.**

The conversation happened because

Heathcliff invited Isabella to come to Heathcliff's favorite place. Isabella guessed that Heathcliff used to invite his sweethearts to come to the place, but Heathcliff said that only Cathy who was invited before Isabella. It meant implicitly that only two girls who had been invited by Heathcliff, so Heathcliff's answer disobeyed the quantity maxim because Heathcliff gives more than 'yes' answer and let Isabella to conclude his answer. it can be seen as:

Isabella : Is this the place where you bring all your sweethearts?

Heathcliff: **Only Cathy before you.** (Yes, but only Cathy was my sweetheart before you)

- 10) Topic: Heathcliff wanted to leave Isabella

Isabella : Where are we going?

Heathcliff : **Although it may not appear to be the case, I have tried over these past four months to make myself love you but I cannot.**

When Isabella woke up, she saw that Hindley had dressed up as if he would go. Then, Isabella asked him where they would go. However, Heathcliff did not answer Isabella's question as relevant as it is required. He told that he could not love Isabella better. It meant that he wanted to leave Isabella and did not want to marry Isabella, although Isabella had laid and had given her reputation as the Lintons family member. According to Heathcliff's answer, he violated the maxim of relation and resulted conversational implicature.

4. Conclusion

The data of this study are utterances of the main character in "Wuthering Heights" movie that contain conversational implicature. By using Cooperative Principle, Conversational Implicature, and Context theory, those data can be

analyzed precisely. Besides that, the research questions can also be answered by data analysis results because there is a correlation and a correspondence between the used theories and the data, so the data can be analyzed precisely.

Furthermore, based on the data analysis of ten utterances of the main character, those ten utterances contain conversational implicature that are influenced by his social condition as a poor foster child who felt in love with his foster sister, his assumption about another character, and his bad mood that is influenced his personal condition.

5. References

- Emzir. (2012). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif: Analisis Data*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers
- Kaloeti, Ade Kristanus. (2012). "Particularized Conversational Implicature in TV Series NCIS: SEASON 2". Semarang: A Thesis, Diponegoro University
- Levinson, Stephen C. (1995). *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Mey, Jacob L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers
- Nolaputri, Dwi Ratih. (2012). "Conversational Implicature Analysis on Sam Dawson's Utterances in I Am Sam Movie".

Semarang: A Thesis,
Diponegoro
University

Widdowson, H. G. (2007). *Discourse Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press