

THE IMPLICATURE OF ROALD DAHL'S CHARLIE AND THE CHOCOLATE FACTORY

Aisyah Wulandari
Fergi Cintia Amalia
Sultan Agung Islamic University

Abstract

Novel is a long prose composition, containing a series of a person's life story with people in surrounding areas and highlight the character and nature of each offender. Sometime, the story of novel start from incident or important incident experienced by the characters, who would change they life. For example, the novel of *Charlie and The Chocolate Factory*, by *Roald Dahl* started when the charcters get a golden ticket which was very rare. In the novel there are so many conversation between characters that was usually in conversation there was a hidden meaning or meanings implied therein. This review will discuss the *implicature* or hidden meanings as opposed to expressed meanings in conversations taken from Roald Dahl novel, *Charlie and The Chocolate Factory*.

Keyword: *meaning of novel, implicatures, charlie and the chocolate factory*

Introduction

The literary work is a series of casting ideas, thoughts, and expressions that do the authors through the interpretation of the life that is reflected through the languages of choice. Those, the source of it is a creation, and based on life as a whole. Therefore, literature offers a number of life values, values that are meaningful to life, directing, and improve the quality of live as a human. Usefulness is what makes need to know for the sake of the usefulness of literature of life.

Novel is a literary work that is most often found. Novel has many categories ranging from adults to children. As we know a novel is a long prose composition containing a series of someone's life story with people in the surrounding environment. In context, there are many conversations between characters.

Language is a basic need that must every human being. It is the most important communication tool to communicate with other. Language is also a method that is most important in writing a novel. Novel is created to channel the ideas of the author. Assessment of a language only at the structural level often does not produce an assessment of the maximum. Conditions that practical use of the language is often out of the structural rules, but the communications process that occurs not run into an obstacle and would produce a more effective communication and efficient. This prompted a study of a language not only just from the structural point of view, but must be linked to aspects outside the structure of language.

The study of languages that contains aspects beyond language aspects in the assessment is pragmatic and discourse analysis. The aspects involves the study of a foreign language in which there is meaning in conversation. Conversation is a speaking event verbally committed by two or more persons. Conversation contains a principle of cooperation also decorum in speaking. So, to understand what is being said interlocutors the need for conversational implicature.

One part of pragmatics is conversational implicature. In communication there is a conversation, it happens sometimes cause a different purpose to the structure of the language used. This condition involves the hidden purpose behind use of structural language. where the study of conversational implicature has an appropriate role to assess a use of language.

Method

The method used in this research is descriptive qualitative method. Descriptive method is research method which describes or presents data based on reality-reality by objective according the data. This research is classified qualitative research because the data is not processed with the use of statistic principles but be guided at literature theory that support the research. Therefore it is literature research. In this research the data were analyzed with the use of pragmatic approach employing a theory of conversational implicature.

Pragmatics is linguistics that studies usage language associated with context usage. Meaning language such can be understood when the context is known. Restriction pragmatics is usage language rules about shape and meaning associated with purpose, speaker, context, and situation. Pragmatics approach is knowledge that learn about, well symptom types, process, or backdrop. Conversation implicature is implication pragmatics that there are in in conversation that appears as consequence happening of violation principle conversation. In line with restriction about implication pragmatic, implicature conversation it were propositions or "statement" implicative, that is what are possible taken as, implicated or intended by speaker, that differ from what is actual said by speaker in a conversation (grice 1975: 43, gadzar 1979: 38 in Rustono 1999: 82). Conversational implicature occurs because of the existing reality that a speech has implication in the form of propositions. (gunarwan 1994: 52 in Rustono 1999: 82).

Implicature

An implicature is something meant, implied, or suggested distinct from what is said. Implicatures can be part of sentence meaning or dependent on conversational context, and can be conventional or unconventional. Conversational implicatures have become one of the principal subjects of pragmatics. Figures of speech provide familiar examples. An important conceptual and methodological issue in semantics is how to distinguish senses and entailments from conventional implicatures.

Implicature has been invoked for a variety of purposes, from defending controversial semantic claims in philosophy to explaining lexical gaps in

linguistics.¹ H. P. Grice, who coined the term “implicature,” and classified the phenomenon, developed an influential theory to explain and predict conversational implicatures, and describe how they are understood. The “Cooperative Principle” and associated “Maxims” play a central role. Other authors have focused on principles of politeness and communicative efficiency. Questions have been raised as to how well these principle-based theories account for the intentionality of speaker implicature and conventionality of sentence implicature. Critics observe that speakers often have goals other than the cooperative and efficient exchange of information, and that conventions are always arbitrary to some extent.

Implicatures and pragmatics

One must take care not to be misled by ‘implicature’ in the label ‘conventional implicature’. Conversational Implicatures are not pragmatic meanings. This is clear from Grice’s original definition, and it is, broadly speaking, a point of consensus among researchers. It is nonetheless worth reviewing the case. Conversational Implicatures are almost always discussed under the rubric of (Gricean) pragmatics, so it is easy to mistakenly conceive of them as importantly similar to conversational implicatures.

Conversational implicatures are calculable. When we discuss them, we escape the arbitrariness of the sign. General principles of rational communication work in conjunction with the encoded semantic meaning and the context (including speaker intentions) to deliver them.

A: What city does Sam live in?

B: Well, I know he lives in France.

B’s calculation as follows:

- i. The city-level information is relevant in this context.
- ii. A cooperative speaker like B will generally provide all the relevant content she can within the limits of her knowledge.
- iii. Thus, B must be conversationally implicating that she does not have specific knowledge about where Sam lives in France.

Conversational implicatures are malleable. That is, they are heavily influenced by the current context, the discourse participants’ knowledge, and any other available pragmatic information. For example, if we change A’s in the question above just slightly, so that it is instead “What country does Sam live in?”, then B’s calculation changes completely and she no longer arrives at the same conversational implicature. (This property is often called cancellability or deniability, but these terms arrive with special senses that might not be appropriate for all cases or all theories. I use malleable in an attempt to remain noncommittal about the precise nature of this phenomenon.)

Conversational Implicatures, like regular semantic entailments, do not enjoy this flexibility. They can be semantically underspecified and thus have their meanings on occasions of use fixed in part by pragmatic information, but there is

no escaping them the way we escape the conversational implicature in above simply by altering A's question slightly.

Discussion

Based on research conducted limitation, the result of the study were presented regarding the use of conversational implicatures contained in novel *Charlie and The Chocolate Factory*. Implicature is something that is not directly spoken by the speaker to explain what may have been intended by the speaker, which is different from what was actually said by the speaker. Understanding of the implicature would be easier if the author or speaker 1 and the reader or listener 2 have shared experiences. Experience and knowledge in question is knowledge and experience about the context surrounding the sentence speech posed by the author.

This following will discuss types of speech that contain conversational implicature at novel *Charlie and The Chocolate Factory*, as follows:

1. Conventional Implicature : Type 1 (Implied)

(1)

"Listen," the man whispered. "I'll buy it from you. I'll give you fifty dollars. How about it, eh? And I'll give you a new bicycle as well. Okay?"

"Are you crazy?" shouted a woman who was standing equally close.

"Why, i'd give him five hundred dollars for that ticket! You want to sell that ticket for five hundred dollars, young man?"

(Charllie and The Chocolate Factory, 2007:45)

The sentence *"Are you crazy?"* implied meaning as follows: show rejection response from the first speaker because her offer is more acceptable, the first speaker's offer is very good, the second speaker thought that the first speaker had mental disorders.

The sentence *"Why, i'd give him five hundred dollars for that ticket! You want to sell that ticket for five hundred dollars, young man?"*, the implied meaning is will give a motivation or high offer to the *young man (Charlie Bucket)* to make him approve her offers. The data (1) can be concluded that the implicature generated from logical reasoning.

(2)

"But who are these worker?" asked Agustus Gloop.

"All in good time, my dear boy!" said Mr. Wonka, smiling at Agustus. "Be patient! You shall see everything as we go along! Are all of you inside? Good! Would you mind closing the door? Thank you."

(Charllie and The Chocolate Factory, 2007:60)

The sentence *"All in good time, my dear boy!"* implied meaning as follows: everything will be happen in the good time, all everyone in the good moment right now, and everything will be see absolutely. The data (2) can be concluded that the implicature generated from unlogical reasoning.

(3)

"Isn't it wonderful!" whispered Charlie. "Hasn't it got a wonderful taste, Grandpa?"

"I could eat the whole field!" said Grandpa Joe, grining with delight. "I could go around on all fours like a cow and eat every blade of grass in the field!"

(Charllie and The Chocolate Factory, 2007:66)

The sentence, *"I could eat the whole field!" said Grandpa Joe, grining with delight. "I could go around on all fours like a cow and eat every blade of grass in the field!"* implied some meaning that the taste of the chocolate is very tasteful (good). The conversation above Charlie asked something to Grandpa Joe. Granpa Joe answered by giving response to Charlie act and say like describing how yummy is the taste of chocolate itself. The data (3) can be concluded that the implicature is generated from unlogical reasoning.

(4)

"Save him!" screamed Mrs. Gloop, going white in the face, and waving her umbrella about. "He'll drown! He can't swim a yard! Save him! Save him!"

"Good heavens, woman," said Mr. Gloop, "I'm not diving in there! I've got my best suit on!"

(Charllie and The Chocolate Factory, 2007:73)

The sentence, *"I'm not diving in there! I've got my best suit on!" said by Mr. Gloop* implied meaning of refuse an asking from someone. Mrs. Gloop ask to Mr. Gloop to save their son Agustus Gloop but Mr. Gloop doesn't want to do that because he wearing his favorite suit. The data (4) can be conclude that the implicature generated from logical reasoning.

2. Conversational Implicature: type 2 (Expressed)

(1)

All at once, they both saw the funny side of the whole thing, and they burst into peals of laughter.

"What the heck's going on!" cried Grandma Josephine, walking up suddenly.

"Nothing," said Granpa Joe. "You go on back to sleep."

(Charllie and The Chocolate Factory, 2007:36)

The sentence *"You go on back to sleep."* on the data (1) the implied meaning is to ask to *Grandma Josephine* to continued her sleep. From the implied meaning canbe concluded that the conversation implicature need speacial context. The

context that can be concluded from the conversation above is, ask someone to sleep again.

(2)

"My dear veruca! How do you do? What a pleasure this is! You do have an interesting name, don't you? I always thought that a veruca was a sort of wart that you got on the sole of your foot! But I must be wrong, musn't I? How pretty you look in that lovely mink coat! i'm so glad you could come! Dear m, this is gong such an exciting day! I do hope you enjoy it! I'm sure you will! I know you will! Your father? How are you, Mr. Salt? And Mrs. Salt? Over joy to see you! Yes, the ticket is quite in order! Please go in!"

(Charllie and The Chocolate Factory, 2007:58)

In the data (2) the sentence "...Please go in!" the implied mesning is ask someone to enter the room or move to another place. Make an invitation to someone or the audience to follow the speaker instruction. From the implied meaning canbe concluded that the conversation implicature need speacial context. The context is about willingness to follow the cues.

(3)

*"I don't want to think about it!" shrieked Mrs. Gloop.
"Nor do I," said Mr. Wonka. "And i do promise you, madam, tgat your darling boy is perfectly safe."
"If he's perfectly safe, then where is he?" snapped Mrs. Gloop. "Lead me to him this instant!"*

(Charllie and The Chocolate Factory, 2007:76)

In the data (3) the sentence, "Lead me to him this instant!" the implied meaning is to ask someone to bring the speaker to go some place by the listener, bring someone to meet someone right now, the speaker want to meet someone instantly. From the implied meaning can be concluded that the conversation implicature need speacial context. The context is about willingness to follow the cues.

Conclusion

The result of this study examines the use of conversational implicature contained in the novel. Based on the result of research on coversational implicature in the novel *Charllie and The Chocolate Factory* work of Roald Dahl discussed above can be concluded that the conversational implicature is a hidden meaning in a sentence uttered by the speaker to use the same language but not phrased messages obviously it is implied, to understand the hidden meaning is the speaker, the speaker should be understood by using conversational implicature. The used of conversational implicature for writer is to realize the importance meaning that implicit in a discourse so that created discourse that easy give understanding against to the reader.

Reference:

- Cummings, Louise. 2007. *Pragmatic: A Multidisciplinary Perspective*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Grice, H. Paul. 1989. *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Web. 26 December 2016
- Grice, Herbert Paul. 1989a. Logic and conversation. In *Studies in the way of words* (22-40). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [Originally published in Cole, Peter and Jerry L. Morgan (eds.) (1975), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts* (41-58). New York: Academic Press.] Web. 26 December 2016
- Huang Yan. 2007. *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Kuahartanti. 2005, *Pesona Bahasa: Langkah Awal Memahami Linguistik*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka,
- Leech, Geoffrey (penerjemah: Oka). 1993. *Prinsip-prinsip Pragmatik*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia.
- Nadar, F.X.. *Pragmatik dan penelitian pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: GRAHA ILMU, 2009
- No author. (1981) Presupposition and conversational implicature. In *Radical Pragmatics*, ed. P. Cole, pp. 183–98. New York: Academic Press. Reprinted in *Studies in the Ways of Words*, ed. H. P. Grice, pp. 269–282. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press (1989). Web. 26 December 2016
- Sperber, Dan and Deirdre Wilson. 2009. *Theory of Relevance: communication and Cognition*.
- Verhaar. 2006. *Asas-asas Linguistik Umum*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.