

APPLYING CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE UPON LIBYAN NON- STANDARD ARABIC SPEAKERS

Abdurahman Ahmed Ali Milad
English Department
Africa University for Human and Applied Sciences
Tripoli, Libya
Abdo160580@gmail.com

Abstract - When speaking, we suppose to understand each other, the words and utterances we make are simply met with our expectations. If we cannot understand each other as the speaker uttered something but it means either directly or indirectly something else; it means in somehow we floated the characteristics of the conversation either semantically, or pragmatically. The research is carried to apply some of the examples taken from the non-standard Arabic language, Libyan spoken dialect by Libyan students in Indonesia on the Conversational Implicature theory and mainly flouting the maxims. A number of the examples will be mentioned in Arabic and then translated into English and finally analyzed to see whether Grice's theory can be applied in Arabic or not. As well as semantically and pragmatically decision will be made whether Grice's theory in semantics and pragmatics in particular and other theories of Pragmatics in general are applied to English language or universal. The results showed that Libyan non-standard Arabic speakers apply the theory of conversational implicature and non-observing the principles.

Keywords: *Conversational Implicature, Grice's theory, Libyan Non-Standard Arabic speakers*

I. INTRODUCTION

A main assumption in psychology and linguistics is that what speakers say often means what they mean to communicate in their utterances. Therefore, semantics is the systematic study of meaning and linguistic semantics is the study of how languages organize and express meanings. On the other hand, pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that is concerned with meaning.

Pragmatics and semantics can be viewed as different aspects of the same general study. Both are concerned with people's ability to use language meaningfully.

When speaking, we, you and I communicate with one another in daily-life; we suppose to understand each other, the words and utterances we make are simply meet with our expectations. If we cannot understand each other; it means that the utterances are either directly or indirectly mean something else; it means in

somehow the speaker flouted the characteristics of the conversation either semantically or pragmatically.

Grice made an attempt to reduce a system in which, how a hearer gets from what is said to what is meant, from the level of expressed meaning (*what is said*) to the level of implied meaning (*what is meant*).

Thus, this research is carried to apply some of the examples taken from the non-standard Arabic language, Libyan spoken dialect by Libyan students in Indonesia on the Conversational Implicature theory and mainly flouting the maxims. Number of examples will be mentioned in Arabic and then translated into English and finally analyzed to see whether Grice's theory can be applied in Arabic or not. As well as semantically and pragmatically decision will be made whether Grice's theory in semantics and pragmatics in particular and other theories of Pragmatics in general are applied to English language or universal.

Semantics and pragmatics have slight different disciplines. Semantics deals with the question of meaning, while pragmatics deals with the questions of use. A typical semantic question is: is (1) true? A typical pragmatic question is: is it appropriate so utter (1) in a given situation?, based on (KRACHT) in his book *PRAGMATICS AND SEMANTICS*. Since they are slightly different to each other; this research is conducted semantically/pragmatically.

In the early 1960s, Chomsky showed us how to give a gist, general specifications of natural language syntax. Soon after, (Grice, 1970) had the inspired idea to do the same for (rational) social interactions; Conversational Implicatures are the centerpiece of the theory, they are of special interest to linguists and psychologists because of the complex ways in which they depend on speakers' understanding of the world, the immediate linguistic context, and each other's intentions.

Conversational implicatures that are conveyed to the context were referred to by Grice as generalized conversational implicatures. Grice's theories on conversational implicature have had extraordinary powers that have influence on linguistic, psychological,

and philosophical theories of conveyed meaning. Following Grice, most scholars have suggested that any meaning not derived by linguistic decoding must be explained via the application of rich pragmatic knowledge (Atlas & Levinson, 1981; Gazdar, 1980; Levinson, 1998). Almost all those theories, including Gricean, give the assumption that contextual information is relevant to resolving vagueness as well as referents play some role in determining what speakers mean by particular utterance; what speakers say, or what is said is (conventional or literal meaning). In this mini-research, the researcher intends to know whether this theory is applicable in non-standard Arabic or it only deals with English language. In other words, do Libyan speakers have a speaker and sentence meaning in conversation?

“Conversational implicatures are functionally independent of what is said; this means in particular that they do not entail, and are not entailed by, what is said. When an alleged implicature does not meet this condition, it must be considered as part of what is said” stated by (Carston, 2013), (Gibbs & Moise, 1997). If the implicature doesn’t meet with the hearer condition or understanding, then it relates to what is said. On the other hand, if the utterance met with the hearer condition, it is called what is meant.

Among the pragmatics/semantics theories is Gricean theory of Conversational implicature. The main reason of choosing the topic is to know whether or not Gricean theory of conversational implicature is applicable in Libyan non-standard Arabic speakers.

The aim of this research is to know whether or not Libyan non-standard Arabic speakers apply the Gricean theory of conversational implicature. Two main questions were addressed 1) Do Libyan non-standard Arabic speakers apply conversational implicature? 2) How Libyan non-standard Arabic speakers flout the maxims of speech?

II. METHODOLOGY

This study essentially qualitative, the collected data has been analyzed based on the conversational implicature theory. The data was collected by tape-recording from two Libyan students in Indonesia. The recorded conversation is spontaneous and lasted for approximately twenty minutes. The collected data was transcribed into the native language (Arabic), then translated into English.

Only certain examples were chosen to be analyzed according to the maxims of the speech. The study took place in Undip University, Semarang city, Indonesia on January 2016.

The subjects of the study are two Libyan students in Indonesia namely (Waleed and Mohammed), studying in Undip University. A spontaneous

conversation in Arabic language was recorded, transcribed, translated into English and analyzed.

The instrument of obtaining data is a recorded conversation that lasted for about twenty minutes. The recording device used is Samsung Galaxy J2.

The main goal of this study is to know how the conversational implicature is applied in Arabic context as well as how Arabic language speakers flout the maxims of the speech. Therefore, the targeted subjects were Arabic people who speak Libyan dialect.

III. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

As stated above, the main goal of this study is to know the conversational implicature is applied in Arabic context as well as how Arabic language speakers flout the maxims of the speech.

Example (1) (Context) Waleed and Mohamed are talking about a trip to Malaysia; Waleed is asking Mohamed who will accompany him in his trip... (Translated into English)

W: who will join you in your next trip to Malaysia?

M: My friend, Aseer...

M: he’s a little bit annoying...

In general, Grice’s theory of Conversational Implicature is mainly non-observance of the maxims of speech. Therefore, implicature is made due to flouting the maxims. A maxim of blatantly is flouted in the example above, the speaker (Mohamed) with no intention to deceive the hearer (Waleed) and flouted the maxim of blatantly. Grice introduced four types of flouting a maxim: Quantity, Quality, Relation and Manner. The above example (1) is an example where in the maxim of quantity has been flouted.

Basically, the maxim of quantity is flouted when a speaker gives either more or less information than it is required. Needless to say, this happens blatantly and an implicature is generated. However, we can notice that the speaker (**W**) has asked the speaker (**M**) a particular question asking for a particular piece of information. That is, Waleed who is the speaker (**W**) has asked Mohamed who is the speaker (**M**) about the person(s) whom will travel with and the answer must be specific like (with B or B and C). Consequently, the speaker (**M**) has provided more information than the situation demands. In other words, it is not Waleed’s question whether the person(s) whom Mohamed will travel with is annoying or not, he has only asked about the name. In spite of this, we couldn’t say that Mohamed has the intention to mislead or deceive Waleed by giving *more* information than needed.

Hence, the utterance made by Mohamed (*he’s a little bit annoying*), could be a speaker meaning; in which Mohamed means if Aseer is not annoying person I would enjoy my trip there.

Example (2) (Context) Waleed is asking Mohamed about the reason of going to Malaysia.

(Translated into English)

W: Are you going for renewing the visa and kitas?

M: we're going to meet a friend in KL, and then will go to Kajang to stay for couple days there...

I think we'll go to Johor to renew the visa.

In example 2, the maxim of quantity is flouted again. (M) gives more information than needed intentionally to keep the conversation running; hence that speaker (W) asked (M) specific information. However, speaker (M) again flouted the maxim of quantity by giving more information than needed.

Hence, pragmatically; it is not possible to say that speaker (M) was uncooperative or trying to mislead or deceive the speaker (W), because he has provided more information than needed. According to Grice's theory we could assume that (M) wants to provide the other (W) with something else rather than the required information. This additional meaning (generated implicature) could be that he understood the question as that how will you spend your holiday in Malaysia. For that matter, he said *we'll meet a friend, going to Kajang and KL*.

Example (3) (Context) Waleed is asking Mohamed about the back home (to Indonesia) flight. (Translated into English)

W: when will you get back to Semarang?

M: only thirteen days there...

It is better to extend it if we didn't finish with renewing the visa, or if we found that "KL" is a worthy place to visit.

Again, the maxim of quantity is flouted as well as the maxim of quality. Speaker (W) asked (M) specific information but the later gave more information than needed; the same of the two previous examples. Waleed inquired about specific information (*the way-back date*) better to answer for example: *on the 28th or after two weeks*; but Mohamed answered in details flouting the quantity maxim of speech. However, in Example 3 the speaker (M) flouted the maxim of quality in contradicting himself; *only thirteen days... better to extend*.

Example (4) (Context) Waleed is asking Mohamed about the cost of the ticket to Malaysia. (Translated into English)

W: how much it costs two-way ticket to Malaysia?

M: we've booked our flight on Air Asia airlines...

You know, going to Malaysia is cheaper than going to Libya... we've no Air Asia's there

In the example above, speaker (M) has flouted the maxims of quality and manner; in which *Mohamed* used ambiguity in his response to *Waleed*, he didn't answer directly to the question proposed, as he's playing around the push. On the other hand, we can claim that the maxim of quality is flouted as well; the context is somehow vague to the reader and a question crossed to the readers' (*how much it costs to Libya?*). in short,

semantically and pragmatically *Mohamed* flouted the maxims based on Grice's theory of Conversational Implicature (flouting the maxims).

IV.CONCLUSION

To some up, this research is aimed to study the theory of Conversational Implicature (flouting the maxims) of Quantity, Quality, Relation and Manner pragmatically and semantically based on Grice theory. The main point of this study to know whether or not Libyan non-standard Arabic speaker use the Gricean theory of conversational implicature and flout its maxims. It took place in Semarang City, Indonesia where the researcher lives in the meantime; through twenty-minute recorded conversation of two Libyan students whom studying master degree in biology science at Undip University.

Basically, Grice introduced the theory of conversational implicature into two cases: first, observing the maxims. Actually, it is said that it's easy to observe the maxims since the *speaker* involved in a conversation has the knowledge about those maxims mentioned earlier. Second, non-observing the maxims, one of the cases in non-observing the maxims is called flouting the maxims, in which what is said is not what is meant; could be the reason to keep the context of negotiating in conversation go further or by not observing one of the maxims mentioned earlier.

The limitation of this study goes only under this case due to the time and lack of qualities to conduct the study in a wider context. Thus, it has been concluded that Libyan non-standard Arabic speakers apply the theory of conversational implicature and non-observing the principles. This study confirms what (Alduais, 2012) claimed in his recent study that non-standard Arabic, Yemeni dialect and an idiolect spoken at IBB city apply the conversational implicature as well as flouting the maxims. However, the findings of the study fulfill the argumentation of the researcher (*whether or not Libyan non-standard Arabic speakers apply the theory of conversational implicature and flouting the maxims*). Thus, it has been concluded that Gricean theory is applied in Libyan dialect semantically pragmatically.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alduais, Ahmed Mohammed. (2012). Conversational implicature (Flouting the maxims): applying conversational maxims on examples taken from non-standard arabic language, yemeni dialect, an idiolect spoken at IBB city. *Journal of Sociological Research*, 3(2), Pages 376-387.
- [2] Atlas, Jay David, & Levinson, Stephen C. (1981). It-clefts, informativeness and logical form: radical pragmatics (revised standard version) *Radical pragmatics* (pp. 1-62): Academic Press.

- [3] Carston, Robyn. (2013). 12. implicature, explicature, and truth-theoretic semantics. *The Semantics-Pragmatics Boundary in Philosophy*, 261.
- [4] Davis, Wayne. (2010). Implicature. *Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. discussion Alonso-Ovalle, Critical. Scalar implicature calculation in Chierchia et al.
- [5] Gazdar, Gerald. (1980). Pragmatics, Implicature, Presupposition and Logical Form.
- [6] Gibbs, Raymond W, & Moise, Jessica F. (1997). Pragmatics in understanding what is said. *Cognition*, 62(1), 51-74.
- [7] Grice, Herbert P. (1970). *Logic and conversation*: na.
- [8] Hancher, Michael. (1978). Grice's "Implicature" and literary interpretation: Background and preface.
- [9] Kreidler, Charles W. (1998). *Introducing english semantics*: Psychology Press.
- [10] Levinson, Stephen C. (1998). Minimization and conversational inference *Pragmatics: Vol. 4 Presupposition, implicature and indirect speech acts* (pp. 545-612): Routledge.