

VIOLATION OF COOPERATION PRINCIPLES IN DRAMA *AHLUL KAHFI* THE WORK OF TAUFIQ AL-HAKIM, ANALYSIS OF GRICE IMPLICATURES

Irfan Effendi Al-Mandury¹, Hisyam Zaini²

UIN Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta^{1,2}

21201011022@student.uin-suka.ac.id¹, hisyam.zaini@uin-suka.ac.id²

Abstract; *This study aims to describe the forms of violation of the principles of cooperation in the first part of the *Ahlul Kahfi* drama. And knowing the conditional meaning of implicature in the first part of the *ahlul kahfi* drama. To achieve this goal, descriptive qualitative research is used by analyzing and collecting the script of the play in the form of conversations between characters using the theory of violation of the principle of Grice's cooperation which gave birth to the conversational implicature. This method can provide a conclusion that in the script of the first part of the *Ahlul Kahfi* drama there are several violations against the principles of cooperation namely the violation of quality maxims, violations of quantity maxims and violations of relationship maxims, and there is no violation of the maxim of means. And the meaning born of the implicature of the conversation due to the violation of the principle is adapted to the context of the speech.*

Keywords: *Principle of Cooperation, Conversational Implicature, *Ahlul Kahfi*.*

Abstrak; Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mendeskripsikan bentuk-bentuk pelanggaran prinsip kerjasama dalam drama *ahlul kahfi* bagian pertama. Dan mengetahui makna kondisional dari implikatur dalam drama *ahlul kahfi* bagian pertama, untuk mencapai tujuan tersebut digunakan penelitian kualitatif deskriptif dengan menganalisis dan mengumpulkan naskah drama yang berupa percakapan antar tokoh dengan menggunakan teori pelanggaran prinsip kerjasama Grice yang melahirkan Implikatur percakapan, dengan menggunakan metode tersebut dapat memberikan kesimpulan bahwa dalam naskah drama *ahlul kahfi* bagian pertama terdapat beberapa pelanggaran prinsip kerjasama yakni pelanggaran maksim kualitas, pelanggaran maksim kuantitas dan pelanggaran maksim hubungan, serta tidak terdapat pelanggaran maksim cara. Dan makna yang terlahir dari implikatur percakapan akibat pelanggaran prinsip tersebut bervariasi disesuaikan dengan konteks tuturan.

Kata Kunci: Prinsip Kerjasama, Konfersational Implikatur, *Ahlul Kahfi*

A. Introduction

Language is an arbitrary sound sign system that speech communities use to collaborate, communicate, and have spoken interactions with one another.¹ The study of language is constantly evolving since communication and interaction are two of language's primary functions. Pragmatics is one of the relatively newer areas of linguistics that studies how context affects interaction and communication.² A subfield of linguistics known as pragmatics studies the significance of speech contexts between speakers and listeners. According to Leech, Levinson, and Yule, pragmatics is the study of language that focuses on the study of language related to its users (speakers), and pragmatics cannot be divorced from the study of language used by people in real life, for specific purposes, and in the actual world.³

The Cooperative Principle, developed by Grice, is a theory that informs the science of pragmatics when people interact or speak using language. However, in the science of pragmatics, there is a language issue that arises during conversations when one of the parties flouts the Cooperative Principle. This conversational event is known as a Conversational Implicature or Conversational Implicate, and these even occur when people are speaking informally, and these occurrences give rise to fresh intentions or meanings that do not correspond to the lexical meaning but do contain indirect purposes or meanings. According to Leech, an implicature occurs when one of the cooperative principles is broken in a conversation. Grice's cooperative principle is made up of the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner (action maxim).⁴ If any one of these maxims is broken, the conversation is deemed to have occurred in violation.⁵

In principle, implicature, according to Levinson, consists of four concepts: (1) providing a meaningful functional explanation for linguistic facts that cannot be

¹ Abdul Chaer, *Tata Bahasa Indonesia Praktis* (Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2011), 1.

² FX Nadar, *Pragmatik & Penelitian Pragmatik* (Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu, 2009), 4.

³ Stephent Levinson, *Pragmatics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 9.

⁴ George Yule, *Pragmatik* (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2006), 63-64.

⁵ Geoffrey Leech, *Prinsip-prinsip Pragmatik* (Jakarta: UI Press, 2011), 29.

explained by linguistic theory; (2) explaining the external differences intended by language users; (3) simplifying semantic descriptions of clause relationships connected by the same connecting words; and (4) explaining a variety of linguistic phenomena that appear unrelated or even contradictory.⁶

According to Basuki, implicature is a linguistic phenomenon employed to communicate messages or meaning.⁷ The meaning or message is subtly and surreptitiously communicated. Brown and Yule found that the term implicature is used to explain when the speaker's literal meaning differs from what the speaker is actually saying.⁸ speech with examples Is this place hot at all? The speaker's implicit request for the addressee to open the window or turn on the air conditioning is included in the speech.

When the cooperative principle is violated, which is done so in violation of the cooperative principle's regulations or conversational maxims, there is conversational implicature. Grice provided the following formula to explain:⁹

1. The maxim of quantity is composed of two unique rules, namely: a) Speak as informatively as you can; b) do not speak more than is necessary or desirable;
2. The Maxim of Quality also includes two additional particular guidelines, namely: a) Don't say what you consider to be incorrect; and b) Don't say anything about which you lack sufficient evidence (proof).
3. The Relevance Maxim. Only one guideline applies to this situation: "Your statements must be relevant."

⁶ A. Hamid Hasan Lubis, *Analisis Wacana Pragmatik* (Bandung: Penerbit Angkasa, 2011), 73.

⁷ Imam Agus Basuki, *Linguistika: Teori dan Terapannya* (Yogyakarta: CV. Grafika Indah, 2005), 15.

⁸ Abdul Rani, *Analisis Wacana; sebuah kajian bahasa dalam pemakaian* (Malang: Bayumedia Publishing, 2004), 170.

⁹ P.W.J. Nababan, *Ilmu Pragmatik (Teori dan Penerapannya)* (Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 1987), 31.

4. Maxim of Manner, or, how one expresses oneself rather than what one says. Grice offers this super maxim as a general principle: "You have to be transparent."

The primary guidelines are further divided into 4 specific guidelines:

- a. Steer clear of ambiguous or vague language.
- b. Prevent vagueness.
- c. You should keep it short (avoid unnecessary superfluous words).
- d. You must regularly communicate.

Taufiq al-Hakim's *Ahlul Kahfi* (Cave Dwellers) is based on the tale "Ashabul Kahfi" that can be found in Q.S. Alkahfi 9-26. The story in the Al-Qur'an differs from Taufiq's work, but the two cannot be distinguished because the concept of the *ahlul kahfi* drama is a reworking of the Al-Qur'anic story into a literary work of fiction. One of Taufiq's best plays, this drama can make a significant contribution to the growth of Egyptian literature, especially drama. Three young lads who dozed off in a harmonically cave are the subject of *Ahlul Kahfi*'s narrative. The three of them awaken fatigued from a sleep they believed lasted only a few days hundreds of years later. They are prepared to give up the things they cherish most, including their families, loves, and even their own lives, in order to avoid King Diqyanus's massacre. They adopted a religion that the king despised, which led to this. The religious convictions of Misylinia, Marnusyi, and Yimlikha persisted to the end of their lives. This story also describes Marnusyi's devotion to his best friend Misylinia and the friendship between the three of them, despite the fact that they are frequently embroiled in difficult disputes.¹⁰

This study will concentrate on identifying the purpose and location of typical mistakes in character conversations in theatrical scripts in light of these problems. *Ahlu kahfi* with research studies that particularly describe a conversation with one

¹⁰ Yusti Dwi Nurwendah dan Intan Annisaul Mahera, "Kajian Pragmatik dalam Bahasa Arab: Analisis Bentuk dan Fungsi Tindak Tutar Direktif Bahasa Arab dalam Film 'Ashabul Kahfi,'" *Tsaqafiyah: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Sastra Arab*, 1, 1 (2019), 3.

Cooperative Principle Grice who was violated and established the intent or meaning included by looking at the context and condition of the conversation. Conversational Implications, which will be studied in the Arabic conversation screenplay for the drama *Ahlul Kahfi* first half, were born because of a violation of the cooperative principles. The following can be inferred from the explanation given above: The objective of this journal article is (1) to describe the types of The Principle of Cooperation in Drama *Ahlul Kahfi* first part violations. And (2) understanding the implicature in the *Ahlul Kahfi* the drama's conditional context.

The researcher discovered various studies in the form of articles from his searches that shared similarities in both formal and non-formal object material. Several of these investigations consist of: In the first place, there is an article by Yuniartha and Farhah in Journals CMES titled "Characteristics of the Main Characters in the First Part of the *Ahlul Kahfi* Drama Manuscript by Taufiq al-Hakim (Analysis of Literary Psychology)" that looks at the traits of the characters as seen from the psychology of the speakers in the *Ahlul Kahfi* drama script.¹¹ Second, a journal article titled "Conversational Implicatures in Indonesian Language Learning in the Accounting Study Program Semester 1 FEB UNMAS Denpasar" that studies conversational implicatures and explains the causes of them in semester 1 Accounting study program students at UNMAS Denpasar.¹² Third, an essay published in a journal named "Conversational Implicature in Ody C. Harahap's *Sweet 20* Film" that covers general implicature, scaled implicature, and unique conversational implicature in Ody C. Harahap's *Sweet 20* film.¹³

¹¹ Lia Yuniartha dan Eva Farhah, "Karakteristik Tokoh Utama dalam Bagian Pertama Naskah Drama *Ahlul Kahfi* Karya Taufiq al-Hakim (Analisi Psikologi Sastra)," *Jurnal CMES*, 1, XI (2018).

¹² Dewa Gede Bambang Erawan, "Implikatur Percakapan dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia pada Program Studi Akuntansi Semester 1 FEB UNMAS Denpasar," *Jurnal Santiaji Pendidikan*, 1, 11 (2021).

¹³ Deby Prana Sari dan M. Syahrin Effendi, "Implikatur Percakapan dalam Film *Sweet 20* Karya Ody C. Harahap," *Diksa: Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 1, 6 (2020).

This research is qualitative in nature.¹⁴ Reading and note-taking strategies were employed to gather the data for this study from the theatre scripts of *Ahlul Kahfi*. In this study, a descriptive analytical approach was utilized to describe the facts in the data before it was evaluated.¹⁵ By using this technique, the researcher will be able to analyze the contextual meaning or conditional meaning in relation to the conversation's expressed circumstances and describe the conversational formats that violate the principle of courteous cooperation and lead to conversational implicatures in drama scripts.

B. Discussion

According to the study's findings, which were based on Grice's cooperative principle theory, various maxims are violated. This can be seen in the following exchanges between characters in the drama *Ahlul Kahfi*:

1. Violation of the Maxim of Quality

The maxim of quality is broken when there are doubts between the speaker and speech partner and when the source of the truth is unclear, as in the following conversation from the play:

مشلينيا :كم لبثنا هاهنا ؟

مرنوش : يوماً أو بعض يوم.

Misylinia : How long have we been here?

Marnusy : A day or a half day.

Because both of them lack sufficient knowledge about the time between when they get up and when they go to sleep, the dialogue contains a breach of the quality maxim. Due to the two's conversation's violation of the quality maxim, the implicature meaning—i.e., the conditional meaning in line with what was said—was

¹⁴ Ilexy J moleong, *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif* (Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya, 2017), 49.

¹⁵ Kuntha Ratna Nyoman, *Teori Metode dan Teknik Penelitian Sastra* (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2015), 53.

created. The speech's context comprised a variety of implicature meanings, including: (1) They could only question close coworkers because they were both confused about how long they had been sleeping. (2) They believed that they had simply temporarily dozed off in a cave, and in the drama *Ahlul Kahf*, there is only one conversational expression that deviates from this standard of quality.

2. Violation of the Maxim of Quantity

When an utterance is made that is either more or less than what the speaker or the listener needs, as in the theater conversation below, the maxim of quantity is violated.

يمليكها : كيف عرف الملك سركما ؟ أمكيدة ؟ أو شاية ؟

مرنوش : أخبره أنت يا مشلينيا.....

مشلينيا : أريد الخروج من هذا المكان

Yimlikha : How did the king know your secret? A storyline? instruction?

Marnusyi : Tell him, Misylinia.

Misylinia : I want to get out of this place

When Yimlikha asked how the two of them had their secret discovered, Marnusyi and Misylinia did not respond with a series of explicit details of how their secret was discovered. As a result, Yimlikha received no information from her question, and their responses were therefore useless. This conversation violated the cooperative principle, specifically the maxim of quantity. Even after asking Misylinia what she wants, she responds, "I want to leave this spot," which violates the request and gives rise to an implicature meaning, or a conditional meaning depending on the context of the speech's context.

The implications of the conversation are as follows: (1) When Yimlika asks Marnusyi to ask Misylinia to tell, this shows that Misylinia understands their problem in more detail; (2) when Misylinia doesn't respond and says she wants to leave the cave, it shows that Misylinia is eager to leave the cave and doesn't want the issue to be brought up again.

مرنوش : إلى أين أيها الراعي المتنسك؟

يمليخا : (في تردد) إلى ... إلى ... إلى ... إلى ... أذهب إلى المدينة تحت ستر الظلام أحضر طعاماً لكما ولي...؟

Marnusyi : Where are you going, Yimlikha?

Yimlikha : (hesitantly) to ... to ... I'm hungry. I will Go to the city secretly, and bring you both food, and I....?

Because Yimlikha provided more information than Marnusyi requested, he or she violated the cooperative principle of the maxim of quantity in this conversation. As a result, an implicature meaning—that is, a meaning that is consistent with the context in which the utterance was made—was formed, and this meaning was when Yimlikha was asked where to go. Since they were hiding at the time and could only out if it was really necessary, he began by stating that he was hungry. This allowed Yimlikha to go out and purchase food because hunger was one of the most pressing needs.

مرنوش : أهذا كلام عاقل؟

يمليخا : ولم لا؟ إلى سمعتُ من جدتي ووالدتي وأنا صغير أن راعياً اعتصم بغار من سيل هائل وكان مؤمناً بالله والمسيح فنام شهراً حتى انقطع السيل فصحا وخرج سالماً كما دخل دون أن يشعر بالزمن

Marnusyi : Is this a reasonable talk?

Yimlikha: Why not? It seems to me that I heard from my grandmother and mother when I was young that a shepherd took refuge in a cave from the great tide and

believed in God and Christ. He slept for a month until the flow stopped and he came out safely as if he entered without feeling the time.

This conversation breaks the rule of quality because Yimlikha gives Marnusyi more information than is necessary. As a result of this violation, an implicature meaning—an implied meaning that is consistent with the circumstances or context of speech—is created. The implicature meaning in this conversation suggests that sleeping for more than a year makes sense in light of the accounts of miracles (miracles) performed by God.

3. Violation of the Maxim of Relevance

When the speech does not correspond with what the speaker is requesting, as is the case in the drama *Ahlul Kahfi* as follows:

مرنوش : استيقظت؟ ماذا تريد مني؟

مشلينيا : أين أنت؟ أسمع صوتك المتبرم ولا أراك . أه ! ظهري يؤلمني!

Marnusyi : You have woken up?, What do you want from me?

Misylinia : Where are you? I heard your whisper and did not see you. eh! My back hurts!

The discourse broke the relationship rule because there was no connection between Marnusyi's questions and Misylinia's responses; a question should have sparked an answer. According to the context of the speech, conversational implicatures derived from these violations have the following meanings: (1) Marnusyi's speech did not inquire as to whether Misylinia was awake, but instead ensured that she was; (2) Misylinia did not need to respond to Marnusyi's question because her voice was evidence that she was awake and nearby Marnusyi.

مشلينيا : أين الراعي؟ أين ثالثنا الراعي؟

مرنوش : أتبين شبح كلبه هنا باسطة ذراعيه..

Misylinia : Where is the shepherd? Where is the third shepherd?

Marnusyi : I can see the ghost of his dog here with outstretched arms.

When Misylinia asked the shepherd where the dog was, Marnusyi responded instead by telling him where the dog was. As a result of this violation of the cooperative principle of relation maxim, an implicature was created, which implied meaning based on the context of the speech. The meaning of the utterance was that the shepherd was also around them because the shepherd's dog is also in that place automatically the owner is not in another place.

مشلينيا : من أدراك ؟

مرنوش : وهل ننام أكثر من هذا القدر؟

Misylinia : Who knows?

Marnusyi : Do we sleep more than this?

As a result of Marnusyi's question and Misylinia's response, a conversational implicature was formed that implied the meaning according to the speech's context: They were both confused about how long they had been asleep and no one knew so they could only ask questions without finding a response. This conversation violates the relationship maxim.

مرنوش : ويحك ! إلى أين ؟

مشلينيا : أو تريدني على المبيت هنا ليلة أخرى؟

Marnusyi : Woe to you! Where to?

Misylinia : Or do you want me to stay here one more night?

The conversation was an implicature due to a violation of the cooperation principle, and the meaning of the implicature in the conversation was that Misylinia could no longer stand being in the cave so he could not wait another few days to get out. This conversation violated the relationship maxim because the question was answered with a question, so the conversation between the two was not connected, but still had meaning according to the context of the speech.

مرونش : (في ارتياب) وهل ستعود إلينا ؟

يمليخا : إني أترك قطميراً هنا

Marnusyi : (suspicious) Will you come back to us?

Yimlikha : I left Qithmir here.

When Yimlikha was asked if she would return or not, she replied that her dog was still there, which violated the maxim of relation and created a conversational implicature that implied that Yimlikha would definitely return because of something valuable. As a result, the conversation was in violation of the principle of cooperation. (Qitmir) was still there by himself.

مشلينيا : وأنا ؟ متى كفرت بك ؟

مرونش : إن الحب لينتلع كل شيء حتى الصداقة وحتى الإيمان .

Misylinia : I? When did I not believe you?

Marnusyi : Love devours everything, even friendship and even faith.

Marnusyi did not respond when Misylinia expressed doubt in him, instead responding merely with, "Love swallows everything, even friendship and even faith," which went against the relationship maxim. Even if he still has faith in Marnusyi, he no longer gives a damn what his best buddy has to say and would much rather meet his love.

مشلينيا : (يكتم اغتباطه) مرنوش ! أتراها حقيقة تركت دينها لهذا السبب ؟

مرنوش : وهل في هذا شك ؟

مشلينيا : أنت دائما تفهمني ذلك

Myslinia : (holding back his anger) Marnusyi! Do you really think he left his religion for this reason?

Marnusyi : Are there any doubts about this?

The discussion went against the relationship rule because Marnusyi followed up on Misylinia's question with another one, creating a conversational implicature that implied there was no doubt Putri Priska had changed her faith as a result of her love for Misylinia and that the question did not need to be answered because the answer was certain.

مرنوش : إلى أين يا مشلينيا ؟

مشلينيا : مهما يكن من أمر فلا ريب أن الأيام الثلاثة قد انقضت

Marnusyi : Where are you going, Misylinia?

Myslinia : Whatever the case, there is no doubt that three days have passed.

Because Misylinia did not respond to the question of where she was going by responding with something unrelated to "Whatever the case, there is no doubt that three days have passed," the conversation violated the principle of relation. This conversation includes an implicature because it violates the principle of relation and implies that Misylinia felt bored in the cave and that she had been there for longer than three days, so she needed to leave the cave as soon as possible.

يمليخا : صه ! أسمعان ؟...

مرنوش : ما هذا أيضا ؟

Yimlikha : Shut up! Did you hear?...

Marnusyi : What about this?

When Yimlikha asked a question that did not need an answer because at that point everyone in the cave had heard the crowd, Marnusyi responded by asking a question, which violated the relationship maxim. This violation gave rise to a conversational implicature that had meaning given the speech's context, namely when Yimlikha asked a question that did not require an answer because at that point everyone in the cave had heard the crowd.

4. Factors Causing the Violation of Maxims

In the first act of the play *Ahlul Kahfi*, the following explanations might be used to explain why speakers or speech partners choose to engage in dialogues that go against the maxims or principles of cooperation:

1. The speaker and partner discuss circumstances about which they are unaware; this frequently constitutes a quality-violating factor because the veracity of the information in the conversation is still in question.
2. The speech partner seeks to conceal the truth and is unwilling to offer information explicitly, leading to the implicit transmission of information through the breach of maxims. This is typically a factor for violating the maxim of quantity by lowering the necessary information.
3. The speech partner wants the speaker to understand the purpose of his actions right away so that the speaker won't have to respond to follow-up questions. To achieve this, the speech partner frequently violates the quantity maxim by providing more information than is necessary, preventing the speaker from having to respond or address follow-up questions.
4. The communication partner comprehends the speaker's implication in the inquiry, which enables the speech partner to react right away with the desired action of the speaker that differs from the expressed expression. Because they

contradict what has been said, the speech partner's responses in conversation often go against the rule of relevance.

C. Conclusion

Based on the findings of the research mentioned above, it can be concluded that there are several violations of the principle of cooperation that result in conversational implicatures in the drama script *ahlul kahfi* in the work of Taufiq Al-hakim, namely, there are maxims of quality, maxims of quantity, and maxims of relation, but there are no violations of the maxim of manner in the speech between characters in the drama script *ahlul kahfi* the first part, and Additionally, each conversational implicature in the play text has a conditional meaning that is adjusted to the conditions present at the time it is pronounced, resulting in unique meanings depending on the context.

The factors that influence speakers or speech partners to use conversations that violate maxims between speakers and speech partners for a variety of reasons include the lack of information, the speech partner's desire to conceal information, the speech partner's aversion to having his or her actions questioned again, or the speech partner's knowledge of the speaker's implied intent.

REFERENCES

- Basuki, Imam Agus. *Linguistika: Teori dan Terapannya*. Yogyakarta: CV. Grafika Indah, 2005.
- Chaer, Abdul. *Tata Bahasa Indonesia Praktis*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2011.
- Dwi Nurwendah, Yusti, dan Intan Annisaul Mahera. "Kajian Pragmatik dalam Bahasa Arab: Analisis Bentuk dan Fungsi Tindak Tutur Direktif Bahasa Arab dalam Film 'Ashabul Kahfi.'" *Tsaqafiya: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Sastra Arab*, 1, 1 (2019).
- Gede Bambang Erawan, Dewa. "Implikatur Percakapan dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia pada Program Studi Akuntansi Semester 1 FEB UNMAS Denpasar." *Jurnal Santiaji Pendidikan*, 1, 11 (2021).
- Leech, Geoffrey. *Prinsip-prinsip Pragmatik*. Jakarta: UI Press, 2011.
- Levinson, Stephant. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

- Lubis, A. Hamid Hasan. *Analisis Wacana Pragmatik*. Bandung: Penerbit Angkasa, 2011.
- moleong, lexy J. *Metodelogi penelitian kualitatif*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya, 2017.
- Nababan, P.W.J. *Ilmu Pragmatik (Teori dan Penerapannya)*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 1987.
- Nadar, FX. *Pragmatik & Penelitian Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu, 2009.
- Nyoman, Kuntha Ratna. *Teori Metode dan Teknik Penelitian Sastra*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2015.
- Prana Sari, Deby, dan M. Syahrin Effendi. "Implikatur Percakapan dalam Film Sweet 20 Karya Ody C. Harahap." *Diksa: Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 1, 6 (2020).
- Rani, Abdul. *Analisis Wacana; sebuah kajian bahasa dalam pemakaian*. Malang: Bayumedia Publishing, 2004.
- Yule, George. *Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2006.
- Yuniartha, Lia, dan Eva Farhah. "Karakteristik Tokoh Utama dalam Bagian Pertama Naskah Drama *Ahlul Kahfi* Karya Tafi al-Hakim (Analisi Psikologi Sastra)." *Jurnal CMES*, 1, XI (2018).