CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter present the discussion of pragmatics, text, context, and implicature.

2.1 Pragmatics

Yule (1996:3) said that pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning. In other word, concerning human uses language, what the writer (a speaker) means and how the reader (a listener) interprets the words uttered. As Aitchison (2003:104) in Dornerus (2005:4) said pragmatics is the branch of linguistics which studies how speakers use language to achieve their goals and how hearers interpret the meaning the speaker wishes to convey.

The using of advertisement in pragmatic implicature has many good, such as attract the customers' attention for buying of the product. Thus, can be the evidence of advertiser tryi to make a good social relationship with the customer. Meanwhile, the advantage of studying language via pragmatics is that one can talk about people's intended meanings, their assumptions, their purposes or goals and the kinds of actions (Yule, (1966:4).Furthermore, the pragmatic implicature, it is better to understand the advertising language and help develop the design of new and more exquisite advertisements (Al-azzawi 2009:2).

2.1.1 Text

Text is the verbal record of the communicative event (Brown and Yule, 1996:190). A text is not only a product, but a process in which the writer and the reader interact with each other (Vivanco, 2006:2). In other word, text in slogan advertisement is not only just a product to inform the people or reader as the customer of the product how interesting and good the quality and quantity of the product, but also a process being interaction happens both of the writer as the producer of the product and the reader as the customer.

To identify text as forming a text, there are principles of connectivity which bind a text together and force co-interpretation.

2.1.1.1 Cohesion

A text has texture and this is what distinguishes it from something is not a text (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:2 in Brown and Yule, 1996:191). As recited in Yule (2010:143):

> "Textsmust have a certain structure that depends on factorsquite different from those required in the structure of a single sentence. Some of thosefactors are described in terms of cohesion, or the ties and connections that exist withintexts."

Cohesion is what meshes the text together. Thus,cohesive relationship within the provider of texture are present to set up a text where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another (Brown and Yule, 1996:191). A paradigm example such from cohesive relationship:

(1) Peel and slice the five red onions. Fried them into griddle.

The text above it is clear that *them* in the second sentence refers back to (*them* is called Anaphoric) the five red onions in the first sentence. The function of the Anaphoric *them*is giving cohesion to the two sentences, so that the writer interpret *them* as a whole that the two sentences together constitute a text.

2.1.1.2 Endophora

In this section, this form direct the hearer or reader to interpret within a text, it is called endophoric relation. However, endhopora is co-reference instruct the hearer or reader to look inside the text to find what is being referred to (Brown and Yule, 1996:199). This form also cohesive ties within the text. There are two kinds of endophoric relations: anaphoric relations and cataphoric relations. Anaphoric relations is looking back in the text for their interpretation. Cataphoric relations is looking forward in the text for their interpretation. These relationship are exemplified in:

a. Endophora:

(i) Anaphoric: look at the butterfly. It is flying beautifully. (*It* refers back to *the butterfly*).

(ii) Cataphoric: it's flying beautifully, the butterfly. (*It* refers forwards to *the butterfly*).

Those examples are relationship of co-reference that was illustrated as holding between a full lexical expressions *the butterfly* and *it* (1996: 193).

2.1.1.3 Substitution

Substitution is an expression may simply be replaced by another in the text(1996: 201). They are not alone in this view. Consider the example above in text (1) reproduced here:

Peel and slice the five red onions. Fried them into griddle.

The writer commented, it is clear that *them*in the second sentence replaced *the five red onions*in the second sentence. As other example drawn by Cutting (2002:11) with lyrics a song:

> *Little boxes on the hillside,*
> *Little boxes made of ticky-tacky,*
> *Little boxes, little boxes,*
> *Little boxes, all the same.*
> *There's a green one and a pink one*
> *And a blue one and a yellow one*
> *And they're all made out of ticky-tacky*
> *And they all look just the same.*
> *(Reynolds 1963)*

The lines '*There's a green one and a pink one / And a blue one and a yellow one*' contain the substitute '*one*'. As with endophoric reference, substitution holds the text together and avoids repetition: *a green one* replaces *a green box*, the *one* substituting for the *box*.

2.1.2   Context

Understanding language not only concern with a text but also context. Means, it's important for understanding context behind what is said to be what is understood.

Such as Brown and Yule (1996:35) said since the beginning of the 1970s, linguist have become increasingly aware of the importance of context in the interpretation of sentences.

There two kinds of context, linguistic context and situational context. First, linguistic context also known as co-text (Brown, Yule 1996:46 and Fromkin, Rodman, Hyams 2011:207). The co-text of a word is the set of other words used in the same phrase or sentence. The surrounding co-text has a strong effect on what we think the word probably means (Yule, 2010:129). Example such as in (Yule 2010:129) the writer identified the word 'can' as a Homonym. Homonym is a single word but there have two meanings. To know which is intended meaning in particular sentence, we normally do such as on basis linguistic context. If word 'can' together with *water* and *fish*, we have no problem deciding which type of *can* is meant. Or, we hear someone say that 'I can get a fish', we know from this linguistic context which type of *can* is intended. And other explanation about linguistic context has explained above in text.

Second, situational context is virtually nonlinguistic in the environment of the speaker in which a sentence or discourse happens. Situational context includes the speaker, hearer, and any third parties present, along with their beliefs and their beliefs about what the others believe. It includes the physical environment, the social milieu the subject of conversation, the time of day, and so on. (Fromkin, Rodmin, Hyams 2011:207). A context can support a range of meanings. As other linguist,Hymes in

Brown and Yule (1996: 37) said the role of context in interpretation as, on the one hand, limiting the range of possible interpretation and, on the other, as supporting the intended interpretation. To know about the meaning and context, Hymesin Coulthard (1985: 44) sets about specifying of context;

a.   **Setting**

All speech events occur of necessity in time and space. Sometimes it is one of the defining criteria of an event that it occurs at a specific time or in specific place (Coulthard, 1985:44).

b.   **Participant**

Goffman (1979) in Coulthard (1985:45) said that traditionally speech has been described in terms of two participants, a speaker who transmits a message and a listener who receives it. However, while in the majority of situations the person who is speaking is also the addressor or the author.

c.   **Purposes**

All speech events or speech acts has a purpose. Purpose here is the goal of the communications (Coulthard, 1985:47).

d.   **Topic**

Topic here is what is being talked about (Brown and Yule, 1963:38).

e.   **Key**

Vakili,Kashandi and Tabande (2012) said that in the course of social interaction, participants offer each other signals as how to interpret the message

content. It refers to the tone, manner, or spirit in which a particular message is conveyed, such as: lighthearted,serious, mocking, sarcastic and so on. The key may also be marked nonverbally by certain kind of behavior, gesture, posture, or attitude.

f.   Channel

Channel is how the contact between the participants in the event being maintained, by speech, writing or signing.

g.   Message form

Message form are illustrated within the three main components which are the purpose of the speech event, the goals and finally the outcome of the conversation. While, Brown and Yule (1963:38) said that the message form is what form is intended.

2.1.3   Implicature

Grice's most important influential contribution to philosophy and linguistics is his theory. According to Grice, what a speaker means by an utterance can be divided into what the speaker 'says' and what the speaker thereby 'implicates' (Neale 1992:523-524)

Bottyan. G (2010) said that Grice's analyzed the implicature is as like the sum of what is said in a sentence and what is implicated in an utterance of the same sentence is called the total signification of an utterance (Grice 1978=1989:41). In the

other hand, such as an example, in the middle of their lunch hour, one woman asks another how she likes the pizza she is eating, and she receives the answer in (a).

(a)   A pizza is a pizza.

The reply in (a) seems to have no communicative value since it expresses something completely obvious. The example (a) pointless expressions like 'business is business' or 'boys will be boys' are called *tautologies*. That something must be more than just what the words mean. It is an additional conveyed meaning called *Implicature*(Yule 1996:35).

According to Grice in Malchenko (2003:25) and Christopher Potts (2014) divided the implicature by two types.

2.1.3.1 Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicatures are the centerpiece of Gricean pragmatics (Grice, 1989) and its subsequent developments. On Grice's conception, they require speakers to reason not only in terms of their language but also their understanding of the context and each other's goals and intentions. This places conversational implicatures at the center of debates about the distinction between semantics and pragmatics and guarantees them a leading role in investigations of language and social cognition (Christopher: 2014, P: 15). Then this following is an example of Conversational implicature:

A: Is that scotch over there?

B: Help Yourself.

A's utterance is literally a request for information (on the nature of the liquor), yet B interprets it as a request for a drink. Nothing in the literal meaning of A's utterance could lead B to that interpretation, which can only be derived by means of conversational implicature.

The conversational implicature also divided into three sub categorizations. The first sub is generalized conversational implicature that is the reader or the listener is not required to have special background knowledge or shared knowledge in context to give the additional conveyed meaning, Yule (1996:40). Example:

Inez: did you see Ira and Ayu?

Zoya: I see Ayu.

From the example above, from Inez question about asking did Zoya see Ira and Ayu, Zoya answer is clear that she only see Ayu. There, does not need any additional conveyed meaning or background knowledge for answering. It make the listener easily understand that Zoya only see Ayu, and she did not see Ira.

The second sub is scalar implicature, scalar implicature is occurring when a speaker selects the word from the scale which is the most informative and truthful (quantity and quality) in the circumstances, Yule (1996:41). As following example:

They're sometimes really confusing.

In the example above, the speaker use the word 'sometime' which is giving a meaning that it is not always and not often.

The last sub is particularized conversational implicature that is in particularized implicature inferences are required to work out the conveyed meanings, Yule (1996: 42 in Yuniar (2015). Such as an example below:

Inez: 'hi, coming to the Zoya's graduation party tonight?'

Ira: 'my boyfriend is visiting.'

From the conversation's example above, the Ira's question should be 'yes' or 'no'. So, to make Ira's answer is relevant, Inez has to draw on some assumed knowledge of Ira's answering that Ira will spend his tonight with his boyfriend, so it means that tonight Ira is not going to the party.

2.1.3.2 Conventional Implicature

Grice (1975) defines two major classes of meaning that are supposed to fall outside of "what is said (in the favored sense)": conversational implicatures, discussed above, and now is conventional implicatures.

A conventional implicature is generated by meanings of words used (and so is a semantic, not a pragmatic, phenomenon). The two classes share the 'implicature' designation, but it's an uneasy union; as we'll see, conventional implicatures have

more in common with presuppositions and at-issue entailments than they do with conversational implicatures (Potts: 2014, P: 27). Further, Potts (2003:282) gives the definition of conventional implicature that related Grice's definition, as the following definitions;

a. Conventional implicatures are part of the conventional (lexical) meaning of words.

b. Conventional implicatures are commitments, and thus give rise to entailments.

c. These commitments are made by *the speaker of the utterance* "by virtue of the meaning of" the words he chooses.

d. Conventional implicatures are logically and compositionally independent of what is "*said* (in the favored sense)", i.e., independent of the at-issue entailments.

Grice gives the following convincing examples:

He is poor but honest

An utterance stating that honesty appears contrary to expectations in relation to financial under privileges.

John is an Englishman therefore he is brave.

An utterance which triggers entailment built on the argumentative of reaching a conclusion based on a set of premises:

-     Premise 1: All Englishman are brave.
-     Premise 2: John is an Englishman.
-     Conclusion: John is brave.

Further, the explanation from Melchenko (2003:22) by inserting 'therefore' the speaker implicates that being brave is a consequence of being an Englishman. Thus, conventional implicatures are similar to presuppositions in this respect. As Karttunen and Peters (1979) said that there is no distinction between presupposition and conventional implicatures. The only quality that distinguishes implicatures from other standard types of presupposition is that the conventional implicatures are often more cancellable than presupposition.

Further, Potts (2007:3) said Grice identifies the descriptive meaning with 'what is said'.

a.   Thora is a baby, but she is quiet.

Descriptive: Thora is a baby, and she is quiet.

Conventional Implicature: Babies are not usually quiet.

b.   Mack is still swimming.

Descriptive: Mack is swimming.

Conventional Implicature: Mack was swimming earlier.

c.   Even Christin passed the test.

Descriptive: Christine passed the test.

Conventional Implicature: Christin was among the least likely to pass the test.

Potts specifies the descriptive meaning with confident equalities.