

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, the writer explore the theories used in the process of analysis about Pragmatics, Implicature, Context, Implicated Premise and Implicated Conclusion.

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader) (Yule, 1996). It has to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves.

Yule defines pragmatics as the study of: (1) speaker meaning, (2) contextual meaning, (3) how more gets communicated than is said, and (4) The expression of relative distance (1996: p.4). First, pragmatics deals with speaker meaning means this has something to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words mean by them. Second, pragmatics deals with contextual meaning with what speakers mean in particular context: to whom they are talking to, when, where, and under what circumstances. Third, pragmatics dealing with how to communicate than what is said. It means it is an interpretation of the speaker's intended meaning. It also is means as the investigation of invisible meaning. Fourth, pragmatics deals with expression of relative distance, whether it is physical or social distance determines the choice between the said and unsaid. Based on how close or distant the listener is, speakers determine how much needs to be said (Yule, 1996: p.3). In this study, pragmatics is used to help

understanding the communication including its context, knowledge of who, when, why, and where the communication takes place.

Pragmatics is different from semiotics. Pragmatics deals with utterances, by which specific events, the intentional acts of speakers at times and places, typically involving language. Logic and semantics traditionally deal with properties of types of expression. Lyons (1977, p.119) found the following:

Although an increasing number of linguists are now beginning to use term “pragmatics” in contrast with ‘semantics,’ most of them do so without associating themselves with the view that linguistics is, or should be, a branch of semiotics. This is also true of the majority of logicians and philosophers who draw a distinction between semantics and pragmatics. Indeed, it is arguable that, by now, the origins of the tripartite distinction in Peirce’s conception of an overall science of semiotics are more or less irrelevant linguists or philosophers. Even less relevant is a subdivision of semiotics and the philosophical movement known as pragmatism.

Specifically, Jackson and Smith (2005) state “In a more focused senses (the one we will use here), pragmatics contrasts with semantics, the study of linguistic meaning, and is the study of how contextual factors interact with linguistic meaning in the interpretation of utterances”.

2.2 Relevance Theory

This study concerns with the Relevance Theory proposed by Sperber and Wilson.

They are the first relevance theorist who proposed this theory. Pérez in his journal (2000) states that Sperber’s and Wilson’s Relevance Theory is nowadays considered as one of the most influential models within the field of pragmatics. It emphasizes the fact that there is a difference between what we say and what we mean, between the abstract semantic representations of sentences and the particular interpretations of utterances in

context. Moreover, Cummings (2005) says that Relevance Theory is more fully developed than Grice's notion of relevance. Therefore, Relevance Theory is considered as an appropriate theory to develop Grice's ideas.

In addition, Cummings (2005) also states that Relevance Theory is the recent theory of human communication that covers Grice's theory of Cooperative Principle, or which is called as four Maxims. Moreover, Sperber and Wilson (2002, cited in Cummings, 2005) also say that all of Grice's maxims can be replaced by a single principle of relevance.

Meanwhile, with Grice's theory of Cooperative Principle or as four Maxims, when the people are communicating, they must give information as required. It should not be too much or too short. They must give true information and relevant as expected as speaker mean. And also they should give information briefly so that they can avoid ambiguity. But, in the real communication they cannot fulfill the four maxims. In short, the people must obey the four maxims in order to get successful communication. Here, the fundamental of Grice's idea is that people need to be cooperative when they are communicating.

Grice's idea of Cooperative Principle is contrast with Sperber's and Wilson's Relevance Theory. In Relevance Theory, it can be said that in order to get successful communication people do not need to obey the maxims as suggested by Grice, but rather people should come to the relevance by understanding the others' intention. In relevance, anything may deliver intention. Furthermore, Sperber and Wilson (1995) state "in relevance, any external stimulus or internal representation which provides an input (a sight, a sound, an utterance, a memory) to cognitive processes may be relevant to an

individual at some time.” That is why no matter how much maxims we disobey in an utterance, the communication still will run well.

There are some ways to come to relevance as stated by (2000, p.102):

a. Explicature: it is an enrichment of original utterance.

For example, a door says, “*Manager*”. Certainly it is not a door’s name, but by using explicature we have to enrich it to get the intended meaning. In order to come to the intended meaning, we have to be able to elaborate the original statement which is this is Manager’s room, so if you looking for Manager this is the place.

b. Higher level explicature

It is the propositional attitude of the speaker to her utterance. It is closely related to the characteristics of the person who products the utterances. For example, send a SMS to someone until 2 pages. Then the receiver replies it by “*yes*” or “*no*”. In this case, we have to be able to elaborate higher level explicature by understanding the characteristics of the speaker. That is why, when we are communicating, we have to understand the characteristics of the speaker since sometimes every utterance may have different meaning for each person. It is very subjective perhaps for us it is okay, but for others it is not okay.

c. Implicature: it is hidden message.

For example, “*Have you seen my book?*” From that utterance, we can take some contexts to determine the hidden meaning behind the utterance. If the speaker was our room-mate, and sometime we borrowed her book without permission, he might be accusing us of borrowing her book. If the context is like that, then the

implicature is she wants her book back. But, if the speaker is a lecturer, the implicature is s/he wants us to read her/his book if we want to get better understanding.

2.2.1 The Principle of Relevance Theory

According to Sperber and Wilson (1995, p.260) there are two principles of relevance. "First, human cognition tends to be geared to the maximization of relevance. Second, every act ostensive communication communicates presumption of its own optimal relevance." From that statement, it is clear that human's cognition takes significant part in communication. Since, cognition functions as a system that stores knowledge. So that in order to get successful communication, people should have good cognitive ability. That is why, Relevance Theory is so important in communication because its usage is not only to communication, but also the crucial use of cognition in communication.

In addition, Grundy also extracts in his book *Doing Pragmatics* (2000, p.106) about some keys of principles of relevance. Those are explained as follows:

1. Every utterance comes with a guarantee of its own particular relevance. It means that every utterance has its intention, so that to understand an utterance mean to prove its intention.
2. Because the addressees cannot prove the relevance of the utterances they hear without taking context into account. As Sperber and Wilson suggest, "the speaker must make some assumptions about the hearer's cognitive abilities and contextual resources, which will necessarily be reflected in the way she communicates, and in particular in what she chooses to make explicitly or what she chooses to have

implicit (Sperber and Wilson, 1995, p.218). In other words, as a listener we have to be able to make good assumption of the speaker's intention by looking at the context. Since, sometimes in expressing something we state it explicitly and implicitly.

3. However apparently grammaticalized linguistic structure may be, utterances are, as we have seen, radically under-determined. Therefore so a single syntactic relation may represent a very wide of logical and semantic relations. Even the determination of sense requires an inferential process. From this key principle, it can be assumed that although the utterance is grammatically corrects but it does not guarantee that what is intended by the addressor has explicitly stated. So, as the addressee we have to be able to uncover what is the message behind the utterance stated by the addressor.

4. Once the propositional form of an utterance has been fully elaborated, the utterance may be regarded as a premise, taken together with other, non-linguistic premises available to the hearer as contextual resources, enabling him to deduce the relevant understanding. To get clearer understanding, the example is as follows:

"Have you seen my book?"

The example above has been very clear. In other words, it is fully elaborated. So, we do not need to enrich the original statement.

5. The most accessible interpretation is the most relevant. This is as important notion because it enables us to determinate in a principled way. It means that when the

listener can interpret the speaker's utterances, s/he is able to uncover the other's intention based on true ideas.

6. Context is not treated as given common ground, but rather as a set of more or less accessible items of information which are stored in a short term and encyclopedic memories or manifest in the physical environment.

In other words, contexts are the supporter in human's cognition, and it has relation to the human's memories. Since, it depends on background knowledge of the speaker and the listener. If the listener understands the contexts, so s/he is able to catch speaker's intention. From the contexts that have been processed by human's good cognitive ability, the communication will run well.

Another linguist, Mey also suggests in his book *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (2001, p.85), "in Relevance Theory, achieving successful communication by the way of the relevance of what is being said is a sufficient aim in conversation or other verbal interaction." It can be said that the successful communication will be reached when the speaker or the one who makes his/her intention can be inferred by two parties, the addressee and the addressor.

Therefore, principally, according to Relevance Theory, utterance interpretation is searched through the human's cognitive ability, where the addressee's aim is to recover information that is relevant to him/her. Therefore, it is not only conveying messages, but rather seeing the possible and available contexts in which the information process occurs.

2.2.2 Implicature

In Grundy (2000), Paul Grice, an English language philosopher has divided meaning into two. The first meaning is what he called ‘natural meaning’ or conventional implicatures. And the second is ‘non-natural meaning’ or conversational implicatures.

Grice states that “in some cases the conventional meaning of the words used will determine what is implicated, besides helping to determine what is said” (Grundy, 2000).

He implied if conventional implicatures don’t have to occur in conversation and depend on special contexts for interpretation. It associated with specific words and result in additional conveyed meanings when those words are used.

Grice’s logic conversation is based on the idea that contributors to a conversation are rational agents; that is, that they obey a general principle of rationality known as the *cooperative principle* (CP). This principle is formulated as follows “In order to fulfil the cooperative principle, the speaker must follow four maxims of conversation, they are:

Quantity, Quality, Relation and Manner (Grice, 1979, P.45).

Gricean maxims of conversation:

1. Maxim of Quantity: a. Make your contribution as informative as is required. b. Do not make your contribution more information than is required.
2. Maxim of Quality: Try to make your contribution one that is true. a. Do not say what you believe to be false. b. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
3. Maxim of Relation: Be relevant.
4. Maxim of Manner: Be perspicuous. a. Avoid obscurity of expression. b. Avoid ambiguity, c. Be brief, d. Be orderly (Grundy 2000, 74-75).

In his concept, Gries argues that speakers have to be cooperative when they talk and one way of being cooperative is for speaker to give as much information as is expected. The term of implicature is derived from Grice's theory cooperative principle. In Grundy (2000), implicature arise because the addressee assumes that the speaker is abiding by Grice's maxims. In the concept of cooperative principle, if we break or disobey the maxims; there will be implicature which leads to the hidden message. On the other side, Grice emphasizes the term implicature to refer to those inferences that are made, not on the basis of the content expressed, but by virtue of the fact that a speaker trying to make communication as effective as possible chose to utter such a content in these particular circumstances. Implicatures are inferences based on certain assumptions about what the speaker is trying to achieve rather than just on the content of what is said.

For example, "*Can you pass the salt?*". This sentence implies if the speaker would like to pass the salt by the hearer. It is not considered polite to say: 'I want you to pass the salt'. In the sentence is clearly shown if the implicature is found in the inference of word 'can'.

According to Sperber and Wilson, Grice's Cooperative Principles lack of psychological aspect. There are some aspects in Relevance Theory which are different from the Grice's theory. The key concept of Relevance Theory is that in order to have a successful communication, we have to be able to uncover the other's relevance or the speaker's intention. This theory views that successful communication is caused by human cognition. Sperber and Wilson (1995, p.46) state that "a cognitive environment is a set of assumption which psychologically human is able to represent and accept it as true."

2.2.3 Context

Definition of context varies according to type of study, and there is thus not just one correct way of defining context. However, it is obvious that context in communication is not just linguistic information that surrounds an utterance. In the study of communication, context is usually conceived as an extensive and multidimensional concept, which includes social, cognitive, cultural, linguistic, physical, and other non-linguistic context (Prutting, 1982). Therefore, context can be said to encompass all the information that the hearer utilises when interpreting language expressions. For example, the hearer's knowledge and beliefs of what the communication partner knows helps in interpretation of his/her utterances. When interpreting contextual factors, there is a need to make connections between significant role in the pragmatic comprehension process (Leinonen *et al.* 2000).

Linguistics skills alone are not enough for successful communication. In communicative situations, listeners need to work out the meaning of a linguistic expression on the basic of the contextual factors of the situation and the basic of their world knowledge and experiences. Pragmatic comprehension is seen as an ability to utilise context in comprehension (Sperber and Wilson 1995 in Leinonen *et al.* 2000). Thus, communicating successfully calls for the ability to go beyond the information.

Context is very important in determining the meaning of an utterance or sentence since the context will make sense of an utterance. Context plays role as elements such as knowledge, time and place in which the words are uttered or written that influence communication (Cutting, 2002). Furthermore, he distinguishes several types of context.

1. Physical context - this encompasses what is physically present around the speakers/hearers at the time of communication. What objects are visible, where the communication is taking place, what is going on around, etc.

Example, a. *I want that book.* (accompanied by pointing)

b. *Be here at 9:00 tonight.* (place/time reference)

2. Linguistic context – what has been said before in the conversation. The “history” of things said so far.

Example, a. *I can't believe you said that!*

b. *If my mom heard you talk like that, she'd wash your mouth out with soap!*

3. Social context – the social relationship of the people involved in communication.

Example, a. *Mr. President, stop bugging me and go home.* (You can't talk like this to the President.)

b. *I do hereby humbly request that you might endeavour to telephone me with news of your arrival at your domicile when such arrival occurs.* (A bizarre sentence if said to a friend instead of “call me when you get home”.)

4. Epistemic – Knowledge and beliefs of the speaker/hearer.

In Relevance Theory, to be successful in communication, the speaker and hearer have to understand each other and not just based on maxims. In their book of *Relevance:*

Communication and Cognition, Sperber and Wilson believe that people have intuitions of

relevance, that they can distinguish relevant from irrelevant information. Furthermore,

Sperber and Wilson (1995: p. 15-16) explain the definition of context:

A context is a psychological construct, a subset of the hearer's assumptions about the world. It is these assumptions, of course, rather than the actual state of the world, that affect the interpretation of an utterance. A context in this sense is not

limited to information about preceding utterances: expectations about the future, scientific hypothesis or religious beliefs, anecdotal memories, general cultural assumptions, beliefs about the mental state of the speaker, may all play a role in interpretation.

So context is constructed with people knowledge about the world. The more they are knowing about the world they will get information easier. It proposes that any assumption and information we have will be the context which influences our background knowledge. Context gives much influence in communication. If the hearer or the reader lacks adequate sources of context, the implicatures of an utterance will be failed to be understood.

2.2.4 Implicated Premise and Implicated Conclusion

Paul Grice coined the term *implicature* to refer to those inferences that are made, not on the basis of the *content* expressed, but by virtue of the fact that a speaker trying to make communication as effective as possible chose to utter such a content in the particular circumstances. Sperber and Wilson (1995: p.195) distinguish two kinds of implicatures: *implicated premises* and *implicated conclusions*.

Implicatures of an utterance could be defined as “Those contextual assumptions and implications which the hearer has to recover in order to satisfy himself that the speaker has observed the principle of relevance” (Sperber and Wilson in Perez, 2000).

The definition presented above proposes that implicature consists of contextual assumption and contextual implication. In terms of Relevance Theory, contextual assumption is called *implicated premise*, and contextual implication is called *implicated conclusion* (Sperber and Wilson, 1995).

Furthermore, Sperber and Wilson clarify that implicated premise is provided by the hearer, by retrieving them from memory or building them by developing assumption schemas retrieved from memory. It is possible to identify the premises as implicatures since they are clearly the most easily reachable premises to do. Whereas, implicated conclusion is inferred by explicating the utterance and looking at the context. It is possible to identify such conclusions as implicatures since the speaker must have expected the hearer to receive them, or some of them. It suggests that the speaker intends his utterance to be clearly relevant to the hearer. Hence, implicated premise and implicated conclusion are parts of the first inferable explanation consistent with the principle of relevance (Sperber and Wilson 1995: p. 195). To get more understanding, an example is presented below:

A.) *John: "Can you lend me some money?"*

B.) *Mary: "Oh John, you know if today is 25th September".*

From the conversation above, we cannot be totally sure what Mary's implies. We are not sure whether she can give John some money or not. The expression in B does not answer directly the question expressed in A. however, it is interpreted as an utterance consistent with the principle of relevance. To be a rational answer, B is processed in a context that contains premises, as well as the hearer has to provide premises C and D:

C.) *25th September is 5 more last days in September.*

D.) *Mary always gets her salary on 1st.*

After A and B are processed in a context containing premises C and D, then they are combined with those premises to calculate the implicated conclusion E:

E.) *Mary will not lend John money.*

From the example above, Mary does not answer John's question explicitly, but she makes a contextually implied answer. The implied answer is intentional, that is an implicature of his utterance, statement C and D as well E are implicatures of B. both implicated premises and implicated conclusions are provided by the hearer. Those premises and conclusions are identified as implicatures regarding the fact that they lead to an interpretation consistent with the principle of relevance.

2.3 Previous Studies

Implicature is one of the major subjects in Pragmatics. It is interesting for many researchers in Linguistics field, that is why the study of implicature has got great attention. It is indicated by the increasing number of studies conducted on the subject of implicature or other subjects related to it.

Wulansari (2010), in her thesis entitled *An Analysis of Implicatures using Relevance Theory in On-Line Conversation On Yahoo! Messenger* had studied implicature based on the theory proposed by Sperber and Wilson. Wulansari pointed out that Relevance Theory was successfully works in her research. She found that implicature in on-line conversation derives from contextual effect. The contextual effect is obtained from background knowledge of the participants especially addressee's cognition. Furthermore, she exposes that implicature can be identified not only by deciding the maxims that are flouted, but the conversation will run smoothly because the addressee is able to understand the speaker's intention which is not literally stated.

The study of implicature was also conducted by Rita Margareta (2010) entitled *Conversational Implicature Analysis of Cigarette Advertisement Slogans*. She investigated the conversational implicature in cigarette advertisement slogans by using

Paul Grice's theory that is Cooperative Principle. In her research, the subject is advertisement slogan that she investigated it by using the questioner to know the response of the people related to the memorability and the understandability to the slogan of cigarette. In her study, she analyzed customers opinion about the slogans instead of just analyzing the kinds of implicature and the hidden meaning. The data of her study is taken directly from the cigarette customer.

Though similar to some previous studies about implicature, this study is different. The second of study analyzed implicature based on the theory of Paul Grice, and using the Cooperative Principle as the basic of her study. Meanwhile, in this research the writer tries to use another theory to analyze implicature, that is the Relevance Theory proposed by Sperber and Wilson which is similar with the first previous study. Unlike the previous study, the writer also tries to use something different from her object of the study. In previous she used on-line Yahoo! Messenger to be analyzed, in this research the writer analyzes utterances in advertisements on back hard cover Kartini magazines from January to December 2012 editions. Hence, this study of implicature in advertisement by using Relevance Theory is the new one and it could enrich the finding about implicature from the previous studies.