CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, it is presented the detail definition of some theories that become supporting theory in this analysis. The given theories are expected to provide more understanding to the readers about discourse analysis, pragmatics, stylistics, figure of speech, and a number of repetitions which are related to the problem analysis.

2.1 Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis (DA) or discourse studies are a general term for a number of approaches to analyze written, spoken, and signed language use. Nunan (1993:7) says that discourse is a study that involved language in use. Discourse also can be described as language beyond the sentence because discourse not only study language beyond the sentence boundary, but also prefer to analyze 'naturally occurring' language use, and not invented examples. George Yule states that the word "discourse" is usually defined as "language beyond the sentences" and the analysis of discourse is typically concerned with the study of language in text and conversation. Text of discourse consists of more than one sentence and the sentences combine to form a meaningful whole. It means, there are relations between one text to another text that make the text became coherent text.

2.2 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the study of words meaning, phrases and sentences. Sometimes we are difficult to distinctive among semantics between pragmatics. Semantics is deal

with the objective word meaning that can be found in dictionaries, but pragmatics is more concerned with the intended meaning of the speakers that they want to convey. As Yule (1996:3) states that pragmatics is the study that involve the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said. It considers to where, who they are talking to, when, and under circumstances. In every conversation, there are intended meaning, assumptions, purposes or goal, and the kinds of actions as the impact when people utter or say something. According to Mey, pragmatics is the study of language use in human communication as determined by the condition of society (2001:6). Then, Levinson argued that pragmatics is the study of the relationship between language and context that underlie the explanation of language understanding. Here, understanding or comprehension language refers to the fact that to understand expression or utterance, knowledge is also needed beyond the meaning of words and grammar relations, namely to do with the context of its use (1983:9). Based on theories above can be concluded that Pragmatics is not only the study of the ability of language users to connect and harmonize sentences and context, but also connected with the situation or context outside of the language. Pragmatics is also seen as a means of interaction or communication in society. Languages and speakers of languages are not observed individually but always associated with activity in society. Language is not only seen as individual phenomena but also social phenomena.

2.2.1 Context

Moving on to what pragmatics and discourse analysis above, we can start by saying that they approach to study languages relation to the contextual background

features. Stilwell and Yule in Cutting argued that both pragmatics and discourse analysis, the one focused is in study of word context, analyzing the parts of meaning that can be explained by knowledge of physical and social world, and the socio-psychological factors influencing communication, as well as the knowledge of the time and place in which the words are uttered or written (2002: 2).

In a context, the expression is the one factor that can support the clearly intention of utterances. Context consists of the situation, speaker, hearer, time, place, scene, topic, event, code and means. Context can help understand the purpose of the speaker. According to Hymes in Bauman and Sherzer, he adapted, rearranged, and extended his earlier model of a speech event, devoting attention also to the problem of the social locus of description. As reformulated, the framework is coded mnemonically by SPEAKING thus: "S" Setting, or Scene, "P" Participants or Personnel, "E" Ends (both goals/purposes and outcomes), "A" Act Characteristics (both the form and the content of what is said), "K" Key (tone, manner, or spirit in which an act is done), "I" Instrumentalities (channel and code), N" Norms of Interaction and of Interpretation, "G" Genres (categories types of speech act and speech event). This theory—SPEAKING theory—use to analyze the small unit in particular of speech community (1975:95). Context also focused on the meaning of words in interaction and how the speakers communicate more information than the words they use. The speaker`s meaning is depended on the situation that happen at that time.

Context –at least in Mey`s view— is more than just reference, but context is action and is about understanding what things are for; it is also what gives our

utterances their true pragmatics meaning and allows them to be counted as true pragmatics acts (2001:41). From the theories above can be concluded that context is a meaning that arise in the word used. That is the meaning that appears as an extra in addition to the true meaning of meaning in the form of impressions and therefore posed a particular situation. Context is supported by the situation, speaker, hearer, time, place, scene, topic, event, code and means. By looking at the context, what the intention of the speaker can be delivered clearly to the hearer or listener.

2.3 Stylistics

Basically, stylistics is concern about the study of style in language. Style is a method or action to give something new and to achieve satisfaction. Style is a matter how to use and interpret language typically, not the typical language in dictionary. It means about the distinctiveness of selection, manipulation, and combination the words. As Leech and Short (1981:10) said that stylistics is the study of style which indicates the way in which language is use in certain context by a certain person for a certain purpose.

Unconsciously, we use style in our habitual activities, in oral or written. In each of our appearance, style is an interpretation of style itself. In speech, the usage of stylistics is how to utter something in a certain way, so that the intended purpose can be achieved maximally. In this stylistics analysis use four general features which may or may not be significant in a given text: lexical categories, grammatical categories, figure of speech, and cohesion and context. That is why this research is focused to the figure of speech.

2.3.1 Figure of Speech

Figure of speech can be defined as a way of describing something by equating it with something else. According to Nyoman Kutha Ratna (2009:164), figure of speech is certain of selection word that describes the speaker`s or author`s intended meaning to get an artistic aspect. It means that we can not interpret the meaning of the whole sentence by lexical meaning interpretation.

Figure of speech can also be regarded as a style or way used by writer to create certain affects on reader. The artistic aspect also can be found in each sentence that contains figure of speech in it. Generally, figures of speech defined into four, namely comparative figure of speech, conflicts figure of speech, innuendo figure of speech and confirmation figure of speech.

2.3.1.1 Comparative Figure of Speech

Figure of speech which is the comparison used to express something by comparing it with something else.

2.3.1.1.1 Simile

In Odle`s view, simile is a comparison between two distinct things using the words like, as, or as though (2012:13). Example: she is as beauty as a rose.

2.3.1.1.2 Metaphor

Cuddon (1998:507) states that metaphor is a figure of speech in which one thing is described in terms of another. He further states that metaphor is a comparison which is usually implicit, whereas in simile it is explicit. Example: life is a zoo in a jungle.

2.3.1.2 Conflicts Figure of Speech

Figure of speech that reveals the contradiction that is anything but a statement of intent to the contrary.

2.3.1.2.1 Antithesis

Antithesis—at least in Bonn`s view—is refers to words or phrase that is the direct opposite of something (2010:14). Example: old young, small and great, rich and poor have equal responsibility before God.

2.3.1.3 Innuendo Figure of Speech

The figure of speech or style of language used to insinuate someone or something.

2.3.1.3.1 Irony

Naufaldi stated that irony is figure of speech that expressed the opposite meaning, with the intention of insinuating (2013). Example: really good writing, to the extent that I can not read.

2.3.1.4 Confirmation Figure of Speech

Figure of speech or a statement of affirmation that is used to reinforce the statement stated.

2.3.1.4.1 Anticlimax

Anticlimax—at least in Cuddon`s view—is refers to sentence in which the last part expresses something lower than the first (1998:42). Example: let a hundred thousand, ten thousand, a thousand, a hundred dollars I was not going to spend money to buy useless goods.

2.3.1.4.2 Rhetoric

Nyoman (2008:443) states that rhetoric is an interrogative sentence which does not need an answer. Example: all of you here, who want to be a president ?

2.3.1.4.3 Repetition

In Hecht`s view, repetition is a mode of figure of speech of emphasizing a point by saying it more than once. He further states that repetition is the simple repeating of a word, within a sentence or a poetical line, with no particular placement of the words, in order to emphasize (1992). Nyoman (2008:441-443) states some types of repetition, they are:

2.3.1.4.3.1 Anadiplosis

In Cuddon`s view, Anadiplosis is repetition of the last word of one clause at the beginning of the following clause to gain a special effect (1998:34). Example: When I think, I think myself.

2.3.1.4.3.2 Anaphora

Cuddon (1998:37) states that anaphora is a rhetorical device involving the repetition of a word or group of words in successive clauses.

Example: Your attitude makes us disappointed.

Your attitude breaks down my mom`s heart.

In this research, not all figures of speech can be found in the analysis.