CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

II.1 Figure of Speech Theory

II.1.1 The Definition of Figure of Speech

Dealing with the use of figure of speech by the presenters of *Kiss* we should first know what is meant by figure of speech. Using figure of speech means we use language out of its literal meaning or say one thing that means another. As Perrine says it is the use of language that cannot be taken literally (Perrine, 1969:65).

In the twenty-eight century a figure of speech was known as a trope meaning a turn. Since the word trope was considered as a beautiful language and misleading it was changed into a figure of speech (Keraf, 1985:129). According to Perrine, figures of speech are another way of adding extra dimensions to language. He also says that figure of speech is anyway of saying something other than the ordinary way (Perrine, 1969:65).

Reashe adds that figurative language is that kind of language that departs from the language employed in the traditional, literal ways of describing persons or objects (Reashe, 1969:33). It deals not only the word itself but also the context.

II.1.2 The Functions of Figures of Speech

Figure of speech has many functions. By using figure of speech we can say what we want to say more vividly and forcefully then by saying it directly (Perrine, 1969:65). He also says that figurative language or figure of speech often provides a more effective mean of saying what something means than direct statement (Perrine, 1969:79). Further, Perrine explains what is meant by effective. He says first, a figure of speech affords the readers imaginative pleasure so a figure of speech provides them sources of pleasure in the exercise of imagination (Perrine, 1969:79). Second, he says figurative language brings additional imagery into verse, makes the abstract concrete and makes poetry more sensuous (Perrine, 1969:79). Third, figurative language adds emotional intensity to informative statements and conveys attitude along with information (Perrine, 1969:79). The last function of figure of speech Perrine says figurative language like words may be multidimensional requires dozens of words to state in literal language (Perrine, 1969:80).

Keraf proposes another functions of figure of speech. He says that figure of speech can be used to explain, strengthen, stimulate association, humor sense, activate dead object, or for symbol (Keraf, 1985:129).

II.1.3 Types of Figures of Speech

There are many types of figure of speech but in this study the writer limits the types of figure of speech into ten types from three groups. They are:

a. Figure of Comparison

1. Simile

Zarefsky (1999) defines simile as an explicit statement that one thing is like another. It clearly invites the audience to see the new or the unknown in familiar term. In other words, simile is a figure of speech in which one thing is directly compared with another. The comparison is usually signaled by the terms "as" or "like" or "such'.

Example:

- He was as strong as a lion.

- It shot out like a bullet.

2. Metaphor

According to Zarefsky metaphor discusses one thing in terns of another rather than stating that one thing is like another. It assumes as much and names the thing as though it actually were the other (Zarefsky, 1999:269). Metaphor is type of figure of speech in which one thing is compared to another, either directly or by implication. Metaphor is different to simile in a way that in metaphor two things are said to be the same whereas in a simile they are only like each other.

Example:

- Life is but a walking shadow.

- I am the way, the truth and the life.

3. Personification

Personification is a figure of speech in which things are described, as having human's characters. Perrine describes personification consists in giving the attributes of a human being to animal, an object, or an idea (Perrine, 1969:67). It is really a subtype of metaphor, an implied comparison in which the figurative terms of the comparison is always a human being (Perrine, 1969:64). Zarefsky defines personification as of the abstract or complex ideas in human terms. It is a powerful means of achieving vividness. He also adds that personification makes issues concrete and enables listeners to identify with another specific person (Zarefsky, 1999:269). Hatch and Brown (1995) say that in personification we talk about objects as though they were people and that we are asking the listener to assign the qualities of humanness to objects.

Example:

- Earth **felt** the salt in her wound.

  (Furman, 1995.27 April 2004)

- My car whines **in pain** as it climbs up steep hills.

  (Furman, 1995.27 April 2004)

b. Figure of Contradiction

1. Hyperbole

Hyperbole is the use of exaggeration for emphasis or usually known as an overstatement. According to Perrine a hyperbole is simply

exaggeration but exaggeration in the service of truth. When we use hyperbole we are merely adding emphasis to what we really mean (Perrine, 1969:101). Like all figures of speech, overstatement or hyperbole may be used with a variety of effects. It may be humorous or grave, fanciful or restrained, convincing or unconvincing (Perrine, 1969:101).

Example:

- My grandmother was **as old as the hills**.

- She cried a **flood of tears**.

2. Paradox

Paradox is a figure of speech in which a statement appears to be self-contradictory but contains something of a truth. As said by Perrine, paradox is any apparent contradiction that is nevertheless somehow is true either a situation or a statement (Perrine, 1969: 100). He also adds that when we understand all the conditions and circumstances involved in a paradox, we find that at first seemed impossible is actually entirely plausible and not strange at all. In a paradoxical statement the contradiction usually stems from one of the words being used figuratively or in more than one sense (Perrine, 1969:100).

Example:

- The **child is a father** to the man.

- Cowards **die** many times **before their death.**

3. Irony

Irony is a figure of speech that tries to implicate something real differently and sometimes contradictive with it truly mean. Perrine says that irony is saying the opposite of what one means (Perrine, 1969:104). He adds that it is a literally device or figure that may be used in the service of sarcasm and ridicule or may not (Perrine, 1969:104). Further Perrine says that like all figures of speech, irony runs the danger of being misunderstood. If irony is misunderstood, the reader goes away with exactly the apparent idea from that the user meant to convey (Perrine, 1969:105).

Example:

- Wake up! It is still nine in the morning. (Tarigan, 1969:63)

- I see you have put on your **best clothes!**

4. Climax

Climax is a figure of speech that is in a stretch of statement in which the next statement is emphasizing the previous one.

Example:

- Pain may bring patience, patience in experience, hope in experience. (Keraf, 1985:124)

- In addition, literary scholars have a long length of time to choose; to think over and even to create new methods and certain

formation in delivering their messages; they also have liberation to go over the conventional writings. (Keraf, 1985:124)

c. Figures of Association or relationship

1. Metonymy

Metonymy is a figure of speech in which an attribute or a suggestive word is substituted for a name of something. According to Hatch and Brown (1995) metonymy is the category where something is closely connected (but not a part) is used to refer to the whole.

Example:

Metonymy	Thing represented
The Crown	the monarchy
Whitehall	the civil service

2. Synecdoche

Synecdoche is a figure of speech in which a part of something is substituted for the whole thing. The part chosen is usually important or essential and the whole (although implied) is easily recognized or understood. According to Cockroff & Cockroff (1992:122) synecdoche is a combinative device involving a relationship between an expressed idea and an unexpressed one. It works on the mathematical principle of dividing a whole into its parts.

Example:

- **United** won the match

    United stands for Manchester United Football Club.

- Give us this day our daily **bread**

    Bread stands for the meals eaten each day.

3. Erotema or Rhetorical question

Erotema or rhetoric question is a figure of speech in which asking a question to differ or to assert something but it is not expected to answer. It is a powerful device because; although it has the appearance of being a question it often acts as a form of persuasion or criticism. Zarefsky says that a rhetoric question is one for which we do not really expect an answer. We ask question solely to make the audience think about an issue to quickly reach the obvious answer, which we already know (Zarefsky, 1969:270).

Example:

- How many times have I told you...?

- Is our country in danger of becoming a hotbed of sleaze? We might have a politician ask 'Are we going to stand by and let these atrocities continue?

II.2 Discourse Analysis

Since this study deals with the use of language in context the writer uses discourse analysis theory to frame the analysis. According to Mc McCarthy (1991:12) discourse analysis is concerned with the study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used. He also says that discourse analysis studies language in use: written texts of all kinds, and the spoken data, from conversation to highly institutionalized forms of talk. Brown and Yule define discourse analysis as the analysis of language in used. Further they explain that discourse analyst is committed to an investigation of what that language is used for (Brown & Yule, 1983:1).

As a language-users when we hear a piece of discourse we do not only try to understand what the words mean but also the speaker's meaning or what they intend to convey. As Yule says that when we as language-users asking how it is that language-users interpret what others intend to convey we are undertaking what is known as discourse analysis (1985:104).

II.3 Pragmatics

II.3.1 The Definition of Pragmatics

Yule (1985) defines pragmatics as the study of intended speaker meaning. He then adds that when we read or hear pieces of language, we normally try to understand not only what the words mean, but also what the writer or speaker of those words intended to convey (Yule, 1985:97).

Verdonk supports the definition of pragmatics by defining it as the study of what people mean by language when they use it in an appropriate context to achieve particular purposes (Verdonk, 2002:19). (Yule, 1985:97).

II.3.2 The Aim of Pragmatics

The aim of pragmatics is to bring a further point. As said by Blum-Kulka (1997), words can mean more or something other than what they say even the same phrase may have different meanings on different occasions. Later he says that pragmatics as a theory could explain how interlocutors bridge the gap between sentence meanings and speaker meanings. Hatch (1992:260) also says that pragmatics helps to explain why and when particular language forms, rather than others, are selected.

Dijk (1977) says that pragmatics has the task of studying the relationships between signs and their users. Further he explains that pragmatics has three tasks. The first task is to provide successfulness conditions for the utterance-act and explain in what respect such an act may be a component in a course of interaction in which it is either accepted or rejected by another agent. Second task of pragmatics is to formulate the principles underlying such courses of verbal interaction, which must be satisfied for an utterance act to be successful. Third he explains that since the data are largely available only in the form of utterance, it should be clear in pragmatics how conditions of success for the utterance as act, as well as principles of communicative interaction are connected with the structure or interpretation of the discourse.

II.3.3 Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics

Discourse analysis and pragmatics have much in common. Cutting (2002:1) says that discourse analysis and pragmatics are approaches to study language's relation to the contextual background features. Brown and Yule state that doing discourse analysis is primarily doing pragmatics. Further they explain that in discourse analysis, as in pragmatics, we are concerning with what people using language are doing and accounting for the linguistic features in the discourse as the means employed in what they are doing (Brown & Yule, 1983:26).

Besides those things that both discourse analysis and pragmatics have in common, they also have differences. The difference between discourse analysis and pragmatics lies in the emphasis on the text structure of discourse analysis. Coulthard (1986) cited in Cutting (2002:2) says that discourse analysis studies how large chunks of language beyond the sentence level are organized, how the social transaction imposes a framework on discourse. Further he says that discourse analysis has covered certain situations have fixed sequences in the overall framework of the exchange, and conversation structure or how what one speaker says can influence the next speaker's response (Cutting, 2002:2).

Pragmatics differs from discourse analysis in a way that it can explain the social principles of discourse. It takes a socio-cultural perspective on language usage, examining the way that the principles of social behavior are expressed is determined by the social distance between speakers. It also can describe the unwritten maxims of conversation that speaker follow in order to cooperate and be socially acceptable to each other (Cutting, 2002:3). This is important since this

study attempts to find out what the speaker (the presenters of *Kiss*) imply when using figures of speech. Meaning that it concerns with the speaker's intended meaning when using figures of speech, which is the concern of pragmatics study.

II.3.4 Pragmatics and Non-literal Uses of Language

Metaphor and other non-literal uses of language such as irony and indirect speech act are a matter of speaker's utterance meaning rather than word or sentence meaning (Searle, in Leezenverg, 2001:118). Searle and also another defenders of pragmatics theory claim that the metaphorical interpretation involved the intentions of the speaker rather than the meaning structure. They against semantics view that seems to be reluctant to conclude that a single utterance can change the lexical meaning as they are also reluctant to treat metaphor and other non-literal uses of language as a deviation from proper usage or as saying one thing and meaning another (Leezenberg, 2001:97). In other words Searle says that metaphor and other non-literal uses of language is a matter of utterance meaning, hence a pragmatics problem.

II.3.5 Context

Studying pragmatics meaning we deal with the use of language in context. As the hearer or viewer we may sometimes find difficulties in understanding the utterance uttered by the presenters especially when they use figure of speech. We will try to understand not only what the words mean but also what the speaker intend to convey or imply. It involved not only the words themselves but also

context. According to Verdonk there are two kinds of context. First is an internal linguistic context build up by the language pattern inside the text. Second is an external non-linguistic context drawing us to ideas and experiences in the world outside the text (Verdonk, 2002:19).

In this study the writer uses the internal linguistic context to analyze the data in order to know the intended meaning of the presenters when they use figure of speech. There are four terms that are considered as internal linguistic context. They are reference, presupposition, implicature and inference.

II.3.5.1 Reference

According to Lyons, reference is the relationship, which holds between words and things (Lyons, 1968:404). It is treated as an action on the part of the speaker. Palmer (1976: 29) says that reference deals with the relationship between the linguistic elements, words, sentences, etc and hold the non-linguistic world of experience. In other words, reference is the relationship of one linguistic expression to another, in which one provides the information necessary to interpret the other. From the pragmatic view as said by Strawson (1950) quoted in Brown and Yule (1983:28), referring is not something an expression does but it is something that someone can use an expression to do.

II.5.3.2 Presupposition

Kamp in Vieu and Bras (2001:57) says that though our understanding of the mechanism in interpreting is still limited but there has been a significant progress and one thing that has become much clearer in recent years is the role played by presupposition. Further he adds that most natural language sentences come with

presuppositions of one kind or another. He says that presupposition must be justified in the context in which the sentence is used. Brown and Yule define presupposition as what is taken by the speaker to be the common ground of the participants in the conversation (Brown & Yule, 1983:29). Fromkin and Rodman support by saying that speakers often make implicit assumptions about the real world, and the sense of an utterance may depend on those assumptions (Fromkin & Rodman, 1983:229).

II.5.3.3 Implicature

According to Grice (1975) cited in Hatch (1992:260) what is conveyed by an utterance falls into two parts: what is said and what is implied. He uses the term implicature to cover what is implied. Further he explains as cited in Brown and Yule (1983:31) that the term implicature is used to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean, as distinct from what the speaker literally says. In other words, implicature is anything that is inferred from an utterance but that is not a condition for the truth of the utterance.

Grice in Sadock (1979) says that the recognition of figurative, or non-literal language use, to apparent violations of one or another of their principles. He also says that when the literal sense of monologue, sentence, phrase, or word is in apparent conflict with the cooperative principles, by seeming to be irrelevant, false, or lacking in justification, the hearer is forced to seek a figurative, but cooperative intent behind the utterance. Further he says that the production of figurative speech is then reflexive governed by the speaker's awareness of the hearer's expectation of cooperative behavior on his (the hearer) part. Grice also

said in Blum-Kulka (1997) that certain figures of speech such as tautologies and irony are the extreme examples of flouting the maxims.

II.5.3.4 Inference

Blum-Kulka in Dijk (1997) says that the process by which interlocutors arrive at speaker meanings necessarily involves inferencing. His statement is supported by Cote (2001). She states that determining the meaning of an utterance can require a great deal of inference. Further she says that a hearer must make time and place inferences about events, as well as inferences about rhetorical relations between pairs of utterances. Brown and Yule say that since we have no direct access to speaker's intended meaning in producing an utterance, we often rely on a process of inference to arrive at an interpretation for utterances or for the connection between utterances (Brown and Yule, 1983:33). Searle in Blum-Kulka also support by saying that it is a matter of utterance meaning of figuring out by inference in context what the speaker intends to convey by saying what he says.

II.4 Related Studies

The study about figures of speech has been done before by Handayani, a student of Airlangga University. She writes a thesis entitles An Analysis of Figures of Speech Found in Advertisement in Cosmopolitan and Men's Health. She tries to find out the difference and the similarities of the use of figures of speech in both magazines. This thesis is analysed by using language and sex theory.

Another student of Airlangga University who studies also about figures of speech is Sejati but she focuses on the use of metaphor. By conducting the study she would like to find out how the use of metaphor reflects the character of Iago in Shakespeare's drama Othello. This thesis is analyzed by using pragmatic approach that is proposed by Searle.

CHAPTER III

DATA PRESENTATION AND DATA ANALYSIS