Pragma-Stylistics Devices and Performative Study of Selected Oral Text

Jubilezer Sihite
0128078303

Abstract

Pragma-Stylistics Devices and Performative Study of Selected Oral Text is explained. The study is intended to investigate the role of pragmastylistics devices and performative study in a selected oral text. In this case an oral text from judge to the witness is selected to be the object of the research. 3 judges did the investigation and delivered some questions to the witness, it is a hate speech delivered by FZ and FH about RS. In understanding dramatic and orla texts through using pragma-stylistic approach. It is also an attempt to examine the stylistic effects of using performative act and their implication in conveying the theme of the play and the intentions of the characters. The analysis reveals that the interaction between pragma-stylistics and performative is a vital tool for analyzing oral and dramatic texts. Pragma-stylistics and performative are grouped into systematic combination depending on the purpose of the speaker or the playwright. The pragma-stylistics and performative analysis of oral text also reveals the importance of untterances in conveying the intended message of the oral through the contextual details offered about the characters and events. Generally the pragmatics device is a good point and performative is also a good way to express some utterances, statetment, question in an investigation, especially in the court. Both pragmatics devices and performatives can prove that it is easy to get trough investigation and can lead to the final decision before sentencing. Entailment and expositives are major element of linguistics and have important role play in an investigation. They are grouped in systematic combinations depending on the purpose of the speaker or the playwright; they may demonstrate the state of action or affairs, then give a request and the like, direction of fit is the most decisive aspect of the combination of expression such as expositives.

Keywords: pragma-stylistics, performatives, entailment, oral text

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Background

Pragmatic Literary Stylistic Analysis is the application of related pragmatic theories in the interpretation of a literary text. This aspect of stylistics takes keen interest in the meaning valueof a literary text using pragmatism as a principle of inquiry and account of meaning. This paper argues that the writer made deliberate linguistic choices which could be interpreted using the pragmatic theories such as inferences, presuppositions and assumptions as basis for theanalysis.Pragmatic literary stylistics is a branch of stylistics which applies idea from linguistic pragmatics to the analysis of texts and their interpretations. Meaning in a text is embedded in the language employed by the writer and in order to carry out an effective exploration of the intendedmeaning of a writer, the language in use in the text has to be fully put into consideration.

In minor misdemeanor cases, judge frequently hand down sentences immediately after the defendant pleads guilty or no contest, or is found guilty after trial. Where the possibility of significant incarceration exists, however, the judge may not impose sentence until some days or weeks later, in a separately scheduled sentencing hearing. The sentencing hearing often follows an investigation by a probation officer, who prepares a presentence report for the judge to review.

The sentencing portion of a criminal case often takes only moments, especially if the judge is rubber-stamping the sentence agreed to in plea negotiations. However, sentencing is not always so brief an affair, especially when the judge has legal authority to order a long period of imprisonment. Typically, the probation department will have prepared a presentence report, and the defense and prosecution will have a chance to argue against or in

favor of the probation officer's recommendations and the factual findings on which those recommendations are based.

When deciding what sentence to impose, judges typically consider oral statements made in open court as well as the probation officer's written presentence report. The people who most commonly speak at a sentencing hearing are the prosecutors, the defense attorney, the victims, and the defendant.

1.2. The Problem

In this research, the problem statements are as follows:

a. What are the typical kinds of pragma-stylistics device and performative used in the court?

b. Do the device and performative act can lead the defendant to give the truth or not?

1.3. The Scope

To the best of the researchers 'knowledge, there exists rare studies that tackle speech acts in sentences using a pragma-stylistic analysis especially entailment, thus this can be an attempt to bridge a gap in the literature. The research is only focused on the discussing of sentences, questions, statement and utterances of the Judge to the witness in the court consisting of entailment and performative act to lead to the final decision. Griffiths (2006) divides entailment as one-way entailment and two-way entailment. His theory also tells that entailments are varied in case of its relation from one or two or more directions; one-way entailment, two-way entailment, mutual entailment, negative entailment, metaphorical entailment. While Austin (1962) distinguishes five different groups of performatives: verdictives, excercitives, commissives, behabitives and expositives.

1.4. The Objectives

The objectives of the research are ;

a. to find out the typical kinds of pragma-stylistics device and performative used in the court.

b. to find out whether kinds of the device and performative act can lead the defendant to give the truth or not?

1.5. The Significances

The benefits of the study are:

a. Theoretical benefit; this study can contribute to the science of linguistics, especially the pragmatics, stylistics and any other kind of pragmatics field.

b. Practical benefit: It is expected that study can improve the reader's knowledge particularly in pragmatics including how to use entailment.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Theoritical Framework

Stylistics has a variety of framework from linguistics within which text could be analyzed. Pragmatic literary stylistics is one of such frameworks. Both adjectives are necessary to identify it because not all pragmatic stylistics focus on literary text and not all literary stylistics apply ideas from pragmatics. The Pragmatic literary stylistics is the theoretical and analytical tool forthis pragmatic stylistic analysis

2.2. Concepts of Stylistics

Stylistics as a conceptual discipline may attempt to establish principles capable of explaining particular choices made by individuals in their use of language. These principles can be applied to areas such as discourse analysis, literary criticism as well as pragmatic analysis. Common features of style include the use of dialogue, accents and idiolects, observation of active and passive voice, use of particular registers, the distribution of sentence lengths and alot more.Finally, stylistics looks at what is going on within the language; what the linguistic associationsare that the style of language reveals.

Stylistics is a branch of linguistics. It is usually defined as the study of style. The concept of style is an old one. It goes back to the very beginning of classical rhetorics and poetics. It is originally taken from the Latin word (stilus) to mean a short stick made of reed used for writing on boards made of wax (Hough,1969, p.1). Throughout its history, stylistics witnessed a great deal of development.

This development is a result of the development of linguistic theories and the political changes in society which affect the life and the language of people. Today stylistics is a solid discipline interested in analyzing the language of different texts. Obviously contemporary

stylistics is influenced by the late twentieth century development of linguistic studies in discourse analysis, pragmatics and sociolinguistics. Consequently, stylistics adopts a range of concepts and models from these fields. These concepts help stylistics to investigate the interpretive impact of linguistic peculiarities used within literature (Fabb, 2002, p.6). Scholars like Radford (1997), Simpson (2004), Jeffries and Mclntyre (2010) and others maintained that contemporary stylistics is a mature discipline not confined to the analysis of literary texts as it always was. Stylistics involves the analysis of non-literary texts such as scientific, political, legal texts, advertisement, etc.

Some stylisticians have focused on the dramatic structure of plays as Burton (1980) , others have dealt with plays in terms of politeness and other pragmatic theories like Leech (1992), Short (1989) and Simpson (1989), Culpeper (1998,pp.3-4). Drama is the literary genre that is mostly like real life situations. It largely consists of dialogues and stage directions. Thus, the Stylisticians use those areas of linguistic analysis that best developed by linguists to describe face-to–face interaction and to infer meaning in context. Besides, the language of dramatic dialogues is similar to the everyday language of people. In effect, it is acceptable to employ pragmatics and discourse analysis theories and techniques such as SAT to arrive at a better understanding and interpretation of the text and the message which the playwright wants to convey to his audience. Language as Action The theory of SAs is one of the basic components of pragmatics for a long time. The concept (SAT) is first introduced by the British philosopher J.L. Austin (1911-1960) in his own lectures at Harvard University. It is initiated as a reaction to many earlier linguistic theories which disregarded language as action. It is based on the assumption that when people say something they do something. This theory has been modified and developed by the American philosopher Searle (1969) in his influential book entitled "Speech Act" (Verschueren, 1999, p.22). Austin (1962, p.6) distinguishes between two types of utterances performatives; acts that describe constant

information, and constatives; propositions which can be stated positively or negatively; statements of facts which could be either right or wrong. In contrast to constatives, Austin remarks that performative are used not to describe something but to achieve something for instance, to promise is not to state something about the world rather it is to perform the act of promising.

Austin (1962) distinguishes five different groups of performatives: 1. Verdictives, acts that provide findings or judgments, such as estimate, value, assess. 2. Excercitives, this class of verbs shows exercise of powers, rights or influences such as order, dedicate, dismiss, 3. Commissives, acts of commitment or promises of different kinds or the taking on of an obligation or states an intention such as promise, guarantee, plan, swear and bet. 4. Behabitives, involve verbs indicate expressions of attitude and social behavior as congratulate. 5. Expositives involve verbs that refer to discussion and argument going by providing different kinds of clarification, such as: ask, assume, concede, and hypothesize.

2.3. Concept of Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a subfield of linguistics that studies the ways in which context contributes tomeaning. Pragmatics studies how the transmission of meaning depends not only on structural and linguistics knowledge of the speaker and listener, but also in the context of the utterance, any pre-existing knowledge about those involved, the inferred intent of the speaker, and other factors. In this respect, pragmatics explains how language users are able to overcome apparent ambiguity, since meaning relies on the manner, place, time etc. of an utterance.

Pragmatics is the study of language in relation to meaning. Pragmatics studies how context contributes to meaning. It is concerned with how language users interact, communicate and interprete linguistic behaviour. The motivational force behind the initial establishment and sub-sequent development of modern pragmatics was to find a systematic

explanation for observable differences between literary and linguistic meaning and also the meaning that particular utterances can convey in text. Individuals working in pragmatics have pursued such an explanation for a variety of reasons; they have been driven by philosophical, linguistical or sociological interests. But the shared goals of pragmaticists have been to establish that theways in which words literally mean and what speakers use them to mean may differ, to identifysome principles or norms of language use which might explain how those differences typically occur in various communicative situations. In the middle of the 20th century, oxford philosophers J.L. Austin and H.P. Grice separately established some central tenets and introduced some signal terminology of pragmatics.

2.3.1. Connotation, Denotationand Stylistics

Connotation refers to the wide array of positive and negative associations that most words naturally carry with them, whereas denotation is the precise, literal definition of a word that might be found in a dictionary. Understanding the difference between denotation and connotation is important to understanding definitions and how concepts are used. For example,if you look up the word 'dove' in the dictionary, its denotative meaning refers to ''a stocky birdwith a small head, short legs, and a cooing voice, feeding on seeds or fruit''. Connotation on theother hand refers to the associations that are connected to a certain word or the emotional suggestion related to that word.

2.3.2. Presupposition

Presupposition in the branch of linguistics known as pragmatics is an implicit assumption about the world or background belief relating to an utterance whose truth is taken for granted indiscourse. Examples of presupposition include:

A presupposition must be mutually known or assumed by the speaker and addressee for theutterance to be considered appropriate in the context. It will generally remain a necessary assumption whether the utterance is placed in the form of an assertion, denial, or

question andcan be associated with a specific lexical item or grammatical feature in the utterance.

2.3.3. Inference

Inference is a literary device used in the interpretation of literary text where logical deductions are made based on premises assumed to be true. Another definition of inference suggests that it is rational, but not logical which ultimately means that through the observation of facts presented in a particular pattern, one ultimately sees different or new interpretations andperspectives. Symbols and anomalies are very important during its use. Inference is the act orprocess of deriving logical conclusions for more premises known or assumed to be true. In pragmatics, reference and inference work side by side. Inference is defined as the non-logical but rational means through observation of patterns of facts, to see new meanings and contexts for understanding indirectly.

2.3.4. Assumption

Assumption is a thing that is accepted as true or as certain to happen without proof, to accept something as true without verification, something considered likely to be true even though no one has told you directly or even though you have no proof. For instance people tend to makeassumptions about you based on your appearance. Assumptions embedded inside the structureof particular sentences are usually called presuppositions, otherwise referred to as micro-assumptions.

2.3.5. Entailment

Whenever people utter statements, they often convey entailment whether intentionally or unintentionally because the basis of semantic description is the notion of entailment. According to Kreidler (1998: 12) entailment is two statements which may be related in such a way that if one is true, the other must be true. In other words, entailment is a relationship in which the truth of one sentence necessarily implies the truth of the other one. In accordance,

Yule (1998 : 129) states that entailment is something that follows from what is mentioned before. Crystal (1998: 169) defines entailment as a term delivered from logic, and has been used as a part of the study of semantics; which is called as entailingness. Entailment refers to a relation between a pair of preposition where the truth of second preposition necessarily follows the truth of the first. For example: I can see a dog entails I can see an animal. One cannot assert the first sentence and deny the second one.

Nouwen (2011: 2) explains that entailment can be used to establish whether two sentences are semantically independent, semantically related, or semantically identical. Technically, Nouwen portrays entailment as Sentence S entails sentence S' if and only if S is true, S' is true too. For instance, Mary owns a pink sweater entails Mary owns a sweater because if Mary has a pink sweater, she surely has a sweater.

By considering the definition of entailment mixed with the idea that denial of something true is false, it can be concluded that a sentence together with the denial of one of its entailment formulates a contradiction. From the sentences above the contradiction that can be obtained is Mary owns a pink sweater, but she does not own a sweater.

A. Types of Entailment

According to some scholars, entailment can be divided into several types. However, every scholar has their own opinion about the types of entailment. Yet, sometimes there are several similarities from each scholar. Griffiths (2006) divides entailment as one-way entailment and two-way entailment. His theory also tells that entailments are varied in case of its relation from one or two direction.

1) One-way Entailment

Brinton (2000: 131) says that one-way entailment is different from paraphrase. It happens when the second sentence is a consequence of the first sentence. According to Crystal (1998: 169-70), this kind of entailment is a term which refers to a relation between a

9

pair of sentences. He clarifies this by saying that the truth of the second sentence necessarily follows the truth of the first. Pennacchiotti (2005) calls it as „strict entailment". He explains that it is when the sentences carry two different facts, but one of them can be inferred from the other. Therefore, in one-way entailment, a sentence does not paraphrase the other sentence. One of them is like the conclusion of the other. It is the entailment that works only in one direction.

Kreidler (1998: 86) provides an illustration of this kind of entailment. It is when two propositions are labeled as „p" and „q". If „p"is true, „q" must also be true, but if „q" is true, it does not necessarily follow that „p" is also true since it can be false. For example, if the sentence *my jacket is navy* is true, then the sentence *my jacket is blue* is true. However, if the sentence *my jacket is blue* is true, then the sentence *my jacket is navy* is not always true. Thus, one-way entailment or strict entailment is if one sentence is true, the other sentence must also be true; when one sentence is false, the other is also false.

2) Two-way Entailment

Griffiths (2006: 27) defines two-way entailment between sentences as paraphrase. In contrast with one-way entailment, two-way entailment has meaning relationship and the sentences that contain two-way entailment paraphrase each other. A paraphrase carries fact that is expressed differently. Kreidler (1998: 86) adds that a paraphrase is an alternative way in conveying the meaning of a phrase or a sentence. It is the relation between two propositions; when one is true or false, the other one always follows. Meanwhile, Hurford and Heasley (2007: 113) illustrate it as a special symmetric case of semantic relationship.

Fromkin, Rodman and Hyams (2003: 197) say that paraphrase or two-way entailment is sometimes expressed in the term of active-passive pairs. For example, the sentence *the mosquito bites the baby* and *the baby is bitten by the mosquito* are in relation of two-way entailment or paraphrase. The entailment is expressed in active-passive pairs. The second

sentence is the passive form of the first sentence, and the first sentence is the active form. However, in some cases, the active-passive pairs are not in the form of paraphrases. The sentence *every student in the class speaks two languages* is not the paraphrase of the sentence *two languages are spoken by every in the class*. It is clear that each person in the first sentence speaks two languages. However, it is possible that each individual speaks different languages. In contrast, the two languages in the second sentence are always the same languages for everyone in the room.

Fromkin, Rodman and Hyams (2003: 198) also add that a phrase in a sentence can also be substituted into a single word to create a two-way entailment. *She can go, She may go*, *She must go* may be expressed differently, such as by using this form: She is able to go, She is permitted to go, She is obliged to go. The sentence *Alisa saw Ron* can also be expressed in a longer sentence like *Alisa perceived Ron using his eyes*. Thus, if those first sentences are true, it is a must that the second sentences are also true, and vice versa. Rambaud (2012: 70) called this type of entailment as „equivalent". Besides Griffiths, Murphy (2003) also has his own types of entailments. Murphy categorizes the types of entailment into mutual entailment and negative entailment.

1) Mutual Entailment

Mutual entailment is actually the same as Gtiffiths" two-way entailment/paraphrase. Therefore, Murphy (2003: 248) defines this type of entailment as synonymy among propositions, not words. For instance: Forget about closing the window entails Let the window opened. The idea of both sentences is the same, but the way of delivering them is different.

2) Negative Entailment

Murphy (2003: 98) also has the idea about negative entailment. Negative entailment is an entailment which is expressed in a negative form. For example, *It's a cat* entails *It's not a*

11

cow. The truth of the first and the second sentence is in semantic relation of entailment although the second sentence is presented in the form of negative expression.

Besides Griffiths and Murphy, Lakoff and Johnsen (2003: 91) state about one more type of entailment; which is metaphorical entailment.

3. Metaphorical Entailment

They define metaphorical entailment as the imparting of a characteristic of the source domain to the target domain. The source domain is the metaphorical image, while the target domain is the concept receiving metaphorical treatment. Therefore, the relationship between the source and the target domain is regarded as entailment or specifically called as metaphorical entailment. When the source domain is interpreted to be the target domain, metaphorical entailment happens (Kovesces, 2003: 121). Kevesces gives an example of a rare metaphorical entailment happens on an entire conversation as follow.

Teacher   : You look like a healthy apple.

Kovesces   : I hope it's not rotten inside.

Teacher   : I hope, too, that it will last a long time

(Kovesces, 2003: 123) In this example, people are portrayed as fruit (apple). An apple could be rotten inside although it is healthy-looking outside. Both healthy apple and rotten inside are the target domain metaphors which are associated with the source domain metaphor or a good person and an evil person. Shortly, healthy apple and rotten inside apple are associated with human. In this context, apple is the illustration of a person, and healthy apple means a good people, while rotten inside apple means a bad people or a person who has evil heart.

B. Orders of Entailment

According to Wilson and Sperber (in Horn and Ward, 2006: 390), when people are producing sentences, they will automatically construct an ordered set of foreground and

background entailments. In his pragmatics book, Yule (1998: 33) also argues about the two kinds of entailments which are background entailment and foreground entailment.

1) Background Entailment

Background entailment is indicated when a sentence is true, it is necessarily related to the truth of a number of entailments. The numbers of background entailments following the main sentence is considered as logical concept. Yule (1998: 33) gives an example as follow.

(1) Rover chased three squirrels. (=p)

(a) Something chased three squirrels. (=q)

(b) Rover did something to three squirrels. (=r)

(c) Rover chased three of something. (=s)

(d) Something happened. (=t)

When a speaker uttered Rover chased three squirrels, he is committed to the truth of those background entailments or the logical concept (=q, =r, =s, =t).

2) Foreground Entailment

The second order of entailment is foreground entailment. While background entailment gives information related to the context, foreground entailment contributes to the main point of the sentence (Blass, 1990: 137). Yule (1998: 33) in his pragmatics book adds that foreground entailment is the main assumption of the speaker. Therefore, the background entailment exists to help the hearer in finding the foreground entailment. Wilson and Sperber (on Blass, 1990: 137) explain some special linguistic devices which could indicate the foreground entailment. They are clefting and stressing.

1) Clefting

Yule (1998: 34) calls clefting as "it-cleft" construction. Clefting is used to help people to focus on a particular part of the sentence, and to emphasize what people actually want to

say. It is performed by adding a new part of the sentence in order to gain the hearer"s attention. The example of clefting is presented as the following sentences.

(1) It was ROVER that chased the squirrels. (2) It wasn"t ME who took your money.

The adding of „it was" and „it wasn"t" are aimed to give more attention to the subjects which are „Louis" and „him".

2) Stressing

Yule (1998: 33) argues that a speaker sometimes will give a stress in their utterances. The stressed part can be assumed as the foreground which is very useful to help the hearer in interpreting the intended meaning of the speaker. Yule (1998: 33) presents the example of stressing in the following sentences.

(1) Rover chased THREE squirrels. (2) ROVER chased three squirrels.

Both sentences share the same grammatical structure. However, the capitalized words indicate the different intentions of the speaker. The capitalized words show that the speaker tries to give stress on that part as those are the most important parts of each sentence.

C. Approach to Detect Entailment

According to Condoravdi ((2002: 5), there are two approaches to detect entailment: contexted clause and context matching.

1) Contexted Clauses

The contexted clauses compromise the actual fact and the fact which is supposed to hold. Some facts are hold in certain context. One context might be derived into several numbers of facts. In this type of approach, Condoravdi (2002:5) on his journal states that „flattening" of a context plays a significant role to determine whether or not the clauses are concerned in one context. This approach is actually parallel with background of entailment because both are emphasizing the idea of „flattening". The application of this approach is presented in the following.

(1) Louis ate two mangoes.

(a) Something happened.

(b) Someone eats two of something. (c) Someone ate two mangoes.

(d) Louis ate two of something.

(e) Louis did something to two mangoes.

There are a number of facts about what holds in the initial context. The examples indicated by a, b, c, d, and e are holding the idea of Louis ate two mangoes. As a result, all those sentences can be considered entail each other. Logically, the more complex the initial sentence is; the more following facts that supposed to hold the complex sentence itself.

2) Context Matching

According to Condoravdi (2002: 6), context matching can be done by comparing at least two texts, and then assuming that both texts describe the same initial context, locating sub-contexts introduced by the two sentences that have parallel relations to the initial context, and identifying local entailments using first-order reasoning for the contexts which are paired. Mirkin (2011: 16) explains regarding the goal of context matching which is to identify the compatible contexts for text expressions which are not necessarily substitutable, and are not necessarily lexical. Context matching approach is useful for the phenomena where meaning correspondence is more needed rather than substitution. For instance, the meaning of the term alien (which actually means foreign, but is associated as extraterrestrial creature nowadays) should be matched to the category of outer space even though both terms are typically not substitutable. The application context matching can be seen in the following example.

(1) Nobody certainly knows whether alien exists or not.

(2) The existence of aliens in outer space remains a big question.

Those sentences above have similar ideas; in which alien is the part of outer space. Even though alien is not the substitute of the word outer space, the word alien here cannot be replaced by any random nouns such as cow, fairy, or human. Thus, context matching only happens when two texts share the same understanding.

2.4. Sentencing

If the jury finds the defendant guilty then the judge will decide on an appropriate sentence. The sentence will be influenced by a number of factors: principally the circumstances of the case, the impact that the crime has had on the victim and relevant law especially guideline cases from the Court of Appeal. The judge will equally take into account the mitigation and any reports and references on the defendant. Only once the judge has considered all of these factors will the appropriate sentence or punishment be pronounced.

With sentences increasingly reflecting the impact of crimes on victims' lives, a crime victim might seek assistance from a friend or counselor when writing an impact statement. Statements may touch on the physical, emotional, and/or financial effects of crimes. For example, how did a crime change the victim's daily life or general lifestyle? How did it affect relationships with family members and friends? What medical and/or psychological treatment has a crime necessitated?

Victims might also be eligible for restitution (from the perpetrator) or crime victim assistance funds (from the county or state), and if so might have to fill in a questionnaire. For further information, ask a court clerk or go online to the Office for Victims of Crime. This article was excerpted from The Criminal Law Handbook, by Paul Bergman, J.D., and Sara J. Berman, J.D.

2.5. Review of Related Works

There have been some conducted researches that deal with entailment. However, those previous researches are different from this research for several reasons. The first

previous research is "A Semantic Analysis of Entailment Applied by the Main Character in the Movie Life of Pi" by HilyatusSa"adah (2014). The research has two different objectives which are identifying the types and orders of entailment the movie Life of Pi. There are 35 data obtained from this research, and each of the data is identified according the types and the orders. In the types of entailment, one-way entailment obtains the first rank with 18 occurrences as it is commonly uttered by the main character. Meanwhile, for the second objective, foreground entailment which is expressed by clefting has 17 times ordered the entailments.

Meanwhile, the second previous research is "Entailment, Intentionality and Text Understanding" conducted by Cleo Condoravdi, Dick Crouch, Valeria de Paiva, ReinhardStolle, Daniel G. Bobrow (2002). The study aims to detect the entailment and contradiction relations between texts. The study describes a contextual clausal representation that permits an extended range of intentional entailments and contradictions to be easily detected.

Both previous studies are conducted under the same scope with this research. On the contrary, they are different from this research since the first study does not explain about how to detect entailment. Meanwhile, the second previous study does not explain about types and orders of entailment. Instead, it discusses the detection of entailment and contradiction between texts.

2.6. Conceptual Framework

The research focuses on entailment applied by the character in The Da Vinci Code movie. Therefore, the study of entailment is under the scope of semantics, since it explores about the meaning of the language. In semantics, there are some relations of the words, phrases, or sentences related to their meanings; the relations are called semantic relations. Meaning relations between words are called lexical semantic relation. Phrasal relations

represent semantic relationships between phrases. Then, entailment is a sentential semantic relation, which is meaning relation between sentences.

Entailment can be described as propositions which are definitely true when a give proposition is true. In other word, it is when the truth of a sentence depends on the truth of another sentence. According to Griffiths (2005), there are two types of entailment: one-way entailment, two-way entailment. Therefore, two others entailment are presented by Murphy (2003), which are mutual entailment and negative entailment. However, mutual entailment shares the same idea with two-way entailment. In addition, Lakoff and Johnsen (2003) present one last type of entailment which is called as metaphorical entailment.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH

3.1. Research method

Research method is defined as a procedure or mechanism necessary applied in finding out the solution for the problems that have been formulated within a research. The research method of the study contains: type of the research, object of the research, type of the data and data source, method of data collection, and technique of data analysis.

3.2. The Model

The researcher is going to follow an eclectic model throughout the analysis of the present data. It contains Searle's (1969) model of the classification of SAs Speech Act: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language Simultaneously, it includes Grice's (1975) CP model Logic and Conversation through the character-character interaction and narrator-reader interaction according to Black (2006) Stylistics Pragmatics, to show to which extent the characters and the narrator adhere to the maxims, or they flout them to generate implicature. As Black (2006, p. 25) clarifies that when flouting the maxims, the hearer is aware of the co-operative principle and the maxims, so that the audience or the readers will ponder about the reason behind such breaching. when flouting a maxim, the conversation will not be broken down; however, the speaker has used an indirect way to accomplish the conversation rather than using a direct answer. Along with these three models the eclectic model contains Niazi and Gautam's (2010).

3.3. Type of the Research

This research is a descriptive research in which the objective is to describe the actual user of language for communication. The nature is not to test and to prove but to explore and to describe. As a describe one, the research is qualitative. The data collected is in the form of

words rather than numbers. The qualitative data consists of detailed description of situation, events, people, interaction, and observed behaviors, direct questions, from people about their experiences, attitudes, beliefs, thoughts, and entire passage from documents, correspondence, records and case histories and the CP on the two previously mentioned levels, and they make clear that they help the author to present his ideas and make them effective for the readers i.e., through investigating the use of the entailment.

3.4. Type of the Data and Data Source

Sentences, statements, utterances and questions from the court are at once the simplest and the most complex form of literary expression. The language styles can be spoken or written. They can be found in song, magazine, drama, poetry, news, music, quiz, etc. In this research, the writer will study language used in court before sentencing. The sources of all the data were taken from the television, internet and live streaming news. The researcher uses primary data as entailment in the utterances and the other data, which can support the research.

3.5. Method of the Data Collection

The data are collected by watching, observing and documentation. Documentation is the method used in scientific research in order to collect the data by using the document or evidence list.

The necessary steps of collecting the data are as follows:

- Searching/surfing internet surface.
- Watching live news and YouTube video.
- Scripting the utterances.
- Reading the script and utterances more than once.
- Underlining the utterances containing entailment and performative.
- Collecting the utterances taken.

20

- Finding out all utterances having performative and entailment.

- Tabulating all the data.

- Classifying the data according to the types.

- Noting down the data based on the classification.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the result of research. The display of the data was done formerly by giving the description of pragma-stylistics device study of the selected oral text in the court. The findings can help the readers to understand what will be provided by the researcher.

4.1. Data and analysis

All the data is downloaded from the You-tube video consisting of utterances, statements and questions that delivered by the judges to the defendant or witness.

4.1.1. Pragmatics Device Analysis

Devices	Utterances
One-way Entailment	a. **truss setelah saudara dapat berita bahwa dia ada kasus pemukulan (x)**, *truss saudara tawarkan untuk membantu menyembuhkan (y)* b. **saudara tadi melihat dari foto, dari medsos dengan profesi saudara seorang dokter (x),** *apa bisa menjadi yakin bahwa itu pemukulan.(y)* c. **jadi artinya dari gambaran (x),** *foto yang lain tadi saudara punya gambaran bahwa itu adalah rumah sakit dr.S.(y)* d. **mereka sedang membodohi diri sendiridan kita (x) ,** *rakyat tertipu dan terbawa amarah.(y)* e. **saudara saksi menyatakan mengetahui permasalahan ini ketika membaca tweet-nya FZ (x),** *saudara mempunyai keyakinan itu bukan bagian dari penganiayaan.(y)* f. **saya ulangi ya, jadi terkait dengan yang tadi saudara tuliskan di tweeter (x),** *saudara banyak pro dan kontra,(y)* g. *mereka menanggapi keterangan saudara tersebut saudara (y)***sebagai dokter bedah karena yang mengeluarkan pendapat itu adalah saudara (x).**
Two-way Entailment	a. *setidaknya dari operasi yang saudara lakukan, (x)* *harus ada simetrik ke kanan kiri.(y)* b. *oke, tadi saudara melihat foto berdua FZ. dengan terdakwa.(x)* *Apa yang saudara baca di tweet-nya.(y)* c. *saudara ada statement.(x)* *kalimatnya jelas.(y)* d. *lanjutan kalimat kita rakyat tertipu,(x)* *itu bahasanya jamak, majemuk.(y)* e. *dari tadi disampaikan bahwa saudara menjawab beberapa counter (x).* *saudara masih ingat me-replay tweeter dari siapa aja. (y)* f. *disini ada read dari halokopilevolusi ya.(x)* *ada saya tanggapan yang lebih tua.(y)*

	ada banyak, jangan tanya buat apa.(z) g. *Nah, itu diperkuat dan dipertegas gambar.(x)* *backgroound foto terdakwa dengan foto ketika ada dr. S.(y)* h. *tadi saudara sudah menjelaskan bahwa malamnya saudara tau. (x)* *awalnya yakin bahwa ada foto dalam klinik. (y)* i. *saudara saksi, saya sedikit mengutip dari tweeter FH.(x)* *tanggapan saudara saya bacakan lagi, saudara membalas dengan....(y)* j. *mereka menanggapi keterangan saudara tersebut saudara sebagai dokter bedah mengeluarkan pendapat itu adalah saudara.(y)* k. *tweeter-tweeter saudara ini kan lebih menegaskan ke operasi bedah plastic.(x)* *Efek bedah plastik yang anda sebarkan.(y)* l. *saudara saksi menyatakan mengetahui permasalahan ini (x)* *saudara tadi sampaikan saudara mempunyai keyakinan itu bukan bagian dari penganiayaan.(y)*
Mutual Entailment	a. *saudara tadi **melihat dari foto dari medsos** (X)* *dengan profesi saudara seorang dokter apa **bisa menjadi yakin** bahwa itu pemukulan (Y)* b. *dari tadi disampaikan bahwa **saudara menjawab beberapa cou**nter dari FH dan FZ. (X)* *saudara masih **ingat me-replay tweeter dari siapa** aja (Y)* c. *disini ada read dari halokopilevolusi ya, itu ada saya tanggapan yang lebih tua ada banyak, **jangan tanya buat apa**. (X)* *kebutuhan tampil lebih segar, **lebih cantik itu hak orang** yang mau.(Y)* d. *saudara saksi menyatakan **mengetahui permasalahan ini ketika membaca tweet**-nya FZ. saudara tadi sampaikan. (X)* *saudara **mempunyai keyakinan** itu bukan bagian dari penganiayaan. (Y)* e. *tadi saudara sudah menjelaskan **bahwa malamnya saudara tau**.(X)* ***awalnya yakin bahwa** ada foto dalam klinik. (Y)* f. *saudara saksi, **saya sedikit mengutip dari tweeter** FH.(X)* *Tanggapan saudara **saya bacakan lagi,** saudara membalas dengan.(Y)*
Negative Entailment	a. *pada waktu saudara mengatakan ini **bukan** pemukulan, **kemungkinan** bedah plastic* b. *setelah itu saudara membalas tweet dari FZ atau pun FH. Selain itu menurut saudara banyak yang **tidak pro** yang lain?....* c. *Malamnya tanggal 3 ya kalau nggak salah ketika saudara mengetahui bahwa ini **tidak** melalui proses penganiayaan **tetapi** operasi plastic*
Metaphorical Entailment	a. *mereka menanggapi keterangan saudara tersebut **saudara sebagai dokter** bedah karena yang mengeluarkan pendapat itu adalah saudara.* b. *tweeter-tweeter saudara ini kan **lebih menegaskan ke** operasi bedah plastic. Efek bedah plastik yang anda sebarkan.* c. *saudara tadi melihat dari foto, dari medsos dengan **profesi saudara seorang dokter** apa **menjadi yakin** bahwa itu pemukulan*
Total	**34**

There are 34 utterances of pragmatic devices had been analyzed in this research.

Having analyze all the data, it is shown that there are 7 utterances containing one-way

entailment. It is when the sentences carry two different facts, but one of them can be inferred

from the other. It does not paraphrase the other sentence. One of them is like the conclusion of the other. It is the entailment that works only in one direction. On the point a,b,c,d,e,f and g where *X* entails *Y* because *X* is a statement which influenced *Y* to be happened. It means that *Y* is a final result or an effect of *X* action. On the second part of the devices it is found that two-way entailment is 12. It is an alternative way in conveying the meaning of a phrase or a sentence. It is the relation between two propositions; when one is true or false, the other one always follows and has meaning relationship and the sentences that contain two-way entailment paraphrase each other. At the point a until l, where *X* entails *Y* because each statement of each point has relationship like if *X* is true, *Y* must be true. And it is possible for *X* entails *Y* and *Z* as it is in the poin f. Next part of the devices is mutual entailment consist of 9 utterances. It is shown by the proposition in the statement contains same intention. This type of entailment as synonymy among propositions, not words. It can be seen from point a to f, where each statement has relationship that *X* has the same intention to *Y*. While, there are 3 utterances contain negative entailment. It is an entailment which is expressed in a negative form. The truth of the first and the second sentence is in semantic relation of entailment although the second sentence is presented in the form of negative expression. It is usually indicated by the word *no.., not..., not ....but, not only* ...but also as it is found on the point a,b and c. Finally the last type of the devices is metaphorical entailment, it is as the imparting of a characteristic of the source domain to the target domain. The source domain is the metaphorical image, while the target domain is the concept receiving metaphorical treatment. Therefore, the relationship between the source and the target domain is regarded as entailment or specifically called as metaphorical entailment. When the source domain is interpreted to be the target domain, metaphorical entailment happens as it is found on the point a,b and c. This is actually rarely used in dayly conversation, especially in the

investigation as the writer discuss on this research. But it is possibly found although it is rare. In the data analysis it is found 3 utterances contain metaphorical.

4.1.2. Table data Devices

No.	Devices	Amount	Percentage (%)
1	One-way Entailment	7	22,58
2	Two-way Entailment	12	38,70
3	Mutual Entailment	6	19,35
4	Negative Entailment	3	9,62
5	Metaphorical Entailment	3	9,62
Total		**31**	**100%**

It is shown that two way entailment is the mostly used in the investigation to find clear and true information from the witness. It is found 38,70%, one way-entailment is 22.58%, mutual entailment is 19.35%, negative entailment is 9.62% and metaphorical entailment is 9.62%. from all kinds of pragmatics devices, namely entailment, it is found that two way-eantailment is the most dominant expressed to investigate. Because that kind of device is telling utterances, statement, questions that has strong relationship eact other to find the truth and lead to the final decision.

4.1.3. Performatives Analysis

Performatives	Utterances
Verdictives	a. *apakah setelah saudara menyatakan ada kecurigaan saudara bahwa itu penganiayaan?* b. *Jadi semua yang saudara periksa atau saudara memberikan pendapat berdasarkan hasil foto?* c. *artinya definisi memeriksa yang dilakukan dokter berbeda dengan memeriksa yang dilakukan profesional?* d. *Apakah mereka menanggapi keterangan saudara tersebut saudara sebagai dokter bedah karena yang mengeluarkan pendapat itu adalah saudara. Orang dokter bedah plastik atau secara pribadi* e. *saudara tadi melihat dari foto, dari medsos dengan profesi saudara seorang*

	dokter apa bisa menjadi yakin bahwa itu pemukulan?
	f. *lanjutan kalimat kita rakyat tertipu, itu bahasanya jamak, majemuk. Kita rakyat tertipu ini menurut saudara bagaimana*
	g. *Ternyata perasaan empati bisa hilang karena dukungan yang membabi buta*
	h. *saya ulangi ya, jadi terkait dengan yang tadi saudara tuliskan di tweeter saudara banyak pro dan kontra, bisa saudara sebutkan salah satunya siapa*
	i. *baik saya lanjutkan pertanyaannya, tadi saudara katakan banyak pro dan kontra. Yang anda maksud pro dan kontra itu sperti apa*
	j. *Apakah menurut etika profesi seorang dokter bolehkah seorang dokter memberikan pendapat terhadap seorang pasien yang tidak saudara saksi*
Ekscercitives	a. *ini keterangan saya ingatkan agar saudara tidak lupa, berita bahwa dia ada kasus pemukulan, truss saudara tawarkan untuk membantumenyembuhkan.*
Commissives	a. *tweeter-tweeter saudara ini kan lebih menegaskan ke operasi bedah plastic*
Behabities	*-0-*
Expositives	a. *pernah diperiksa tim penyidik?* b. *kalau disini saudara terangkan pertama kali sekitar tanggal 2 oktober 2018, jam 13.47?* c. *pada waktu saudara mengatakan ini bukan pemukulan, kemungkinan bedah plastic* d. *setidaknya dari operasi yang saudara lakukan harus ada simetrik ke kanan kiri atau?* e. *tadi saudara mengatakan bahwa kalau saudara sempat membandingkan dengan foto-foto dengan latar belakang yang sama* f. *foto yang lain tadi saudara punya gambaran bahwa itu adalah rumah sakit dr. Sidik* g. *itu artinya ada silang pendapat saudara dan FH.* h. *tadi saudara melihat foto berdua FZ. dengan terdakwa* i. *jadi sudah pernah ada komunikasi dengan salah satu pihak?* j. *Ini contoh bagus bagaimana oknum polisi memainkan isu* k. *kalau begitu kalimat terakhir saudara tadi karena saudara menjelaskan akan....* l. *tadi disampaikan bahwa saudara menjawab beberapa counter dari FZ dan FZ.* m. *jadi intinya operasinya disalahgunakan ya?* n. *jika terbukti gorong, doa itu akan balik ke kamu* o. *saudara saksi menyatakan mengetahui permasalahan ini ketika membaca tweet-nya FZ.* p. *tadi saudara sudah menjelaskan bahwa malamnya saudara tau, awalnya yakin bahwa ada foto dalam klinik* q. *saudara mengetahui bahwa ini tidak melalui proses penganiayaan tetapi operasi plastic* r. *saksi menjelaskan ada banyak komentar pro kontra dalam jawaban tweeter-tweeter saksi* s. *menurut penilaian saudara bukan kecelakaan, ya atau bukan karena penganiayaan tapi karena operasi.* t. *saya baca tadi banyak yang menyerang ya diantara orang-orang yang masih beranggapan kejadian penganiayaan ini tuh masih benar.*
TOTAL	**32**

There are 32 utterances of performatives by the judges. It consist of *verdictives* consist of 10 utterances, it is an act to provide findings or judgements, such as : estimate, value, assess. As in the point a to j where each statement contains estimating, value assessing from judges to the witness or defendant. It is only 1 found in *excercitives* and 1 for *commissive* where the meeaning is showing exercises of power, rights or influences, such as : order, dedicate, dismiss and also acts of commitment or promises of different kinds or the taking on of an obligation or states an intention, such as : promise, guarantee, plan, swear and bet. While, nothing found in *behabities* that indicate expressions of attitude and social behavior, such as : congratulate. And the last but not list is *expositives* consist of 20 utterances. As can be seen on the point a until t, where they:involve verbs that refer to discussion and argument going by providing different kinds of clarification, such as : ask, assume, concede, hypothesize.

4.1.4. Table data performatives

No.	Performatives	Amount	Percentage (%)
1	Verdictives	10	31,25
2	Excercitives	1	3,1
3	Commissives	1	3,1
4	Behabitives	0	0
5	Expositives	20	62,5
Total			**100%**

After analyzing all the data shown in the table analysis, it is better to provide it all to a percentage table in order to get easily to find the most dominantly used. By looking at the table, it is found expositives is the dominantly expressed in the court by the judges to the witness or defendant. it means that so many utterances involve verbs that refer to discussion

and argument going by providing different kinds of clarification, such as : ask, assume, concede, hypothesize. And it is easy for judges to find the truth and lead to the final decision.

4.2. Findings

Both pragmatic devices, especially for entailment and also performatives types are showing the same influence to people in making or getting a decision especially for judge before sentencing. It is proven that two way-entailment is one of the best pragmatic devices can be used to find the truth because it has a true formula of expressing the idea, statement and questions to the people, especially in the court when judge investigave a witness or defendant. and also kinds of performatives, especially expositives is a good way to ask some question to the witness to find the true information. So by using devices and performatives, it is easy for judges to get throuhg and it can lead to get final decision. Both the things now have strong relationship. Entailment is used to set up a good statement and question before delivered, while expositive is a good way to deliver the statement and questions.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1. Conclusions

Pragma-stylistics device and performative study of selected oral text can be concluded that generally the pragmatics device is a good point and performative is also a good way to express some utterances, statetment, question in an investigation, especially in the court. Both pragmatics devices and performatives can prove that it is easy to get trough investigation and can lead to the final decision before sentencing. Entailment as one of pragmatics devices is very good to set up some statements and question to be delivered in the court. And expositives as part of performative is a good way to deliver the statement question.They are grouped in systematic combinations depending on the purpose of the speaker or the playwright; they may demonstrate the state of action or affairs, then give a request and the like, direction of fit is the most decisive aspect of the combination of expression such as expositives.

The stylistics analysis points out that the use of these acts is so important in conveying the intended message of the playwright in that they afford details about the characters and events. The implication of pragma-stylistics in dramatic texts provides the analyst with contextual details about the message which the playwright wants to convey to his audience. Pragma-stylistics and performative can illustrate stylistic effects and purposes such as the psychological state of the characters, the dimensions of the character's personality and social and power relations among characters. Representation of pragmatics in this case *entailment* and performatives in this cae *expositives* delivered in court in the court are to show respect, honesty, politeness and kinship.

5.2. Suggestions

      The study finds out that the interaction between stylistics and pragmatics is a vital tool for analyzing dramatic texts, so it can be concluded that the application of pragma-stylistics and performative can support the analysis of dramatic texts and demonstrate the functions of their words and acts. As the case with other types of praggma-stylistic and performative, it can illustrate stylistic effects and purposes such as the psychological state of the characters, the dimensions of the character's personality and social and power relations among characters. A similar study can be conducted, but this time on either fictional or narrative, oral texts and pragma-stylistics study in media interviews deserves an investigation.

References

Allan, K. (Ed.). (2016). *TheRoutledge Handbook of Linguistics*. London and New York: Routledge.

Black, E. (1992). *Rhetorical Questions: Studies of Public Discourse*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Briner, B. (2013).*Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.

Burton, D. (1980*). Dialogue and Discourse: A Socio-linguistic Approach to Modern Drama and Naturally Occurring Conversation*. London: Ruthledge and Kegan Paul.

Cruse, A. (2006).*A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

D'hondt, S., Östman J., &Jef, V. (2009).*The Pragmatics of Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/hoph.4

Enkvist, N. (1973). *Linguistic Stylistics*. The Hague: Mouton.

Fabb, N. (2002). *Language and the Structure of Literature. The Linguistic Analysis of Form in Verse and Narratives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gray, M. (1984). *A Dictionary of Literary Terms*. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and Semantics, III:

Fraser, B. (1974). "An examination of the performative analysis", Papers in Linguistics,7:1-40.

Hancher, M. (1979). "The classification of cooperative illocutionary acts", Language *in Society 8* (1) :1-14.

Hawthron, J. (2000). *A Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory*. London: Edward Arnold Press.

Hickey, L. (1992).*Politeness apart, Why Choose Indirect Speech Acts? Linguae Stile*, 27 (March 1992).

Hough, G. (1969). *Style and Stylistics*. London: Rutledge and K. Paul.

Huang, Yan (2012). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jackson, R. (1981). *Fantasy: The Literature of Subversion*. London: Methuen & Co Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203328446.

Leech, G. (1983). *The Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Leech , G. (1992). " Pragmatic principles in Shaw's you never can tell" in M. Toolan (ed) *Language, Text and Context:Essays in Stylistics*. London: Routhledge.

Leech, G., & Short, M. (2007).*Style in Fiction*. London: Longman.

Levinson, S. (1983).*Pragmatics. Cambridge*: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813313.

Ohmann, R. (1972). "Instrumental Style: Notes on the Theory of Speech as Action". In *Current*

Mey, J. (2001). *Pragmatics: an Introduction (2nd ed.)*. New York: Blackwell Publishing.

Niazi, N., &Gautam, R. (2010).*How to Study Literature: Stylistic and Pragmatic Approches*. New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.

Riemer, N. (2010). *Introducing Semantics*. New York: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511808883

Saeed, John (1997). *Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1976). *A Classification of illocutionary acts*. Language in Society, 5:1-23

Sell, R. D. (Ed.). (1991). *Literary Pragmatics.* London and New York: Routledge

Short, M. (1989). "Discourse Analysis and the Analysis of Drama*"*. In R. Carter and P. Simpson

Stefoff, R. (2018). *How Is a Simile Similar to a Metaphor?* North Mankato: Capston Press.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction*: An Introduction to Pragmatics. London: Longman.