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The Maxims of Conversation guide communication. This includes conversation as well as advertising. Because the Maxims of Conversation apply to both conversation and advertisements, does it mean that the maxims are universal to all languages? This thesis examines the principles of conversation and analyzes eight advertisements in English and German to show a universality of the maxims between the languages. Furthermore, I explore the gap between the semantics (what is actually said) and pragmatics (what is inferred by the viewer) of advertising that is bridged by one of the maxims. My findings report that a universality of the Maxims of Conversation exists among languages, and that there is a problem between semantics and pragmatics, which rests primarily on the Maxim of Quantity.
"Catching our attention and imagination and aiding memory are perhaps the primary functions of advertising language" (Dyer 1982:139-140).

I have taken on this project because I find it intriguing that the Maxims of Conversation are as universal to language as are the steps of childhood language acquisition. Advertising language, like normal conversation, is governed by H. P. Grice's Maxims of Conversation. My focus centers on how these maxims apply to advertising and how they help to bring out the true meanings of advertisements. Though the Maxims of Conversation help to clarify the meaning of advertisements, advertising sometimes severely misrepresents the product or service being offered through poor use of the maxims. Every advertisement conveys some relevant information (other non-pertinent information may be used to bring closure to the ad), which must be exchanged for meaningful conversation to take place. However, advertisers carefully choose their words so they implicate a lot but entail a little, which clouds the true meanings of certain advertisements. This analysis provides general background information about the principle components of conversation, conversation style and conversation register. It also discusses how the tools of speech (inferences, entailments and implicatures) are used to interpret conversations and advertisements. A comparison of conversation positions, the literalist and pragmatist view, and cooperativeness and culture aids an in-depth examination of how the Maxims of Conversation affect advertisements. Finally, using these tools involved in analyzing the structure of language, I attempt to show, using Grice's Maxims of Conversation, that the gaps between what is said by the speaker and what is perceived by the hearer are filled by pragmatics (inferences that people bring to sentences) of the advertisements. This model assists me in making the inference-process more precise to clarify meaning of English and German advertisements. More specifically, it examines the maxims' universal qualities that exist not only between English and German, but in all languages.

Background information

In order to begin the analysis, the principle components that constitute a conversation and how this conversation is comparable to advertising must be discussed. A conversation is an effort to communicate which consists of a speaker and a hearer. Ideally, conversations are created because of a shared desire between the speaker and the listener to communicate truthfully and effectively. Each believes that the other is cooperating in an effort to achieve one another's goals, regardless of the motives behind those goals.
Conversation includes attempts of spoken and written language (with perhaps the exception of gestures) across all media (face-to-face, one-way conversation such as television, text) that shows the intent to communicate and use the Maxims of Conversation. The Maxims of Conversation, which will be discussed in detail later, ask the speaker to make true propositions, to make them as informative as possible, to make them relevant to the conversation, and to present them orderly and free of ambiguity. Gumperz (1990:430) defines this type of cooperation as "collaboration in the pursuit of shared communicative goals which serves as a precondition for maxim-based inferences." These maxim-based inferences are at the heart of conversation which this paper will explain further in later sections. Grice (1975:48) notes that "contributions of the participants should be dovetailed, mutually dependent," so that cooperation between the parties works to achieve their common communicative goals. Gumperz (1990:430) further asserts that "since communication consists of intentional acts, cooperativeness must be assessed with reference to some commonality of purpose or mutual agreement as to the general direction that an exchange is expected to take." Grice then points out that there should be an understanding between the speaker and the hearer about whether the conversation should continue in a relevant manner or if it should be aborted. However, this understanding must be clear to avoid a rude disruption that terminates the conversation; as Grice (1975:48) puts it "You do not just shove off or start doing something else." Furthermore, Michaels and Reier (1981:188) "suggest that establishing and sustaining conversational cooperation requires on-going interaction, whereby participants signal and interpret activity schemata and conversational cues in assessing one another's intent." This supports the idea that most conversations are created with a common purpose between the speaker and the listener. It is true that not every participant in a conversation has the same goals as another participant, so based on the context of the conversation "cooperation cannot be purely a matter of content" (Gumperz 1990:431). Content and context are closely interwoven, which affect cooperation.

While the topic of conversation is influenced by what is said and how it is said, it also reflects "the purpose of the conversation, the context in which the conversation takes place, and the social relationship that exists among the parties to the conversation" (Geis 1982:136). The context of a conversation itself is made up of four aspects: (1) the linguistic context specifies what has been said already, (2) the epistemic context delivers background information that is shared by all participants of the conversation, (3) the physical context describes the current environment of the conversation, and (4) the social context explains the reason that has brought the participants of the conversation together. Because Gricean "conversational logic is context-independent" (Lakoff 1990:472),
implications by speakers which make an informative contribution to hearers are considered universal across cultural and communication boundaries. This is especially helpful with my consideration of English and German advertisements as it leads me to conclude that the Maxims of Conversation are applicable to German.

Besides the above-mentioned context of a conversation, the speech style and speech register also influence the conduct of a conversation. Speech style considers how people talk to one another during a conversation, which results from the social context of the conversation. Examples of speech style include "frozen speech that consists of verbal formulas, formal speech of the sort one might use in giving a public lecture, consultative speech which is characteristic of strangers talking to each other, casual speech among friends and acquaintances on nonformal occasions, and intimate speech of the sort intimate friends might use" (Geis 1982:136). Speech register, on the other hand, illustrates the social relationship between the participants of the conversation. The differences between speech registers lies in word choice. For example, given the setting of an ice cream parlor, the store owner may speak to a customer at the counter in one tone of voice, "OK, I'll get you a banana split with chocolate sauce," and to his son, who works in the store, in another tone of voice, "Get me that banana split with chocolate sauce, now!" The physical context of the ice cream store remains the same throughout the conversation. However, the speech register differs between the three people involved because the relationship between the owner and his son, a subordinate employee, differs from the relationship between the owner and a customer. Thus, ordinary conversation employs speech style, which relies on the context in which the conversation is held, and speech register, which emphasizes the relationship between the participants of the conversation.

The same tools involved in analyzing the structure of conversation are used to interpret television (and to some extent magazine) advertisements. Television advertising is "a format where time is precious and information is paramount, [and] valuable moments cannot be spent on sheer emptiness" (Lakoff 1990:479), which alters the nature of the conversation but does not dismerit the maxims. Furthermore, the format of communication is one-way, not two-way as in ordinary discourse. Nevertheless, the principles of conversation still hold true for this type of one-way interaction as they do in two-way conversations. In order to interpret ads, both speech style and speech register must be identified. In most advertisements the relationship between the advertiser and the viewer "is closer to that of strangers than to anything else" (Geis 1982:138). The speech style befitting this relationship is consultation—advertisements will generally be formal, where one party has all the information and the other party must be persuaded to pay attention. Such is the case with a German advertisement by AEG, in which a man dressed in a tuxedo
is introducing a new stove to an audience. His speech is in the form of a presentation, so as to best describe and exemplify the stove's features to a supposed television audience. While this formal approach works for television advertisements employing conversation, the viewer "must be willing to accept the premises of the conversation" (Geis 1982:162). Thus, what is said and who says it in the advertisement not only influences the success of the advertisement, but it also affects the hearer in the type of inferences he will draw from the ad.

Given a statement from a conversation or an advertisement by a speaker, a listener will draw an inference, or conclusion, based on this statement. For example, a German speaker may say the following: "Heute ist langer Samstag." [Today is the extended Saturday—shops will be open longer than regular weekdays and weekends.] The hearer of the above statement may infer several things from what is actually said: (1) the speaker intends to go shopping, (2) the speaker is indirectly asking the hearer to accompany her, (3) the speaker is making this statement simply to call the hearer's attention to the fact that it is indeed the extended Saturday of the month, (4) the speaker is staying home but wants the hearer to go shopping for her. The hearer infers these statements in addition to what the speaker has said in his original statement, and the speaker's inferences further help to explain the possible meanings of the original statement to the hearer.

Inferences drawn by a hearer, such as the ones above, may be further classified into entailments and implicatures. Semantics, which is defined as the literal meanings of sentences and propositions, include the discussion of entailments. However, all inferences and implicatures are captured under the heading of pragmatics, or what the hearer brings to the sentence or proposition. Such is the case with Grice's Maxims of Conversation which will be discussed later. An entailment is a proposition that must be true if the sentence is true. In other words, "A sentence S entails a proposition P if and only if in every possible circumstance in which S is true, P is also true" (Geis 1982:28). Whenever a first sentence (S1) is true, a second sentence (S2) will be true. So, S1 entails S2 if the negation of S2 contradicts S1. This means that entailments cannot be canceled. An example of an entailment is: (1) I attend Swarthmore College. (2) I attend college. Given the two statements I will now negate the second statement I don't attend college. This shows that I attend Swarthmore College and I don't attend college creates a contradiction. Therefore, I attend Swarthmore College entails I attend college. However, sentence (2) does not entail (1) because I attend college and I don't attend Swarthmore College does not create a contradiction. Since (2) does not entail (1) the relationship between them is at best an implicature. In a given conversation which describes that I attend college but not

1 For future reference I will show the gloss for German advertisements in square brackets.
specifically Swarthmore College, this implicature arises out of conversation. Moreover, the relationship between I attend college and not specifically Swarthmore College may be a conversational implicature (implicatures will be explained in the following sections). If, however, it appears from the conversation that the hearer is led to believe that I attend Swarthmore College comes from I attend college, then (2) is said to suggest (1). But given the original circumstances and no prior knowledge of the situation, sentence (1) entails (2), but sentence (2) at best implicates (1).

Though entailments and implicatures are distinct, conventional implicatures act like entailments. Conventional implicatures are a sub-class of entailments whose need arises because entailments cannot "explicate inferences we draw from questions or imperative sentences, for neither questions nor imperative sentences can be true or false" (Geis 1982:28). For example, Wer hat mein Auto geklaut? [Who stole my car?] would most likely be answered with Jemand hat dein Auto geklaut. [Someone stole your car.] The question is neither true nor false, and it is impossible to determine whether it entails the response. I must mention, however, that Jemand is generally an expression that would be found in factually-stated sentences. Jemand is not conventionally used as an answer to a question. While it sounds strange to respond with Jemand hat nicht dein Auto geklaut. [Someone didn't steal your car.] to Wer hat mein Auto geklaut? [Who stole my car?], these statements do show direct contradiction. Thus, Wer hat mein Auto geklaut? [Who stole my car?] conventionally implicates Jemand hat dein Auto geklaut. [Someone stole your car.] because Jemand hat dein Auto geklaut. [Someone stole your car.] is neither true nor false. Like entailments, conventional implicatures cannot be canceled, which will be useful when analyzing advertisements.

It is important to note that "different listeners [may] draw different inferences from the same claim" (Geis 1982:27). So during a conversation, if one statement does not entail another statement but the two propositions are context-related, then an implicature is created. While conventional implicatures act more like entailments, theoretical and conversational implicatures are slightly different. Theoretical implicatures have the underlying notion that the listeners draw inferences based on what is said, but also what they believe to be true. A good example is a young child who may believe that a certain flavor of food can only be made from the essence of that flavor. Such is the case with orange flavored soda, which may not even contain any oranges and is instead flavored with chemicals. Conversational implicatures, on the other hand, arise from propositions that are context-related. These implicatures are governed by Grice's Maxims of Conversation.

The above principles (i.e., inferences, entailments and implicatures) tie into two prevalent views, the literalist and pragmatist, that deal with the truth of advertising. The
literalist standard attempts to hold advertisers "responsible only for what they assert and for what the things they say entail" (Geis 1982:12). Geis, in fact, argues that this view is the weakest defensible theory of truth in advertising because this theory only applies to the inferences that follow directly from the advertisers' words. He further points out that those inferences derived from the ad by the listener are the responsibility of the listener, not that of the speaker. Given the information about inferences, entailments and implicatures, "according to the literalist theory of truth in advertising, advertisers can be held responsible for assertions and conventional implicatures, but not theoretical implicatures or conversational implicatures" (Geis 1982:32). Advertisers cannot be held responsible because of differing theoretical and conversational implicatures which consumers will draw from one advertisement, and consumer beliefs and reasoning cannot be composed by advertisers. Thus, the literal view deals only with what is asserted in the advertisement, not what is inferred by consumers.

The pragmatist theory holds advertisers responsible for "nonidiosyncratic inferences drawn by consumers" (Geis 1982:12), which, according to Geis, lives up to actual human cognitive skills rather than ideal ones. So, if this theory is to be based on actual human cognitive skills, then "advertisers are also held responsible for conversational implicatures and (in some cases) theoretical implicatures of what they say as well as for conventional implicatures" (Geis 1982:40-41). The pragmatist theory is more applicable to today's advertisements because advertisers realize that they are dealing with humans, not with perfect machines, that understand advertisements' hidden messages and implicatures. Hence, advertisers use this theory to their advantage. However, advertisers have also come to realize that they must entail very little and imply more in order to influence inferences people draw about a given product or service. At the same time, advertisers must be careful in their choice of words so as to make their claim as best understood as possible so as to avoid misunderstandings between what is actually said and what is inferred by the consumer.

The advertiser manipulates the consumer with a verbal counterpart to the visual image which provides an explanation of what is happening in that image. In fact, many products or services "promoted on television have too little intrinsic visual appeal, or they differ too little from competing products at a visual level to be promoted visually" (Geis 1982:237), making verbal additions necessary to cause the product to seem unique. What should advertisers be held responsible for, their implications or their assertions? Laws regarding false advertising try to make this definition as well as Geis' literalist theory of truth, which makes advertisers responsible for their assertions and their assertions' entailments, and the conventional implications of their assertions. The pragmatist theory of
truth in advertising takes this one step further, requiring that the advertisers be responsible for the above three elements plus conversational implicatures. The advertisers are responsible for standing by their advertisements' assertions, entailments and conventional implicatures, which are a direct result of the conveyed meaning of the advertisement. Conversational implicatures, however, are the product of the viewer's inferences drawn from the advertisement; it is the viewer's responsibility to deal with these inferences and consequently the conversational implicatures.

Regardless of which view is adopted, advertisers must be aware of the background knowledge of the supposed audience for an advertisement. Advertisers do not intentionally trick consumers, or so consumers are led to believe. Any discrepancies or conversational implicatures that arise due to a lack of or a difference in background knowledge between consumers can be traced back to the advertiser; it should be the advertiser's responsibility to inform the consumer of background knowledge needed to understand the advertisement. This is very true when one considers Michaels and Reier's (1981:178) theory that "in real-life conversations far more is communicated than is actually expressed in words." This non-verbally communicated background information must be explained so that the advertiser can make the strongest claim possible. This strong claim, then, makes the product desirable and indisputable, and this claim may become an entailment. However, those claims that do not justify entailments will rely on implications to make a proposition "sound good" (Geis 1982:242). An advertiser's claim that frozen chocolate yogurt has a chocolate flavor like real chocolate ice cream does not entail that the "frozen chocolate yogurt tastes like real chocolate ice cream in all respects but only that it tastes like real chocolate ice cream in some respect" (Geis 1982:242). No serious tests can be made for this claim, but it sounds good enough to entice consumers to try frozen chocolate yogurt. Thus strong claims are the main place where a product may be misjudged by a consumer.

Regardless of language, conversational strategies (the way people to talk to one another) are learned as "a function of a speaker's long term interactive history as a member of a particular community and a particular network of associations" (Gumperz in Michaels and Reier 1981:181). This fact suggests that actual cooperation between different cultures will vary while the principle of cooperation is still intact: people want to communicate with one another. As Georgia Green (1990:419) points out, it "would astonish [her] to find a culture in which Grice's maxims were not routinely observed, and required for the interpretation of communicative intentions, and all other things being equal, routinely exploited to create implicature." Green's (1990:424) basic point is that Grice's maxims and principles are universal to the larger picture of "the human condition," which supports that an analysis of advertising in English and German should yield the same results. Ordinary
discourse, regardless of which language is being spoken, generally observes the Maxims of Quality and Relevance. However, the Maxims of Quantity and Manner are more culture-specific. The Maxims of Relevance and Quantity are of particular importance in the field of advertising, as is shown in my analysis of eight advertisements. Given these advertisements I will then draw specific conclusions about the maxims' link to universality across different cultures.

Before analyzing advertising language, it is beneficial to examine H. P. Grice's Maxims of Conversation, which govern any type of conversation, which includes advertising language. Grice's rules of conversation are captured under a broad heading of the Cooperative Principle. It states for the speaker to "make [his] conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which [he] is engaged" (Grice 1975:45). The Cooperative Principle contains four sub-maxims which are known as the Maxims of Conversation and are the actual rules that people follow in any type of conversation.

(1) The Maxims of Quantity tell the hearer how much information is presented to her. The Maxims of Quantity require the speaker to make his contribution "as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange) [and not to make his] contribution more informative than is required" (Grice 1975:45). A German example of this is the following: *Ein Mann fragt eine Frau wie sie heißt. Sie antwortet "Christiane Müller."* [A man asks a woman what her name is. She replies "Christiane Müller."] She answered in accordance with the Maxims of Quantity. Had she said "*Christiane Müller. I live on Berliner Straße 37,*" she would have violated this maxim by providing superfluous information. Additional, unnecessary information carries the risk of causing the hearer to misinterpret crucial information or believe that there is another point the speaker wishes to make.

(2) The Maxims of Quality are headed by the request that the speaker should try to make his contribution true by not saying what he believes to be false. Furthermore, a second maxim notes that the speaker should avoid making a proposition without having sufficient information to support that claim. As a default, the hearer assumes what the speaker says to be true. An example of the above maxims is the following: *There is a large human population on the planet Pluto.* Given the background knowledge that there is no human life on Pluto, the above statement is false. However, hypothetically speaking, there could be a human population on the planet Pluto. Since there is no given evidence to support this, the listener must rely on her previous knowledge and assume the statement is false.

(3) The Maxim of Relevance demands that the speaker should make a contribution that is relevant to the conversation. While this is by far the most succinct maxim, it is the one
that causes the most difficulties in conversations. The relation between one proposition and another depends entirely upon the Maxim of Relevance and how the speaker intends to connect the first proposition to the second. An example is provided by the following conversation: (A) What movie did you see at the theater complex last night? (B) I ate a peanut butter and jelly sandwich. In the given context, (B)'s answer to (A)'s question does not fulfill the relevance issue posed by (A), that of which movie (B) saw last night. Of course, (A) assumes that (B) went to see a movie at the theater complex and that peanut butter and jelly sandwich is not the title of the movie. If the assumption is true that if (B) did indeed go to see a movie last night, then by answering with I ate a peanut butter and jelly sandwich (B) makes a statement that is irrelevant to (A)'s question. Thus, (B) has violated the Maxim of Relevance, which violates the principles of ordinary discourse.

4) The Maxim of Manner encompasses four maxims: 

(1) Avoid obscurity of expression. (2) Avoid ambiguity. (3) Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity). (4) Be orderly" (Grice 1975:46). An example of how this manner is abused follows: I went down to the market and ran into this guy whom I knew from high school and he asked me to let him know if I wanted to go work for him in his bicycle shop if I needed the extra work, and he told me to take care of myself, and I told him that I would do that. The sentence is obscured by too much information, leading the hearer to infer multiple, confusing conclusions. The hearer may infer that the speaker, who went to the market, accidentally bumped into an old acquaintance and this old friend proceeded to offer the speaker a job. However, the ambiguity in the statement arises with I told him that I would. The statement does not clarify whether it refers to the speaker wanting to take the job or whether the speaker is telling his friend that he will take care of himself. This sentence must be broken down into smaller sections, and perhaps multiple questions are necessary in order to correctly respond to each issue raised. This division of the sentence will improve brevity of the propositions and will may help avoid ambiguity, but as it now stands, it defies the Maxim of Relevance.

Besides specific failures of the Maxims of Conversation, a speaker "may quietly and unostentatiously violate a maxim; if so, in some cases he will be liable to mislead" (Grice 1975:49). An example of such is the expression that is commonly found when speaking about past times of the same year in English: a man speaks in November 1996 about an event that occurred in May 1996, of which he says "The crash occurred last May." This may mislead a hearer to think that the crash happened a year earlier in 1995, when instead it actually happened in May 1996. Another way to fail to fulfill a maxim is to opt out of cooperating in the conversation and not abiding by a specific maxim. An example of opting out is the following: Eine Mutter fragt ihre Tochter "Was ist denn los?" Die Tochter
antwortet "Ich weiß nicht, und ich möchte nicht (mit dir) darüber reden." [A mother asks her daughter "What's wrong?" The daughter replies "I don't know, and I don't want to talk about it (with you)."]. The conclusion is that the daughter does not comply with the mother's request and opts out of the Maxim of Quality. A third failure to fulfill a maxim results if there is a clash between two maxims. Grice (1975:49) gives the following example: "He may be unable, for example, to fulfill the first maxim of Quantity (Be as informative as is required) without violating the second maxim of Quality (Have adequate evidence for what you say)." The last way to fail to fulfill a maxim is to flout a maxim by blatantly failing to fulfill it. Grice points out the following:

On the assumption that the speaker is able to fulfill the maxim and to do so without violating another maxim (because of a clash), is not opting out, and is not, in view of the blatancy of his performance, trying to mislead, the hearer is faced with a minor problem: How can his saying what he did say be reconciled with the supposition that he is observing the overall Cooperative Principle? This situation is one that characteristically gives rise to a conversational implicature; and when a conversational implicature is generated in this way, I shall say that a maxim is being exploited.

Given an overview of the components of conversation, of speech style and speech register, of inferences, entailments and implicatures, of the literalist and pragmatist views, of background knowledge about the world and products and services, of the Cooperative Principle and the Maxims of Conversation, and of the failures to fulfill the Maxims of Conversation, we are now ready to analyze advertisements to find their true meanings.

**Advertisement analysis**

The following section will be devoted to the analysis of television and magazine advertisements in English and German. As a default I will assume that the Maxim of Quality is always adhered to so that the hearer assumes what the speaker says to be true. This will aid me with the analysis of those maxims at work in the various advertisements. The general format is the following: (1) a transcription of advertisement, (2) a brief explanation of the visual context or background information if it is needed, (3) an analysis of what is implicated by the ad—what inferences are made that go beyond what the ad entails, and (4) an explanation of how the implicatures in (3) arise.

The first advertisement that I will analyze is from 7-Eleven.

Dallas Cowboy Charles Haley has had to pay quite a price to get to the Super Bowl. But thanks to 7-Eleven you might only have to pay the price of a coffee mug. Now, when you buy a fresh ground, fresh brewed 7-Eleven coffee in your favorite team mug, you could win tickets to the Super Bowl from Hershey's. You even get $1 off a haircut at Supercuts. The NFL Thermal Mug Instant Win Game. From 7-Eleven.
The accompanying visual segments show X-rays of Dallas Cowboy football player Charles Haley's numerous injuries. The X-rays also show shots of a person receiving a haircut. A male voice-over narrates this advertisement. A visual disclaimer is shown during the ad at the bottom of the screen stating *No purchase necessary. Void where prohibited. See alternate means of entry. Participating stores.*

The ad implies that Charles Haley's price to get to the Super Bowl is paid in the form of multiple bodily injuries, while the customer's price might only be that of an NFL team coffee mug, which would give him the chance to win tickets to the Super Bowl, the equivalent of Haley playing in the Super Bowl. The viewer's perception of the ad may be distorted by the choice of words in the advertisement, such as *might* and *could.* The customer may infer that he is obligated to buy the coffee mug in order to have a chance to win these tickets to the Super Bowl. However, the disclaimer of the advertisement states that there is no purchase necessary and to see alternate means of entry (but this is in small print and never said).

The question of intrigue that this advertisement presents is the following: why is it that people conclude that *if a customer does not purchase a mug, then he will not have a chance to win Super Bowl tickets (if ~p then ~w)?* This has to do with the condition that is set up for the customer: *if a customer purchases a mug, then he has a chance of winning tickets to the Super Bowl (if p then w).* Let's look at the propositions presented in this advertisement. I will use three constants (p, q and w) to represent these propositions in logic statements:

- p = The customer purchases a mug.
- q = The customer sends away for a game piece.
- w = The customer has a chance of winning Super Bowl tickets.

The advertisement states, and therefore entails, *(1)* *if a customer purchases a mug, then he has a chance of winning Super Bowl tickets (if p then w).* Furthermore, the disclaimer states, and thus entails, *(2)* *if a customer enters the contest by sending away for a game piece, then he has a chance of winning Super Bowl tickets (if q then w).* I will designate the statement of intrigue *(3)* *if a customer does not purchase a mug, then he will not have a chance to win Super Bowl tickets (if ~p then ~w)* as *(3).* How can a customer come to believe statement *(3)* given that statement *(2)* is entailed by the advertisement (because *if q then w* contradicts *if ~p then ~w)*? The customer must simply ignore *(2).*

This brings us to the question of how to derive *(3)* *if a customer does not purchase a mug, then he will not have a chance to win Super Bowl tickets (if ~p then ~w)* from *(1)* *if a customer purchases a mug, then he has a chance of winning Super Bowl tickets (if p then w)*.
Having stated that (1) is entailed by the advertisement, it is difficult to explain how (3) is derived from (1). If a customer does not notice (2) if a customer enters the contest by sending away for a game piece, then he has a chance of winning Super Bowl tickets (if q then w) but wants to bring w about, then the only way to do this is by pursuing p. So, the customer must assume that all the necessary information is contained in (1) in order to conclude (3) if ~p then ~w from (1) if p then w. This inference made by the customer is made by a conversational implicature by the Maxims of Quantity and Relevance. First, the customer must assume that all the necessary information is provided by the Maxim of Quantity. That is, if the customer is unaware of the alternate means of entry then the purchase of the mug is the only way to win tickets. Furthermore, if the customer must purchase the mug in order to win, then it is apparent to the customer that if he does not purchase the mug he will not have a chance to win Super Bowl tickets. Thus, the customer must then assume that this information is relevant enough to believe (3) if ~p then ~w from (1) if p then w.

Thus, given p, q and w, the statement if the customer purchases a mug or sends away for a game piece, then he has a chance of winning Super Bowl tickets (if p or q then w) holds true for the contest regardless of p or q. The probability of winning tickets is the same for both means of entry. While 7-Eleven’s advertisement entails that a customer has a chance to win Super Bowl tickets by either buying a team mug or by entering by alternate means, the ad merely implicates that a customer might actually win these tickets. The Maxim of Quantity ensures that the advertisement is adequately "informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange" (Levinson 1994:101). It tells the viewer, by means of disclaimers in small print, that the purchase of the mug is not necessary. By law, as well as by the Maxim of Quantity, advertisers are required to inform the viewer/reader to the extent that is necessary for comprehension. However, there is no need to reveal further information other than that which is required.

It becomes important to ask why does a customer believe that if the customer purchases a mug, then he has a chance of winning Super Bowl tickets (if p then w) is a stronger statement than if a customer sends away for a game piece, then the customer has a chance of winning Super Bowl tickets (if q then w)? This claim of a stronger statement comes from the viewer’s perception of the advertisement, or the perception that 7-Eleven wishes to create for the customer. If the chances of winning tickets to the Super Bowl are equal, then some people find it easier to buy the team mug at a 7-Eleven store rather than to send away for a game piece through the mail. Furthermore, the task of writing a letter to the company requesting a game piece, having to address an envelope and putting a stamp on it, plus finding the address of the company may seem daunting to some people. The
ease of the task of going to the local 7-Eleven store and buying a mug to receive a game piece is much more appealing. In other words, the instant gratification of getting the game piece and having a chance to win tickets to the Super Bowl is preferred to sending away for a game piece that will take three to four weeks to arrive by mail.

The disclaimers allow the ad to draw in the customer and avert his attention to the purchasing of a mug, which is advantageous for 7-Eleven, instead of openly mentioning that no purchase is necessary. 7-Eleven uses the Maxim of Relevance to unify the items displayed in the advertisement. The ad's reference to getting $1 off a haircut at Supercuts directly relates to the purpose of advertising the chance to win Super Bowl tickets by purchasing a team mug. The coupon for $1 off a haircut at Supercuts is available only at 7-Eleven. Furthermore, this coupon is only available if the customer buys coffee in a team mug from 7-Eleven. Thus, 7-Eleven sets the conditions such that the purchase of the mug directly correlates to obtaining a coupon for $1 off from Supercuts. The Supercuts information is also interesting because it connects the visual elements of the advertisement: Charles Haley's numerous injuries, the portrayal of these injuries in X-ray form, and X-ray shots of a person receiving a haircut. The screens following those of the person's head receiving a haircut show Super Bowl tickets and a team mug appearing in that person's head as he thinks about those items. These scenes do not influence the meaning of the ad's dialogue, but by the Maxim of Relevance the X-rays creatively tie together the ad.

7-Eleven suggests for a customer to buy the mug even when there is no purchase necessary. In addition, 7-Eleven entails that by buying a mug, one could have the chance to win Super Bowl tickets. The reality is that there is an alternate way of entry, one that requires no purchase of the mug. Looking at the greater picture, 7-Eleven's strategy to sell coffee is supported by the team mug-giveaway, which is further supported by an instant win game for Super Bowl tickets. While 7-Eleven hopes the customer will buy the mug to win the tickets, the chances of winning are equal if one enters by alternate means. Hence, according to 7-Eleven's rules of the competition, it is true that if one enters to win tickets without purchasing a mug, it is also true that one may win tickets when one purchases a mug. 7-Eleven arranges the ad to its benefit to make money without ever being false and defying any maxims.

This next advertisement, taken from Sports Illustrated (7-Eleven October 1996), shows a slightly altered version of the earlier 7-Eleven television advertisement.

Be an NFL Super Fan! Make your NFL season Super with this FREE offer from Supercuts and 7-Eleven. It all starts at Supercuts, but quantities of mugs are limited, so get going today! Super Haircut: Head to Supercuts for a good deal on an all-pro haircut that's no-nonsense and no-hassle. Call
1-800-SUPERCUTS for the location nearest you. Super Deal: Get a FREE NFL Team Mug at 7-Eleven with the coupon you get at Supercuts. This 20 oz. Aladdin insulated mug comes complete with a coffee fill-up. Super Bowl: Look inside your FREE NFL Team Mug. You may be an instant winner of a trip for 2 to Super Bowl XXXI in New Orleans, or other great prizes.

This Supercuts/7-Eleven advertisement is similar to its 7-Eleven television counterpart: it advertises a free NFL mug that gives the customer a chance to win tickets to the Super Bowl. Unlike the television ad, there is no mention of alternate means of entry to win Super Bowl tickets. The question at hand is the following: given the vague meaning of get in the statement Get a FREE NFL Team Mug at 7-Eleven with the coupon you get at Supercuts, is the purchase of a haircut necessary in order to receive a FREE NFL Team Mug and a chance to win tickets to the Super Bowl?

One interpretation of Get a FREE NFL Team Mug at 7-Eleven with the coupon you get at Supercuts is that it is possible to walk into a Supercuts store and pick up a coupon for the mug and a refill, which ensures a chance to win tickets to the Super Bowl. In this description no purchase of the mug is necessary; it is really free. Thus, the meaning of get is that of physically obtaining or picking up. The customer may go to 7-Eleven to redeem the coupon from Supercuts for the free team mug, but he is not obligated to do so.

A second interpretation, which I believe to be the one that 7-Eleven and Supercuts wish to portray, tells the customer that he may get a FREE NFL Team Mug at 7-Eleven with the coupon he receives at Supercuts after he purchases a haircut. Of course, the chance to win Super Bowl tickets is still applicable once the customer has purchased a haircut at Supercuts and received his coupon for the free mug from 7-Eleven, but he has had to pay for something in order to have this chance at tickets.

The problem with these two interpretations lies within the vagueness of get. Get does not specify what the customer must do in order to obtain a FREE NFL Team Mug at 7-Eleven. Must he go and physically pick up the coupon or is the purchase of a haircut involved? The Maxim of Quantity tells the reader of this advertisement to get a free mug at 7-Eleven with the coupon from Supercuts. However, 7-Eleven/Supercuts' choice of words in get does not adequately describe what they want the customer to do. Thus, 7-Eleven/Supercuts fails to choose words in their advertisement that makes its "contribution as informative as is required for the current purpose of the exchange" (Grice 1975:45) by the Maxim of Quantity.

Another English language television advertisement comes from Carnation.
For the first year of life there is the gentleness of Carnation Good Start, the only routine formula whose protein is specially processed into smaller pieces, to be gentle on a baby's system. And Good Start digests more like breast milk in your baby's stomach than the leading formula. Breast milk is nature's miracle. Good Start is Carnation's. Carnation Good Start. Made to be gentle.

Carnation expects consumers to make the assumption that their formula is as good as breast milk because it is Carnation's miracle, instead of nature's miracle. A consumer's choice to use formula instead of breast milk is influenced by a society's cultural practices or an individual's circumstances. For instance, a consumer may switch from breast feeding to formula because of time constraints, health reasons or culture-specific intolerance of public breast feeding. This advertisement is an immediate result of more women working away from their homes.

The statement the only routine formula whose protein is specially processed into smaller pieces, to be gentle on a baby's system is a purpose clause (a motivation for Carnation to make its product superior to the other leading formulas on the market). This purpose clause may be broken down into two components:

\[ p = \text{The protein is specially processed into smaller pieces.} \]
\[ q = \text{The formula is gentle on a baby's system.} \]

It is easily seen from the protein is specially processed into smaller pieces and the formula is not gentle on a baby's system (\( p \) and \( \neg q \)) that \( p \) does not entail \( q \). However, the question of intrigue becomes: why do consumers still believe that \( \text{if } p \text{ then } q \text{ is likely to be true} \)? This belief is supported by the proof below:

**STATEMENT:**
(1) Carnation does \( p \) for the purpose of \( q \).
(2) Carnation believes \( \text{if } p \text{ then } q \).
(3) If an authority believes something, it is likely to be true.
(4) Carnation is an authority.
(5) If Carnation believes something, it is likely to be true.
(6) If Carnation believes \( \text{if } p \text{ then } q \), it is likely to be true.
(7) \( \text{if } p \text{ then } q \) is likely to be true.

**JUSTIFICATION:**
Entailed by what is said in the ad assuming the Maxim of Quality
Implicature by Maxim of Quantity & conventional implicature based on (1)
General assumption about the world
Specific assumption about the world (3), (4), universal instantiation
(5), universal instantiation
(2), (6), Modus Ponens

Line (1), Carnation's doing \( p \) for the purpose of \( q \), is entailed by the ad. The consumer must believe that the propositions in the ad are true by the Maxim of Quality. In Line (2), Carnation simply does \( p \) for the purpose of \( q \) not believing \( \text{if } p \text{ then } q \). This
results in (2) not entailing (1) by non-contradiction. So, because no additional information is needed or given, an implicature by the Maxim of Quantity arises. Furthermore, Carnation also does p for the purpose of q believing if p then q. This results in a conventional implicature based on line (1) because of a felicity condition (this is an example of a felicity condition) on the purpose clause. Line (3) states a general assumption about the world that an authority is a credible source of information. Line (4) makes a specific assumption that Carnation is an authority on baby formula. Statement (5) uses (3) and (4) to claim that Carnation is a credible source of information for consumers regarding baby formula. Line (6) substitutes if p then q for something using standard principles of predicate logic. By lines (2) and (6) and using standard principles of predicate logic, line (7) shows that if the protein is specially processed into smaller pieces then the formula will be gentle on a baby's system (if p then q) is likely to be true. Even though line (7) if p then q is likely to be true is not entailed by Carnation's advertisement, consumers still believe this statement because they infer it from the ad. By using the argument of if p then q Carnation is able to draw the conclusion that they have created a miracle that is exchangeable for nature's miracle of breast milk.

This magazine advertisement comes from The Princeton Review:

Great test scores make you look better...to colleges and graduate schools. While the first step is a stunning test score, The Princeton Review has the complete solution. When it comes to standardized tests and the admissions process, no one understands what you're going through better than we do. Our focused, personalized approach is famous for giving students an exceptional edge and top-rate scores. To find out about our intensive courses call us today at (800) 2-REVIEW or browse us at www.review.com. Or look for our award-winning books and software at a store near you. We'll give you a strategy make-over and enhance your chances. GET AN EDGE.

The Princeton Review wishes to establish itself as an authority on giving their students an exceptional edge and top-rate scores. In fact, the company's personalized approach is famous for giving students an exceptional edge and top-rate scores. The question at hand is the following: given that the advertisement does not entail that the personalized approach will give students an exceptional edge and top-rate scores, why do people still believe that Princeton Review gives students an exceptional edge and top-rate scores?

The following proof shows how consumers are likely to think that the Princeton Review gives students an exceptional edge and top-rate scores is true.

STATEMENT:  

JUSTIFICATION:
(1) Princeton Review states: *Our personal approach is famous for giving students an exceptional edge and top-rate scores.* Entailed by what is said in the ad assuming the Maxim of Quality

(2) For all Y, for all X if Y says it is *famous for* X, then Y can do X. Felicity condition on Y being *famous for* X.

(3) For all X, if Princeton Review says it is *famous for* X, then Princeton Review can do X. (2), universal instantiation

(4) If Princeton Review says it is *famous for giving students an exceptional edge and top-rate scores*, then Princeton Review gives students an exceptional edge and top-rate scores. (3), universal instantiation

(5) Princeton Review gives students an exceptional edge and top-rate scores. (1), (4), Modus Ponens

Line (1)'s statement, Princeton Review states: *Our personal approach is famous for giving students an exceptional edge and top-rate scores,* is entailed by the advertisement assuming that Princeton Review is telling the truth by the Maxim of Quality. Line (2) states that for all Y, if Y claims that it is *famous for* X, then Y can do X. Line (2) is explained by a felicity condition on being *famous for* X, which means in order to for Y to claim that it is *famous for* X, Y must be able to do X. Line (3) substitutes Princeton Review for Y, which comes about by (2) and standard principles of predicate logic. Statement (4) substitutes *giving students and exceptional edge and top-rate scores* for X by line (3) and standard principles of logic. Finally, line (5) comes about by lines (1) and (4) and standard principles of logic. Thus, while the advertisement does not entail Princeton Review *gives students an exceptional edge and top-rate scores,* line (5) is convincingly attractive to many consumers. Princeton Review implies success when, in reality, the approach does not entail that students will receive *an exceptional edge and top-rate scores.* Rather, the statement implies that after having taken the course, students may be rewarded with good scores. In sum, many people have heard about the Princeton Review, which can play off of people's test-taking anxieties and will very easily convince them that the Princeton Review can help.

This German magazine ad is from Nikon:

Angst bei Regen nehmen wir Ihnen ab. Die neue Nikon AW 35 fürchtet sich vor keinem Gewitter.

[Don't ever try this with a normal camera. Raindrops knocking on the lens. What a nightmare. But not with the new Nikon AW 35. Because it isn't just protected from spray-water, it also has much that is worth protecting: extensive automatic functions, red-eye flash, 30 second focus memory, double-self-timer, zoom up to 65 cm, and much more. Is the convertible top up? Is the wash still outside? Did I take the camera inside? We'll remove (calm) your fear of rain. The new Nikon AW 35 is not afraid of any thunderstorm.]

The visual information shows the Nikon AW 35 splashed with water drops. According to the ad, one should not try this situation with a normal camera. This leads the reader to believe that this is not a normal camera (i.e. Nikon is implying that they are selling a unique camera) even though the ad does not entail this proposition. The question of intrigue here is: why does the consumer infer that the Nikon AW 35 is not a normal camera?

Don't ever try this with a normal camera leads the reader to believe that the Nikon AW 35 is not a normal camera, and the proof will show how this inference is drawn.

STATEMENT:
(1) Don't ever try this with a normal camera.
(2) No one violates his own imperative.
(3) Nikon does not violate its own imperative.
(4) If there is a camera that Nikon is doing this to, then the camera is not normal.
(5) The camera that Nikon is doing this to is not normal.
(6) Nikon is doing this to a camera.
(7) The camera that Nikon is doing this to is not normal.
(8) Nikon is doing this to the Nikon AW 35.
(9) The Nikon AW 35 is not a normal camera.

JUSTIFICATION:
An imperative in the ad by Nikon assuming the Maxim of Quality
Felicity condition on imperatives (2), universal instantiation
(3), universal instantiation
(4), Maxim of Relevance
Observed in advertisement (5), (6), Modus Ponens
Observed in advertisement (7), (8), substitution of equivalent expressions

Line (1) is given by the advertisement and is assumed to be true by the Maxim of Quality. this in the imperative of line (1) replaces "spraying water on...." Thus, anytime this is mentioned in the proof it refers to "spraying water on" and will be used in conjunction with to a camera so that it fits the sentence grammatically. Line (2) is a universal statement that is justified as a felicity condition on imperatives. In line (3), Nikon does not violate its own imperative because of (2) and standard principles of predicate logic. Line (4), Nikon is not violating (1), arises from (3) and standard principles of predicate logic. Statement (5) arises from line (4) and the Maxim of Relevance (since line
(1) is contained within the explanation of line (4)). In this statement Nikon sprays water on to a camera to show that the camera is indeed not normal, and if this is done it is because this activity is relevant to showing that the camera is not a normal one. Line (6) shows that Nikon is spraying water on a camera, which is observed in the advertisement and believed that the camera is indeed sprinkled with water drops by the Maxim of Quality. Line (7) arises from lines (5) and (6) and standard principles of logic to show that the camera is not a normal one. Line (8) shows that Nikon is spraying water on the Nikon AW 35, which is again observed in the advertisement and assumed to be true by the Maxim of Quality from the advertisement's picture. Finally, line (9) then shows that the Nikon AW 35 is not a normal camera by lines (7) and (8) and a substitution of equivalent expressions. Again, the ad does not entail that the camera is not a normal one, but with the opening statement reading Don't ever try this with a normal camera certainly leads the consumer to believe that it is truly not a normal camera.

This German television ad is from Signal toothpaste.


[A mother cannot help herself. Not only does she want to believe that her child is well, she wants to know. Especially with such an important issue like cavities. Signal protects from cavities. It is proven in the largest anti-cavities test in Germany. Your child trusts you, you should trust Signal. Signal shows where it works: white like healthy teeth, red like healthy gums. Give your family the protection of Signal.]

This ad makes use of a nationwide anti-cavities test. Signal mentions in verbal as well as visual disclaimers that the toothpaste has been tested in clinical laboratories. Signal does not use recognized governmental support in its disclaimers; the ad merely shows a small, round highlight (with a cross signifying health—like the Red Cross) saying that the toothpaste protects from cavities—proven in clinical test. Signal hopes that the mention of clinical tests will provide a strong enough argument that the company and its product should be trusted. The following three assumptions are based on background knowledge about the toothpaste-users that Signal must consider when advertising its product: (1) Signal cannot claim that all those people who use its toothpaste will never get cavities; (2) Signal cannot claim that using this toothpaste will prevent the formation of future cavities;
(3) Signal cannot claim that using this toothpaste will stop the current development of cavities or prevent the formation of future new cavities.

The interesting question is whether consumers think that Signal toothpaste will protect them from all cavities. Given the statement *Signal protects from cavities*, consumers may be led to believe that they will never get cavities. That, however, is a misconception: protection does not equal prevention. The assumptions from the above section (while it is not necessary to mention them by virtue of the Maxim of Quantity) lay the groundwork for the explanation of how Signal is able to claim *Signal protects from cavities*. Signal may protect from and may even prevent some or most of the cavities that the user encounters, but Signal does not protect from all cavities. That is, does *Signal protects from cavities* entail that it protects from all cavities? The contradiction test *Signal protects from cavities* and *Signal doesn't protect from all cavities* shows that there is no entailment. Since there is no entailment that says that *Signal protects from all cavities*, it merely implies *Signal protects from cavities* so that those who have never had cavities and who use the toothpaste regularly may never have cavities in later life. Furthermore, it is also merely implied that those who have had cavities before may now be protected from further cavities if they use this toothpaste on a regular basis; that is, these people may be protected from further cavities if their cavities are under control and they continue to practice good oral hygiene with Signal toothpaste. In sum, the use of statistics, even if Signal does not mention any, is always good because people always assume that tests are true and not manipulated by the advertiser.

This next German magazine advertisement comes from Commerzbank:

will enjoy personal insurance protection. World wide, of course. And all that with 46 cm².

The advertisement shows a man relaxing in the sun on a floating mattress in a pool. The other half of the page is devoted to the text of the advertisement. Given the accompanying text, the question here is the following: how do the time of 15 days and the space of 46 cm² relate to personal security of financial freedom?

46 cm² is the surface area of a normal credit card. In this case, 15 days is the length of the vacation that the man in the picture is taking, assuming he has the EUROCARD GOLD. If he is issued a card, he is able to take that fifteen-day vacation. In essence, the fifteen-day vacation is somehow contained within those 46 cm². Furthermore, the reference of 15 days with 46 cm² implies that the credit card carries a credit limit large enough to afford this vacation. The GOLD not only implies but it entails that the man is able to afford a purchase such as the fifteen-day vacation. In order to validate the proposition that the customer can take his fifteen-day vacation with 46 cm², I make several general assumptions about credit card users: (1) the cardholder must be in good financial standing, (2) he must have sufficient credit to cover the charges he is making, and (3) he must eventually be able to repay the debts he incurs on his credit card. If these predispositions are met, then Commerzbank will lend its cardholder the money through credit to take a fifteen-day vacation, as is the case in this advertisement.

So, if the customer is able to meet the above-mentioned assumptions, the references made to whether it is a planned vacation, a purchase when shopping or even filling up the car, Commerzbank will always be there to back up its cardholder, regardless of the size of the purchase. However, Commerzbank violates the Maxim of Quantity because it provides inadequate information about the requirements needed to obtain a EUROCARD GOLD. These requirements are not printed in the ad by the Maxim of Quantity because they may scare potential card applicants away.

The Maxim of Relevance also appears in this advertisement with the description of the size of the card. The measure of 46 cm² in the metric system is very relevant to German culture, but certainly not to American culture. Even if the card were in inches, an American would not understand its size. Americans are aware of big spaces, Germans of small ones. Regardless of the use of the metric system, in the larger picture Commerzbank uses the small size of its EUROCARD GOLD to contrast with the vast spending power it brings. The mention of 15 days with 46 cm² shows the capacity that this GOLD card has. Germans think that the card is small, efficient, and packs much (purchasing) power into it. They think in terms of 46 cm². Americans, on the other hand, think in terms of the actual
size of the card; an American ad may picture the card in its actual size in the advertisement. Therefore, this small card makes a vacation more simple. The customer can afford to purchase a fifteen-day vacation, and thus the contrast of the small size of the credit card and the purchasing power with which it provides its customer brings the Maxim of Relevance into the advertisement. In this case, relating an abstract idea of financial freedom to a concrete example of a plastic card shows Germans' interest in small objects (like a credit card) link to personal enjoyment of a vacation or to shopping.

This last television advertisement comes from Braun in Germany.

Man's voice: Alles in einem Topf, Multipractic Plus von Braun.
Woman's voice: Damit wollen Sie Hefeteig kneten?
Man's voice: Sie kann einfach alles, alles in einem Topf.
Woman's voice: Und damit wollen Sie Teig rühren?
Man's voice: Sie kann einfach alles, alles in einem Topf.
Woman's voice: Und Fleisch hacken, und Gurken schneiden, und Karotten raspeln, und Pommes Frites?

Man's voice: [All in one pot, Multipractic Plus by Braun.
Woman's voice: You want to knead dough with that?
Man's voice: She can do simply everything, all in one pot.
Woman's voice: And you want to knead dough with that?
Man's voice: She can do simply everything, all in one pot.
Woman's voice: And hack up meat, and cut cucumbers, and shred carrots, and make french fries?
Man's voice: The new Multipractic Plus by Braun. She can do simply everything, all in one pot.]

Braun's advertisement shows the Multipractic Plus' abilities to knead, shred and cut food at the touch of a button. When the button is pressed and the shredding and cutting begins, one readily sees the work at hand. However, at the end of the commercial, the camera zooms out and away from the Multipractic Plus to show a variety of dishes and desserts, all of which have been delicately prepared. This image, coupled with the repeated statement *She can do simply everything, all in one pot*, could conceivably lead to a misconception not only about the abilities of this machine but also about the gender of *She* who is doing *simply everything, all in one pot*.

I will first eliminate the confusion about gender in this advertisement. In *She can do simply everything, all in one pot*, *She* refers to the machine. It is interesting to note that Multipractic Plus does not necessitate a natural German gender. The gender of the article of *machine* in German is feminine, and the Multipractic Plus is referred to as a machine in the advertisement. Thus, the translation from German into English may sound strange, but it is done so that *She* refers to the machine, not the woman in the ad asking the male voice-
over questions. Thus by the Maxim of Relevance, while She refers to the machine grammatically, metaphorically it refers to the woman who will be empowered to use the Multipractic Plus to do simply everything.

This advertisement is a fairly simple example of the Maxim of Relevance. The words everything and all do not restrict the possibilities of what the machine can do (in one pot). However, it should be noted that since I am focusing only on the spoken text the visual component merely enhances my textual analysis. Hence, this is where the Maxim of Relevance comes into play: everything and all are restricted by the context of the advertisement. That is, what everything and all refer to is limited to the context of food. The machine can prepare everything, the food item, in the way that is requested. This requested way is denoted by all, which includes kneading, hacking, cutting and shredding. Therefore, given the relationship between the machine and its limited abilities to knead, hack, cut and shred, it is impossible to have an entailment where the machine can make all these dishes; rather, it is a conversational implicature that is created out of the conversation between the man and the woman, where the woman will be the maker of these dishes. Furthermore, the verb do is restricted, and thus relevant, to the context of food processing; do refers simply to kneading, hacking, cutting and shredding. Thus, She can do simply everything, all in one pot is a context-specific statement that holds its constituents together by the Maxim of Relevance.

Conclusions

From this thesis it becomes possible to propose that the Maxims of Conversation are present in every conversation and advertisement across cultures and languages. The maxims are applied to all the advertisement case studies of this thesis, especially the Maxims of Quality, Quantity and Relevance, allowing us to conclude that they prevail in the English and German languages. Furthermore, research by Grice and Green proposes that the Maxims of Conversation are universal to all languages, and although I am presently restricting my study to Germanic languages, my findings concur that the maxims may work universally for all languages. In my research, the Maxim of Quality is adhered to in all advertisements, and one should note that all these advertisements, with the exception of Nikon, Princeton Review and Braun, utilize the Maxim of Quantity in one way or another (either they abide by it or they violate it). Furthermore, some of the ads analyzed in this thesis apply the Maxim of Relevance, as well as making general and specific assumptions about the world. This analysis of the advertisements also reveals that the Braun and Commerzbank advertisements apply the Maxim of Relevance culture-specifically. In the Braun ad the maxim is used to make particular reference to a culture-specific form of She,
where *She* refers not only to the machine, but also to the woman who prepares meals using the machine. In the Commerzbank ad it is used to make a reference to size which has meaning only to a German audience.

The statements of intrigue in these advertisements stem from propositions that are stated in the ads and the inferences that people draw from them. Thus, the statements of intrigue arise with the help of the following: (1) semantics (what is actually said), (2) general assumptions about the world, (3) specific assumptions about the world, (4) felicity (faithfulness) conditions on purpose clauses, (5) Grice's Maxims of Conversation, and (6) standard principles of predicate logic such as Modus Ponens and universal instantiation. All these sources are used to show the gap between what conversations or advertisements entail and what people infer from them. Specifically, it is the Maxim of Quantity that causes or fills the gap between what is entailed and what is inferred. In fact, this gap is filled by the pragmatics (inferences that people bring to sentences) that people apply to advertisements.

People across all cultures use Grice's Maxims of Conversation to interpret advertisements because written or spoken text in advertisements abides by the same rules as do participants in a conversation. This is readily apparent in how the maxims are applied to analyzing the meanings of advertisements. The maxims are subconsciously present in speakers/listeners, but are not contained within conversations or advertisements. As people interact, maxims come into play, which are properties of human communication. While conversations and advertisements are governed by the Maxims of Conversation, speakers/listeners are not required to use the maxims in conversations or advertisements. Thus, the maxims are universally present, but they may not always be utilized for purposes of making and interpreting communication. With the exception of the Maxims of Quality and Relevance (assuming that what advertisers present is true and relevant to understanding the ads), not every maxim is used. The consistency with which the other maxims are used in ads is difficult, if not impossible, to predict. However, my research shows that the Maxims of Quantity and Manner are applied advertisement-specifically; advertisers may use these maxims to clarify their objectives and customers may apply these maxims to correctly interpret the advertisements. These maxims may or may not be necessary in order to analyze advertisements correctly. More importantly, besides being advertisement-specific, the Maxim of Manner may be culture-specific (I have found no evidence of this fact in these case studies) as is pointed out by Green (1990). Thus, the maxims are best categorized as a tool of analysis.

The difficulty of predicting the consistency of use of the maxims in this thesis is due in part to the few advertisements I have chosen to analyze. Eight advertisements out of
thousands do not provide a dependable picture of when certain maxims will be used. The method with which these ads are analyzed may also have influenced the conclusions drawn. I, too, draw inferences based on advertisements I see in magazines or on television. My interpretations of the advertisements may be very different from those of other people. Whichever way my interpretations of these advertisements may have led my analysis, I hope that this thesis opens up opportunities for further exploration of the application of the Maxims of Conversation to advertisements. This research may lead to a future discovery of one universal application all four maxims to all advertisements, or perhaps a grouping of advertisements into certain categories (i.e., automobile advertisements, alcoholic beverage advertisements, etc.) so that the maxims may then be applied universally within each category. My current conclusions drawn about the application of the Maxims of Conversation in English and German advertisements from this thesis show how similar the system of language really is.
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