CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2. Theoretical Framework

In completing this thesis, I use Yule’s theory (1996) and Risana (2005) as the basic reference of the analysis. I apply many others theory like Jannedy (1994), Leech (1993), Akmajian (1980), Guntur (1986) and related source from the internet as additional references to support the analysis. Below are the arrangement of the theory:

2.1 General Issues in Pragmatics

2.1.1 What is Pragmatics?

Yule (1996:3) states pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It has, consequently, has more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning.

This type of study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said. It requires the consideration of how speakers organize what they want to say in accordance with who they are talking to, where, when and under what circumstances.
Pragmatics also necessarily explores how listeners can make inferences about what is said in order to arrive at an interpretation of speaker’s intended meaning. This type of study explores how a great deal of what is unsaid is recognized as part of what is communicated.

(As quoted from www.wikipedia.org) Pragmatics studies the ability of natural language speakers to communicate more than that which is explicitly stated. Another perspective is that pragmatics deals with the ways we reach our goal in communication. Pragmatics explains language use in context. It seeks to explain aspects of meaning which cannot be found in the plain sense of words or structures, as explained by semantics. As a field of language study, pragmatics is fairly new. Its origins lie in philosophy of language and the American philosophical school of pragmatism. Pragmatics is regarded as one of the most challenging aspects for language learners to grasp, and can only truly be learned with experience.

2.1.2 Pragmatics and Semantics

Yule (1996:4) has defined that semantics is the study of the relationships between linguistics forms and entities in the world; that is, how words literally connect to things. While pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and the users of those forms. Pragmatics allows human into the analysis. The advantage of studying language via pragmatics is that one can talk about people’s intended
meanings, their assumptions, their purposes or goals and the kinds of actions (for example requests) that they are performing when they speak.

As quoted from (www.tripod.com/pragmatics_teaching) pragmatics studies the meaning of words, phrases and full sentences, but unlike semantics which deals with the objective meanings of words that can be found in dictionaries, pragmatics is more concerned with the meanings that words in fact convey when they are used, or with intended speaker meaning as it is sometimes referred to. It can be said that pragmatics attempts to analyze how it happens that often more is communicated than said.

Semantics and pragmatics, are concerned with getting at the meaning of a sentence. In the first stage (semantics) a partial representation of the meaning is obtained based on the possible syntactic structure(s) of the sentence, and on the meanings of the words in that sentence. In the second stage (pragmatics), the meaning is elaborated based on contextual and world knowledge. To illustrate the difference between these stages, consider the sentence:

- He asked for the boss.

From knowledge of the meaning of the words and the structure of the sentence we can work out that someone (who is male) asked for someone who is a boss. But we can't say who these people are and why the first guy wanted the second. If we know something about the context (including the last few sentences spoken/written) we may be able to work these things out.
Maybe the last sentence was ``Fred had just been sacked.'', and we know from our general knowledge that bosses generally sack people and if people want to speak to people who sack them it is generally to complain about it. We could then really start to get at the meaning of the sentence - Fred wants to complain to his boss about getting sacked.

Anyway, this second stage of getting at the real contextual meaning is referred to as pragmatics. The first stage based on the meanings of the words and the structure of the sentence is semantics.

I may conclude that semantics is the study of linguistic meaning of words, phrases and sentences. Whereas pragmatics is the study of language use in context. There is a close relationship between semantics and pragmatics in which both equally concerned with meaning.

2.1.3 Context and Meaning in Pragmatics

Jannedy, et. Al, (1994:227) states pragmatics concerns itself with how people use language within a context and why they use language in particular ways. This unit examines how factors such as time, place and social relationship between speaker and hearer affect the ways in which language is used to perform various function. To fully understand the meaning of a sentence, we must also understand the context in which it was uttered. Context is a factor in the determination of the propositional content of particular tokens of utterance inscriptions on different occasions of utterance. Consider the word ball. In a sentence as *He kicked the ball into the net*, we
may visualize a round black and white soccer ball. In a sentence, *She dribbled the ball down the court and shot a basket*, we would visualize a basketball. By looking these examples, the word ball is understood in different ways depending on what type action is associated with it. From context, we can determine utterance meaning of a text at three level:

1. It tells us what sentence has been uttered.
2. It tells us what proposition has been expressed.
3. It tells us that the proposition in question has been expressed with one kind of illocutionary force rather than other.

Jannedy, et. Al (1994:228) then divide context into four subparts, they are:

a. Physical Context

   Where the conversation takes place, what objects are present and what action are taking place.

b. Epistemic Context

   The background knowledge shared by the speakers and the hearers.

c. Linguistic Context

   It is concerned with sentence or utterances preceding a certain sentence utterance in communication event.

d. Social Context

   Concerned with social relation and setting background that complete the relationship between speakers and hearers.
As stated by Jannedy (1994:228) this division of context may seem abstract, so let us consider how context helps people interpret a sarcastic remark. Suppose that two people talking loudly, into an individual section of the library (physical context). They sit down, still talking loudly, but no one says anything to them. After about five minutes, a person across from their table says sarcastically, “Talk a little louder, won’t you? I missed what you just said.” The hearers will interpret this utterance as a request for them to be quiet, despite the fact that literally the speaker is requesting them to talk louder. Certain contextual help to signal that this is a request for silence: the utterance interrupts their conversation and breaks the silence between them and others (linguistic context); people usually do not talk to strangers (epistemic context); library is quiet place (epistemic context); and they are in the library (physical context). From these observations, the hearers must conclude that the utterance is a request for silence. These four context may influence how the communication works.

2.1.4 The Goals of Pragmatic Theory

Akmajian, 1980 (in Debora, 2005:12) summarizes the minimal requirements on an adequate pragmatics theory as follows:

a. A pragmatic theory must contain a classification of speech acts
b. A pragmatic theory must contain analysis and definitions of various speech acts.
c. A pragmatic theory must contain a specification of various uses of expression, it must be said that:
   i. Expression e is standardly (literally and directly) used to do x (in context c).
   ii. Expression e has n different uses.
   iii. Expression e has e’ have the same use or uses

 d. A pragmatic theory must relate literal and direct language use to such phenomena as:
   i. Linguistic structure (semantic, syntax, phonology)
   ii. The structure of the communication, the course of conversation. And social institution.
   iii. Speaker meaning, implication, (pragmatics) presupposition and understanding.

   In pursuing these pragmatic goals over the last ten years, there are five discipline have been interested, they are philosophy, linguistics, psychology, sociology and anthropology (Akmajian (1980) in Debora, 2005:13). Philosophers have been mainly concerned with the categorizing types of speech acts and defining each category. Linguistics concern with specifying expressions in the language have which uses or conditions on uses. Psychologist have evaluate this investigation of how information concerning language use in processed, store, and acquired. Finally, anthropologist and sociologist concerned with regularities between language use and social role, as well as the structuring of speech acts into conversation, in short, goal (dii).
From the explanation above, we may see that a successful pragmatics will require the cooperation of many disciplines.

2.2 The Overview of Pragmatics

2.2.1 Speech Acts

(Yule, 1996:47) states pragmatics is defined as the study of language use and linguistic communication, and the central concern of pragmatics is the study of speech acts. In attempting to express themselves, people do not only produce utterances containing grammatical structures and words, they perform actions via those utterances.

Actions performed via utterances are generally called speech acts and, in English are commonly given more specific labels, such as apology, complaint, compliment, invitation, promise or request.

These descriptive terms for different kinds of speech acts apply to the speaker’s communicative intention in producing an utterance. The speaker normally expects that his or her communicative intention will be recognized by the hearer. Both speaker and hearer are usually helped in this process by the circumstances surrounding the utterance.

As quoted from (online.sfsu.edu by Kent Bach) In general, speech acts are acts of communication. To communicate is to express a certain attitude, and the type of speech act being performed corresponds to the type of attitude being expressed. For example, a statement expresses a belief, a request expresses a desire, and an apology expresses a regret. As an act of
communication, a speech act succeeds if the audience identifies, in accordance with the speaker's intention, the attitude being expressed.

2.2.2 Types of Speech Acts

On any occasion, the action performed by producing an utterance will consist of three related areas Yule (1996: 48), they are:

a. Locutionary Act

Locutionary act is the basic act of utterance, or producing a meaningful linguistic expression. In addition, Austin (in Peccei 1999:44) says that Illocution is the actual form of words used by the speaker and their semantic meaning. For example: Mike uttered the words “Give me some cash” which can be semantically paraphrased as: 'Hand some money over to me’, with me referring to Mike.

b. Illocutionary Act

Illocutionary act is an utterance with some kind of function in mind. In addition Austin (in Peccei 1994:44) says it is what the speaker is doing by uttering those words: commanding, offering, promising, threatening, thanking, etc. Illocutionary acts performed via communicative force of an utterance. For example: in uttering “Give me some cash”, Mike performed the act of requesting Annie to give him some cash. Another examples: “I promise I’ll be there.” (act of promising), “I’m sorry.” (act of apologizing) and so on.
Besides of the examples above, there are some more another examples of illocutionary acts. They are ordering, apologizing, offering, condoling, giving permission, betting, vowing, proposing and so forth.

c. Perlocutionary Act

Perlocutionary act is an utterance with a function with intending it to have an effect. It is performed by saying something or act that produces effects to the hearer. Austin (in Peccei, 1994:44) says It is the actual result of locution. For example: Mike’s utterance \((\text{Give some cash})\) could have the following perlocutions: ‘Mike persuaded Annie to give him the money.’; ‘Annie refused to give the money’; ‘Annie was offended’, etc.

2.2.3 The Understanding of Illocutionary Act

a. The definition of Illocutionary Act

As has been defined before, illocutionary acts is an utterance with some kind of function in mind. It is performed via the communicative force of an utterance (Yule, 1996:48)

In saying an utterance, we minimally involve three different kinds of doing (Lyons, 1981:245):

- The act of producing an inscription.
- The act of composing a sentence.
- The act of contextualizing that sentence.
To utter a sentence, in all normal communicative contexts, is to perform a complex act which in three kinds of doing are integrated and have as their product some identifiable and meaningful language signal: an utterance inscription.

There are many English verbs that can be used to performed illocutionary acts (Leech in Oka, 1993). Some of them are:

- announce
- admit
- thank
- ask
- express
- request
- assert
- order
- report
- apologize
- predict
- greet
- report
- congratulate
- request

Illocutionary acts have three important characteristics (Akmajian 1980, in Debora, 2005:21), they are:

1. Illocutionary acts can often be successfully performed simply by uttering the right explicit performative sentence with the right intention and believe and under right circumstances.

2. Illocutionary acts are the central to linguistic communication. Our normal conversations are composed in large part of statements, requesting, ordering, greeting and so forth. The performed acts are
governed by rules. When one does perform perlocutionary acts of persuading, one does so by performing illocutionary act of stating or informing.

3. The most important characteristic possessed by illocutionary acts used to communicative have the feature that one performs them successfully simply by getting one’s illocutionary intention recognized. For example, if you say, “The book is the best books.” is not sufficient for me just to recognize your intention to persuade me. I must also believe what you say and I will prove it by reading the book.

b. The Ways of Performing Illocutionary Acts

Speech acts in general, and illocutionary acts in particular can be performed in variety of ways. According to Akmajian et.al, (1980) in Debora, 2005:18) there are some ways of performing of speech acts:

1. Literal Act, happens if the speaker means what he says in his utterances.

2. Non Literal Act is the contradiction of literal act where the speaker does not mean what he says.

3. Direct Act, is when a speaker does not perform that act by means of performing any other act.
4. Indirect Act, happen when a speaker performs that act by means of performing another speech act.

In communicating, sometimes we find a speaker says an utterance to hearer, but the hearer can not understand what a speaker intend to. It may be possible for a speaker to state something successfully but still fail as communication. The reason for that may be the hearer asleep, the hearer not know what the words mean or the hearer may not know the language. Thus, to be successful in communication, the hearer must identify what it is the speaker means to do (state, order, ask, report, promise, etc.)

There are six possibilities of the ways of performing illocutionary acts, namely (Akmajian, et.Al 1980 in Debora 2005:19):

1. Literal direct act

   It is literal when the illocution of the act most directly indicated by literal reading of grammatical form the vocabulary of the utterance. It is a direct when the speaker does not perform an act by means of perform another act.

   e.g: Please, come here!

   This sentence means a request to someone to come here.

2. Non literal direct act

   In this case the illocution of an utterance is not directly indicated by the literal reading of grammatical form and the vocabulary of the utterance.
The speaker doesn’t mean what his words, phrases, sentence mean literally. Non literal is in which speaker doesn’t mean what his word mean literally. It is direct act, if the speaker performs an act but it is not performed by means of performing another act.

E.g: You come so quickly.

It is used figuratively to allude someone. In brief the speaker means the contrary that the hearer ‘come late’.

3. Literal direct act + Non literal indirect act

In literal direct act, the speaker means what he says literally and it is not performed any other act. In non literal indirect, the speaker does not mean what his word means literally and he performs the act by means of performing another speech act.

E.g: My glass is empty

First it is used to report that is empty, second the request some water.

4. Literal direct act + Literal indirect act

In literal direct act, the speaker means what he says literally and it is not performed by means of performing any other act. In literal indirect, although the speaker means what he says, but it is performed by means of performing any other act (indirectly).

E.g: Don’t bloody do that to me again!
First it is to report that he does not like the hearer doing that, second as a warning for the hearer.

5. Non literal direct act + Non literal indirect act

In non literal indirect act, the speaker does not mean what this words mean literally and it is not performed by means of performing any other. In non literal indirect act, the speaker does not mean what his words mean literally but it is performed by means of performing any other acts.

e.g : Eat them out, we have a lot of rice now.
First, it is used sarcastically to point out that the mother does not like her son to eat all the rice, and the second, it is used to ask her son to stop eating.

6. Non literal direct act + Literal indirect act

In this case, there are two acts to contend with. Those acts are direct and indirect act. In non literal direct act, the speaker does not mean what his words really mean and it is not performed by mean of any other act. In literal indirect act the speaker means what he says but it is performed by means performing any other act. The typical example of non literal direct act and literal indirect act are rare and hard to find.

c. The Function of Illocutionary Acts

Leech 1983 (In Oka, 1993:162) classify illocutionary acts into four functions in accordance with relationship to social purposes. They are :

1. Competitive
In this function, illocution purposes compete with social purposes such as ordering, asking, claiming, etc. In competitive, the politeness contains negative side.

2. Convivial

In this function, the illocution purpose is parallel to social purpose such as offering, inviting, greeting, thanking, and congratulating. Its form tends to be positive in politeness.

3. Collaborative

The illocution purposes apart from social purposes, such as, stating, reporting, announcing, and teaching. This function involves no politeness for it is not relevant.

4. Confictive

The illocution purposes conflict with social purposes, such as threatening, accusing, etc. Its form has no politeness because in threatening or accusing someone is not likely to do in a polite.

Whereas, Yule (1996:53) explain that there are five types general function of illocutionary acts. They are as follow:

1. Declarations
Declarations is those kinds of speech acts that change the world via their utterances. For example, the speaker has to have a special institutional role, in a specific context, in order to perform a declaration appropriately. In using a declaration, the speaker changes the world via words.

Example: I now pronounce you husband and wife.

We find the defendant guilty.

(Guntur, 1986:48) states If the declarations have succeed to be done, the equality between the propositional content and reality will happen. In declaration, the speaker has an authority to do it. Thus, declaration is the special class of illocution because it is only performed by a speaker who is in charge from a certain institution, such as, priest, a judge, etc.

As an institutional act, this act almost does not involve politeness factor. For instance, a judge has right and obligation to give punishment; therefore we can not blame that he does impolite. The speaker of declaration utters speech just as physical sign that an institutional, social, or religion or law act or decision has been made.

2. Representatives

Representatives represents some state of affairs. It is the kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker believes to be the case or not. Statement of act, assertion, conclusions, and description are examples of the
speaker representing the world as he or she believes it. In using a representative, the speaker makes words fit the world (of belief).

Example : The earth is flat.

It is a warm sunny day.

(Guntur, 1986:48) states representatives are grouped into Leech’s collaborative illocutionary function. It is neutral in the case of politeness.

3. Expressives

Expressives are acts those kinds of speech act that what the speaker feel. They express psychological states and can be statement of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy or sorrow. They can be caused by something the speaker does or the hearer does, but they are about the speaker experience. In using an expressive, the speaker makes words fit the word (of feeling).

Example : I’m really sorry!

Congratulations!

(Guntur,1986:47) states it is considered as a politeness principle. But it is also allowed for making expressive such as deprecating, deploring an so on.
There are six types of expressives (Risana, 2005:27), which will be analyzed in this thesis, they are:

1. **Expressives for Thank**

Expressing gratitude is considered to be one universal of interpersonal communication, in particular in realization of the politeness principle. Thanking is classified as an expressive illocutionary act that can be defined as an expression of gratitude on the part of the speaker to the addressee. For example: ‘Thank you so much for calling.’, “Thank you for letting me know.”

2. **Expressives for Apologize**

Apologizing is an expression of regret. Some definitions of apologizing such as; acknowledge faults or shortcoming failing, defend, explain, clear away or make excuses for by reasoning. There also some related terms of apologizing : alibi out of, apologize for, ask forgiveness, beg pardon, express regret, plead guilty, do penance and so on. For example: “I’m sorry to waste your time.”, “I really do apologize.”, “I beg your pardon.”

3. **Expressives for Congratulation**

Congratulating, applauding and condoling are the kinds of expressives for congratulation. Those show the speaker’s sympathy toward what has been happening to the hearer.
Congratulating expresses the feeling of pleasure toward the hearer’s luck, applauding expresses the feeling of honor toward hearer’s ability, while condoling expresses the feeling of compassion toward the hearer’s sadness. For example: “Well done!”, “I congratulate you for your success.”, “Oh, poor little thing!”

4. **Expressives for Greetings**

Greeting is an expression of welcoming. It is also the act of greeting by the speaker to the hearer. For example: “Come in, young man!”, “Good day to you!”

5. **Expressives for Wishes**

Wishing is the expression of speaker’s desire and wants in order to expect it becomes reality. For example: “I wish I knew the cause.”, “I hope you all have a marvelous holiday.”

6. **Expressives for Attitudes**

This kind of expressives is about criticizing, complaining, and deprecating that express the feeling of disagree or dislike with the hearer’s attitude. Those expect the hearer to mull over the speaker’s utterance. For example: “That's no good.”, “It’s quite nasty.”, “Nonsense, old son.”.

4. Directives
Directives are those kinds of speech acts that the speakers use to get someone else to do something. They express what the speaker wants. They are command, orders, requests, suggestions. They can be positive and negative. In using a directive, the speaker attempts to make the world fit the words (via the hearer).

Example: Don’t touch that.

Could you lend me a pen please!

(Guntur, 1986:47) states directives are considered to have competitive illocutionary function. It deals with negative politeness.

5. Commissives

Commissives are those kind of speech acts that speakers use to commit themselves to some future action. They express what the speaker intendeds. They are promises, threats, refusals, pledges. They can be performed by the speaker alone or by the speaker as a member of a group. In using a commissive, the speaker undertakes to make the world fit the words (via the speaker).

Example: I’m going to get it right next time.

We will not do that.

(Guntur, 1986:47) states commissives tend to be convivial than to be competitive. Thus they involve more positive politeness because
commissives do not refer to the speaker’s importance but to the hearer expectations

2.3 Relevant Studies

In the making of this thesis, I use some previous research as references that discuss the same topic, illocutionary acts. They are as follow:

Debora Pangaribuan (2005) in her thesis “Commissive Illocution in Ernest Hemingway’s The Sun Also Rises : A pragmatic analysis” analyzes commissive illocutionary acts in the novel. She uses library research with descriptive method in the analysis. She finds that there are four types of commissive illocution in that novel, they are promising, offering, threatening and betting. The most dominant commissive used in the novel is commissive for promise.

Rosmaidha Mariaty Banjar Nahor (2005) in her thesis “An Analysis of Illocutionary Acts in Never Been Kissed” also discusses about types of illocutionary acts and how they are performed in the dialogues of the film. Unlike Debora, she determines all kind of illocutionary acts in the dialogue. She also applies library research with descriptive method in the analysis. She finds that the most dominant illocution appeared is representatives and it is most of all literal direct act.

Risana A. Silalahi (2005) in her thesis “Expressive Illocution on James Herriot’s All Things Wise and Wonderful : A Pragmatic Analysis” analyzes expressive illocution in the novel. By using library research with descriptive method, she describes that there are six types of expressive illocution and she
finds the most dominant one is expressive for thanking. She does not discuss the way of its performing.

I would like to explain that my analysis focuses on describing the findings of expressive illocutionary acts in the novel and how they are performed. I also do the library research with descriptive method (content analysis). I will find expressive illocutionary acts in each chapter, classify them into specific category and show how they are performed in the dialogues. Then I use formula to count the number of occurrence. It can be said my analysis is nearly the same with Risana but I do the other thing, that is to show the performing of expressive illocutionary acts in the dialogues in the novel.