Chapter II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 An Overview of Pragmatics

Pragmatics is often defined as the theory of the way language is used. It links the language and its user. It is the study of relationships between linguistic forms and the users of those forms. This study allows humans into the analysis. In this study, it's possible to discuss people's intended meanings, assumptions, purposes or goals and the kinds of actions that they perform when speaking.

Pragmatics is concerned with how people use language within a context, in real-life situations, while semantics is concerned with the relationship between linguistic forms and entries in the world. In pragmatics, people study about how factors such as time, place and the social relationship between speaker and hearer affect the ways in which language is used to perform different functions. It is clear that the role of pragmatics is to understand how context affects the meaning of certain utterances.

Yule (1996:3) states that there are four definitions of pragmatics, and these four definitions becomes the areas that pragmatics are concerned with. The four definitions of pragmatics are described below:

1. Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning. It is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It analyzes what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves.

2. Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning. It involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said. It requires a consideration of how speaker organize what they want to say in accordance with who they are talking to, where, when, and under what circumstances.
3. Pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said. It explores how listeners can make inferences about what is said in order to arrive at an interpretation of the 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. It can be called as the investigation of invisible meaning.

4. Pragmatic is the study of the expression of relative distance. It raises the question of what determines the choice between the said and the unsaid. The basic answer is tried to the notion of distance. Closeness, whether it is physical, social, or conceptual, implies shared experience. On the assumption of how close or distant the listener is, speakers determine how much needs to be said.

In conclusion, pragmatics is the study of how language is used in context and how meaning is derived from the context. Different context will result the different meaning. It is important to know the context of some utterances in order to get the real meaning of the utterances. For example:

1. Alex has a knife.

The example above can be used to accomplish different things in different contexts, such as:

a) to make an assertion.

The context is when some people are on a beach and they are thinking about how to open a coconut. Suddenly, someone says “Alex has a knife.” People will understand that this utterance is an assertion that Alex has a knife to open the coconut.

b) to give a warning.

The context is Alex is trying to bully two new students in order to take their lunch and money. One of the new students just turns around and starts to walk away. He doesn't see that Alex brings out a knife.
student then yells “Alex has a knife.” People will understand that this utterance is a warning that Alex has a knife and he will hurt the student.

2.2 Speech Acts

The central concern of pragmatics is the study of speech acts. Speech act is a part of pragmatic discussion which relates to what a certain sentence and utterance possesses certain act within it.

Speech act is the usage of language to accomplish something. It enables people to do or perform an extraordinarily wide range of activities simply by using language, such as to convey information, request information, give orders, make requests, make threats, give warnings, make bets, give advice, etc.

Yule (1996:47, 53-54) says that actions that performed by utterances are generally called as speech acts and, in English, are commonly given more specific labels, such as apology, complaint, compliment, invitation, promise or request. There are five types of general functions that are performed by speech acts, they are:

1. Declarations

   Declarations are those kinds of speech acts that change the world via utterance. It is kind of sentence that typically used in assertions to convey information that having truth conditions. It brings extra linguistic state of affairs into existence, as people declare war, appoint, veto and so forth. For example:
   - Priest: I now pronounce you husband and wife.
   - Referee: You’re out!
   - Jury Foreman: We find the defendant guilty.

2. Representatives

   Representatives are those kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker believes to be the case or not. For example:
   - The earth is flat.
   - Chomsky didn’t write about peanuts.
   - It was a warm sunny day.
3. Expressives

Expressives are those kinds of speech acts that state what the speakers feel. They express psychological states and can be statements of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy, or sorrow. For example:

- I’m really sorry!
- Congratulations!
- Oh, yes, great, mmmm, ssahh!

4. Directives

Directives are those kinds of speech acts that speakers use to get someone to do something. For example:

- Gimme a cup of coffee. Make it black.
- Could you lend me a pen, please?
- Don’t touch that.

5. Commissives

Commissives are those kinds of speech acts that speakers use to commit themselves to some future action. For example:

- I’ll be back.
- I’m going to get it right next time.
- We will not do that.

Stewart and Vaillette (2001:222) says that there are some common speech acts that has different function for each of them, they are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech act</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assertion</td>
<td>conveys information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>elicits information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>(more or less politely) elicits action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>demands action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promise</td>
<td>commits the speaker to an action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>intimidates the hearer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here are the examples of the seven common speech acts according to Steward and Vaillette as described above:

- John read the book. assertion
- Did John read the book? question
- Please pass the salt. request
- Kim’s got a knife! warning
- Get out of here! order
- I will love you forever. promise
- I’ll give you a reason to cry. Threat

Certain speech acts are so central to communication that people have special syntactic structures that are typically used to mark them. The sentence forms that will be discussed are:

1. **Sentence Forms:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>“He is cooking the chicken.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>“Is he cooking the chicken?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>“Cook the chicken!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Typical association between Sentence Form and speech act:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Speech act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>Assertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Order/Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.1 Types of Speech Acts

Yule (1996: 48) states that on any occasion, the action performed by producing an utterance will consist of three related acts, they are:

1. **Locutionary Act**
   
   Locutionary act is the basic act of utterance, or producing a meaningful linguistic expression. This act is simply the speech acts that have taken place. It is an utterance that is well organised in grammar terms.

2. **Illocutionary Act**
   
   Illocutionary act is used when people form an utterance with some kind of function in mind. It is performed via communicative force of an utterance. This act is the real actions that are performed by the utterance, such as make a statement, an offer, an explanation, etc.

3. **Perlocutionary Act**
   
   Perlocutionary act is used when people say an utterance which is intended to give an effect to the hearer. So, this act is simply the effects of the speaker’s utterance on the hearer. For example:

   **Utterance**: Shoot her!

   1. **Locutionary Act or Locution**:
      
      He said to me “Shoot her!” meaning by shoot “shoot” and referring by her to “her.”

   2. **Illocutionary Act or Illocution**:
      
      He urged (or advised, ordered, etc.) me to shoot her.

   3. **Perlocutionary Act or Perlocution**:
      
      He persuaded me to shoot her.

Besides the three types of speech acts above, speech acts can also be classified into two types, they are direct speech act and indirect speech act.
In daily life, people often do not directly express what they intend, but instead formulate their utterances in ways which appear more polite to hearers. For example:

1. Lend me your book!
2. Could you lend me your book?

Both examples above are uttered in order to give requests, but the first one, phrased as an imperative and the second, phrased as an interrogative. It's obvious from experience that the second example, “Could you lend me your book?” is not actually a question about the ability of the addressee to lend the book, but a prompt to action. People usually respond this prompt simply by saying “Yes, I could” and if they do not do it, it will not be a polite reaction.

Therefore the second example above, “Could you lend me your book?” has two pragmatic levels. First, it is a question and second, it is a request. It therefore qualifies as an indirect speech act, whereas the first example, “Lend me your book!” is a direct speech act.

2.2.1.1 Direct Speech Act

Yule (1996:55) states that direct speech acts will happen if there is direct relationship between the structure and the function of the utterance.

Stewart and Vaillette (2001:223) also states that direct speech act is the relationship between the structure and the function of some utterances. It occurs when a particular sentence type is being used to serve its typical function. It is based on the literal meaning of the sentence. For example:

1. Utterance: You wear a seat belt.
   Declarative sentence type; Assertion

2. Utterance: Do you wear a seat belt?
   Interrogative sentence type; Question

3. Utterance: Wear a seat belt!
   Imperative sentence type; Order/request
2.2.1.2 Indirect Speech Act

Yule (1996:55) states that indirect speech acts will happen if there is indirect relationship between the structure and the function of the utterance.

Stewart and Vaillette (2001:225-226) states that indirect speech acts are generally considered to be more polite than direct ones. Indirect usages are not rare or marginal. It takes little reflection, however, to notice that in most cases, some notion of politeness plays a role. The direct imposition can be ameliorated by avoiding a direct demand and instead asking whether the addressee is willing to or capable of carrying out the act. This gives the addressee the option of not carrying out the implied request without losing face. Hence “Would you pass the salt?” or “Can you pass the salt?” are more polite than “Pass the salt!”

Indirect speech act occurs when a particular sentence type is used to serve an atypical function. It suggests a different purpose than it actually has. For example:

1) **Direct:** Please close the door.
   Imperative sentence type; Order/request
   **Indirect:** Do you think you could close the door?
   Interrogative sentence type; Order/request

2) **Direct:** Did Bart get the job?
   Interrogative sentence type; Question
   **Indirect:** I was wondering if Bart got the job.
   Declarative sentence type; Question

Akmajian, et al (2001:381-383) states that sometimes when people speak they are not only performing some direct form of communication but also speaking indirectly. When people speak indirectly, they mean something more than what they mean directly and they want the hearer to guess or to conclude what they mean by saying the utterance. For example:

   a. The door is over there. (used to request someone to leave)
   b. I want 10 gallons of regular. (used to request 10 gallons of regular)
c. I’m sure the cat likes having its tail pulled. (used to request the hearer to stop pulling the cat’s tail)
d. I need some foods. (used to request the hearer to give foods)
e. You’re the boss. (used to agree to do what the speaker says)
f. I should never have done that. (used to apologize)
g. Did you bring any tennis balls? (used to inform the hearer that the speaker did not bring any)
h. It’s getting late. (used to request the hearer to hurry)

The hearer will know that the speaker is not speaking merely directly but indirectly by virtue of contextual inappropriateness. For instance, it would be strange if, on driving into a gas station, the speaker (in example b) had only been reporting her wants and was not also making a polite request for some gas. A mere report of what one now wants is relevant to the taking of a poll, perhaps, but is not contextually appropriate at a gas station. Thus, the same sort of contextual information and presumptions used in recognizing previous communicative intentions and acts are also used with indirect acts.

The hearer is also able to use context and the Conversational Presumptions to find the speaker’s indirect communicative intent. Once the hearer identifies why the speaker cannot merely be speaking directly, he is able to use this information to aid in recognizing her indirect intent. Thus, reporting a desire for a tank of gas at a service station would be contextually inappropriate if that were all the speaker was doing. Since requesting expresses the desire that the hearer do something, it would be natural in the circumstances for him to conclude that in reporting this desire the speaker was also requesting the gas, since requesting would be the contextually appropriate thing to do. Suppose that the speaker utters (in example a) ‘The door is over there’ to the hearer, thereby indirectly requesting the hearer to leave. How might the hearer reason? The first thing he must notice is that it would be contextually inappropriate for the speaker to be merely reporting the location of the door, assuming that the speaker and the hearer both already know the location of the door, and this is not relevant to the conversation.

Stewart and Vaillette (2001:224) say that associated with each speech act is a set of felicity conditions that must be satisfied if that speech act is to be correctly
(including honestly) performed. Here are some felicity conditions on the acts of questioning and requesting (where “S” stands for the speaker, “H” for the hearer, “P” for some state of affairs, and “A” for some action):

A. S questions H about P:

1. S does not know the truth about P.
2. S wants to know the truth about P.
3. S believes that H may be able to supply the information about P that S wants.

B. S requests H to do A:

1. S believes that A has not yet been done.
2. S believes that H is able to do A.
3. S believes that H is willing to do A-type things for S.
4. S wants A to be done.

Here are examples of direct and indirect speech act analysis in question and request form according to explanation above:

C. Question

1. Direct
   a. Did you marry Helen?
   b. I ask you whether or not John married Helen.

2. Indirect
   a. I don’t know if John married Helen. (A.1)
   b. I would like to know if John married Helen. (A.2)
   c. Do you know if John married Helen? (A.3)
D. Request

1. Direct
   a. Please take out the garbage!

   b. I request that you take out the garbage.

2. Indirect
   a. The garbage isn’t out yet. (B.1)

   b. Could you take out the garbage? (B.2)

   c. Would you mind taking out the garbage? (B.3)

   d. I would like for you to take out the garbage. (B.4)