

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter deals with the theories as the devices in analyzing the data of the research. It discusses the review in related literature. Still, it is related on linguistics in general and about pragmatics as well as implicatures in particular. In the other hand, the researcher adds some other related theories to support the data analysis in order to make a detail and effective analysis.

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics in one of the linguistic terms that is used to label one of the three major division of semiotics, along with semantics and syntactics (Crystal, 2008:379). This prior introduction is also explained in Levinson's pragmatics (1983:1) by quoted the idea from the philosopher Charles Morris (1938) who concerned to outline the broadly shape of a science of sign or semiotics. In semiotic concern, Morris divided three distinct branches of inquiry, there are syntactics (being study of "the formal relation of signs to another"), semantics (the study of "the relations of signs to the object to which the signs are applicable") and pragmatics (the study of "the relation of signs to interpreters").

Based on Morris' introduction about the trichotomy syntax, semantics and pragmatics, one can easily defined that pragmatics is the study about the language

usage. Otherwise, Levinson considers by no means easy to provide the possible definitions of pragmatics because it lacks of clear boundaries. He (1983:7) explained that one quite restricted scope for pragmatics that has been proposed is that pragmatics should be concerned only with the principles of language usage and have nothing to do with the description of linguistic structure.

Other definition comes from the pragmaticist, George Yule. He defined pragmatics is the study about speaker meaning because the study is concerned of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). Yule also realized that the context plays an important role in interpreting of what people mean in particular context and how the context influences what is said, thus pragmatics is said to be the study of contextual meaning. The contextual study helps to create a specific interpretations toward the participants in communication, so the misleading parts of communication can be minimalized. It is also needed in unsaid parts of communication, although the speakers sometimes imply their notion the contextual study is necessarily explores how listeners can make inferences about what is said in order to arrive at an interpretation of the speakers' intended meaning. This part explains that pragmatics also studies about how more gets communicated than is said. Then the question comes from this part, the question of what determines the choice between the said and the unsaid. The basic answer is tied to the notion of distance, the closeness or how close and distant the listeners are might be the determination of how much needs to be said. Because of this concern pragmatics also studies about the expression of relative distance (1996:3).

Although the wide range of phenomena that have been investigated before may not fit under the only one definition of pragmatics, people who pay their attention a lot in pragmatics get the advantages of studying language via pragmatics. The advantages are one can talk about people's intended meanings, their assumption, their purposes or goals and the kinds of actions (request, for instance) that they are performing when they communicate. In the other hand, pragmatics can be a frustrating area of study because it requires us to make sense of people and what they have in mind (Yule, 1996:4).

What is for sure is that pragmaticists take a special interest in language as it is used. This general definition is taken to simplify the understanding of pragmatics because it is not easy to define a study that has a wide range of scopes. Grundy noted that it may seem odd to begin without defining this subject but he finds another important matter than defining what is pragmatics. In his view, the more difficult even than defining pragmatics is the task of delimiting its domain. Broadly, there is a distinction between what is called 'conventional' sentence meaning and pragmatic speaker meaning. Taking 'conventional' sentence meaning to be a meaning associated with linguistic expressions whenever they are used, and pragmatic speaker meaning to be the meaning that is associated with them in particular contexts (2008:214).

2.2 Principles of Textual Pragmatics

Halliday proposed that language has three functions. The first function is ideational function, explained that in ideational function language functioning as a means of conveying and interpreting experience of the world. The second function

is interpersonal function, here language functioning as an expression of one's attitudes and an influence upon the attitudes and behavior of the hearer. The last function is textual function. The textual function is a very different from the others. Yet, he gave it the special status of an 'enabling function' and it is instrumental to the other functions. Although the textual principle plays an important part in an overall functional account of language, Leech reluctantly called the textual function as a 'function'. There is something misleading about saying that language has the function of transmitting itself through texts, conversely it is text that has the function of transmitting language. However, rather than to say with Halliday that a language has a textual function, Leech made better sense to say that a text has a linguistic function (a function in the communication of linguistic messages).

The texts, in fact, give their contributions into the total communicative process and might emerge some probability in determining the language use. Then the term of textual pragmatics is emerged. The textual pragmatics has so far been chiefly illustrated only by one maxim: the Maxim of End-focus. But then, Leech proposed a scheme for the textual rhetoric which resembles that already proposed for the interpersonal rhetoric. There is a set of four principle which were postulated by Slobin in Leech's book. Those principles are:

1. 'Be humanly processible in ongoing time';
2. 'Be clear';
3. 'Be quick and easy';
4. 'Be expressive'.

Slobin's reasons for postulating these principles are he disagreed that these precepts are observed by language themselves rather than the by the language users. Thus, he considered that the languages actually will always tend to change in

directions which preserve these principles. For the Slobin's postulate which is focused in language themselves and has no relation in regarding grammar as being under the functional influence of pragmatics, Leech was interested in observing these principles in the exercise of stylistic preference in language use (Leech, 1989:56-64). Further, he labeled the Slobin's principles as follows:

2.2.1 The Processibility Principle

This principle recommends that the text should be presented in a manner which makes it easy for the hearer to decode in time. A text is essentially linear and time-bound, so when someone tend to encode the intention, it is often presented with choices as how to segment the message into units, how to assign the degrees of prominence to different parts of the message, and how to order the parts of the message. These decisions, in fact, are interrelated. The relations of these decisions might be applied in two maxims, the end-focus maxim and the end-weight maxim. Each maxim relies on the different process of the decision making.

For the further explanation about this principle, Leech gave the examples of how the end-focus and end-weight maxim work. The end-focus maxim facilitates phonological decoding of the message. It tends to apply the tone-units therefore the operation is dependent on logically prior choice regarding the segmentation of the utterance into tone-units. Thus, the maxim implies that this decision entails a decision about order because the decision will focus on which part of the tone that is signaled as the prominent and then it focuses on the rests. Otherwise, in the end-weight maxim, the processibility principle applies to syntactic aspect of the text. Regarding syntactic ordering, Leech may postulate that a syntactic structure in

which 'light' constituents precede 'heavy' ones. Thus, it becomes the one of the English characteristics that the utterance has a predominance of right-branching over left-branching. Along with this explanation, it helps to ensure that complex constituents are placed at the end of a clause or sentence (1989:64-65).

2.2.2 The Clarity Principle

Leech explained that the clarity principle applies to different coding, but in common conditions it may be broken down into the Transparency Maxim and Ambiguity Maxim. The Transparency Maxim retrains a direct and transparent relationship between semantic and phonological structure (between message and text), then the rule of ambiguity maxim is to avoid the ambiguity. Sometimes the speakers tend to communicate by ignoring this principle, thus what is meant by them sometimes causes the misinterpretation of their interlocutors.

To illustrate the Transparency Maxims on the syntactic level: for clarity's sake, Leech agreed that it is a good idea for semantically adjacent items also to be syntactically adjacent. It is for the reason that discontinuous structures in syntax tend to causes problems of understanding:

The morning came at last when we were due to leave.

The separation of the modifying clause *when we were due to leave* from its head *morning* obscures the relationship between argument and predicate. The requirement to avoid an ambiguity is closely connected with transparency, but it can be important in its own right. For example, ambiguity occurs notoriously with pronoun anaphora:

If the baby won't drink cold milk, it should be boiled.

And it may extend the avoidance of ambiguity to include avoidance of 'garden path' ambiguities. For example, the syntactic ambiguities which are temporary, and are resolved by latter part of the same sentence.

Before we started eating the table was absolutely loaded with delicacies.

It could be argued that such cases do not ultimately lead to a loss of clarity (*eg* the reading that someone was eating the table, is soon ruled out by subsequent context). But the same point can be made about all ambiguity, the danger from ambiguity is not so much that it will end by misleading hearer, as that it will confuse and delay the hearer's interpretation of the sentence (1989:66-67).

2.2.3 The Economy Principle

'Be quick and easy' can be regarded as a valuable precept not only for hearer but also for speaker. If one can shorten the text while keeping the message unimpaired, this reduces the amount of time and effort involved both in encoding (implying) and decoding. This explanation makes Leech considered that the Economy Principle has the endless war with the Clarity Principle. But obviously to maximize this principle would be to make the text unintelligible. In practice, a balance has to be struck between saving time and effort, and of course the point is the maintenance of intelligibility. Once and again, the balance depends in part on contextual factors, such as the physical distance between speaker and hearer, and the social predictability of the message.

The Maxim of Reduction might have the contribution to the Economy Principle. The maxim has the 'reduce where possible' principle which evidently leads to the big mistake of interpreting. This reduction, however, is not recommended when it leads to ambiguity. Leech, further, explained that the processes which are subsumed under the heading of 'reduction' are pro-nominalization, substitution by other pro-form and deletion. The major cases occur in pro-nominalization process, the injudicious pro-nominalization often causes a number of misinterpretations. Then, to avoid the ambiguity in several cases, the speakers have to sacrifice the Economy Principle. After all these explanations, Leech concluded that the reduction in the pragmatic viewpoint abbreviates the text and often simplifies its structure while maintaining the recoverability of the message. At the time when the message's recoverability is impaired the reduction, there comes time when that reduction comes into conflict with the Clarity Principle (1989:67-68).

2.2.4 The Expressivity Principle

The fourth principle was considered by Leech as the principle that is more diffuse and difficult to define because it is concerned with effectiveness in a broad sense which includes expressive and aesthetic aspects of communication, rather than simply with efficiency. He gave some examples of the influences about this principle in inhabiting the reduction:

1. John Brown was guilty of the crime, and John Brown would have to pay for it.
2. They put in the best they had and we put in the best we had and we beat them and beat them bad.

3. She saw there an object. That object was the gallows. She was afraid of the gallows.

After reading those examples one by one, it might be possible to abbreviate each of them into a simpler way without causing ambiguity. The abbreviation might be the substitution of the pro-form or the pro-nominalization, but in fact the Economy Principle does not operate. Although the ambiguity does not inhabit in those sentences, there are considered to have some other factors that influence them in such way, that other principle is in play. Leech thought that it is reasonably argue that these are cases of expressive repetition, where the emphasis of the repetition has some rhetorical values, for instances, surprising, impressing and emerging the interest the addressee. So, the repetition of John Brown in the first example seems to carry the implicature that John Brown and no one other than John Brown would have to pay for it (1989:68-69).

2.3 Discourse Analysis

In other linguistics terms, there is a sub-study called discourse analysis. The word 'discourse' was defined by Yule (2006:124) as 'language beyond the sentence', meanwhile the analysis of discourse is generally concerned with the study of language in text and conversation. Discourse analysis also discusses the way in which the speakers produce and understand texts in relation to other texts that have come before them and other texts that may follow them as well. The discussion also includes whether a spoken and written discourse (Paltridge, 2008:2). In a complex activity called conversation, discourse analysis also focuses on the meaning of words in interaction and how interactors communicate more

information than the words they use, thus it concerned with function (Cutting, 2002:2).

Brown and Yule (1983:25) also had another determination about function that was already said by Cutting, that discourse analysis interests in the function or purpose of a piece of linguistic data and also in how that data is processed, both by the producer and the receiver. So, both of them agree that this approach arrives in discourse as a process and the text as a product. Further, the researcher ensures with these explanation that discourse analysis studies the language in the level of text and the language in use. By using the language, people may achieve the goals in their communication, do their communicative acts and even take the part in communicative situations. At last, the researcher adds Paltridge's statement that discourse analysis also considers how people manage interactions with each other (2008:9).

2.4 Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis

From the theories that have been proposed by some linguistic experts, the researcher notes that there is a small different perspective which differ the focus of Pragmatics and Discourse analysis. It can be simplified that, Pragmatics may focus on how people produce their conversations, thus it is conversation analysis. A little bit different from pragmatics, Discourse analysis is a general approaches to analyze written, spoken or signed language use. Furthermore, the researcher also finds that Discourse analysis concerns with function (Cutting, 2002:2).

Derive from Yule's explanation (1996:6), the researcher finds that pragmatics' objects are any kind of informative intents, communicative intents and speakers' meanings. In consequences, the researcher takes Paltridge's explanation as the further explanation of the central area of pragmatics. He (2008:3) proposed that the central interest area of pragmatics is what people mean by what they say (rather than what words in their most literal sense). In the other hands, he also differs the central interest area of discourse analysis by explaining that, what these linguistic features meanings are and how they are realized in language, as the point (2008:2-3). Thus, this research can be considered as the discourse analysis that works in pragmatics area, it will provide a deeper understanding of the utterances and how they become meaningful to their speakers. This is almost similar to Paltridge's statement that, the discourse analysis that works in pragmatics area considers the ways in which people mean more than what they say in spoken and written discourse (2008:4).

2.5 Implicature

The word 'implicature' comes from the verb 'imply'. Mey simply said that the word 'imply' means 'to fold something into something else', therefore that which is implied is 'folded in', and has to be 'unfolded' in order to be understood (2001:45). The concept of implicature was drawn firstly in 1957 by the philosopher Paul Grice. Grice drew an important distinction between what a speaker means or implies and what a sentence or other expression means or implies. By the time he delivered his concept, for the first time he introduced the verb *implicate* and the

cognate noun *implicature* as technical terms denoting “the act of meaning or implying something by saying something else” (Davis, 1998:5).

Based on these basic concepts of the implicature, it might be simplified that the implicature is the concept of utterance meaning as opposed to the sentence meaning. Herewith, has already stated that meanings have the important role in human interaction where the utterances are placed as the communicational device. The later explanation may cause the researcher to determine the relation between implicature and communication. Quoted from Bara (2010:1), communication is a social activity of a combined effort of at least two participants, who consciously and intentionally cooperate to construct together the meaning of their interaction. Thus, to be able to say that the communication takes place successfully, all the participant must share their ideas and act together in order to realize the communication. Along with what has been discussed, the communication tends to both intended and overtly communicated by the speakers. In every communication the participants should be able to understand all the intentions expressed. Here, the implicature (concept) might help to process all the intentions communicated by the participants.

2.6 Conversational Implicature

*A: Am I in time for supper?
B: I've cleared the table.*

The example which is quoted from Cruse's (2000:26) shows us that in normal circumstances, it is very clear that B's intended message is A's is too late for supper time because the food on the dining table is already cleared. From this case, it shall be given the name utterance meaning to the totally of what the speaker

intends to convey by making an utterance, within certain necessary limits. In addition, the researcher takes Paltridge's explanation in order to simplify the term of conversational implicature. In his explanation, conversational implicature refers to the inference a hearer makes about a speaker's intended meaning that arises from their use of the literal meaning of what the speaker said (2008:70).

Further, Yule (1996) proposed that the conversational implicature is based on the co-operative principle or the maxims. Because of this reason, the implicature normally will be acceptable in conversation. Other arguments come from Cruse (2000:349), he said that one of the ways to recognize the conversational implicatures is from the context dependence criterion, because an expression with a single meaning can give rise to different conversational implicatures in different contexts. Again, it allows the hearers to use the context in interpreting of what is said to them. The conversational implicature makes possible of tentative talk because an implicature assumes that speaker and hearer can access a meaning which is conveyed but not stated, according to Grundy (2008:116), it reinforces the solidarity between them. In his view, also, the term of conversational implicature might be used as a confirmation of people's solidarity and common knowledge. It is clear then about what is exactly the understanding of this term, this type of implicature involves the speakers and the hearers as the participant of communicational process, it is based on the co-operative principle and it carries the encoded meaning.

2.6.1 Generalized Conversational Implicature

In particular, the conversational implicatures have been classified into generalized and particularized types (Crystal, 2008:238). The explanation shall begin with the first type of conversational implicatures, the generalized type. Here is the example which is taken from Iten's (2005:81),

Peter : Let's go for a walk
Mary : It's raining

There are two assumptions according to this example. The first one that it is raining at time T in the place where Peter wants to go for a walk, and Mary does not want to go for a walk (at time T). Clearly that the generalized conversational implicatures do not require a particular context to encode and decode. This researcher's conclusion which is derived from Iten's example might support Grice's explanation that the generalized type of conversational implicatures are those what arise without any particular context or special scenario being necessary (Levinson, 1983:126).

2.6.2 Particularized Conversational Implicature

In preceding example, the first type of conversational implicatures have been calculated without any particular context. Otherwise, the particularized type shows that it needs a special knowledge and particular context as in Yule's view. He proposed that particularized conversational implicatures require such inferences to work out the conveyed meaning (1996:42). The researcher inputs Levinson's example (1983:126) in order to make the distinction between these types of implicatures clear, but the setting of the particular sort are illustrated first.

The dog is looking very happy, perhaps the dog has eaten the roast beef

A: What on the earth has happened to the roast beef?
B: The dog is looking very happy.

The implicature in this conversation is thus particularized. It really needs a specific context to figure out what is exactly the relevance between those utterances. Although it seems irrelevant, in fact, the conversation flows well without causing any ambiguity. Here, it is known that context plays the important role in interpreting several inferences. And because each of these implicatures is context-bound, Grice called them ‘particularized’ (Grundy, 2008:82).

2.7 To Meet the Politeness Principles

Much of what are said and a great deal of what are communicated, are determined by the social relationship. Thus, a linguistic interaction is necessarily a social interaction as proposed by Yule (1996:59). In the other words, there is a relationship in sociolinguistics and pragmatics in defining what the politeness is. The combination of the idea from these studies comes in Crystal’s definition (2008:373), that politeness phenomena which is taken from sociolinguistics and pragmatics is characterized linguistic feature which mediates norms of social behavior, in relation to such notion as courtesy, rapport, deference and distance. From these explanations, the researcher simplifies the basic idea of politeness as the idea of ‘polite social behavior’ or etiquette as stated by Yule in the beginning of Politeness sub-chapter.

Two further key notions in the area of pragmatics and discourse are politeness and face (Paltridge, 2008:72). Face is a public self-image, the emotional

and social sense of self that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize. Meanwhile, the term politeness refers to showing awareness of and consideration for another person's face (Yule, 2006:119). In general point, Leech (1989:131) noted that politeness concerns a relationship between two participants whom he may call self and other. He also stated that politeness is an aspect of goal-oriented behavior. To say that self is being polite in using a particular utterance to communicate that goal towards other. Further, the matter of avoiding discord and fostering concord become his consideration.

In his journal, Leech related the term of politeness with the communicative behavior. Politeness concerns about the evident in communication especially through what meanings are expressed or implicated (2007:6). From this viewpoint, the researcher agrees that politeness has a role in the language which is used to communicate social meaning. The exercise of language choice in politeness shows that every utterance is uniquely designed to create context intended to match the addressee's notion of how he/she should be addressed. In being polite, a speaker (often) creates an implicated context that matches the one assumed by the addressee (Grundy, 2008:145-146). Eventually, Leech (1989:131) found it necessary to consider what other principles and maxims must be postulated in order to explain the relation between sense and force in any communicational terms. There are 6 (six) maxims in list, the Tact Maxim, the Generosity Maxim, the Approbation Maxim, the Modesty Maxim, the Agreement Maxim, and the Sympathy Maxim. Each of these maxims will be explained as follows:

2.7.1 As Maxim of Tact

The tact maxim, which is according to Leech (1989:132), only applicable in illocutionary functions as impositives and commissives has the principle: a. Minimize cost to other (b. maximize benefit to other). Watts (2003:66) illustrated the tact maxim with the following example,

You know, I really do think you ought to sell that old car. It's costing more and more money in repairs and it uses up far too much fuel.

The tact maxim is adhered to by the speaker minimizing the 'cost' to the addressee by using two discourse markers, one to appeal to solidarity, *you know*, and the other, *really*, one attitudinal predicate, *I do think*, and one modal verb, *ought*. On the other hand, the speaker maximizes the benefit to the addressee in the second part of the utterance by considering that he/she could save the money by selling the and maybe he/she could have the new one that more economical than the old one.

2.7.2 As Maxim of Generosity

The generosity maxim, which is according to Leech (1989:132), only applicable in illocutionary functions as impositives and commissives has the principle: a. Minimize cost to self (b. maximize benefit to self). Watts (2003:66) illustrated the generosity maxim with the following example,

It's none of my business really, but you look so much nicer in the green hat than in the pink one. If I were you, I'd buy that one.

In the first part of the utterance the speaker reduces any concern of hers to a minimum but indicates in the second part of utterance that she would far prefer to see her friend in the green hat rather than the pink one.

2.7.3 As Maxim of Approbation

The approbation maxim, which is according to Leech (1989:132), only applicable in illocutionary functions as expressives and assertives has the principle:

a. Minimize dispraise to other (b. maximize praise to other). Watts (2003:67)

illustrated the approbation maxim with the following examples which the first example shows maximizes praise of the addressee and the second example shows minimizes dispraise,

1. Dear Aunt Mabel, I want to thank you so much for the superb to Christmas present this year. It was so very thoughtful of you.

2. I wonder if you could keep the noise from your Saturday parties down a bit. I'm finding it very hard to get enough sleep over the weekends.

2.7.4 As Maxim of Modesty

The modesty maxim, which is according to Leech (1989:132), only applicable in illocutionary functions as expressives and assertives has the principle:

a. Minimize praise to self (b. maximize praise to other). Watts (2003:67) illustrated

the modesty maxim with the following example which the speaker belittles his/her own abilities in order to highlight the achievements of the addressee,

Well done! What a wonderful performance! I wish I could sing as well as that.

2.7.5 As Maxim of Agreement

The agreement maxim, which is according to Leech (1989:132), only applicable in illocutionary functions as assertives has the principle: a. Minimize disagreement between self and other (b. maximize disagreement between self and other). Watts (2003:67) illustrated the modesty maxim with the following example which the speaker and the addressee are engaged in a political debate. The speaker wishes to make a claim about his political party but to minimize the agreement with the interlocutor,

I know we haven't always agreed in the past and I don't want to claim that the government acted in any other way than we could have done in power, but we believe the affair was essentially from the outset.

2.7.6 As Maxim of Sympathy

The sympathy maxim, which is according to Leech (1989:132), only applicable in illocutionary functions as assertives has the principle: a. Minimize antipathy between self and other (b. maximize sympathy between self and other). Watts (2003:67) illustrated the sympathy maxim with the following example which the speaker makes an effort to minimize the antipathy between himself and the addressee,

Despite very serious disagreement with you on a technical level, we have done our best to coordinate efforts in reaching an agreement, but have so far not been able to find any common ground.