2.1 Pragmatics

Yule (2000:3) concerns with four areas of pragmatics definitions. First, *pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning*. It concerns with the study of meaning as communicated by the speaker or writer and interpreted by the listener or reader. It has, consequently, 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. The second, *pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning*. This study involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said. It is required a consideration of speaker's utterance according with the listener of where, when, what circumstance. Third, *Pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said*. This study explores how a great deal of what is unsaid is recognized as part of what is communicated. There is a choice between the said and the unsaid as in the previous definition; thus, there is a notion of distance. The speaker determines the needs to be said. Therefore, *pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance*.

Yule (1996:4) also states that the advantage or studying language via pragmatics is that ones can talk people’s intended meanings, their assumption, their purposes, or goals and the kinds of actions that they are performing when
they speak. The disadvantage is that all these very human concepts are extremely difficult to analyze in a consistent and objective way.

Searle, Kiefer and Bierwisch (1980:8) suggest that “Pragmatics is one of those words (societal and cognitive are others) that give the impression that something quite specific and technical is being talked about when often in fact it has no clear meaning.”

In different definition, Levinson (2000:21) defines pragmatics as the study of the relations between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding. It claims understanding an utterance involves a great deal more than knowing the meanings of the words uttered and the grammatical relations between them but understanding an utterance must take account to the context.

2.1.1 Speech Acts

Speech acts are in the field of pragmatics because their effects are bound by context. An utterance may have a different speech act when it is said in a different context.

An utterance at the same time has three acts. The first act is called as locutionary act. It is the literal meaning of the utterance itself. The second act is called as illocutionary act. It is the intension of the speaker in saying the utterance. The utterance said by a speaker will be responded by the hearer. This response is the third act of an utterance, that is called perlocutionary act. It is the act that is the act in result of the interpretation of the hearer.
The speech act may be direct or indirect. If the locution and illocution have direct connection, the interpretation of the utterance is simple because the intended meaning of the utterance is expressed literally. It is called direct speech act. The vice versa applies.

Searle (1969) proposes five types of speech acts as follows:

1. **Assertive Speech Acts**
   The speech acts in which the speaker is bound by the truth of the proposition he says. For instance, stating, reporting and whining, concluding, asserting.

2. **Directive Speech Acts**
   The speech acts of which purpose is trigger hearer’s action. For instance, commanding, pleading, begging, questioning., requesting, advising, ordering.

3. **Commissive Speech Acts**
   The speech act in which the speaker commits to a future action. For instance, offering, promising, pledging, refusing, threatening.

4. **Declarative Speech Acts**
   The speech acts that require the performance of the illocution which results in the accordance of proposition and reality. For instance, naming, sentencing, excommunicating,

5. **Expressive Speech Acts**
   The speech acts that express what the speaker feels. For instance, praising, thanking, condemning., congratulating, blaming.
2.2.2. Implicature

The term implicature is proposed by Grice which represents the act of meaning, implying, or suggesting one thing by saying something else, or represents the object of that act (http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/implicature/). It is a component of speaker meaning that constitutes an aspect of what is meant in a speaker’s utterance without being part of what is said (Horn, 2006:3). Implicature is more being communicated than is said. Grice cited in Meibauer, asserts ‘what is implicated’ and ‘what is said’ are part of speaker meaning. ‘What is said’ is that part of meaning that is determined by truth-conditional semantics, while ‘what is implicated’ is that part of meaning that cannot be captured by truth conditions and therefore belongs to pragmatics (2006:365).

Implicature is not part of the conventional meaning of the sentence uttered, but depends on features of the conversational context. Grice divides implicature into two kinds, conventional implicature and conversational implicature (1975:45). Conventional implicature depends on meaning in the conventional use of linguistic form and expressions, on the other hand; conversational implicature is derived from a set of maxim of the cooperative principle that lead the proper conduct of communication.
a. Conversational Implicature

The most widely accepted type of implicature is the conversational implicature. Conversational implicature has become one of the principal subjects of pragmatics. Grice observed that conversational implicatures are generally connected to what is said rather than the way it is said, so that that “it is not possible to find another way saying the same thing, which simply lacks the implicature in question” (1975: 39). Conversational implicature deals with the conceptual and principles. Conversational implicature refers to the implication, which can be deduced, from the form of an utterance, on the basis of certain cooperative principles that governs the efficiency and normal acceptability of conversation (Crystal, 1997:191). Therefore, the notion of conversational implicature is derived from a general principle of conversation, where the communication need to consider the principles that should be obeyed by the participants in order to get well communication, which is known as Cooperative Principle. Grice postulates a general Cooperative Principle and four maxims specifying how to be cooperative (1975: 26–30). People generally follow these rules for efficient communication.

*Cooperative Principle*

Make your 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 you are engaged.
Maxim of Quantity

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of exchange).

2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Maxim of Quality

Try to make your contribution one that is true.

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.

2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Maxim of Relevance

Be relevant.

Maxim of Manner

Be perspicuous.

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.

2. Avoid ambiguity.

3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).

4. Be orderly.

It is called as principle of conversation when the listener assumes that the speaker follows the rules or maxims above. But if there is violation in one of those maxims, then there is something more than what is said.

The first maxim, the maxim of Quantity is about the amount of contribution toward the coherence of conversation. The listeners are not suggested to give information that is not more informative than is required. If the speaker
only needs a bit of information, then the listener also should give an equal contribution, and vice versa. For example:

(1)  **Oprah:** Are you happy with all of these happening to you now?

    **Bieber:** Yes, definitely I am

    **Oprah:** And you really, without being pretentious, love your fans?

    **Bieber:** Of course I do

(2)  **Oprah:** Do you enjoy the fame?

    **Bieber:** Yes I do and it’s mostly because I can connect with a lot of people and can do things to help them in needs and definitely because I can travel to many cool places in the world.

In conversation (1) above, the participants are being more cooperative than in (2) conversation. It is because the addressee only gives adequate information that is not more than required. The addressee gives sufficient contribution quantitative in every step of conversations. While in conversation (2), the addressee is not being cooperative by answering the question exaggeratedly because the answers are not yet necessary in the step of those conversations.

The second maxim, the maxim of Quality, contains the message to give a true contribution along with its certain evidence. The speaker is not allowed to state something that is believed to be false. The point of this maxim is the participants should tell the truth in the conversations.

(3)  **Oprah:** Where did you firstly perform in public?

    **Bieber:** At the threshold of a restaurant in Stratford.
Bieber is cooperative in the conversational above by saying the truth about the place where the first president of Indonesia was born. The addressee also has valid evidence because it can be found in many history books or news.

The third maxim, the maxim of Relevance, proposes the speakers to give contributions which are relevant to the principle of conversation. By following this, it will be the same as following the cooperative principle. Conversely, infringing the rules will break the cooperative principle and the principle of conversation itself. The message of the speaker must be relevant to the response of the addressee. Thus, both the speakers and the listeners should have relation with the utterances.

(4)  Bieber: I am kinda hungry.

        Oprah: We can order good steak and pizza here.

The conversation above has a good relation in both participants. Bieber says that she feels cold, and then Oprah gives a response that they can order good steak and pizza in the restaurant they are holding the interview. Oprah is relevant with the topic of Bieber’s utterance. But there will be irrelevant contribution if Oprah tries to change the topic being discussed, as the following example:

(5)  Bieber: I am kinda hungry.

        Oprah: We can go to the next question.

Being hungry and offering to go to the next question are different topic in the normal situation. Oprah’s reply is not literally relevant with the maxim of relevance and Oprah is not cooperative indeed.
Lastly, the maxim of Manner requires that an utterance should be clear and understandable. This maxim suggests the participants to avoid obscurity and ambiguity expression when it is used in context. Also, by avoiding some unnecessary contributions or being brief and being orderly. Therefore, when the speaker does not observe this maxim, then the utterance is obscure or ambiguous or disorderly and this is intended to convey an implicit meaning.

(6)  

**Oprah:** How did you get this superstar fame?

**Bieber:** My mom posted my singing competition videos on Youtube for relatives who wanted to see them, and then they got viral online, then a guy named Scooter Braun called and said he wanted to sign me up, and then he and mom got into a long discussion ending up with me and my mom flying to New York for further signing, and then I had recording session and worked hard for months and so then good things were getting into us.

*Oprah* asks a question and *Bieber*’s literal reply is complicated. At the literal level, *Bieber* does not appear to be observing the maxim of manner. But *Oprah* assumes that *Bieber* is being cooperative and following the maxim of manner. *Bieber* could have just said “by hard work” but he does not, so the added detail must be necessary. In other words, *Bieber* is being as perspicacious as he could be. And so *Oprah* infers that *Bieber*’s elaborate details are somehow important.
After all, the violation and floating of the maxims of conversation often happens in the conversation. When it happens, the utterances’ illocutionary is not similar with their locutionary meaning. Or in the words, they become conversational implicature. The speakers have particular intention in doing so. Some of them are to maintain the partner’s face, to make utterance less cruel or to soften the utterance, etc. Below is an example taken from the Oprah Winfrey and Justin Bieber interview of how the violation of maxim plays a role in some particular intention in conversation:

Oprah: “Do you respond to all tweets your followers send via Twitter?”

Justin: “Can you reply forty million tweets one by one?”

This example is interesting. As much as discussed above, Justin Bieber uses implicature again in answering Oprah’s question. He violates the maxim of relevance and maxim of quality by answering Oprah’s question with another question. At glance, it might not be a relevant answer but it actually is. In the superficial form, his speech act is acting therefore it belongs to Directive. However, it is actually answering a question not asking question therefore it is a statement and it is categorized as assertive. Justin’s answer actually means ‘no’ to Oprah’s question. He does not use the strong negative answer ‘no’ because in such interview live in 30 different countries at the time, he has to maintain his reputation. He cannot afford saying that he does not reply all of his fan’s tweets on Twitter. Thereby, he presents a logical fact to Oprah by mentioning the number
of followers he has on Twitter and asks a rhetoric question if he can reply all of them in tweet one by one given the fact that he is very busy with concert tours and album making and so on. His answer is inevitably wise. It can hinder a wave of disappointment from the fan because they can understand that Justin Bieber cannot respond to that many number of followers and tweets on Twitter. It is a very effective way of communication.