CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Commonly, in maintaining a study, support usually comes from previous studies dealing with the same issue / idea. The reason is, it is believed that, it will prove that there was evidence related to the specific Issue / idea. Thus, to support this research, then researcher have to looking back for some of previous researches related to the topic the researcher want to study as the representative of many research with the same issue. It is better being a foundation of a thought to be considered in a research and of course as the guidelines in analyzing the result later on.

2.2 The Nature of Pragmatics

Firstly, talking about pragmatic, this term has large interpretation. Different expert may have different explanation about the concept of pragmatic and what pragmatic dealing with. Let’s have an attention to some of concept of pragmatic bellow.

Pragmatics seeks to ‘characterize the features of the speech context which help determine which proposition is expressed by a given sentence’ Stalnaker in Horn & Ward (2006). The meaning of a sentence can be regarded as a function from a context (including time, place, and possible world) into a proposition, where a proposition is a function from a possible world into a truth value. Pragmatic aspects of meaning involve the interaction between an expression’s context of utterance and the interpretation of elements within that expression. They continued that Pragmatics is
the study of the context-dependent aspects of MEANING which are systematically abstracted away from in the construction of LOGICAL FORM. In the semiotic tracheotomy developed by Morris, Carnap, and Peirce in the 1930’s, syntax addresses the formal relations of signs to one another, semantics the relation of signs to what they denote, and pragmatics the relation of signs to their users and interpreters (Horn & Ward, 2006 p. 1).

Others concept, pragmatics is the study about the relationship between form of linguistics and the user of it. According to Levinson as cited in Nadar (2009, p. 53) pragmatics is the study of the relationship between language and the context, which is a basis in understanding the meaning of language. Referring to this statement, pragmatics is the study of the aspect of the relationship between language and context that are relevant to the writing grammar. It is dealing with language use and the relationship between language form and language uses.

While, Peccei (1999, p. 13) states that pragmatics concentrates on the aspect of meaning that could not be predicted by linguistic knowledge alone and take into account our knowledge about the physical and social world. The focus of pragmatics analysis is on the meaning of words or sentence.

Yule (2010, p. 128) states that in many ways, pragmatics is the study of “invisible” meaning, or how we recognize what is meant even when it isn’t actually said or written. In order for that to happen, speakers (or writers) must be able to depend on a lot of shared assumptions and expectations when they try to communicate. The investigation of those assumptions and expectations provides us
with some insights into how more is always being communicated than is said. In addition, pragmatics is the study about the relationship between linguistics form and the use of linguistic term. According to her the coverage of pragmatics includes presupposition, implicature, entailment, speech act, and Deixis (Yule, 1996, p. 113-115).

Then, from some of description about the definition of pragmatic that was stated above, the researcher is capable to sum up that pragmatics is the study about meaning conveyed by the speaker or writer and interpreted by listener or reader. From the speaker view, pragmatics is an analysis about meaning of the speaker utterance rather than the meaning of a word or phrase that is used them. From the contextual point of view, pragmatics is the interpretation about the meaning of a person in a particular context and the influence of context to his or her statement. So, pragmatics is an approach used to explore the way of listener to inference an utterance that utters by the speaker in order to arrive at an interpretation of the speaker’s intended meaning.

According to Yule (1996, p. 115) pragmatics study covers:

2.2.1 Entailment

Entailment is the relationship between two sentences where the truth of one (A) requires the truth of the other (B). For example: Sentence A, *The President was assassinated* entails (B) *He is dead*. The statement “The President was assassinated” is not only suggests that “He is dead” is true, but requires that it is true. The first sentence could not be true if the second is not true. If the President is not dead, then
whatever it is happened to him, he would not have counted as a successful assassination.

2.2.2 Implicature

Implicature is the relationship between two statements where the truth of one suggests the truth of the other, but distinguishing implicature from entailment does not require two statements. Example: *Mary had a baby and got married.*

It means the example above strongly suggest that Mary had the baby before the wedding, but the sentence would be still strictly true if Mary had her baby after she got married.

2.2.3 Presupposition

Presupposition is an assumption about the world whose truth is taken for granted in discourse. Example: *Do you want to do it again?* Presupposition: You have done it already, at least once.

2.2.4 Speech Act

Speech act is the study of how we do things with utterance. There are the basic acts in saying utterance namely: Locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary

2.2.5 Deixis

Deixis is the way in which languages encode-feature of the context and thus concerns ways in which the interpretation of utterance depends on the analysis of that context of utterance.

2.3 Notion of Deixis (Indexicality)
There are some very common words in our language that can’t be interpreted at all if we don’t know the context, especially the physical context of the speaker. These are words such as *here* and *there*, *this* or *that*, *now* and *then*, *yesterday*, *today* or *tomorrow*, as well as pronouns such as *you*, *me*, *her*, *him*, *it*, and *them*. Some sentences of English are virtually impossible to understand if we don’t know who is speaking, about whom, where and when. For example: You’ll have to bring it back tomorrow because she isn’t here today.

Out of context, the purpose of the sentence is really hard to catch. It contains a large number of expressions (*you*, *it*, *tomorrow*, *she*, *here*, and *today*). Expressions such as tomorrow and here are real examples of bits of language that we can only understand in terms of the speaker’s sense. They are technically known as deictic (/dɛːktɪk/) expressions, from the Greek word Deixis, which means “pointing” via language (Yule, 2010, p. 130). We use Deixis to point to things (*it*, *this*, *these boxes*) and people (*him*, *them*, and *those idiots*), sometimes called person Deixis. Words and phrases used to point to a location (*here*, *there*, *near that*) are examples of spatial Deixis, and those used to point to a time (*now*, *then*, *last week*) are examples of temporal Deixis. All these deictic expressions have to be interpreted in terms of which person, place or time the speaker has in mind. We make a broad distinction between what is marked as close to the speaker (*this*, *here*, *now*) and what is distant (*that*, *there*, *then*). We can also indicate whether movement is away from the speaker’s location (*go*) or toward the speaker’s location (*come*).
But in the proper usage, People can actually use Deixis to have some fun. Yet the use of Deixis itself is truly easy to understand by the speaker themselves. Because, speaker play the major position in the utterance in the certain context where the utterance is made. When someone say ‘she is beautiful’ without considering speaker position and context of the utterance, it is really hard to catch which she that the speaker intended to pointed to. But when the speaker is recognized, it will be easily to know the meaning. For example, the previous utterance is uttered by a student to his friend while he is talking to someone else, it can be recognize that the word she probably refer to someone (a girl) near by the speaker position. However, the word she here is called deictic expression which point out to person (a girl).

Mey (2001, p. 89).) give an example a guest in a hotel, who staying in her room, but suddenly someone comes and knock the door and ask “Who is there” then answered with ‘it’s me’. From the visitor sense, the word me cannot indicate who is the speaker because me is pointed to someone unknown by the visitor. As it, the word me is deictic expression and pointed to the speaker out of the room. If the speaker change, then the word me will indicate different addressee.

Deixis, in prior time, was divided into three categories: person, place and time Deixis. But now, there are two more Deixis categories listed in Levinson (following Lyons, 1986 and Fillmore, 1975), that are social and discourse Deixis (1983, p. 62). Meanwhile, Yule (2006, p. 115) states that the word Deixis derived from Greek (pronounced like ‘day-icksis’), which means ‘pointing, showing, indicating, displaying, demonstrating, or referencing’ via language. We use Deixis to point to
things (it, this, these boxes) and people (him, them, those idiots), sometimes called **person Deixis**. Words and phrases used to point to a location (here, there, near that) are examples of **spatial Deixis**, and those used to point to a time (now, then, last week) are examples of **temporal Deixis**. A word can be considered as Deixis if the referent move depends on when and where the utterances are made (Kaswanti Purwo as cited in Nadar, 2009, p. 54)

**2.3.1 Social Deixis**

Levinson (1983, p. 63) describes social Deixis as the predetermination of social differences that are relative to participant-roles, mainly aspects of the social correlation that is possessed between the speaker and addressee(s) or speaker and some referent. Social Deixis is divided into two basic kinds that are relational and absolute (Levinson, 1983, p. 90). The relational social Deixis is manifested through this certain relationship (Levinson, 1983, p. 90):

- a. speaker and referent (addressee honorifics by referring him)
- b. speaker and addressee (addressee honorifics without referring him)
- c. speaker and bystander (bystander or audience honorifics)
- d. Speaker and setting (formality levels or social activity).

While absolute social Deixis are in the form of (Levinson, 1983, p. 91):

- a. authorized speaker (forms reserved for certain speaker)
- b. Authorized hearer (restriction of most title, e.g. Your Honor).

Social Deixis, however, truly cannot be separated from the concept of **honorifics**. Furthermore, honorifics concerns about the relative rank or respect between speaker,
referent, and also bystander (Levinson, 1983, p. 90). Social Deixis is sometimes encoded in person Deixis, and it is related to the different social status (higher and lower) between speaker and addressee. Moreover, it also deals with familiar and non-familiar addressee in some languages, as French, Spanish, and Javanese have. The T/V distinction in French is a well known example for this. ‘Tu’ is used to address familiar addressee and ‘Vous’ for nonfamiliar (or with higher status) one. In Spanish it is called ‘Tu/Usted’ and in Javanese the term ‘Kowe/Sampeyan/Panjenengan’ is included in this distinction. It also could possibly lie in a verb, as ‘Mangan/Dhahar’ in Javanese.

1. Panjenengan sampun dhahar “Have you taken your lunch?

2. Kowe wis mangan? /dinner/breakfast?”

Both sentences above have the same meaning, but they are uttered in different way considering the addressee or the listener. Sentence (1) could be spoken to give more respect to the listener. On the other hand, sentence (2) could be spoken to make the situation more relax. Uttering sentence (2) does not mean that a speaker does not respect the hearer. It might be used to make the situation more relax. However, sentence (2) could only be used between the same position or close relationship between speaker and hearer.

2.3.2 Person Deixis

Levinson (1983, p.62) states that person Deixis deals with the predetermination of the role of participants in the speech event in which the utterance in question is uttered and it is reflected directly in the grammatical categories of person. According
to him person Deixis that can be considered as ‘truly’ deictic are personal pronoun, first and second person pronoun. Besides, the other than first person, known as speaker and second person, known as addressee, another important participant in the speech situation, neither speaker nor hearer are also included to person Deixis, that are known as third person.

Person Deixis is a word that has functions as personal pronoun. Person Deixis related with personal pronoun, if its reference which is used appropriate with the context is being used. “Personal Deixis concerns the encoding of the role of participant in the speech event in which the utterance in question is delivering. The category of personal divided into three: the category first person is the grammaticalization of the speaker’s reference himself, second person the encoding of the speaker’s reference to one or more addressees. Third persons encode of reference to person and entities that are neither speakers nor addressees of the utterance in question”. (Levinson as cited in Nadar, 2009, p.56)

Personal Deixis is deictic reference to the participant role of reference, such as: the speaker the addressee, and referent that are neither speaker nor addressee. The criteria of personal Deixis are the actor in the event, such as first person, second person, and third person. In this case, the first person refer to the speaker, and second person refer to the audience or addressee and the third person refer to someone or thing which is not the speaker and not the audience. While person Deixis itself is devided into First person, Second and third person Deixis.
Levinson as cited in Nadar (2009, p. 56.) maintain a specific characteristic of Person Deixis “as speaker switch, so the deictic centre, on which the rest of deictic system hangs, is itself abruptly moved from participant to participant”. Such as the use of personal pronoun he in the “he is not the Duke. He is the butler” and 'John came in and then he called his assistant” which is pointed to the butler and John.

2.4 Concept of Context, Reference, Inference and Anaphora

2.4.1 Context

A: I loved you All (said a lecturer to the students)

The word ‘love’ can be interpret in different way depends on the context of the utterance. From the example, Love which is uttered by a lecturer could mean care to the student, but when the speaker is different people, it could be interpreted into different meaning.

In the last example, it is emphasized the influence of context. There are different kinds of context. One kind is described as linguistic context, also known as co-text. The co-text of a word is the set of other words used in the same phrase or sentence. The surrounding co-text has a strong effect on what we think the word probably means. We usually identified the word bank as a homonym, a single form with more than one meaning. How do we usually know which meaning is intended in a particular sentence? We normally do so on the basis of linguistic context. If the word bank is used in a sentence together with words like steep or overgrown, we have no problem deciding which type of bank is meant. Or, if we hear someone say that she
has to get to the bank to withdraw some cash, we know from this linguistic context which type of bank is intended.

More generally, we know how to interpret words on the basis of physical context. If we see the word BANK on the wall of a building in a city, the physical location will influence our interpretation. While this may seem rather obvious, we should keep in mind that it is not the actual physical situation “out there” that constitutes “the context” for interpreting words or sentences. Yule (2010, p.130) argues that the relevant context is our mental representation of those aspects of what is physically out there that we use in arriving at an interpretation. Our understanding of much of what we read and hear is tied to this processing of aspects of the physical context, particularly the time and place, in which we encounter linguistic expressions.

2.4.2 Reference

In discussing Deixis, we assumed that the use of words to refer to people, places and times was a simple matter. We have to define reference as an act by which a speaker (or writer) uses language to enable a listener (or reader) to identify something. Whereas Carlson argue that reference, then, is a kind of verbal “pointing to” or “picking out” of a certain object or individual that one wishes to say something about (as Cited in Horn & Ward, 2006, p. 76). To perform an act of reference, we can use proper nouns like Levinson, Yule, Chomsky, Jennifer, and Whiskas, other nouns in phrases (a writer, my friend, the cat) or pronouns (he, she, and it) (Yule, 2010, p. 131). We sometimes assume that these words identify someone or something
uniquely, but it is more accurate to say that, for each word or phrase, there is a “range of reference”. The words Jennifer or friend or she can be used to refer to many things in the world. As we observed earlier, an expression such as you doesn’t directly identify anything by itself, because its reference depends on who is using it.

We can also refer to things when we’re not sure what to call them. We can use expressions such as the blue thing and that icky stuff and we can even invent names. For instance, there was a man who always drove his motorcycle fast and loud through my neighborhood and was locally referred to as Mr. Kawasaki. In this case, a brand name for a motorcycle is being used to refer to a person.

2.4.3 Inference

As in the “Bank” example, a successful act of reference depends more on the listener’s ability to recognize what we mean than on the listener’s “dictionary” knowledge of a word we use. For example, in a restaurant, one waiter can ask another, where’s the spinach salad sitting? And receive the reply; He’s sitting by the door. If you’re studying linguistics, you might ask someone, Can I look at your Chomsky? And get the response; sure, it’s on the shelf over there. These examples make it clear that we can use names associated with things (salad) to refer to people, and use names of people (Chomsky) to refer to things. The key process here is called inference (Yule, 2010, p. 131).

An inference is additional information used by the listener to create a connection between what is said and what must be meant. In the last example, the listener has to operate with the inference: “if X is the name of the writer of a book, then X can be
used to identify a copy of a book by that writer.” Similar types of inferences are necessary to understand someone who says that Picasso is in the museum or We saw Shakespeare in London or Jennifer is wearing Calvin Klein.

2.4.4 Anaphora

We usually make a distinction between introducing new referents (a puppy) and referring back to them (the puppy, it). We saw a funny home video about a boy washing a puppy in a small bath. The puppy started struggling and shaking and the boy got really wet. When he let go, it jumped out of the bath and ran away. In this type of referential relationship, the second (or subsequent) referring expression is an example of anaphora (“referring back”) (Yule, 2010, p. 132). The first mention is called the antecedent. So, in our example, a boy, a puppy and a small bath are antecedents and The puppy, the boy, he, it and the bath are anaphoric expressions. Anaphora can be defined as subsequent reference to an already introduced entity. Mostly we use anaphora in texts to maintain reference. The connection between an antecedent and an anaphoric expression is created by use of a pronoun (it), or a phrase with the plus the antecedent noun (the puppy), or another noun that is related to the antecedent in some way (The little dog ran out of the room). The connection between antecedents and anaphoric expressions is often based on inference, as in these examples.

We found a house to rent, but the kitchen was very small. I caught a bus and asked the driver if it went near the downtown area. In the first example, we must make an inference like “if X is a house, then X has a kitchen” in order to interpret the
connection between antecedent a house and anaphoric expression the kitchen. In the second example, we must make an inference like “if X is a bus, then X has a driver” in order to make the connection between a bus and the driver. We have used the term “inference” here to describe what the listener (or reader) does. When we talk about an assumption made by the speaker (or writer), we usually talk about a “presupposition.”

2.5 Review of Related studies

In order to give more evidence, here are some discoveries that have been revealed by the previous researcher related to pragmatic. The first one is A Social and Pragmatic Analysis of the Second Person Deixis You by Li (2001). The result is there is an adequate semantic account of presupposition in natural language, so that contextual accounts of this notion are unnecessary. The idea that there are CONTEXTUAL PRESUPPOSITION and above SEMANTIC PRESUPPOSITIONS has been gaining in popularity in both linguistics and philosophy.

The second one is A Pragmatic Theory of Presupposition Projection by Schlenker (2008). He found that there are two problems precipitated a ‘dynamic turn’ in the analysis of meaning: the puzzle of ‘donkey anaphora’, and the analysis of ‘presupposition projection’. In ‘donkey’ sentences, an existential quantifier appears to bind a pronoun that does not lie within its syntactic scope.

Subsequently, at the end of this chapter the researcher would like to provide some recent studies linked with. The first research has been conducted by Hasanah (2006), entitled “The Use of Deixis in Gladiator Movie Manuscript”. The result of her research shows that, the forms of Deixis are person Deixis, time Deixis, place Deixis,
discourse Deixis, and social Deixis. The reference of Deixis is based on the semantic meaning. It refers to lexical meaning and based on the pragmatic meaning which refers to the meaning covers in the discourse.

The second research has been done by Iksan H (2008), entitled “Pragmatic Analysis of Deixis in Jane Austen’s Novel “Pride and Prejudice”. The result of his research shows that 1) there are three types of personal Deixis, namely first personal Deixis, second personal Deixis, and third personal Deixis 2) there are three kinds of the referents in personal Deixis, namely, the referent which refers to first person, the referent which refers to second person, and the referent refers to third person. The third research has been conducted by Purnasari (2007), entitled “A Discourse Analysis of “Your Letters” in the Jakarta Post Newspaper”. The result of her research shows that 1) the most configurations that the researcher found in those letters are: subject line, body of letter, and the sender 2) the most Deixis that used in discourse “Your Letters” in the Jakarta Post are: personal Deixis, place Deixis, time Deixis, and discourse Deixis.

Then comparing Personal Deixis used by President Megawati and President SBY in “Hari Kebangkitan Nasional” Speech That Represent Speaker Position organized by Persada (2011). He uncover that basically there are no significance differentiations between Deixis used by President Megawati and SBY. But in this case, the speech of precidency is a representation of speaker position especially a president in order to use personal Deixis to represent his or her ideology.
Other recent study is *The Use Of Person Deixis In Relation to Politeness Function* yielded by Rahmawati (2011) From this case study inquiry it can be concluded that first person Deixis which is used are aku, saya and kita, meanwhile second person Deixis are kamu, Kowe, beliau and the name of addressee. On the other side, third person Deixis are dia, deknen, beliau, and the name of third person. The use of Deixis itself is usually pressured by the situation a speech occurs and the relation between speaker and the addressee so that sometimes deixis appears and used in appropriate exertion. Followed by an outcome of an investigation conducted by Juliari (2008) discusses about *personal Deixis and clarifies the reference of Deixis used in English Translation of Al-Qur’an*. She found that the types of Deixis are singular first personal (I, me, my, we, our, us, my), singular second personal (you, your) and singular third personal (them, he, him). It also distinguished based on its function in the sentence, as subjective pronoun (I, we, and you), objective pronoun (me, us, and you), possessive pronoun (your, our, and my) and reflexive pronoun (themselves, yourself, himself, and myself). She uses the reported speech as an instrument to analyze the data.

And the last three previous study are first, *a discourse study about Deixis Used in Ernest Hemingway’s “The Killers’’ Short Story* investigated by Ika Winarsih (2009) She Found that there are Some kind Of Deixis in The Novel and those are Spatial, personal and sosial Deixis. second one is a research whis was conducted by an English Department in Gorontalo state university which is investigate about Deixis in F. Scott Fitzgerald’s Novel, the great Gatsby by Sri ariyanti Sabiku, (2012). The
result is the three types of person Deixis and clarifies the reference of each deictic expression. The function is subjective, objective and possessive. And also how many deictic expression that appears in the novel. And the third is Yulan ali in 2012, she conducted a study about Person Deixis in song lyric of Maher Zein’s album. She also analyses the meaning of the deictic expression in the song.

The similarity between the previous researches with the research done by the writer is discussing about Deixis, while the differences is that previous researches are focusing on Deixis used in movie manuscript, novel, a Speech, Personal Deixis related to politeness function and newspaper. Here, the researcher focuses on social and personal Deixis used by English department students in daily conversation.