CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL BASES

2.1 Pragmatics

In early 1980s, when it first became common to discuss pragmatics in general textbook on linguistics, the most common definitions of pragmatics were: meaning in use or meaning in context (Thomas, 1995: 1). Moreover, Pragmatics is one of the areas of linguistics study. There are many definitions about pragmatics. According to Leech (1983: 8) pragmatics is the study of how utterances have meanings in situations. Further, Yule (1996: 3) defines that pragmatics is the study about meaning which is delivered by the speaker and interpreted by the addressee. Furthermore, Levinson (in Nadar 2009: 4) said that pragmatics is the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized or encoded in the structure of language. It means that pragmatics concerned with utterance meaning, and it deepens on the situation where the utterance happens.

Leech (1983: 6) defined pragmatics is the study of meaning in relation to a speech situation. Furthermore, Leech (1983: 13-14) stated that there are some aspects in doing pragmatic study. Those aspects are:

1. Addressers or addressees
2. The context of an utterance
3. The goal of an utterance
4. The utterance as a form of act or activity: a speech act and
5. The utterance as a product of verbal act.
Arguably, the above request characterized speech as a form of acts or behavior, or called speech act

2.2 The Illocutionary acts

Illocutionary act is the one part in study of speech act. Besides that we can find the effect of politeness in the illocutionary act. According to Thomas (1995:49) Illocutionary act is “the force or intention behind the words”. Additionally, Searle in Leech (1983: 199) defines that Illocutionary is the “act of doing something”. It means that Illocutionary act is what is the goal that the speaker want when the speaker uttering something.

Afterwards, Searle in Leech (1983: 105) divided an illocutionary functions into five classes. His categories defined as follows:

1. Assertive: Illocutionary acts which is commit the speaker to the truth of what it said. (Cruse 2006, 168) for examples: suggesting, complaining, claiming, reporting. Such illocutions tent to be neutral as regards politeness. But there are some exceptions: for example, boasting is generally considered to be impolite.

2. Directive: Illocutionary acts aims to produce some effect through action by the hearer (Searle in Leech 1983: 105-106): for examples, ordering, commanding, requesting, advising and recommending. This Illocutionary frequently need a negative politeness. On the other hand, some directives of illocution such as invitation are intrinsically polite.
3. Commissive: Illocutionary acts that have an effect of committing the speaker to some action in the future. (Cruse, 2006: 168); for examples promising, vowing, offering. This illocution not refer to the interests of speaker but for the interest of the hearer.

4. Expressive: Illocutionary acts that have a function to expressing or making known, the speaker’s psychological attitude toward a state of affair which the Illocution presupposes (Searle in leech 1983: 105-106). For examples: thanking, congratulating, pardoning, blaming, praising, condoling. Like the *commissive*, this Illocution is more delight, and therefore intrinsically polite, except for expressive illocutions like blaming and accusing.

5. Declarative: illocutionary acts that said to produce a change of some sort in the world; for example: resigning, dismissing, christening, naming, excommunicating, appointing, sentencing, Searle (in Leech 1983:106) defines this Illocutionary is a very special category of speech acts, they are normally speaking, by someone who is especially authorized to do so within some institutional framework.

Searle’s categories of illocution correlate only roughly with different types of politeness, although leech already try to associated one or more of these categories with each maxims of politeness, but Searle’s fifth category of ‘declarations’ does not involve politeness, that category is excluded from the list.
2.3 The Politeness Six number of maxims

According to Watss (2003:20) politeness is a form of behavior of a given society and at the same time as one dimension of culture. One indication of politeness in language can be seen in the expression of language utterances (linguistic utterance). In this case, speakers seek to create a harmony in the relationship of communication, by trying to arrange the selection of speech forms that are expressed verbally supported by non-verbal behavior in order to appreciate the context, and in accordance with the socio-cultural norms and values.

There are six maxim of politeness proposed by Leech (1983) as follows:

(I) The Tact maxim (in impositive and commissive)

The Tact maxim states: ‘Minimize cost to other’; ‘Maximize benefit to other.’ (Leech, 1983:132).

(II) The generosity maxim (in impositive and commissive)

Leech’s generosity maxim states: ‘Minimize benefit to self; Maximize cost to self.’ (Leech, 1983:132).

(III) The Approbation maxim (in expressive and assertive)

The Approbation maxim states: ‘Minimize dispraise of other; Maximize praise of other.’ (Leech, 1983:132).

(IV) The Modesty maxim (in expressive and assertive)

(V) The Agreement maxim (expressive and assertive)

The Agreement maxim runs as follows: ‘Minimize disagreement between self and other; Maximize agreement between self and other.’ (Leech, 1983:132).

(VI) The sympathy Maxim (expressive and assertive)


These maxims above recommend the expression of polite rather than impolite beliefs, all of them come under the politeness. Then, we can pay attention what Leech, (1983:132) stated in pairs the first four maxims because they deal with bipolar scales: the cost-benefit (tact and generosity maxims), and praise-dispraise (Approbation and modesty maxims) scales from the impolite to more polite. The other two maxims (agreement and sympathy maxims) deal with not bipolar scales. Although there are various connection links between the scales, each maxim is distinct in that it refers to an evaluative scale which is distinct from the scales referred to by the others.
Whereas, tact maxim and generosity maxim respectively concern the cost of benefit of future action to other and to self, Approbation maxim and modesty maxim respectively concern with good or bad evaluation of other and of self, for example, the approbation maxim is exemplified in the intrinsic courtesy of congratulations, and the modesty maxim in that of apologies.

Not all of the maxims are equally important. Of the twinned maxims they are tact maxim and generosity maxim, approbation maxim and modesty maxim, tact maxim appears to be more powerful constraint on conversational behavior than generosity maxim. The approbation maxim to be more powerful than modesty maxim, this all, if true, reflect a more general law that politeness is focused more strongly than on other than on self.

2.3.1 The Tact maxim

Basically, characteristic of politeness is asymmetrical. It means that, the polite utterance to the hearer or third person are impolite to the speaker, and vice versa. Therefore, the justification for the maxims of politeness is precisely that they explain such asymmetries and, their consequences in terms of indirectness. Leech (1983:107) explained it by the operation of the tact maxim. Perhaps Tact maxim is the most important kind of politeness in English-speaking society.

In addition, tact maxim organized two kinds of Searle’s categories of illocutions there are directive and commissive. And also, there are two sides to the tact maxim, a negative side ‘Minimize the cost the hearer’, and a positive side, ‘Maximize the benefit to the hearer. The second is less important, but is a natural
corollary of the first. It means that there is a relation between illocutionary acts and kinds of politeness. Watss (2003:66) give an example of the tact maxim in illocutionary function of advising:

“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 minimising the ‘cost’ to the addressee by using two discourse markers, one to appeal to solidarity, you know, and the other as a modifying hedge, really, one attitudinal predicate, I do think, and one modal verb, ought. On the other hand, the speaker maximises the benefit to the addressee in the second part of the turn by indicating that s/he could save a lot of time and money by selling the car.

2.3.2 The generosity maxim

Generosity maxim states in commissive and impositive utterances. Leech (1983:133) already mentioned the bilateral aspect of impositive and commissive speech acts. Bilaterality means that in practice of the tact maxim which centralized to other and the generosity maxim which centralized to self do not need to distinguish. Watss (2003:66) give an example of Generosity Maxim in illocutionary function of recommending as follow:

“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”.

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

2.3.3 The Approbation maxim

An unflattering subtitle for the Approbation maxim would be ‘the Flattery maxim’ but the term flattery’ is generally reserved for insincere approbation. In its more important negative aspect, this maxim says ‘avoid saying unpleasant things about others, and more practically, about hearer. And, this maxim states in expressive utterance and assertive utterance. Watss (2003:67) give an example of The Approbation maxim in illocutionary function of thanking and complaining.

a. “Dear aunt mabel, I want to thank you so much for the superb Christmas present this year. It was so very thoughtful of you.”

b. “I wonder if you could keep the noise from your Saturday parties down a bit. I am finding it very hard to get enough sleep over the weekends”.

This italic sentence in the first example means the speaker maximises praise of addressee. While, the second is to minimises dispraise of other.
2.3.4 The Modesty maxim

The modesty maxim, like the other maxims of politeness, shoes itself in asymmetries. And this maxim also states in expressive utterance and assertive utterance. Watss (2003:67) give an example of The Modesty Maxim in illocutionary function of praising as follow:

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

In this utterance, the speaker bellittles her/his own abilities in order to highlight the achievements of the addressee.

2.3.5 The Agreement maxim

The Agreement maxim also states in expressive utterance and assertive utterance. Although there is less evidence for other maxims, it is worth noting, for example that there is tendency to exaggerate agreement with other people, and to mitigate disagreement by expressing regret, partial agreement. Watss (2003:67) give an example of the agreement maxim as follow:

“I know we haven’t always agree in the past and I don’t want to claim that the government acted in any other way than we would have done in power, but we believe the affair was essentially mismanaged from the outset”.

In this utterance, 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 disagreement with the interlocutor.
2.3.6 The sympathy Maxim

The Sympathy maxim also states in *expressive* utterance and *assertive* utterance. Sympathy maxim explains why congratulations and condolences are courteous speech acts, even though condolences express beliefs which are negative with regard to the hearer. Watss (2003:67) give an example of The agreement maxim in illocutionary function of reporting as follow:

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

In this utterance, the speaker makes an effort to minimise the antipathy between himself and the addressee.
2.4 Review of Relevant study

1. “Politeness in Review Texts Written By American And Japanese Reviewers”
   

   This study was conducted by Andreas Winardi from Duta Wacana Christian University Yogyakarta. This study was attempted to investigate how culture influences writing, especially in review texts. The corpus studied consists of 20 review texts published in the journals of Modern Language from 2000-2004, 10 reviews were written by American authors and the other 10 were constructed by their Japanese counterparts. The findings suggest that there are similarities and differences between American and Japanese reviewers in the utilization of compliments as positive politeness strategies and hedging as negative politeness strategies.

   
   [Link](http://humanitas.ub.ac.id/index.php/humanitas/article/view/103)

   This study was conducted by I Ketut Seken from University of Brawijaya. The communicative behaviors of four klian adats were investigated to reveal their choice of politeness strategies that concern their intent to respect their interlocutors’ dignity. Data analysis showed that various appealing strategies are used in the deliverance of acts with a potential to threaten the addressee’s face.
The study was concluded with a claim that politeness strategies are related to the concept of face held by the community concerned. The appealing strategies are claimed to be the type of politeness strategies that feed to the addressee’s desires that his dignity be preserved and respected.

3. “Politeness Strategies Used by Indonesian Chatters in Internet Relay Chat (IRC)”


This study was conducted by Ima Khalimatus Sa’diyah from State University of Malang. This study was attempted to investigate three downloaded data of written conversations or messages in the IRC. The results of the analysis show that bald on record strategy is most widely used by Indonesian chatters in IRC. It may happen due to the setting of the conversation that is the cyber world where the people communicate there may not really know each other and they may never meet in the ‘real’ world. It can be said that there is almost no boundary for everyone to say what they want to say.

4. “Directive Illocutionary acts in relation to politeness strategy in the historica movies The King’s Speech”

Http://Eprints.Undip.Ac.Id/31202/2/Directive_Illocutionary_Acts_In_Relation_To_Politeness_Strategy_In_The_Historical_Movie_The_King’s_Speech.Pdf
This study was conducted by Garnis Trisnawati from Diponegoro University of Semarang (2011). This study attempted to elaborate the kinds of directive illocutionary acts of the dialogues in *The King’s Speech* used by the speaker seen from the aspect of (i) explicit or implicit performative, (ii) direct or indirect directive illocutionary acts, (iii) literal or nonliteral directive illocutionary acts, (iv) function of directive illocutionary acts, and (v) the speaker’s mood in making directive illocutionary acts; and to justify the use of politeness principles and strategy by speaker in uttering directive illocutionary acts. The result of the study showed that there were 50 utterances which contain directive illocutionary act, 20 utterance of that uttered as directed and 29 utterance of that produced as indirectly. On the other hand, there were 48 produced as literal and non literal. Based on the politeness, 23 directives illocutionary acts which produced by speaker as direct and indirect.

From the previous studies above, the conclusion is some researchers had been studied about “politeness strategy used in the IRC community”, studied about “Politeness in Review Texts Written by American and Japanese Reviewers”, studied about “Politeness in Balinese: The Appealing Strategies”, and also “Directive Illocutionary acts in relation to politeness strategy in the historical movies *The King’s Speech*” but there is no one who talked about politeness strategies in *Othello*. Since there is no study about the politeness strategies used in *Othello* by using the theory by Leech (1983), this study tries to present study about an analysis of politeness strategies in *Othello* (a film adapted from William Shakespeare’s play).