

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Related Theories

In this chapter the writer will explain what theory that is used to accomplish this study. The main data in this analysis is the drama script by Eugene Ionesco and it will be supported by some resources. The theory of discourse analysis by George Yule's *Discourse Analysis, An Introduction to Discourse Analysis* by Malcolm Coulthard will help the writer to analyze this study and the theory of illocutionary acts by Searle will also support this analysis. Some books with other theories will be also used by the writer to finish his thesis.

2.1.1 Pragmatics

Yule (1996: 3) states that pragmatics is the study which concern in the meaning of communication delivered by the speaker and interpreted by the listener (reader). By this definition, it can be said that meaning is important to be known for everyone to communicate each other. Then, Yule (1996: 3) also states that pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning, the study of contextual meaning, the study of how more gets communicated than is said, and the study of the expression of relative distance (closeness in physical, social, or conceptual). For the first, pragmatics learns about the speaker meaning. In other words, it can be said that every utterance delivered by the speaker has meaning. Pragmatics will also learn the contextual meaning of utterances whether it is written or spoken. Based on the third statement

given by Yule about pragmatics, it can be captured that pragmatic also learns how far the reader or listener can grasp the contextual meaning delivered by the speaker or the writer. The last statement from Yule can be meant that the closeness between the speaker and the listener will affect the meaning of the utterance.

Levinson (1983: 9) states in Riza (2005: 11) that pragmatics as the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language. From this definition, it can be seen that pragmatics will explore the meaning of utterances which involve of grammatical structure and words based on the context.

Mey (2001: 5) states that pragmatics is interested in the process of producing language and in its producers, not only in the end-product, language. From the definition given, it can be meant that pragmatics also pay attention to who is the speaker, who is the listener, where, when, and why is stated. It does not only focus on the utterance itself.

Based on those all theories, the writer can grasp that pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning which also considers the process of an utterance produced. The pragmatics theory has an important role for the study of the writer. It will help him to link and to analyze the data of his study to the context of the data source.

2.1.2 Context

Context can help the listener to reveal the intended meaning of a speaker's utterance. The meaning of grammatical utterance from the speaker cannot be understood easily without knowing the context of the situation. It is important for the

hearer to comprehend the context of the situation where the utterance is produced, because it is possible for an utterance to have more than one meaning. Thus, it will be not complete if the hearer only knows the textual meaning of the utterance if they want to know the intended meaning of the speaker.

The writer will give any example to show the relationship between context of situation and the utterance of a speaker:

A. “Your nails are so long!”

- ❖ When the utterance in [A] is delivered by a teacher to the students in Indonesia, it can be understood that it is a command for them to cut the nails in order to obey the school’s rule. Generally, the schools in this country forbid their students to have long nails.
- ❖ In the different situation, when this utterance is delivered by a woman to her friend, it can be meant as a praising of having long nails. It is not an easy thing for woman to keep their nails long because it needs to be cured.

From that example, it can be understood that knowing the speaker and the hearer of an utterance is needed in order to catch the intended meaning well. It is not enough when someone who wants to reveal the intended meaning only based on the speaker and the hearer. The situation when the utterance produced is also important to be known. The writer will explain the importance of it through the example below:

B. “Give me fire!”

- ❖ When the speaker who delivers the utterance in [B] is a smoker, it can be understood that he wants anyone to help him to turn on his cigarette. In other

words, by saying that utterance, he wants to borrow matches from someone else.

- ❖ When the utterance in [B] is delivered by a student who failed in the daily exam to his or her friend, it can be understood to ask for help. The helping which is meant by the writer is not to cheat, but the helping here is to motivate the student who failed in the exam. He asks his friend to give him motivation for studying harder. It is done to avoid the same failed in the future.

Later on, by knowing the situation of an utterance produced can help the listener reveals the unsaid meaning of the speaker.

Gee (1999: 101) states that context in writing is obviously somewhat different than context in speech because writer and reader are not face-to-face physically encountering each other. From this statement, it can be known that to explore the intended meaning of a speaker will be different with a writer because in writing, the reader will not see the gesture of the writer which can help them to explore the intended meaning as in the listener. Hymes in Brown and Yule (1983: 38) states that there are nine components in exploring the intended meaning from the context, they are participants, topic, setting, channel, code, message-form, event, key, and purpose.

From these nine components, the writer will choose participants, topic, and purpose to find the type of the illocutionary acts, the illocutionary force, and the purpose of using it from the characters' utterances. The participants in this study are focused on Mr. Smith and Mrs. Smith. So, their utterances will be analyzed in this

study. The topic of their dialogue will be discussed to in this study. Then, the writer will predict the purpose of the characters using the illocutionary acts.

2.1.3 Discourse Analysis

Communication is needed in every person's daily life. When a person wants to communicate with others, they will produce a language that is understood by his interlocutor. Language has some functions, they are as transactional, and interpersonal (Yule, 1996:1). A natural language utterance would be used to fulfill only one function, to the exclusion of other. Transactional serves the expression of content (Yule, 1996:1). Then, the function of language that serves social relations and personal attitudes called interactional as stated by Yule (1996:1). Bennet remarks that communication is primarily a matter of a speaker's seeking either to inform a hearer of something or to enjoin some actions upon him Yule (1996:2).

Then, we shall call the language which is used to convey 'factual or propositional information' *primarily transactional information*. In primarily transactional information we assume that the speaker or the writer has primarily in mind is the efficient transference of information (Yule, 1996:2). Language is used in a certain situation and it is important for the recipient to understand the message which is delivered as stated by Yule (1996:2).

There are two kinds of language. They are written and spoken language (Yule, 1996:4). It is clear that the spoken and written language make somewhat different demands of language- producers. The speaker has available to him the full range of voice quality effect (as well as facial expression, postural, and gestural system). Not

only is the speaker controlling the production of communicative systems which are different from those controlled by the writer, he is also processing that production under circumstances which are considerably more demanding (Yule, 1996:4) but, the writer is characteristically under no such pressure advantages for the speaker. He can observe his interlocutor and if he wishes to, modify what he is saying to make it more accessible or acceptable to his hearer (Yule, 1996:5).

2.1.4 Speech Acts

As stated on Yule (1996: 231), speech acts creates in Austin's observation (1962) that while sentence can often be used to report states of affairs.

- a. I bet you sixpence it will rain tomorrow.
- b. I name this ship the Queen Elisabeth.

Austin states that the two sentences above are examples of explicit performatives which are not just a specialized group of ritual sentence forms, but are a subset of the utterances in the language which can be used to perform acts (Yule, 1996: 231). However, Austin noticed that the concept of the performative utterance, of doing something by saying something had a more general application for in saying 'I promise', I warn you', and etc. those words actually performing the acts of promising, and warning (Coulthard, 1977:15). Speech act theory states that the action performed when an utterance is produced can be analyzed in three levels; they are locutionary act, illocutionary force, and perlocutionary effect (Cutting, 2002:30). It is different with Austin's opinion which says that there are kinds of speech act;

they are locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act. Actually, their theory has the same meaning but they mention it in the different terms. Yule, (1996:47) also gives the definition about speech act which says that it is the actions performed via utterances. His theory has the same meaning with the theories which are stated before but he adds that in English, speech act given more specific labels such as apology, compliment, and etc.

Illocutionary act is the utterance of sentence by speaker which is sent to have performed some acts Yule (1996: 232). In other words it can be said that the speaker wants the hearer do something after hear their utterances. Then, Yule (1996: 232) also states that perlocutionary act is the utterance which gives effects for the hearer.

Coulthard states that Austin concludes that in issuing an utterance, a speaker can perform three acts simultaneously: a *locutionary* act which is the act of saying something in the full sense of ‘say’: an *illocutionary* act which is an act performed in saying something, the act identified by the explicit performative: and a *perlocutionary* act, the act performed by or as a result of saying (1977:18). Then, Austin distinguishes between locutionary and illocutionary act. While the interpretation of locutionary act is concerned with the meaning and the interpretation of illocutionary act is concerned with force (Coulthard, 1977:18). Yule, (1996:48) stated that locutionary act is the basic act of utterance. In other words, it can be said that locutionary act is the smallest unit of speech act.

The distinction of locutionary and illocutionary act is not an easy one; it is stated by Coulthard (1977: 18). In receive this issue, some linguists state their

opinion. Strawson (1964) accepts that in explicit performative utterances the meaning may use the force but points out that in primary performatives the meaning though it limits does not use the force (Coulthard, 1977:19). Not only Strawson, but also Searle also states his opinion about this issue. He argues that where a certain force is the part of the meaning, where the meaning uniquely determines a particular force, these are not two different acts, but two different labels for same act, illocutionary act (Coulthard, 1977:19).

2.1.5 Kinds of Illocutionary Acts

In separating the kinds of speech acts, the two philosophers of it cannot be separated. They are, Austin and Searle. They are the two philosophers who have the theory of speech acts. Austin divides the kind of speech act in three kinds, while Searle divides it into five kinds of speech act. Austin divides the kinds of speech act into locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act. In other sides, Searle divides the kind of speech acts into commissives, directives, assertive, expressives, and declarations.

Here, the writer will give the definition of each kinds of speech act by Searle. The first is directives. Directives refer to the attempts made by the speaker to get the addressee to do something. Verbs denoting members of this class are ask, order, command, request, beg, plead, pray, entreat, and also invite, permit, and advise (Searle, 1979: 14).

Then, the second class is assertives. The point or purpose of the members of the assertive class is to commit the speaker (in varying degrees) to something's being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition (Searle, 1979: 13). In other words, assertives is the utterance by the speaker to commit in doing something. The examples of assertives are concluding, deducing, and complaining.

Commissives are those illocutionary acts whose point is to commit the speaker (again in varying degrees) to some future course of action. It seems like assertives class. Verbs denoting members of this class are offering, promising, swearing, and threatening (Searle, 1979: 13).

Expressives is the next class of illocutionary acts proposed by Searle. The illocutionary point of this class is to express the psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about a state of affairs specified in the propositional content (Searle, 1979: 15). In short, expressives is the acts which reveal expression in the utterances. Thanking, congratulating, apologizing, condoling, deploring, and welcoming are the examples of expressives.

The last class of speech act proposed by Searle is declarations. Declarations are the acts containing utterances that are intended to alter the world. Including in this group is 'defining', 'abbreviating', 'naming' 'calling' or 'christening'.

2.1.6 Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)

Searle (1969: 30) states that illocutionary force is what illocutionary act the speaker is performing in the utterance of the sentence. In other words, it can be said that the illocutionary act produced by the speaker can be known from the

illocutionary force. While Yule (1996: 49) defines that illocutionary force is a slot for a verb that explicitly names the illocutionary act being performed. It also can be understood that illocutionary force will help the listener to classify the illocutionary act being performed by the speaker.

Furthermore, Searle (1969: 30) states that illocutionary force indicating devices in English include word order, stress, intonation contour, punctuation, the mood of the verb, and the so-called performative verbs. From that statement, it can be seen that there are several things in illocutionary force which have to be known before classifying the type of illocutionary acts in a utterance.

In order to give more understanding, the writer will give the example of the illocutionary force below:

- a. She is eating.
- b. She is eating?
- c. Is she eating?

In the utterance [a], the illocutionary force is telling that she is eating. In the utterance [b], it seems like a statement but actually it requests the confirmation about her activity. Then, the utterance in [c] can be seen clearly as asking a question if she is eating. Those three utterances have different illocutionary force which can be seen from their punctuation and the word stress. The differences among those are the word stress. The first utterance puts the word stress in the word of *she* and it is ended by the punctuation of dot (.). Then, the second utterance puts the word stress in the word of *eating* and it is ended by the punctuation of question mark (?). The last utterance

puts the word stress in the word of *is* and it is ended by the punctuation of question mark (?) too.

2.2 Related Studies

Illocutionary act is one of interesting topics to be talked. Illocutionary act has close relation with the daily communication in our life. The writer thinks that speech act is analyzed by many researchers in the different fields and objects. The study of illocutionary act also becomes the study of Riza Astutie, the student of Surabaya State of University on 2005 in her thesis untitled *A Study of Illocutionary Acts in Eugene O'Neills Ile Through Symbols and Repetitions: With a Special Reference to Captain Keeney and Annie*. In the thesis, the researcher explains about the illocutionary acts which are used by those two characters and count it. The writer chooses Riza's study as one of his references because it has the same things to be analyzed. It is illocutionary acts. Because of this reason, the writer thinks that it can help him in finishing his study.