PRAGMATICS

Pragmatics is the study of the use of language in communication, the relationship between sentences, context, situation, and the time it is said in the sentence. The full definition can be seen in the following: (a) How the interpretation and use of speech depends on real-world knowledge. (b) How the speaker uses and understands speech acts; (c) How the structure of the sentence is affected by the relationship between the speaker or speaker and the listener or speaker. Pragmatics is a field for who learns the language in its use and the meaning produced by sentences that can be known by looking at the context in the speech is taking place. Then we can know the meaning desired by the speaker by paying attention to the context surrounding the speech event.

In this book, Silpia Rahayu as a writer tries to elaborate the definition of pragmatics, what kinds of pragmatics, and why pragmatics is important to people who are learning language. This book is suitable for people or students who are currently learning English language and for the ones who want to just add their insight of language.

PRAGMATICS

SILPIA RAHAYU

PRAGMATICS

SILPIA RAHAYU

PRAGMATICS

SILPIA RAHAYU

pena persada
CV. PENA PERSADA

PRAGMATICS

Penulis :
Silpia Rahayu

ISBN : 978-623-315-145-0

Design Cover :
Retnani Nur Brilliant

Layout :
Hasnah Aulia

Penerbit CV. Pena Persada
Redaksi :
Jl. Gerilya No. 292 Purwokerto Selatan, Kab. Banyumas Jawa
Tengah

Email : penerbit.penapersada@gmail.com

Website : penapersada.com

Phone : (0281) 7771388

Anggota IKAPI

All right reserved

Cetakan pertama : 2021

Hak cipta dilindungi oleh undang-undang.
Dilarang memperbanyak buku ini dalam bentuk dan cara apapun
tanpa izin penerbit

PREFACE

Learning a language is learning to communicate. Therefore, learning English improves students' ability to communicate, both orally and in writing. Language as a means of communication is used in various functions and is presented in a meaningful context, not in the form of loose sentences. By being oriented towards a communication skill, language learning can also be approached through one of the fields of language studies, namely pragmatics. Learning language with a pragmatic approach is commonly called a communicative function with a number of functions. Pragmatics is a language study involving various aspects outside of language that can give meaning.

The ability to study matters outside of language will certainly greatly help students in applying their language competencies practically in their real conditions. With a pragmatic approach, in language learning, it is hoped that students will be more able to actualize their language skills in everyday life in society. In addition, the demands of the latest curriculum also lead to a competency in students. Departing from the things mentioned above, this book discussed several things related to pragmatics and language teaching. This book is sufficient to discuss pragmatics and its types. This book is expected to be able to help students or students who are teaching pragmatics courses or who want to just know about pragmatics.

Cimahi, Januari 2021

Author

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
CHAPTER 1 DEFINITION AND BACKGROUND.....	1
CHAPTER 2 DEIXIS AND DISTANCE	8
CHAPTER 3 REFERENCE AND INFERENCE.....	24
CHAPTER 4 PRESUPPOSITION	30
CHAPTER 5 ENTAILMENT.....	39
CHAPTER 6 COOPERATION	41
CHAPTER 7 IMPLICATURE.....	45
CHAPTER 8 SPEECH ACTS AND EVENTS.....	52
CHAPTER 9 CONVERSATION	59
CHAPTER 10 PREFERENCE STRUCTURE	66
CHAPTER 11 POLITENESS	70
CHAPTER 12 INTERACTION	76
CHAPTER 13 DISCOURSE AND CULTURE	79
REFERENCES	84

CHAPTER 1

DEFINITION AND BACKGROUND

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics concerned with the use of language in social contexts and the ways people produce and comprehend meanings through language. The term *pragmatics* was coined in the 1930s by psychologist and philosopher Charles Morris. Pragmatics was developed as a subfield of linguistics in the 1970s.

Pragmatics is a subfield of linguistics and semiotics that studies the ways in which context contributes to meaning. Pragmatics encompasses speech act theory, conversational implicature, talk in interaction and other approaches to language behavior in philosophy, sociology, linguistics and anthropology. Unlike semantics, which examines meaning that is conventional or "coded" in a given language, pragmatics studies how the transmission of meaning depends not only on structural and linguistic knowledge (grammar, lexicon, etc.) of the speaker and listener but also on the context of the utterance, any pre-existing knowledge about those involved, the inferred intent of the speaker, and other factors. In that respect, pragmatics explains how language users are able to overcome apparent ambiguity since meaning relies on the manner, place, time, etc. of an utterance.

The ability to understand another speaker's intended meaning is called *pragmatic competence*.

A. Background

Pragmatics was a reaction to structuralism linguistics as outlined by Ferdinand de Saussure. In many cases, it expanded upon his idea that language has an analyzable structure, composed of parts that can be defined in relation to others. Pragmatics first engaged only in synchronic study, as opposed to examining the historical development of language. However,

it rejected the notion that all meaning comes from signs existing purely in the abstract space of *langue*. Meanwhile, historical pragmatics has also come into being. The field did not gain linguists' attention until the 1970s, when two different schools emerged: the Anglo-American pragmatic thought and the European continental pragmatic thought (also called the perspective view).

Pragmatics has its roots in philosophy, sociology, and anthropology. Morris drew on his background when he laid out his theory of pragmatics in his book "Signs, Language and Behavior," explaining that the linguistic term "deals with the origins, uses, and effects of signs within the total behavior of the interpreters of signs." In terms of pragmatics, *signs* refers not to physical signs but to the subtle movements, gestures, tone of voice, and body language that often accompany speech.

Sociology – the study of the development, structure, and functioning of human society – and anthropology played large roles in the development of pragmatics. Morris based his theory on his earlier work editing the writings and lectures of George Herbert Mead, an American philosopher, sociologist, and psychologist, in the book "Mind, Self, and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist," writes John Shook in *Pragmatism Cybrary*, an online pragmatism encyclopedia. Mead, whose work also drew heavily on anthropology – the study of human societies and cultures and their development – explained how communication involves much more than just the words people use: It involves the all-important social signs people make when they communicate.

B. Pragmatics vs. Semantics

Morris explained that pragmatics is different from semantics, which concerns the relations between signs and the objects they signify. Semantics refers to the specific meaning of language; pragmatics involves all the social cues that accompany language.

Pragmatics focuses not on what people say but how they say it and how others interpret their utterances in social contexts (Finch, 2016). Utterances are literally the units of sound you make when you talk, but the signs that accompany those utterances give the sounds their true meaning.

C. Pragmatics in Action

The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) gives two examples of how pragmatics influences language and its interpretation. In the first, ASHA notes:

"You invited your friend over for dinner. Your child sees your friend reach for some cookies and says, 'Better not take those, or you'll get even bigger.' You can't believe your child could be so rude."

In a literal sense, the daughter is simply saying that eating cookies can make you gain weight. But due to the social context, the mother interprets that sentence to mean that her daughter is calling her friend fat. The first sentence in this explanation refers to the semantics—the literal meaning of the sentence. The second and third refer to the pragmatics, the actual meaning of the words as interpreted by a listener based on social context.

In another example, ASHA notes:

"You talk with a neighbor about his new car. He has trouble staying on topic and starts talking about his favorite TV show. He doesn't look at you when you talk and doesn't laugh at your jokes. He keeps talking, even when you look at your watch and say, 'Wow. It's getting late.' You finally leave, thinking about how hard it is to talk with him."

In this scenario, the speaker is just talking about a new car and his favorite TV show. But the listener interprets the signs the speaker is using—not looking at the listener and not laughing at his jokes—as the speaker being unaware of the listener's views (let alone his presence) and monopolizing his time. You've likely been in this kind of situation before, where the speaker is talking about perfectly reasonable, simple subjects but is unaware of your presence and your need to

escape. While the speaker sees the talk as a simple sharing of information (the semantics), you see it as a rude monopolization of your time (the pragmatics).

Pragmatics has proved helpful in working with children with autism. Beverly Vicker, a speech and language pathologist writing on the Autism Support Network website, notes that many children with autism find it difficult to pick up on what she and other autism theorists describe as "social pragmatics," which refers to:

"...the ability to effectively use and adjust communication messages for a variety of purposes with an array of communication partners within diverse circumstances."

When educators, speech pathologists, and other interventionists teach these explicit communication skills, or social pragmatics, to children with autism spectrum disorder, the results are often profound and can have a big impact in improving their conversational interaction skills.

D. Areas of Interest

1. The study of the speaker's meaning focusing not on the phonetic or grammatical form of an utterance but on what the speaker's intentions and beliefs are.
2. The study of the meaning in context and the influence that a given context can have on the message. It requires knowledge of the speaker's identities, and the place and time of the utterance.
3. The study of implicatures: the things that are communicated even though they are not explicitly expressed.
4. The study of relative distance, both social and physical, between speakers in order to understand what determines the choice of what is said and what is not said.
5. The study of what is not meant, as opposed to the intended meaning: what is unsaid and unintended, or unintentional.
6. Information structure, the study of how utterances are marked in order to efficiently manage the common ground of referred entities between speaker and hearer.

7. Formal Pragmatics, the study of those aspects of meaning and use for which context of use is an important factor by using the methods and goals of formal semantics.

Pragmatics deals with *utterances*, by which we will mean specific events, the intentional acts of speakers at times and places, typically involving language. Logic and semantics traditionally deal with properties of *types* of expressions, and not with properties that differ from token to token, or use to use, or, as we shall say, from utterance to utterance, and vary with the particular properties that differentiate them. Pragmatics is sometimes characterized as dealing with the effects of *context*. This is equivalent to saying it deals with utterances, if one collectively refers to all the facts that can vary from utterance to utterance as 'context.' One must be careful, however, for the term is often used with more limited meanings.

Different theorists have focused on different properties of utterances. To discuss them it will be helpful to make a distinction between 'near-side pragmatics' and 'far-side pragmatics.' The picture is this. The utterances philosophers usually take as paradigmatic are assertive uses of declarative sentences, where the speaker *says* something. *Near-side pragmatics* is concerned with the nature of certain facts that are relevant to determining what is said. *Far-side pragmatics* is focused on what happens *beyond saying*: what speech acts are performed *in* or *by* saying what is said, or *what* implicatures (see below for an explanation of these terms) are generated by saying what is said.

Near-side pragmatics includes, but is not limited to resolution of ambiguity and vagueness, the reference of proper names, indexicals and demonstratives, and anaphors, and at least some issues involving presupposition. In all of these cases facts about the utterance, beyond the expressions used and their meanings, are needed.

We can divide these facts into several categories. For indexicals such as 'I,' 'now,' and 'here,' basic facts about the utterance are required: the agent, and when and where it occurred. For other indexicals and demonstratives, speaker intentions are also relevant. While it seems the referent of 'you' must be a person addressed by the speaker, which of several possible addressees is referred to seems up to the speaker's intentions. Within syntactic and semantic constraints, anaphoric relations seem largely a matter of speaker's intent. Speaker's intentions and the way the speaker is connected to the wider world by causal/historical 'chains of reference' are relevant to the reference of proper names.

Far-side pragmatics deals with what we do with language, *beyond* what we (literally) say. This is the conception according to which Voltaire's remarks belong to pragmatics. It's up to semantics to tell us what someone literally says when they use expressions of a given type; it's up to pragmatics to explain the information one conveys, and the actions one performs, in or by saying something.

Pragmatics is usually thought to involve a different sort of *reasoning* than semantics. Semantics consists of conventional rules of meaning for expressions and their modes of combination. Locke supposed that communication was basically a matter of a speaker encoding thoughts into words and the listener decoding words back into thoughts. The same basic picture is found fairly explicitly in Saussure and other influential theorists. This picture seems to fit reasonably well with the picture that emerged from the logicians and philosophers of language in the tradition of logical analysis, of language as a system of phonological, syntactic and semantic rules, of which competent speakers and interpreters have implicit mastery. Paradigmatically, the sincere speaker plans to produce an utterance with the truth-conditions of a belief she wishes to express; she chooses her words so that her utterance has those truth-conditions; the credulous interpreter needs to perceive the utterance, and recognize which phones,

morphemes, words and phrases are involved, and then using knowledge of the meanings, deduce the truth-conditions of the utterance and of the belief it expresses.

In contrast, pragmatics involves perception augmented by some species of 'ampliative' inference — induction, inference to the best explanation, Bayesian reasoning, or perhaps some special application of general principles special to communication, as conceived by Grice (see below) — but in any case a sort of reasoning that goes beyond the application of rules, and makes inferences beyond what is established by the basic facts about what expressions are used and their meanings.

The facts with which pragmatics deals are of various sorts, including:

1. Facts about the objective facts of the utterance, including: who the speaker is, when the utterance occurred, and where;
2. Facts about the speaker's intentions. On the near side, what language the speaker intends to be using, what meaning she intends to be using, whom she intends to refer to with various shared names, whether a pronoun is used demonstratively or anaphorically, and the like. On the far side, what she intends to achieve by saying what she does.
3. Facts about beliefs of the speaker and those to whom she speaks, and the conversation they are engaged in; what beliefs do they share; what is the focus of the conversation, what are they talking about, etc.
4. Facts about relevant social institutions, such as promising, marriage ceremonies, courtroom procedures, and the like, which affect what a person accomplishes in or by saying what she does.

CHAPTER 2

DEIXIS AND DISTANCE

Deixis means ‘pointing’ by using any linguistic form which is then called as deictic expression or indexicals. The indexicals include person deixis to indicate people, spatial deixis to indicate location and temporal deixis to indicate time. Deixis refers to the context of the speaker either using ‘near speaker’ (proximal terms) or ‘away from speaker’ (distal terms) of deictic expressions. The speaker’s location, so called deictic center, is identified by the proximal terms.

Deixis encompasses the way how the context of utterance or speech event is encoded and put into grammatical features, and how the utterances are interpreted based on the context analysis. In this view, pragmatics concerns how the context plays a role in the sentences uttered. This pragmatics logically precedes semantics in which pragmatics component output is the input for the semantic component.

A. Person Deixis

The grammatical category of person directly reflects the different roles that individuals play in the speech event: speaker, addressee, and other (Levinson 2000 in Horn and Yard 2006). The paradigmatic analysis of person marking, whether in pronouns or agreements, is a more complex area than one might at first suppose. Although the traditional notions first, second and third persons hold up remarkably well, there are many kinds of homophony, or different patterns of syncretism, across person paradigms (Cysouw 2001 in Levinson 2000 in Horn and Yard 2006).

Person deixis refers to personal pronouns such as I, you, he, and they. When a speaker produces the word I that pronoun refers to that specific speaker. For example, if I, Josh, produce the utterance “I went shopping yesterday,” the meaning of the word I is “Josh.” We can rephrase the sentence

to “Josh went shopping yesterday” and the sentence’s meaning will remain the same. However, if you were to say the sentence “I went shopping yesterday,” the I in the sentence would refer to your name.

One much studied phenomenon in person deixis is in the effect of reported speech on speakers’ self-reference –where we say John said he would come many languages permit only in effect “John said ‘I will come’.” Then there is the phenomenon of honorifics, which typically make reference to speaking and recipient roles, dealt with separately below under the rubric of social deixis. Yet another important area is the special role that speaker and addressee roles play in typologically significant grammatical hierarchies; many languages have no dedicated reflexives in first and second person, and many treat first and second person as the topmost categories on an animacy hierarchy, governing case-marking, passivization, and other syntactic process.

Apart from its grammatical importance, person has a special significance because of its omnipresence –it is a grammatical category marked or implicit in every utterance, which inevitably indicates first, second or third person in nominal or verbal paradigms, either explicitly or by contrastive omission (Levinson 2000 in Horn and Yard 2006). Third person pronouns are consequently distal forms in terms of person deixis. Using a third person form, where a second person form would be possible, is one way of communicating distance (and non-familiarity). This can be done in English for an ironic or humorous purpose as when one person, who’s very busy in the kitchen, addressee another, who’s being very lazy, as in below:

1. Would his highness like some coffee?
2. Each person has to clean up after him or herself (pointed to someone who didn’t clean up after having a meal)

Pronominal systems, which are the most obvious manifestations of person, generally exhibit this three way distinction. Here it is important to see that the traditional

category of plural is not symmetrically applied to first person in the way it is to third: we does not mean plural speakers in the same way that they means more than one third person entity. In addition, in many languages, there are two first person 'plural' pronouns, corresponding to 'we-inclusive-of-addressee' and 'we-exclusive-of-addressee'. See the example below:

1. Let's go to the cinema (to some friends)
2. Let us go to see you tomorrow (to someone who has captured the speakers and friends)

Person deixis localises an entity in relation to the position of the speaker and/or hearer (Green, 2008). First and second person pronouns typically refer to the speaking and hearing speech participants, whereas third person pronouns designate the non-speech or narrated participant.

According to Lyons (1983) the active participants are the speaker and the addressee, whereas the third person is not an active participant in the speech act. To give an illustration let's look at the following examples:

1. I was late.
2. You arrived early.
3. I saw them.

Third person pronouns may be used deictically or anaphorically. An anaphoric use of a deictic expression occurs when reference is being made to another entity that was introduced earlier in the text/speech. Examples:

1. John believes she is beautiful. (deictic use)
2. John thinks I heard him. (anaphoric use)

In English, pronouns come in singular and plural forms, several are marked for case, and the third person singular forms encode gender. This is shown in the table below:

Table 1 – Personal Pronouns in English

	<i>Singular</i>		<i>Plural</i>	
	<i>Nominative</i>	<i>Accusative</i>	<i>Nominative</i>	<i>Accusative</i>
<i>1st person</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>Me</i>	<i>We</i>	<i>Us</i>
<i>2nd person</i>	<i>You</i>		<i>You</i>	
<i>3rd person</i>	<i>Masculine He</i>	<i>Masculine Him</i>	<i>They</i>	<i>Them</i>
	<i>Feminine She</i>	<i>Feminine Her</i>		
	<i>Neuter It</i>			

B. Spatial Deixis

Spatial deixis localises both the speech participants and the narrated participants in space. The most frequent words are the pronouns *this/that* and *these/those*. Other expressions that belong to this category are the adverbs *here/there* and prepositions *in/on*.

Spatial deixis also entails whether something is near the speaker or not (*this* vs *that*). In all languages, there are pairs of verbs such as *come/go*, *bring/take*, which are interpreted to identify the direction of the motion, towards or away from the place of speech event, hence the spatial deixis is the marking in language of the orientation or position in a space.

Lyons (1977:648) states that “there are two ways in which we can identify an object by means of a referring expression: first, by informing the addressee where it is; second, by telling him what it is like, what the properties it has or what class of objects it belongs to”.

Fillmore (1977) talks about the fact that deictic pointing can be achieved in different ways. He distinguishes between two types of uses: the gestural and symbolic ones. The gestural use requires monitoring the speech event in order to identify the referent, whereas the symbolic use involves activating knowledge about the communicative situation and the referent.

Levinson (1983) exemplifies the two uses with the following examples:

1. This finger hurts (gestural).
2. This city stinks (symbolic). In the first example, we notice that the demonstrative can be accompanied by a pointing gesture which illustrates the gestural use. In the second example, which does not involve a pointing gesture and shows a larger situational context illustrates the symbolic use.

Spatial deixis, or place deixis, concerns itself with the spatial locations relevant to an utterance. Similarly to personal deixis, the locations may be either those of the speaker and addressee or those of persons or objects being referred to.

The most salient English examples are the adverbs *here* and *there*, and the demonstratives *this*, *these*, *that*, and *those*, although those are far from exclusive.

Some example sentences (spatial deictical terms are in *italics*):

1. I enjoy living in *this* city.
2. *Here* is where we will place the statue.
3. She was sitting over *there*.

Unless otherwise specified, spatial deictical terms are generally understood to be relative to the location of the speaker, as in.

C. The shop is *across the street*.

Where "across the street" is understood to mean "across the street from where I [the speaker] am right now." Although "here" and "there" are often used to refer to locations near to and far from the speaker, respectively, as in:

1. *Here* is a good spot; it is too sunny over *there*. "there" can also refer to the location of the addressee, if they are not in the same location as the speaker, as in:

2. How is the weather *there*?
3. Deictic projection: In some contexts, spatial deixis is used metaphorically rather than physically, i.e. the speaker is not speaking as the deictic center. For example: I am *coming* home now.

The above utterance would generally denote the speaker's *going* home from their own point of reference, yet it appears to be perfectly normal for one to project his physical presence to his home rather than away from home. Here is another example:

4. I am not *here*; please leave a message.
5. Despite its common usage to address people who call when no one answers the phone, the *here* here is semantically contradictory to the speaker's absence. Nevertheless, this is considered normal for most people as speakers have to project themselves as answering the phone when in fact they are not physically present.
6. Languages usually show at least a two-way referential distinction in their deictic system: proximal, i.e. near or closer to the speaker; and distal, i.e. far from the speaker and/or closer to the addressee. English exemplifies this with such pairs as *this* and *that*, *here* and *there*, etc.

D. Temporal Deixis

Temporal deixis is another category of deictic expressions. It refers to an event of an utterance, which takes place any time relative to the speaking time and is, therefore, represented by tense, time adverbials and sometimes by spatial prepositions such as *in the evening*, *at midnight*, *on time*. The location of an event referred to and represented by time and tense constitutes the deictic centre in the utterance of a speaker. In English, the present and the past are morphologically marked. Morphology is an area of study within grammar that describes how words are composed.

A linguistic element is morphologically marked when it is more distinctively identified than another element, by adding

a morpheme. A morpheme is the minimal unit of meaning. For example, the first person present tense I work is not morphologically marked. On the other hand, the third person he work-s, and the past tense he work-ed are marked by the morpheme -s and -ed.

The future is constructed using the modal verb will . Another way to express the future in English is by attaching an adverb of time indicating the future illustrated in the following example:

1. I go on holiday next week .
2. More examples of temporal deixis:
3. My friend is going to sing in a concert tomorrow. (future with phrasal verb be going to)
4. They will bring the car in to be fixed. (future with modal verb will)
5. I lived in Cyprus for eight years. (morphologically marked past tense -ed)
6. She drinks tea every morning . (morphologically marked present tense -s , expressing an event occurring on a regular basis)

Levinson (1983:73) argues that “complexities arise in the usage of tense, time adverbs and other time deictic morphemes wherever there is a departure from this assumption, for example in letter writing, or the pre-recording of media programmes”. For example, if a letter says I am leaving tomorrow , we are unaware of when tomorrow is, unless we have a fixed reference point of when the letter was written.

Fillmore (1977) and Levinson (1983) note that the deictic words yesterday, today, and tomorrow , pre-empt the absolute ways of referring to the relevant days. Thus, the utterance, I will see you on Thursday, said on Thursday, can only be referring to next Thursday, otherwise the speaker should have said today. If it is said on a Wednesday, the speaker should use tomorrow . Having presented the traditional deictic categories, what will now be discussed is the discourse and the social

deixis. The discourse deixis provides a reference to an utterance backward or forward to other utterances.

Levinson (1985:62) states that discourse deixis is “the encoding of reference to portions of the unfolding discourse in which the utterance is located”. In other words, discourse deixis refers to all expressions and phrases that point the reader or hearer through spoken or written text. These examples illustrate discourse deixis (Fillmore 1977): earlier, later, the preceding x, the following s, in the following paragraphs, in the following weeks, during next month, in the next chapter

Discourse deixis can very easily be confused with anaphora; anaphora is used to refer to something previously mentioned.

Examples:

1. That was interesting.
2. This is a lie.

Examples of anaphora:

1. Take a look at this book. This is the best book I have read in a long time.

Anaphora is often contrasted with cataphora where the words refer forwards. It has been shown that this can be used both anaphorically and cataphorically, whereas that can be used anaphorically only. Examples:

1. This is what I mean. (anaphoric or cataphoric reference)
2. That is what I mean (anaphoric reference only).

Some forms of deixis may be simultaneously deictic and anaphoric. Example:

1. Lola is coming over later; we are having dinner together.
2. She was born in Romania and has lived there all her life.

Example 1 refers to the set consisting of Lola and me : the speaker component of this is determined deictically by we being a first person pronoun, while the inclusion of Lola in the set is determined anaphorically by the previous mention of her.