

**A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS ON COMMISIVE UTTERANCE USED IN
“RAGE OF ANGELS” NOVEL BY SIDNEY SHELDON**

JOURNAL PUBLICATION



by

HENING SETYA NUGRAHENI

A 320090270

**SCHOOL OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
MUHAMMADIYAH UNIVERSITY OF SURAKARTA**

2014



**UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH SURAKARTA
FAKULTAS KEGURUAN DAN ILMU PENDIDIKAN**

Jl. A Yani Tromol Pos I – Pabelan, Kartasura Telp (0271) 717417 Fax : 715448
Surakarta 57102

SURAT PERSETUJUAN ARTIKEL PUBLIKASI ILMIAH

Yang bertanda tangan dibawah ini pembimbing skripsi/tugas akhir:

Nama : Dra. Siti Zuhriyah Ariatmi, M.Hum (Pembimbing I)
NIP/NIK : 225
Nama : Siti Fatimah, S.Pd, M.Hum (Pembimbing I)
NIP/NIK : 850

Telah membaca dan mencermati naskah artikel publikasi ilmiah, yang merupakan ringkasan skripsi (tugas akhir) dari mahasiswa :

Nama : HENING SETYA NUGRAHENI
NIM : A 320090270
Program Studi : Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
Judul Skripsi : **A PRAGMATIC NOVEL ANALYSIS ON COMMISIVE
UTTERANCE USED IN RAGE OF ANGELS BY SIDNEY
SHELDON**

Naskah artikel tersebut, layak dan dapat disetujui untuk dipublikasikan.

Demikian persetujuan dibuat, semoga dapat dipergunakan seperlunya.

Surakarta, 16 September 2014

Pembimbing I,

Dra. Siti Zuhriyah Ariatmi, M.Hum.
NIK. 225

Pembimbing II,

Siti Fatimah, S.Pd, M.Hum.
NIK. 850

ABSTRACT

Hening Setya Nugraheni. A 320090270.A Pragmatic Analysis on Commissive Utterance Used in Rage Angels Novel by Sidney Sheldon. Research Paper. Surakarta. Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta. 2014.

This study focuses on analyzing the type of commissive utterance and describing the violation of Grice Maxim's Cooperative Principle in commissive utterance in Rage of Angels novel. This study aim at 1) clarifying pragma linguistic form found in the utterance of commissive utterances in Rage of Angels, 2) describing the implicature of commissive utterance found in Rage of Angels, 3) describing the violation of Grice Maxim's Cooperative Principle in commissive utterances in Rage of Angels novel. It is conducted in order to know what maxims which are violated by the characters of Rage of Angels novel and the implicature of speaker's utterance when violating the maxims. The type of this research is descriptive qualitative, the several steps are done to analyze the data. In analyzing the type of commissive utterance the steps are: describing the data in the form of dialogue, describing the dialogue what is belongs into commissive utterance. In analyzing the implicature the steps are: describing the data in the form of dialogue and describing the intended meaning of speaker utterance and combines by describing pragma linguistic form: downgraders and upgraders. The study shows that 1) there are found 3 pragma linguistic forms, namely downgraders, upgraders, and the other has no pragma linguistic form 2) the implicature of speaker's utterances are to threats someone, convincing someone, to offering something, to promise, and to intends other to be careful. 3) the maxim which often violated by the characters is maxim of Quality, as many as 21 data, Maxim Quantity is violated as many as 14 data, Maxim of Relation is violated as many as 8 data and Maxim of Manner is violated as many as 8 data.

Keywords: pragma linguistic form, implicature, and Cooperative Principle

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Background of the Study

In communication, people say anything. Sometimes, they say about future actions. For example, a speaker utters words that make hearer to do something or not to do something in the future, but there is a moment when the hearer does not believe in the speaker's word. Then, the speaker commits to him/herself to make hearer believe in the speaker's word. Therefore, people use commissive utterances in their conversation to show their acts in the future.

According to Kreidler (1998: 192), commissive is utterances used in theory of speech acts that commit a speaker to a course of action. These include promises, pledges, threats, warns, etc. Commissive verbs are illustrated by *agree, ask, offer, refuse*, all with the following infinity. They are prospective and concerned with the speaker's commitment to the future action.

In the real world of communication, commissive utterances are different from directive utterances only in their purpose. The purpose of directive utterances involves the speaker trying to get the hearer to behave in some required way, while commissive utterance involves the speaker committing himself to behave in some required way. Verb like promise, threat, and offer marked this utterance. After this utterance is listened, the listener looks for its proportional content, then determine which one is the old information. It is clear here that the new information of the first sentence is to *buy a rubber dinghy of someone*, the second sentence is to *threaten someone to go away*

from the house, and the last sentences is to *offer the meals to someone*.

Commissive utterance is not asking or ordering something, so there is no act that must be done, it is like representative utterance. The act of commissive utterance is only in the form of the information in the conversation.

The writer finds the phenomena dealing with such commissive utterances in *Rage of Angels* novel. In this novel, she finds some conversation in commissive utterance with its situational context, its relationship between speakers. The examples of commissive utterances that the writer finds in *Rage of Angels* novel are:

- Di Silva : How long have you and Michael Morreti been sweethearts?
 Parker : Mr. Di Silva, we've gone all over this. You've been questioning me now for eve hours. I'm tired. I have nothing more to add. May I be excused?
 Di Silva : If you move out of the chair I'll have you placed under arrest. You're in the big trouble, Miss Parker. There's only one way you're going to get out of it. Stop Lying and start telling the truth.
 Jennifer : I've told you the truth. I've told you everything I know.

The first utterances “**If you move out of the chair I'll have you placed under arrest**” are the commissive utterances. Di Silva commits to himself by threatening to Jennifer (hearer) to make her afraid. So the implicature of Di Silva's utterance is that he threats Jennifer if she move out of the chair, he will put Jennifer in the jail. The commissive utterance” If you move out of the chair I'll have you placed under arrest” implies threatening.

Jennifer's utterance obeys maxim of quantity. Since her utterance is clear she makes utterance which is no more or less information toward Di Silva's statement. She also obeys maxim of manner. By her answer to Di

Silva's statement, she does not make ambiguity on his utterance. The meaning and purpose of his utterance can be understood directly.

The utterance violates maxim of quality. The word *if* means the incident does not happen in that current time, it is possibility. So, the utterance does not has fact to make contribution true. The pragmalinguistic form of the utterance above is the datum above is declarative sentence. Di Silva delivers his threats by wishing. He makes a statement by adding conditional clause." If you move out of the chair I'll have you placed under arrest". Conditional clause is mark of downgrader form. He applies of syntactical downgrader. The utterance violates maxim of quality. The case is possibility, so the utterance does not have a fact and truth. It can be seen with the word *if*. It means this case probably happen in the future time.

The pragmalinguistic of the datum is the utterance above is declarative sentence. He makes a statement by adding conditional clause. Conditional clause is mark of downgrader. He applies a form of syntactical downgrader. Through implicature, as one of the studies of Pragmatics, it gives more meanings of an utterance. The other implied understanding can be revealed by one of the pragmatics techniques in order to get a better comprehension of the Rage of Angels Novel.

Based on the cases above, the writer is interested in finding out the implicatures (the implied meaning) of the commissive utterances in Rage of Angels novel. The writer chooses the Rage of Angels novel because it consists of so many commissive utterances.

2. Previous Study

The research in which the writer wants to focus is not the first research that concerns with Pragmatics. To develop the original analysis, the writer presents previous study dealing with the Pragmatics study.

The first previous study is conducted by Hatmini (UMS, 2008) in *A Pragmatics Analysis of Commisive Utterance in English Translation of Prophetic Tradition Related by 'Bukhori'*. This research studies about commissive utterances in English translation of Prophetic Tradition related by Bukhori. Her goals on the research are to identify the form and to describe the implicature of commissive utterances in English Translation of Prophetic Tradition related by Bukhori. She finds the interrogative forms of commissive utterances are begun with WH question and modal as question mark of the sentence in the exclamation sentence, it's formed by the pattern "What + S + V". The imperative sentence is formed by the pattern " $v_1 + O + \text{to infinitive}$ ", while declarative sentence has pattern "S + V". Related to the implicature, she categorizes them into six classifications. They are offer, threat, swear, volunteering, and promise.

3. Problem Statement

- a. What are the pragmalinguistic of commissive utterance used in *Rage of Angels* novel?
- b. What are the implicature of commissive utterance used in *Rage of Angels* novel?
- c. What maxims are violated in the commissive utterance used in *Rage of Angels* novel?

4. Objective of the Study

- a. To identify the types of sentence of Commissive utterance used in *Rage of Angels* novel.
- b. To describe the implicature of commissive utterance used in *Rage of Angels* novel.
- c. To describe the maxims are violated of commissive utterance used in *Rage of Angels* novel.

5. Limitation of the Study

This study will only deal with one of the speech act's classifications. That is commissive utterances. The writer chooses it because she wants to enrich the discussion of commissive utterances viewed pragmatic angle. She will analyze the sentence types, the implicature and the maxims are violated of commissive utterance.

6. Benefit of the Study

a. Practical Benefit

1) Teachers or Lecturers of English

The writer hopes this study can be useful for additional information and suggestion that can be applied by the teacher in the process of teaching learning of pragmatic analysis study.

2) Others Researcher

This research hopefully will be useful for the other researcher who is interested in the study of pragmatic analysis especially in implicature and commissive utterances.

b. Theoretical benefit

This study contributes to the science linguistic especially Pragmatic Analysis, especially about Commissive Utterance.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

1. Type of Research

The type of research of this study is descriptive qualitative research because the writer collects the data, analyzes the data, and draw conclusion. Descriptive research is a type of research, doesn't includes of any calculation or statistic but it includes sentence or description of the object as a result. Qualitative research often involves no statistical analysis; it is associated with hypothesis generating and developing an understanding. This study aims at identifying the sentence types and clarifying the meanings and the violation of maxim on commissive utterance in *Rage of Angels* novel.

2. Object of Research

As the object of the study, the writer focuses on commissive utterance in *Rage of Angels* novel.

3. Data and Data Source

The data of this research are in the forms of words, phrases, and sentences which have correlation with commissive utterance. Meanwhile, the data sources of this research are conducted from the novel of *Rage of Angels*.

4. The Method of Collecting Data

In *collecting* data, the writer uses the documentation method. The writer does the following procedures:

a. Reading

The writer read the novel by skimming.

b. Selecting and Collecting

The writer selects the commissive utterances in the novel of *Rage of Angels* by underlying the dialogues which contain commissive utterances then collects them.

5. The Technique of Analyzing Data

In analyzing the data, the writer applies descriptive approach. The steps taken by the writer in analyzing the data source are follows:

- a. Describing the pragmalinguistic of the commissive utterances by referring to linguistic form.
- b. Analyzing the implicature of the commissive utterance based on the context of pragmatics.
- c. Illuminating the maxims that violated of commissive utterance on the novel.

C. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

1. Analysis

a. Pragmalinguistic of Commissive Utterances

There are features of pragmalinguistic form in commissive utterances: internal and external modification form. The writer focuses on internal modification form in analyze the data. Internal modification form is divided into two: *downgraders* and *upgraders* (Trosborg, 1995:209) in internal modification. Downgrader is the features which makes the utterance more polite. There are two kinds of downgraders: *syntactic* and *lexical/phrasal* downgraders. There are common features of syntactic downgraders that can be used to make the utterance more polite, such as *question*, *past tense/negation*, *tag question*, *conditional clause*, *embedding*, *ing-form* and *modals*. There are markers of lexical/phrasal downgraders: *politeness marker*, *consultative device*, *downtoner*, *understatement*, *hedge*, *hesitator* and *interpersonal marker*. Upgraders have the opposite functions from downgraders, they increase the impact of

utterances on the hearer. The features which belong to upgrader are *adverbial intensifier*, *do-instruction*, *commitment upgrader* and *lexical intensification*.

b. Implicature and the Violation of Grice's Cooperative Principle Maxim

In this part, the analysis constitutes the answer of the second problem and the third statement of this study. The writer analyzes the context first, and then analyzes the implicature and the end is the maxim of violance. It is conducted because the context will lead in finding out the implicature. To reveal the implicature; what is meant, suggested, intended by the speaker; the writer uses principles of conventional and conversational implicature theories by Grice. Meanwhile, in finding out the context, the writer restricts only in the pragmatics context by Hymes.

c. Conventional Implicature

It reveals an explicit meaning which can be generally or conventionally accepted by all people. It is a kind of direct implicature.

- 1) Offer. It is the utterance that expresses the intention or willingness to give or to do something to somebody if desire.
- 2) Volunteering. It is the utterance express willingness to do something for somebody else without being forced. The speaker usually has known what the listener needs his/her action.
- 3) Promising. It is utterance contains commitment of the utterer to do something in the future.
- 4) Refusing. Refusing is an action of refusing, rejecting, repulsing, prohibiting, etc. Generally, it is expressed by a word "No".

- 5) Swear. Swear is the utterance contains saying or promising solemnly or definitely or great confidence in something.
 - 6) Threat. Threat is the utterance that contains statement of an intention to punish or harm somebody.
 - 7) Warning. Warning is the utterance that the speaker informs or asks the hearer to be careful to do not do something, etc.
 - 8) Prohibiting
- d. Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature reveals an implicit meaning that only assumed by participants is more pragmatic feature rather than the conventional one, because the conversational implicature closely relates to its context, especially related to the participants.

- 1) Promise. Promising is utterance contains commitment of the speaker to do something in the future.
- 2) Threat. Threat is the utterance that contains statement of an intention to punish or harm somebody.
- 3) Warning. Warning is the utterance that the speaker informs or asks the hearer to be careful to do not do something, etc.

2. Discussion

Based on the data analysis above, the writer then summarizes them in detail. The writer also encloses three tables as additional explanation of the findings. They are:

a. Pragma Linguistic Form

Here, the three form of pragma linguistic. That is upgraders form, downgraders form, and has no form of pragma linguistic.

The result of the analysis is there are ten data belong to form of downgrader (23, 25%). The second, there are only one data belong to form of upgrader (2, 32 %). And the last, there are thirty two data belong to has no form of pragma linguistic (74, 4 %) found in *Rage of Angels* novel. As the result, sentence that has no form of pragma linguistic are the mostly found in this novel (74, 4%). It is because most of the dialogue is in bald- on record form.

b. Commissive Utterances

Here, the four forms of commissive utterances. That is declarative sentences, interrogative sentences, imperative sentences, and exclamatory sentence.

The result of the forms of commissive utterances is that first, there are thirty eight data belong to declarative sentence (88, 4%). The second, there are three data of interrogative sentence (6, 97%). Then, there are two data of imperative sentence (4, 65%). And the last, no one data of exclamatory sentence (0%) found in *Rage of Angels* novel. As the result, commissive utterances in declarative sentence are the mostly used by the speaker addressee towards the hearer (88, 4%). It is because most of the dialogue is in the form of statement.

c. Kinds of Maxim which are violated in characters utterance

After we learn about the cooperative principle in conversation, especially from the Grice cooperative principle that consist of: Quality, Quantity, Relation, and Manner. That will be very beneficial if people

understanding the implicature of a speaker's utterance then he reveal the Maxim of cooperative principle which are violated in conversation.

When the speaker violates the maxim of quality, that's mean if the speaker tries to close the conversation or cover up the conversation. That's will happen when people said something which is he believes that's false intentionally. He must know the truth but doesn't tell the truth then he must covering something in order to make other people don't know about that.

A speaker who violates the maxim of Quantity, it means that they don't give sufficient information/explanation about something, then, the speaker hearer must reveal the purpose of the speaker when he generates an implicature and he makes the conversation to be longer or shorter, it depends on the situation while the conversation occurs.

A speaker who violates the maxim of relevant he may give us chance to reveal his utterance when generating implicature by saying the same thing or methamor of their topic, so if we understand how the speaker violates the maxim of relation, so we should know if the speaker would make the Methamor of his purpose.

The speaker who violates the maxim of manner give us understanding if they want to say that utterance directly, that's the reason why the speaker generates the implicature by violates the maxim of manner, by showing ambiguity and don't to brief explanation.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

1. Conclusion

After analyzing the data and discussing the finding, the writer draws the conclusion as follows:

a. In analysis of pragmalinguistic form

Here, the writer only takes the sample of commissive utterance which has been analyzed in research finding. The writer only focuses on internal modification form.

The writer discusses the pragmalinguistic form to prove that the request may contain one of pragma linguistic form. When the writer analyzes the type of commissive utterance, he also combines with pragmalinguistic form based on theory of internal modification by Trosbrog (1995). It is used to give impact of request to the hearer. They are *upgraders* and *downgraders*

b. In the implicature analysis of the data, the writer found some form of commissive utterance. There are eight forms of commissive utterance which is found by the writer. They are promising, warning, offering, volunteering, refusing, forbidden, threatening, and swearing.

c. After we learn about the cooperative principle in conversation, especially from the Grice cooperative principle that consists of: Quality, Quantity, Realation, and Manner. That will be very beneficial if people understanding the implicature of a speaker's utterance then he reveal the Maxim of cooperative principle which is violated in conversation. And there are the conclusions in every maxim.

When the speaker violates the maxim of quality, that's mean if the speaker tries to close the conversation or cover up the conversation. That's will happen when people said something which is he believes that's false intentionally. He must know the truth but doesn't tell the truth then he must covering something in order to make other people don't know about that.

A speaker who violates the maxim of Quantity, it means that they don't give sufficient information/explanation about something, then, the speaker hearer must reveal the purpose of the speaker when he generates an implicature and he makes the conversation to be longer or shorter, it depends on the situation while the conversation occurs.

A speaker who violates the maxim of relevant he may give us chance to reveal his utterance when generating implicature by saying the same thing or methamor of their topic, so if we understand how the speaker violates the maxim of relation, so we should know if the speaker would make the Methamor of his purpose.

The speaker who violates the maxim of manner give us understanding if they want to say that utterance directly, that's the reason why the speaker generates the implicature by violates the maxim of manner, by showing ambiguity and don to brief explanation.

2. Suggestion

As the last chapter, besides giving conclusion the writer also gives suggestion. The suggestions are for the English teacher and for the other researcher.

a. For the English Teacher

The teachers should be able to increase and improve their student's knowledge and their knowledge about pragmatics theory especially about commissive utterances in the form of pragmalinguistic, implicature, and maxim are violated.

b. For the Next Researcher

In recent study, the researcher limits study in the pragmatic analysis of commissive utterances used in *Rage of Angel* novel by Sidney Sheldon. Here, the writer suggests to the next researcher can analyze the commissive utterance especially in the pragmalinguistic form, implicature, and maxims are violated. And the different object such as *Rage of Angel* novel by Sidney Sheldon. The other researcher can analyze using the different way. And also the next researchers are expected to extend this research. So, the reader will have better and deeper understanding related to the study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anwar, Saiful. 2012. *A Pragmatic Analysis on Directive Utterances Used in Donald Duck Comics Manuscript*. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University.
- Austin, J.L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bloomer, Aileen and Patrick Griffiths. 2005. *Introducing Language in Use: A COURSE BOOK*. London and New York: Routledge
- Brown, Gillan and George Yule. 1996. *Analisis Wacana: Discourse Analysis*. Jakarta: Gramedia
- Dewi, Dian Ayu Rosita. 2010. *A Socio Pragmatic Analysis of Threatening Utterances in Action Film and Their Subtitles*. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University.
- Erfianah, Yulianti. 2007. *The study on Representative Utterances in English Translation of Al-Quran*. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University.
- Grice, P. 1975. *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hastuti, Anis Umi. 2011. *A Socio-Pragmatic Analysis On Utterances of Criticism In Aristocratic Movie Manuscript*. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University.
- Hatmini, Anis Tri. 2008. *A Pragmatic Analysis of Commissive Utterances in English Translation of Prophetic Tradition Related by "Bukhori"*. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University
- Khasanah Nurul. 2009. *A Study of Directive Utterances in Children Stories: A Pragmatic Approach*. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University.
- Kreidler, Charles W. 1998. *Introducing English Semantics*. London: Routledge.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1983. *The Principle of Pragmatics*. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 2000. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, Stephen. 1983. *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, John. 1981. *Language Meaning and Context*. Fantana: Hofflok.

- Nidak, Muslihatun. 2013. *A Pragmatic Analysis of Commissive Utterance in The Wizard Of Oz Movie Manuscript*. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University.
- Nunan, David. 1993. *Introducing discourse Analysis*. London: Penguin
- Peccei, Jean Stilwell. 1999. *Pragmatics*. London and New York: Routledge
- Renkema, Jan. 1993. *Discourse study: An Introductory textbook*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Searle, J. R., Kiefer, F & Bierwisch, M. 1980. *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*. Synthese Language Library, Dordrecht: Riedel.
- Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech acts: an Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sundari, Dewi. 2009. *A Pragmatic Analysis of Commissive Utterances in Aristocratic Movie Manuscript*. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University
- Susilowati. 2008. *A Pragmatic Analysis of Commissive Utterances in the Headline of The Jakarta Post*. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University.
- Trosborg, Anna. 1995. *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Vriandika, Adhiva Setyo. 2011. *A Pragmatic Analysis of Compliment Utterances on Legally Blonde Movie and Its Translation*. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University.
- Wibawati, Via Anggun. 2009. *Analysis of Interrogative sentence in Subtitling of Mean Girls Film*. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University.
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, George, 2006. *Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
- Yulianti. 2010. *A Translation Analysis of Promising Utterances in the Novel Twilight*. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University.

VIRTUAL REFERENCES

- Kasper, Gabriele. 2008. *Introduction: Interlanguage Pragmatics in SLA*. <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=255322>. Accessed February 16th 2013 at 08.20 a.m.