CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL REVIEW

This chapter describes the specification of theories which relates to the topic and the problems under study. The theories consist of pragmatics, as a basic theory of the research, and hedging, as a theory used to analyze the data.

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a basic theory in this research because it becomes a root of the topic and the analysis in this research. In addition, it holds the important role in this research because this research relates to the relationship between language, context, and intention that become a part of pragmatics study. For understanding the explanation of pragmatics, I describe the explanations of pragmatics qouted from some linguists below.

According to Rudolf Carnap (1939:4), pragmatics is the field of all those investigations which take into consideration such as action, state, and speaker's or hearer's environment. Yule (1996:4) also explains that:

> "*Pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistics forms and the users of those forms. The advantage of studying language via pragmatics is that one can talk about people's intended meanings, their assumptions, their purposes or goals, and the kinds of action (request) that they are performing when they speak".*

From the explanations above, it can be assumed that pragmatics is the study of understanding human intention through the action, state, and the environment of the

speaker or hearer. In addition, pragmatics can also be defined as the study that discusses the correlation between the linguistics forms and the form users (the speaker or the writer). So, by studying language through pragmatics, the speaker can explain his/her assumptions, purposes, and requests when they are speaking. At the same time, the hearer can also understand the intention of speaker's utterances.

The intention of speaker's utterance is generally expressed explicitly and implicitly. Furthermore, there is an implicit intention which is frequently used to reduce the negative impact of the utterance and believed as one of communication strategies that can smooth the utterance; it may be found in hedging construction.

2.2 Hedging

In pragmatics, hedging has an important role in politeness, mitigation, and vagueness. Hedging was introduced first by G. Lakoff (1972), he argues 'hedges' as words whose function is to make meanings fuzzier or less fuzzy. He (1972:195) also defines as follows:

> "*For me, some of the most interesting questions are raised by the study of words whose meaning implicitly involves fuzziness-words whose job it is to make things fuzzier or less fuzzy. I will refer to such words as 'hedges'".*

For adding Lakoff's fuzzy concept, Zadeh (1972) made a correlation between fuzzy concept and hedging in his article "Fuzzy-Set-Theoretic Interpretation of Linguistic Hedges". He analyzed some words that can be categorized as a fuzzy set such as: *very, much, more or less, essentially, technically, and practically*.

The explanations above can be interpreted that hedging consists of some simple words that can be a device to make things fuzzy or less fuzzy. For example, the words *very, much, more or less, essentially, and slightly* can be determined as words that influence things fuzzy.

Besides making things fuzzy or less fuzzy, Hyland (1996a) explained that some hedging devices such as *I think, sort of, maybe, and possibly* are frequently used to create conviviality, facilitate discussion, show politeness, and oil phatic wheels.

It can be assumed that in hedging, the fuzzy and less fuzzy things are used by the speaker to show conviviality and politeness of his/her utterance. Hence, the speaker can manipulate his/her utterance to make it soft, so he/she can spare his/herself from the negative impact of the hearer.

To understand the division of hedging, Prince/Bosk/Frader (1982:85) generally distinguish kinds of hedging into two parts: approximators and shields. In approximation classification, they argue that approximators affect the truth-conditions of propositions, Prince/Bosk/Frader note:

> "*People who produced such a sentence would be committed to the truth of the proposition the sentence expresses, but would also maintain that the proposition expressed is not a clear-cut one. Those people would probably reserve such hedges for discourse about situation that are not prototypical or not subject to exact measurements".*

For example:
This example is taken from Pride and Prejudice movie script.

> *On that day, Elizabeth got misunderstanding about Mr. Darcy. She explained her anger roughly and continuously.*

> *Mr. Darcy: You have said quite enough, Madam. I perfectly comprehend your feelings. Forgive me for having taken up so much of your time, and accept my best wishes for your health and happiness.*

The adverbial 'quite' in Darcy's utterance indicates an approximation that appears when he approximates the quantity of Elizabeth's words. As stated in situation above, the intention of Mr. Darcy is that actually he feels Elizabeth talks too much. By using construction 'quite enough', he intends to stop Elizabeth words and explains his intention politely.

Different from approximators, shields do not affect the truth-conditions of propositions because people who express the sentence are not fully committed to the truth of the proposition. Here, people usually use hedges for discourse to regard something uncertain or regard situation they believe for various reasons.

In conclusion, based on the linguists' idea of hedging, hedging is a device that can mitigate the negative impact of the utterance and help the speaker to convey his/her intention smoothly. Hedging devices can be distinguished into two parts; *approximators*, when the speaker uses hedging devices to approximate his/her utterance to adapt or round something, and *shields,* when the speaker uses hedging devices to shield the intention of his/her utterance. The approximators and shields can influence things fuzzy or less fuzzy such as: *very, much, more or less, essentially, and slightly, technically, practically, sort of, maybe, and possibly*. The using of fuzzy or less fuzzy concept is used to raise conviviality and politeness in a conversation.

2.2.1 The Function of Hedging

From all definitions of hedging which were explained by linguists, I resume that the most important point of hedging functions is to make the speaker in the safe position when he/she utters his/her utterance. This is because hedging device used by the speaker affects the hearer to feel comfortable when hearing the speaker's utterance. When the speaker softens his/her utterance, he/she can also expresses his/her idea freely without feeling afraid of the negative impact of his/her utterance.

2.2.2 Types of Hedging Construction

Hedging is defined as devices that can diminish the impact of utterance with various purposes. Those devices are classified into hedging construction. It consists of some word classes that can be assumed as types of hedging. Types of hedging are frequently used in conversation. There are linguists that classify the types of hedging such as Salager-Mayer (1994) and Chan Swee Heng-Helen Tan (2002).

Salager-Mayer (1994) defines types of hedging into taxonomy of hedges. He explains that there are some word classes included of the principle of hedging. There are: modal auxiliaries (may, can, might, could, would), modal lexical verbs (to seem, to appear, to believe, to assume, to suggest), adjectival, adverbial and nominal modal phrase (possible, probable, assumption, claim, possibility, perhaps, probably, likely, apparently), approximators (approximately, roughly, about, often, occasionally, a lot of), Introductory phrases (I believe, as far as I/we know), and certain "if" clauses (if true, if anything).

On the other hand, Chan Swee Heng-Helen Tan (2002) limits Salager-Mayer's theory by mitigating adjectival, nominal, approximators, and introductory phrases and adds some word classes in her theory of hedging construction types that she calls typology of hedging construction. Her typology of hedging include of adverbials (approximately, generally, quite), epistemic verbs (suggest, seem, appear), modal verbs (may be, would be), cognition verbs (believe, surmise, think), hypothetical construction (If, and unless), and anticipatory it-clause (It and there).

From the theory described by two linguists above, it can be concluded that hedging has several types whose have functions. Each type has own intention; modal is commonly used to express the tentativeness of the proposition or the possibility in the future. Adverbial is commonly used to modify a complete idea expressed in a claim and approximate or shield something. Modal lexical verbs that consist of epistemic and cognition; epistemic verb is used to soften idea and cognition verb is used to precede the use of verbs giving a focus to the speaker's or writer's assumption. Certain "If" clauses and hypothetical construction are usually used in making hypothesis politely. Anticipatory it clause is commonly used to front the claim giving it more focus in the proposition. These types of hedging construction are used by the speaker to convey his/her intention which can be understood by seeing the context. From all the theory of types of hedging constructions, I took the adverbial hedging construction to be the subject of this research because its simple construction.

2.2.3 Adverbial Hedging Construction

Adverbial is one of types of hedging construction. It can be defined as a quite simple construction in hedging because it consists of one or two words. Adverbial hedging construction includes *perhaps, possibly, probably, practically, likely, presumably, virtually, apparently, sort of, kind of, approximately, very, generally, quite*. The speaker usually uses adverbial hedging construction to modify a complete idea expressed in an utterance and approximates or shields something.

Adverbial is a word, a phrase, or a clause that can explain the question where, when, how, and why in the sentence pattern. An adverb can modify verbs, adjectives (including numbers), clauses, sentences and other adverbs. Randolph Quirk (1985:479) distinguished adverb as seven main categories of semantic role: (a) space (position, direction, and distance), (b) time (position, duration, and frequency), (c) process (manner, means, instrument, and agentive), (d) respect (e) contingency (cause, reason, purpose, result, condition, and concession), (f) modality (emphasis, approximation, and restriction), (g) degree (amplification, diminution, measure).

However, not all of types of adverb can be categorized as adverbial hedging construction. To determine the difference of adverbial as hedging and adverbial without hedging, I make the example of them.

- Adverbial as hedging, (this example is taken from the Amy Tan's Rule of The Game short story)

> *At the Christmas party, Vincent got the chess set, which would have been a very decent present to get at a church Christmas party, except it was obviously used and, as he and his mother discovered later, it was missing a*

black pawn and a white knight . His mother graciously thanked the unknown benefactor, saying , "too good. Cost too much". When they got home, his mother told him to throw the chess set away.

From the short story above, the adverbial 'too' in the utterance of Vincent's mother can be defined as adverbial hedging construction. It can be assumed that the intention of the mother is actually she doesn't like the gift because it is a bad and used chest. It can be seen when she asks Vincent to throw away the gift when they get home. However, by using adverbial hedging 'too', she can thank the benefactor politely.

- Adverbial without hedging (this example is taken from Titanic movie script)

Rose sits on a deck chair and opens the sketchbook. On Jack's sketches...each one an expressive little bit of humanity: an old woman's hands, a sleeping man, a father and daughter at the rail. The faces are luminous and alive. His book is a celebration of the human condition.
Rose: "Jack, these are quite good! Really, they are".

The adverbial "quite" and "really" in Rose's utterance cannot be defined as hedging because Rose uses the adverbial construction in her utterance only for representing her admiration of Jack's sketches. She has no hidden intention by using the adverbial in her utterance.

As stated in example above, it can be interpreted that an adverbial can be defined as hedging or not depends on the context as the background of the speaker to utter his/her utterance. To understand more about adverbial hedging construction, I explain some linguists' explanation.

According to Lakoff (1972:195), he was not interested in the communicative value of the use of hedges but was concerned with the logical properties of words and

phrases like rather, largely, in a manner of speaking, very, in their ability "to make things fuzzy or less fuzzy". The idea of Lakoff was also adopted by Fraser (1980), he adds Lakoff's view by adding adverb '*sort of'* and '*kind of*'.

Salager-Mayer (1994, 1997) argues that the some of important elements of hedge is adverbial and approximators of degree, quantity, frequency, and time, such as: *perhaps, possibly, probably, practically, likely, presumably, virtually, apparently, approximately, roughly, about, often, occasionally, generally, usually, somewhat, somehow, a lot of*. Last, Chan Swee Heng-Helen Tan (2002) adds another example of adverbial which relates to hedging construction: *approximately, generally, and quite*.

From all the definition above, there are some types of adverb which can be defined as hedging construction includes of adverb of degree, adverb of quantity, disjunctive adverb, adverb of frequency, and adverb of time

2.2.3.1 Adverb of Degree

According to Quirk (1985: 485-486), "degree adverbials are concerned with the assessment of gradable constituents in relation to an imaginary scale; one of the subroles is *amplification*, which is concerned with asserting a generalized high degree, and another is its opposite, *diminution"*. "Thirdly, there is the expression of *measure,* without implication that the degree is notably high or low".

Chan Swee Heng and Helen Tan (2002) describe the example of hedging in adverb of degree:

- His view on the matter were *quite well* received.

2.2.3.2 Adverb of Quantity

According to English vocabulary adverb of quantity is a word that specifies the quantity of things such as *any, both, each, few, a lot of, many, numerous, several, some.* According to Ernst (2002) treats multiplicatives, frequency adverbs, and adverbs of quantification as instances of quantificational adverbs, with Q-adverbs (largely corresponding to 'habitual adverbs' in his terms) preceding freq-adverbs because the former must modify longer time intervals than the latter.

Salager-Mayer (1994,1997) argues that adverb ‘ a lot of’ can be categorized as adverbial hedging

2.2.3.3 Disjunctive Adverb

Disjunctive adverb is an adverb that expresses the information considered the descriptive statements of the speaker. It is generally used to refer to the sentence that is not fully described in the previous conversation. Thus, It is commonly appears at the beginning or at the end of sentence. It includes of honestly, actually, unfortunately, in my opinion, frankly, interestingly, luckily, clearly, fortunately.

Based on Quirk (1985:440), He identifies disjunct with the speaker's authority for, or comment on, the accompanying clause

> “*Semantically, **DISJUNCTS** (cf 8.121ff) express an evaluation of what is being said either with respect to the form of the communication or to its meaning*.”

Salager-Mayer (1994,1997) considers some adverbs that can be assumed as adverbial hedging in disjunctive adverb includes *perhaps, practically, probably,*

generally, and apparently. In addition, Chan Swee Heng and Helen Tan (2002) describe the example of hedging in disjunctive adverb:

- Generally, girls are more eloquent speakers compare to boys.

2.2.3.4 Adverb of Frequency

Adverb of frequency generally considered as an adverb that can answer the question "how frequently?" or "how often?" . This adverb gives the information how often something happens. It consists of *daily, weekly, often, sometimes, rarely and frequently.*

Quirk (1985:541) defines that frequency can sometimes be conceived in absolute terms without concern for the period of time over which the recurrence in question took place. He also defines it into two categories: definite frequency and indefinite frequency.

Salager-Mayer (1994,1997) considers some adverbs that can be assumed as adverbial hedging in adverb of frequency and time category such as: *often, occasionally ,sometimes, and usually.*

For Example:

- Fever is present in about a third of cases and *sometimes* there is neutropenia.

2.2.3.5 Adverb of Time

Adverb of time can tell when the event happens, how long, and how often it happens. It commonly consists of yesterday, today, tomorrow last year, next Saturday, next week the day, after tomorrow, last night, the other day. It can refer to a period of time in the past, present, or future.

Quirk (1985:526) describes obligatory predication adjuncts of time occur in BE clauses where the subject refers to an event *(cf* 10.10, 10.25).

As stated in adverb of frequency category, Salager-Mayer (1994,1997) considers some adverbs that can be assumed as adverbial hedging in adverb of frequency and time category such as: *often, occasionally ,sometimes, and usually.*