

PRAGMATICS AS A TOOL FOR ANALYZING THE MEANING OF WORKS OF ART

Slamet Supriyadi

pripus@staff.uns.ac.id Scopus ID: 57658533800

Sebelas Maret University Surakarta

Abstract. The research reveals 1. How the work of art is able to be understood by the appreciator what is the intention of the work created by the artist, (2) what steps must be taken in analyzing works of art by utilizing pragmatic tools, (3) how art appreciators respond in understanding works of art created by artists. This research uses a qualitative approach. The data collection technique used interview techniques and observation of artworks. The sampling technique used was purposive sampling technique. Data validity using data source triangulation. To analyze the data, the analysis technique used is means-end analysis technique and contextual analysis (Subroto, 1992). The results showed that the pragmatic approach as a way of communicating that looks at the intent of the speaker is very logical to be used as part of a complete analysis as an effort to develop multi-intelligence, in understanding works of art that are visual in terms of the creator's intention in presenting his artwork. The conclusion of this research is that pragmatics as a linguistic science has its own characteristics that can be used as one of the methods in analyzing a work of art.

Keywords: Artwork, analysis ability, Pragmatics, Fine Art

INTRODUCTION

Cultural transformation through art is a necessity because culture has given birth to art. On the other hand, the function of art in culture is to fulfill needs: religious, social, political, economic, psychological and educational needs. Subsequent developments in art education are not only required to educate children only to the extent of narrow artistic abilities, namely creating art, but are required to develop multi-intelligence abilities which are conceived to understand works of art broadly, comprehensively, from various scientific perspectives that are considered to support and sharpen understanding of art.

I intend to introduce an understanding from the perspective of another science (linguistics) that I think can be used as a tool to analyze how to understand a work of art through the form of the work itself, the creator and the art appreciator. The formulation of the analysis of works of art, especially works of fine art, is still limited to semiotic analysis that is limited to the object of the artwork, but sometimes the intention contained in the artwork itself is forgotten.

Pragmatics as a language that looks at the intention of the speaker is very logical to be part of a complete analysis for students as an effort to develop multi-intelligence, in understanding works of art that are visual in terms of the intention of the creator to present the work. In the language of advertisements, caricatures are very suitable to be understood through the language of pragmatics, because it will be able to reveal the creator's intention. What does the creator want to make the artwork and with what intention does the artwork have? created. Is it in an effort to influence the *image* of prospective buyers so that they want to buy their products, is it to criticize the authorities in the wrong policy, or to invite the community in a particular program and others. Pragmatics as a science has its own characteristics that can be used as a reference in understanding works of art.

Levinson explains that, "*Pragmatics is the study of the relations between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding*" (Levinson, 1983, p. 21) 'Pragmatics is the study of the relationship between language and its context which is basic to an account of language understanding'. Meanwhile, (Parker, 1989, p. 1) states, "*Pragmatics is distinct from grammar, which is the study of the internal structure of language. Pragmatics is the study of how language is used to communicate*". "Pragmatics is distinct from grammar, which is the study of the internal structure of language. Pragmatics is the study of how language is used in communication. Parker distinguishes pragmatics from the study of grammar which he considers to be the study of the internal intricacies of language.

(Mey, 1993) in providing pragmatic boundaries is no different from Levinson or Parker. The emphasis is on the conditions of language use determined by the context of society. From the

limitations put forward by the experts above, it can be concluded that pragmatics is basically determined by the context that accommodates and backgrounds the use of language. Of the three actions, namely locution, illocution and perlocution, actually in analyzing works of art, all three can be used as references. First, the act of saying something usually means that the artist in creating art wants to say something to the public that their work is intended to say something about themselves through their work. Second, illocution or the act of doing something is how artists through their work want to do something to the public with visual language even though if expressed through spoken language the expression is even more resonant complete and in-depth. Third, Perlokusi is the act of influencing the interlocutor. Here the artist will try to make an effort to influence the image of the interlocutor. In visual language, the visual work is expected to be able to influence the public so that they want to be invited according to the artist's wishes. These three actions in pragmatics, the act of wanting to do something and the act of influencing the public (appreciators) are very dominant for artists in creating works of art. To bridge the understanding between readers and writers or speakers, pragmatic tools are needed which (Kartomihardjo, 1992; Rohmadi, 2004) call pragmatic phenomena, namely.

Reference, is everything that is referred to by the author.

Inference, is the reader or listener does not necessarily understand the utterance spoken by the speaker, so the reader or listener can only make an interpretation through the conclusions of the speaker's speech.

Presumption

Presumption is a shared knowledge (*common ground*) between speakers and speech partners that does not need to be expressed. It is the speaker who understands what is presupposed by the speaker (Kartomihardjo, 1992; Rohmadi, 2004). "Presumption is what the speaker uses as a common ground for the participants of the conversation".

Implicature.

The most important concept in pragmatics and the one that best emphasizes pragmatics as a branch of linguistics is the concept of conversational implicature. Levinson (1983) states that, "*the notion of conversational implicature is one of the single most important ideas in pragmatics*". The notion of conversational implicature is a very important thing in pragmatics. Implicature can explain explicitly about how to interpret what is said outwardly differently from what is meant and the language user understands the intended message (Levinson, 1983).

So, from Levinson's statement above, a statement can be drawn that the principles that produce implicatures have general explanatory power, namely, the principles in implicatures provide very many explanations and are related to facts that are not linguistically related (Haryono, 2004, p. 51).

(Mey, 1993, p. 99) suggests the notion of conversational implicature etymologically. The term *implicature* is derived from the verb *to imply* which means '*To fold something into something else*'. Therefore, conversational *implicature* means something that is stated in conversation, that is, something that is implicit in the use of language.

In the study of pragmatics, it is known that in speaking or using language in a certain situation, time, place to someone not only states something but also does something (in a broad sense) (I. D. P. Wijana, 1996, p. 24). Furthermore, Wijana (1996) states that the act of doing something can advise, prohibit, promise, remind, announce, or inform, give thanks, convey congratulations, condolences and so on. *Utterances* that express the use of doing something are called *performative utterances* (Mey, 2001, p. 27); see (I. D. P. Wijana, 1996, p. 24). Pragmatic power is the pragmatic effect of an utterance. Pragmatic power can take the form of illocutionary or perlocutionary power of an utterance.

RESEARCH METHOD

Based on the problems raised above, this research emphasizes more on the problems and the process of meaning (speech acts), the typical research method used is descriptive qualitative research. The data sources used are all caricatures published in newspapers, magazines, caricatures on the internet. Data collection used interview techniques, observation and document analysis. Sampling technique used by using purposive sampling technique consisting of; Fine Arts lecturers,

Fine Arts teachers, Fine Arts students, and the newspaper reading public. data validity using data source triangulation from (Huberman et al., 2014). The analysis technique used is means-end analysis technique and contextual analysis, which connects the caricature text with its non-lingual context, because meaning is pragmatically determined by extra-lingual things depending on the context (Subroto, 1992, p. 55); see (Haryono, 2004, p. 77)

RESULT AND ANALYSIS

Based on the way the message is conveyed in the caricature, more direct speech acts are used, meaning that if the speech is deliberately functioned as a command sentence, the content is also intended for someone to do something. Similarly, if the speech produced in the caricature is in the form of an interrogative sentence, the intention is most likely to ask something. However, caricaturists often use indirect speech acts to express other intentions, namely question sentences that are intended not to ask, but to command. Based on the meaning of the utterances in the caricature, he also uses literal speech acts whose meaning is synonymous with the utterances that compose them. In addition, caricatures also use a type of non-literal speech act, where the speaker expresses a meaning that is opposite to the utterance expressed literally.

The use of implicature in caricature discourse reveals the hidden mission behind the caricature created, containing the meaning of indirect criticism and things that are implicitly desired by the caricaturist can be a reflection on the object referred to. In terms of the principle of cooperation, caricaturists violate the principle of cooperation, among the maxims violated are the maxims of quantity, quality, manners and relevance. The violation of the maxims used in caricature discourse is not only intended to confuse or complicate the reader's understanding, But also to criticize the intended object, especially government policies that are considered to be less defensive of weak groups. interests. The violation of maxims that often occurs is because caricaturists deliberately want to produce a sense of satire that is humorous, this is evidenced by some of the word choices used in caricatures that semantically arouse the reader's sense of humor.

The linguistic aspects applied in caricature discourse are phonology, words, phrases, sentences, and discourse. If we observe the caricatures from the aspect of coherence between linguistic aspects, themes, lingual units, images, and pictures, there is significant coherence. The icons presented through the images are integrated and related to each other, allowing readers to reflect the unity of meaning of shared sustainability.

Based on the perspective of social function, both caricaturists and readers have different understandings. From the caricaturists' point of view regarding the social function of a caricature, every caricature essentially has a basic social function, especially a critical function to convey the mission of enlightenment and improvement of odd symptoms or something wrong in society that really needs significant improvement. The issue of whether or not the criticism is followed up by the target party, for caricaturists, is not a big deal. What is important for caricaturists is that their job is only to provide opinions to be solved and read by readers, especially those who are the target of their criticism. Judging from the reader's understanding of social functions, caricatures have broader and more detailed functions, namely critical function, illumination function suggestion function, control function, supervision function, and entertainment/humor function. Based on the social function point of view presented by research informants and linguists, caricatures as part of the newspaper opinion segment have the main functions of criticism and entertainment/humor. Verbal caricature involves elements of text/discourse and elements of humor.

The images/visuals must integratively support each other and clarify the intent and message of the caricature. To clarify the intent reflected in the image, caricaturists emphasize the need for textual elements to complement the visual elements. Caricature discourse that uses linguistic aspects including phonological aspects, words, phrases, sentences, and discourse as aspects to explain the meaning of the utterance reflected in the caricature. (Levinson, 1983, p. 9) in his book entitled "Pragmatics" provides a limitation on understanding, "pragmatics is the study of the relations between language and context that is programmatized, or encoded in the structure of a language". Pragmatics is a language study that studies the relationship between language and its context. There are two types of context, namely social context and societal context. Social context is a context that arises as a result of interactions between community members in a particular social and cultural society.

The societal context is a context whose determining factor is the position(rank) of community members in social institutions in a particular socio-cultural society. Thus, the societal context arises because of power (force), while the factors underlying the social context are caused by solidarity (Haryono, 2004, p. 16; Rahadi, 2008, p. 48; Cutting, p. 51). To interpret the speech utterance, the speaker uses a mean-end analysis strategy, while the speech partner's task is to use a heuristic analysis strategy. The heuristic strategy seeks to identify the pragmatic force of a speech by formulating a hypothesis and then testing it based on the available data. If the hypothesis is not tested then a new hypothesis will be made (Leech, 1993, p. 61).

Caricature as an image filler in the opinion section of newspapers is an effective instrument to evoke readers' emotions, a sense of nationalism, solidarity, hatred, and even racism. However, most caricaturists are often presented in a humorous way that makes people satirize while smiling amusedly. Many interpret the images as jokes in the mass media only express humor, without implicitly reflecting social criticism, mere cartoons; and joke pictures that carry messages of social criticism that are often found in every newspaper opinion space are called caricatures, which according to Sudarta 'of course do not reflect social criticism'.

Therefore cartoons are all humorous drawings, including caricatures, which are intended outwardly in mockery (Sudarta, 1987). (Pramono, 1996, p. 49) argues that caricatures are actually part of opinion cartoons which are then misunderstood. Caricatures that contain certain messages, criticism, etc. are opinion cartoons. In other words, cartoons that contain certain messages of social criticism in every newspaper published are political cartoons or editorial cartoons, which are another editorial version of the humor version. This is what is commonly called caricature [Sudarta, 1987].

The above opinions conclude that caricature is part of a cartoon drawing depicted in a fictional form or character of a certain character whose purpose is to satirize, criticize, and appeal, giving an impression on the target object. If you want to look contextually from the reader's point of view as an Easterner, respectively an Indonesian, then the person targeted by the caricature will feel insulted. However, many Westerners would rather be caricatured than photographed. Former Presidents of the United States, Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan, were very proud of their prominent teeth and high tufts of hair. They thought that by being caricatured, they would be more respected by the person who made the caricature (Sobur, 2004, p. 139).

Caricature is part of the publisher's opinion expressed in the form of certain images. At first, caricatures were just illustrations, but in later developments more and more people used caricatures as a means to convey criticism in a subtle way, because caricatures are expressed in the form of witty and interesting images. Caricature has its own function, one of which is to create satire, criticism, or rebuke. The caricature is the result of a selection of thousands of events. This is It also reflects the degree of freedom of the author's soul and environment in expressing thoughts and criticism.

A caricature can be in the form of images and texts that cannot be separated and integrated with each other. Caricatures are linguistically interesting to study, especially with regard to (a) types of speech acts, implicatures (b) linguistic aspects can refer to the harmony between themes, language units, and images; in addition to (c) the social function of caricatures. If caricatures are to be traced in terms of their social function, they serve to express criticism, information, education, morality, politics, ideology, defense and security, entertainment, and more importantly criticism and satire to perfect criticism.

Levinson explains that, "*Pragmatics is the study of the relations between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding*" (Levinson, 1983, p. 21). Pragmatics is the study of the relationship between language and its context which is basic to an account of language understanding'. Meanwhile, (Parker, 1986, p. 11) states, "*Pragmatics is distinct from grammar, which is the study of the internal structure of language. Pragmatics is the study of how language is used to communicate*". "

Pragmatics is different from grammar which is the study of the internal structure of language. Pragmatics is the study of language use in communication. Parker distinguishes pragmatics from the study of grammar which he considers as the study of the intricacies of language internally. The study of grammar does not need to be related to context, whereas the study of pragmatics must be related to context.

(Mey, 1993) in providing pragmatic boundaries is no different from Levinson or Parker. The emphasis is on the conditions of language use determined by the context of society. From the limitations put forward by the experts above, it can be concluded that pragmatics is basically determined by the context that accommodates and backgrounds the use of language.

Of the three actions, namely locution, illocution and perlocution, actually in analyzing works of art, all three can be used as references. First, the act of saying something usually means that the artist in creating art wants to say something to the public that their work is intended to say something about themselves through their work. Second, illocution or the act of doing something is how artists through their work want to do something to society with visual language even though if expressed through spoken language the expression is even more complete and profound. Third, Perlokusi is the act of influencing the interlocutor. Here the artist will try to make an effort to influence the image of the interlocutor. In the visual language, the visual work is expected to be able to influence the public so that they want to be invited according to the artist's wishes.

These three actions in pragmatics, the act of wanting to do something and the act of influencing society (appreciators) are very dominant for artists in creating works of art. To bridge the understanding between readers and writers or speakers, pragmatic tools are needed which (Kartomihardjo, 1989, p. 5); Muhammad Rohmadi, 2004) call pragmatic phenomena, namely.

Reference, is everything that is referred to by the author.

Inference, is the reader or listener does not necessarily understand the utterance spoken by the speaker, so the reader or listener can only make an interpretation through the conclusions of the speaker's speech.

Presumption

Presumption is a shared knowledge (*common ground*) between speakers and speech partners that does not need to be expressed. It is the speaker who understands what is presupposed by the speaker (Kartomihardjo, 1992; Rohmadi, 2004). "Presumption is what the speaker uses as a common ground for the participants of the conversation".

Implicature

The most important concept in pragmatics and the one that best emphasizes pragmatics as a branch of linguistics is the concept of conversational implicature. (Levinson, 1983) states that, "*the notion of conversational implicature is one of the single most important ideas in pragmatics*". The notion of conversational implicature is a very important thing in pragmatics. Implicature can explain explicitly about how to interpret what is said outwardly differently from what is meant and the language user understands the intended message (Levinson, 1983, p. 97). So, from Levinson's statement above, a statement can be drawn that the principles that produce implicatures have general explanatory power, namely, the principles in implicatures provide very many explanations and are related to facts that are not linguistically related (Haryono, 2004, p. 51)

(Mey, 1993, p. 99) suggests the notion of conversational implicature etymologically. The term *implicature* is derived from the verb *to imply* which means '*To fold something into something else*'. Therefore, conversational *implicature* means something that is stated in conversation, that is, something that is implicit in the use of language. In the study of pragmatics, it is known that in speaking or using language in a certain situation, time, place to someone not only states something but also does something (in a broad sense) (I. D. P. Wijana, 1996, p. 24). Furthermore, (I. D. P. Wijana, 1996) states that the act of doing something can advise, prohibit, promise, remind, announce, or inform, give thanks, convey congratulations, condolences and so on. *Utterances* that express the use of doing something are called *performative utterances* (Subroto, 2003, p. 27); see (I. D. P. Wijana, 1996, p. 24). Pragmatic power is a pragmatic effect the pragmatic power of an utterance. Pragmatic power can take the form of the illocutionary or perlocutionary power of an utterance.

The study of pragmatics as a science of language can be juxtaposed with visual language in artworks, because visual artists also express their language through visual language, while pragmatics studies the intentions of speakers in speech. Thus, visual forms can also be analyzed through pragmatics in addition to semiotic analysis. However, this discourse needs to be studied more deeply to understand the content contained in a work of art for a more comprehensive understanding. In art theory, there is something called pragmatics theory, a theory that views works of art as a means to convey certain interests and goals to the viewing public. The purpose can be political, economic, educational, ethical, and other purposes, so it can be equated that pragmatics in

language and pragmatics in art theory have something in common, namely both as a means to understand the intent and purpose of a work of art created by an artist to the public.

1.1 Analyzing the Meaning of a Work of Fine Art with Pragmatic Tools



Figures 1. Source Kompas Newspaper, 2008

The steps to analyze a caricature with Pragmatics analysis are as follows:

1. View the icon
2. Seen presumption of reference and inference
3. Judging from the context of the caricature
4. Judging from the implicature of the picture
5. Judging from the pragmatic power of the picture

The caricature utilizes the linguistic aspects of the discourse form taken from the lyrics of a song popularized by Betharia Sonatha, with the title "**Hati yang Luka**", set against the background of events in the 1980s. At that time musicians in Indonesia created songs that were categorized as whiny with the theme of love and domestic rifts. This made Harmoko, who at the time was the Minister of Information, uncomfortable. He then banned television and radio stations from airing and playing whiny songs at that time, which were pioneered by musicians Rinto Harahap, Obby Mesack and Pance Pondaag.

In 1988, whiny songs pioneered by singer Betharia Sonatha were so popular in the market that every child to grandmother memorized the song. The caricature has a hidden purpose from the caricaturist who sees the phenomenon in society, which is being *infatuated* with whiny songs. According to the caricaturist, the phenomenon in society reflects the character of the people who are whiny and less persistent in facing socio-cultural developments in society. People prefer to live casually rather than working hard to achieve progress. While the steps to analyze a painting with Pragmatic analysis are as follows:

1. View the icon from the painting
2. Seen presumption of reference and inference
3. Judging from the context of the painting
4. Judging from the implicature of the painting
5. Judging from the pragmatic power of the painting.



Figure 2. Source Joko Pekri Exhibition catalog

The painting, seen from its icon, is a depiction of the joyful atmosphere of a people's party with the object of people carrying a wild boar being paraded as an offering from the people who are having *Kaul* (Javanese language) because they have succeeded in their wishes. The background of the creation of the painting is during the fall of the New Order and replaced by the Reform Order. Why is the boar the icon in the object of the painting? Because the boar is a symbol of a very greedy animal. Anything is eaten. Thus, the boar is likened to the new order period, which was considered greedy by the rulers. The context of the emergence of the painting can also be interpreted in the context of the new order power. So that the implicature in the painting is to emphasize the greed and greed of the new order rulers in running the wheels of government in Indonesia. While the pragmatic power in painting. The painting is remind and encouraging/inviting the public not to repeat the actions that have passed during the new order, and suggesting that this reformation period can really run well, so that it can prosper the Indonesian people as a whole unlike the new order.

CONCLUSION

Thus, pragmatic tools in speech can also be used as a method of analyzing a work of art. Pragmatics in language and the theory of pragmatics in art are essentially the same, namely wanting to study how the intentions of speakers and artists in expressing the intentions of speech or the intentions of their works of art. With the pragmatics approach as a method of analyzing artworks, it is possible that we can perform a stage in assessing an artwork more comprehensively and complement the semiotic approach that is often used to assess artworks.

References

- Haryono, P. (2004). *Speech Acts in the Discourse of Office Meetings of the Regional House of Representatives of Klaten Regency*. Postgraduate Program, UNS.
- Jazuli, M. (2008). *Contextual Paradigm of Art Education*. Unesa University Press.
- Kartomihardjo, S. (1992). *Discourse Analysis and its Application - Scientific Speech in the Framework of Inauguration of Professor of IKIP Malang*. IKIP Malang.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, J. L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Blackwell.
- Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction (Second Edition)*. Blackwell.
- Rohmadi, M. (2004). *Pragmatics Theory and Analysis*. Media Circle.
- Soedjatmiko, W. (1991). *Linguistic and Sociocultural Aspects of Humor*.

Slamet Supriyadi,

Pragmatics As A Tool For Analyzing The Meaning Of Works Of Art

- Supriyadi, S. (2008). *Caricature by GM. Sudarta in Kompas Newspaper (Pragmatics Study)*. Postgraduate Program in Linguistics, Sebelas Maret University.
- Wijana, I. D. P. (1985). Indonesian in Humor Stories. *Indonesian Linguistics*, No. 5(Th. 3).
- Wijana, I. D. P. (1989). *Discourse of Indonesian Cartoons*.
- Wijana, I. D. P. (1995). *Cartoon Discourse in Indonesian*. Postgraduate Program, Gajah Mada University.
- Wijana, I. D. P. (1996). *Fundamentals of Pragmatics*. Andi.
- Wijana, P. (2006). *Humor Discourse: Textual and Contextual Analysis*. Postgraduate Program, Gajah Mada University.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G. (2006). *Pragmatics*. Student Library.