Analysis Discourse of "Blarak" Short Story by Yanusa Nugroho

Rosita Sofyaningrum [a], Ririn Nurul Azizah [b], Rissa Filyang [c], Muhammad As'ad [d]

[a,b] Universitas Ma'arif Nahdlatul Ulama Kebumen, Kebumen

[c]Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta

[d]Univesitas Muhammadiyah Gombong, Gombong

Email of corresponding author (rositasofyaningrum@umnu.ac.id)

Abstract

In communicating, humans sometimes need to show directly what they mean. The use of language in communication between humans in dating is a form of discourse. Besides discourse being a form of language use, discourse is also an utterance. Discourse analysis based on context is, of course, inseparable from the use of pragmatics. Pragmatic discourse analysis in literary works has been done— analysis of the novel Bumi Manusia by Pramodya Ananta Tour, translated into English by Max. This study aims to analyze discourse with a pragmatic approach in the short story Blarak by Yanusa Nugroho. The type of research used in this research is descriptive qualitative research. The data of this study are the words or sentences contained in the short story *Blarak* by Yanusa Nugroho which are contained in the 2009 Kompas short story collection. The data collection technique in this study used note-taking techniques. This study's research instrument (data collection instrument) is from the researcher himself. The analysis technique used in this study is a qualitative data analysis technique. Based on the research results, it can be concluded that the deixis in the short story Blarak by Yanusa Nugroho includes personal deixis, place deixis, and time deixis.

Keywords: analysis, discourse, short story

INTRODUCTION

Humans live in society by using language as a means of communication. A language is an essential tool in human life. Without language, humans cannot socialize with each other. In communicating, humans sometimes need to show directly what they mean. The use of language in communication between humans in dating is a form of discourse. Besides discourse being a form of language use, discourse is also an utterance.

Discourse as a language use is also a form of speech with pragmatics. Pragmatics examines the relationship between the sentences used and the context. This is reflected in many written conversations in literary works, such as short stories, novels, or drama scripts. In literary works, there are also various pragmatic discourses. One of the easiest to recognize is the use of persona deixis. In terms of storytelling, the use of me, him, and the characters is widely used. A personal pronoun is a form of language that must be analyzed based on the context.

Discourse analysis based on context is, of course, inseparable from the use of pragmatics. Pragmatic discourse analysis in literary works has been done—analysis of the novel Bumi Manusia by Pramodya Ananta Tour, translated into English by Max. The novel's contrastive study of pragmatic discourse analyzes speech discourse in direct conversations between characters.

The writer will use pragmatic discourse analysis in short stories to analyze this paper. The object in the study of this paper is one of the short stories in the 2009 Kompas short story collection entitled "Blarak". This short story is the work of Yanusa Nugroho. There are many uses of pragmatics in this literary work, so the writer only focuses on using Deixis. Deixis, as a form of pragmatic discourse analysis, focuses on using persona deixis, place deixis, and time deixis.

METHOD

The type of research used in this research is descriptive qualitative research because the research data is in the form of sentences which are explained based on context. Descriptive research is research to investigate circumstances, conditions, or other matters whose results are explained in the form of a report (Arikunto, 2013: 3). Meanwhile, Sugiyono (2012: 22) says that the data in descriptive research are in the form of words or pictures, not numbers. The data of this study are the words or sentences contained in the short story Blarak by Yanusa Nugroho. The focus of this research is a form of pragmatic discourse analysis on the use of persona deixis, place deixis and time deixis. The research instrument (data collection instrument) in this study was a human instrument or the researcher himself. The data collection technique in this study was using note-taking techniques. The analysis technique used in this study is a qualitative data analysis technique. This technique includes three stages, namely data reduction, data presentation, and drawing conclusions or verification.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Discourse

Discourse can be interpreted as a language organization broader than sentences or clauses. It can also be meant as a larger linguistic unit. Discourse analysis is an analysis of language in its use. Discourse analysis cannot be limited only to the description of linguistic forms or their meaning (cohesion and coherence) which is separate from the purpose and function of language in human interaction. Discourse analysis seeks to find answers to what language is used by humans.

Brown and Yule, in Wahab (1991: 128), provide two terms to describe language functions, namely:

1. Transactional function is a language function whose purpose is to express content. The language used to convey factual information or information. In the transactional function, what is essential is that people get the correct information.

The problem is the clarity of what the speaker is saying. What happens in the transactional function is the efficient transfer of data. The language used is very message-oriented.

2. Interactional function, namely the function of language, which involves social relations and individual attitudes. The language used aims to form and maintain social ties. The reason is that most daily human interactions are colored more by human connections and are not solely message-oriented. Willingness to be polite, to speak, and to form social relations even though most daily conversation consists of one person's opinion about something that is present in front of him and in the presence of listeners.

Based on the function of language according to the Wahab above, it can be concluded that discourse analysis is not only in the form of sentences detached from the context. Context becomes very important in discourse analysis. Any analytical approach to linguistic phenomena that involves considering context is called pragmatics.

Yule (1996: 27) emphasizes that discourse analysis must consider the context in which parts of discourse exist. According to him, some of the most apparent elements of language that require contextual information are deixis forms such as here, now, I, you, this, and that. To interpret these elements, we need to know who the speakers and listeners are and when and where the discourse is produced. Because discourse analysis investigates the use of language in context by speakers/writers, it pays more attention to the relationship between speakers/writers and their utterances/writing on particular occasions of use, and not the potential relationships between one sentence and another, regardless of usage.

Based on the notion of discourse from several experts, Deborah Schiffrin (1994:28-60) tries to categorize the idea of discourse into three; namely, discourse is language above sentences, discourse is the use of language, and discourse is utterance.

1. Discourse is the language above the sentence (also called discourse is the language above the clause). This understanding of discourse is called the classical or structural notion of discourse. The definition of discourse in the sense of language above this sentence, according to Deborah Schiffrin (1994; 40), is a discourse that leads to the analysis of constituents (smaller units) that have a particular relationship with each other in a text. Constituents mean morphemes and morpheme sequences (words and phrases). This understanding of discourse focuses on the reader. An example of discourse in terms of language above this sentence is the news text in a newspaper.

2. Discourse is the use of language (functionalist). Discourse analysis, of course, is an analysis of the language used. Thus, the analysis cannot be limited to descriptions of language forms independent of the purposes or functions designed to use these forms in human affairs (Brown and Yule (1983; 1). An analysis of language use

cannot be separated from an analysis of the purposes- the purpose and functions of language in human life. Discourse is considered interdependent with social life, so its analysis always intersects with meanings, activities, and systems outside itself. According to this view, discourse is seen as a way of speaking governed by social and cultural.

3. While functional analysis focuses on how people use language for different purposes, such analyzes are usually less concerned with how people mean what they say to fulfill the meaning of reference (to convey propositional information) and more concerned with meaning—unintended social, cultural, and cultural origins from how their utterances are situated in context. The drawback of this view is that there needs to be a specific place for analyzing cooperation between statements. However, the functionalist definition of discourse includes all uses of language. This definition provides no way of defining discourse as distinct from other levels of language use (e.g., the use of sounds, words, or sentences). This understanding of discourse focuses on context. An example of discourse is the use of language, namely:
A: Do you have time for lunch today?
B: I have to teach until the evening.
Apart from being identified as questions and answers, we can easily find out that the utterances in the dialogue above are used to realize certain functions, namely, trying to achieve interpersonal goals and convey expressive and social meanings. But even though we can determine the purpose and meaning, we cannot prove it without other knowledge about the exchange context, which includes information such as the relative status of and the relationship between the participants, location, familiar ways of interacting with them, as well as information about the conventional meaning of the invitation, for lunch.

4. Discourse is speech. Discourse is the utterance, which implies that discourse is above other language units. Fasold (in Deborah Schiffrin, 1994) states that utterances do not need a grammatical background, and sentences are abstract objects and have never actually "happened" or been realized. Utterances are units of language production (both spoken and written) that are always contextualized. According to this definition, discourse focuses not only on context but also on other relationships that exist between language and context (context as 'culture', 'society', or 'interaction'). Language in society becomes a minor system and depends on a larger matrix of social structures and interactions. Examples of discourse are utterances, namely:
A: Indonesian is fun.
B: Indonesian is fun.
A: I like writing lessons.
A: Me too! Indonesian is fun

Yuwono (2007:92) states that discourse is a unity of meaning (semantic) between parts in a language structure'. With the agreement of definition, discourse is seen as a complete language structure because every aspect of the discourse is coherently related. In addition, discourse is also bound by context. As an abstract entity, discourse is distinguished from text, writing, reading, speech, or inscription, which refers to the same meaning, namely a concrete form that is seen, read, or heard. According to him, there are various contexts in the discourse. Oral discourse is a unit of language tied to the context of the situation in which it is spoken. SPEAKING, formulated by Hymes (1974) is the context of an utterance in oral discourse.

In his journal, Yowono (2007:93-94) explains that discourse can be classified based on several aspects as a unit of language in communication. Leech (1974) organizes lessons on:

1. Expressive discourse, if the address originates from the ideas of speakers or writers as a means of expression, such as speech discourse
2. Phatic discourse, if the lesson originates from a channel to facilitate communication, such as introduction discourse at a party.
3. Informational discourse, if the lesson originates from messages with an emphasis on the beauty of the message, such as poetry and song discourse
4. Directive discourse, if the lesson is directed at the actions or reactions of the speech partner or reader, such as a sermon discourse.

Meanwhile, based on communication channels, discourse is divided into oral discourse and written discourse. The verbal lesson includes the presence of speakers and speech partners, the language spoken, and speech over (turn-taking) which marks the turn of speech. Written discourse is characterized by the presence of writers and readers, the language in which it is written, and the application of the spelling system.

Based on the responses of speech partners or readers, discourse is grouped into transactional and interactional. Transactional discourse is characterized by the fulfillment by the speech partner/reader of the hopes or wishes of the speaker/writer, such as in an order or a request letter. Interactional discourse is characterized by responses and reciprocity from speakers and speech partners, as in buying and selling.

Discourse can be presented in spoken and written language. Spoken language will bring up dialects, accents, and 'registers' but with a poor syntactic structure. While written language cannot bring out these three things, it usually has a better syntactic structure.

In communicating, the elements must exist the speaker/writer, interpretant (opposite/reader), and information. Information is said to be adequately conveyed if the speaker's intent is understood by the interlocutor, that is when both parties have an understanding. However, there often needs to be more clarity in communication activities. The trigger is disagreement due to differences in cultural and social backgrounds. The speaker's intention (the information) needs to be better understood by the interlocutor. The branch of linguistics that studies this is called pragmatics.

B. Understanding Pragmatics

Levinson in Nadar (2009:12) pragmatics is the study of Deixis, implicature, presupposition, speech acts, and aspects of discourse structure.). Meanwhile, according to Djajasudarma (1994:56), pragmatics includes the study of the interaction between linguistic knowledge and basic knowledge about the world that is owned by listeners/readers. Pragmatics examines the relationship between language and context, which is very important for explaining the understanding of language.

Context is a feature/image that focuses on culture and linguistics according to the speech produced and its interpretation. Some characteristics/descriptions of the context are knowledge about: (1) norms (norms of speech and social conventions) and status (concepts of social status), (2) space and time, (3) level of formality, (4) media (means) , (5) themes, and (6) language areas.

The concept of context also includes the social and psychological world used by language users. This involves the language user's beliefs and prejudices about the temporal, social, and spatial setting, actions (verbal and nonverbal), as well as the level of knowledge and concern in social interaction.

Pragmatic supporting elements include:

1. Deixis

Deixis is a way of referring to something that is closely related to the speaker's context. Thus there are references that come from speakers close to the speaker and far from the speaker. Deixis relates to the way of grammaticalizing the characteristics of the speech context or speech event. The word Deixis comes from the Greek deiktikos, which means direct designation. Djajasudarma (1994:59) Deixis, based on a prototype, uses pronominal, tense, special temporal, and location, including grammatical features that are directly related to the speech situation.

According to Levinson in Nadar (2009:55), Deixis is classified into three types, namely persona deixis, spatial Deixis, and time deixis.
a. Persona deixis relates to the understanding of speech participants in the speech situation where the utterance is made. Personal Deixis can be seen in the forms

of the pronoun itself divided into first person pronouns (I, I; we, us), second person pronouns (you, you, you; you, you, you), third person pronouns (he, she, he; they).

1) First persona deixis: the speaker's reference to himself
   For example, me, me (free form), Ku- (bound state)
2) Second persona deixis: refers to one/more opponents
   For example, you, you, you (free form), you- (bound form)
3) Third person deixis: refers to other than the speaker himself or his interlocutor
   For example, he, she, he (free form), his (bound form)
   First persona with the second persona: we (free form)
   First persona without dual persona: we (free form)
   The dual persona is more than one: you, you guys
   The third persona is more than one: they

   Kushartanti (2007: 105) adds that from the choice of pronouns, one can know the level from a social point of view (among superiors/subordinates), etc. As a form of politeness and politeness etc. Another form of politeness is the disclosure of something in an indirect way.

b. Place Deixis relates to the understanding of the location or place used by the speech participants in the speech situation. For example: here, there, there.
c. Time deixis relates to understanding the point or period when the speech was made (or the message was written). Time deixis is manifested in adverbs of time, such as now, yesterday, next year, etc.
d. Spatial deixis relates to the relative location of speakers and speech partners involved in the interaction. For example, here, there, and there. The speaker's starting point is expressed by this and that.

2. Implicature

An understanding of implicature is needed in pragmatic discussions. According to Nadar (2009:60), implicature means something that is implied in a conversation. Implicature can be interpreted as an additional meaning conveyed by the speaker, sometimes not contained in the utterance itself. A statement can imply propositions that are not part of the utterance. The implied recommendation by Grice is called conversational implicature. Implicature provides an explicit explanation of how to tell more of what is said.

When people talk, in their conversations, a speaker has a specific intention when saying something. The meaning contained in the utterance is called the implicature. The speaker in the exchange must make what he says relevant to the situation in the conversation, clear, and easily understood by the listener. In short, there are rules that

must be obeyed by the speaker so that the conversation can run smoothly. These principles, in pragmatic studies, are known as cooperative principles. For example: 'there is trash on the floor'.

The implication is that you have to pick up the trash. That is not found in the grammatical meaning of the sentence. Sperber and Wilson in Nadar (2009:62) distinguish implicatures into two kinds: implicated premises and implicated conclusions. Listeners must obtain implied premises from memory or arrange them by developing assumptions obtained from memory. Meanwhile, the implicated judgment is obtained by inferring from the statement of speech with the context.

Examples of the two implications above are as follows:

Jhon: "would you like to drive a Mercedes?"

Mar: "I don't want to drive any luxury cars."

Mar's answer was different from a direct answer to John. However, through his memory and knowledge, Jhon concluded that a Mercedes is a luxury car. Jhon's understanding that Mercedes is a luxury car is what is called the implicated premises. Jhon continued to think about why Mar's answer was like that, namely, "I don't want to drive any luxury car," and combined it with his knowledge that a Mercedes is a luxury car. This process led to the conclusion that Mary did not want to drive any luxury cars, which was called an implicated conclusion.

3. Presuppositions

Presuppositions contain the meaning of all background assumptions that can make an action, theory, expression, or utterance reasonable or rational (Nadar, 2009:64). Presuppositions can be explained in terms of certain pragmatic inferences or assumptions that seem to be built into linguistic expressions.

Wiyana in Nadar (2009: 65) states that a sentence is said to presuppose another sentence if the untruth of the second sentence (the presupposed sentence) results in the first sentence (the presupposing sentence) cannot be said to be true or false. For example, the sentence "the official's wife is wonderful" presupposes the official has a wife. The penalty can be considered true or false if the official has a wife. However, if the opposite is true, the truth of the sentence cannot be determined. The definition of pragmatic presupposition contains two main things: suitability or satisfaction and mutual understanding.

C. Pragmatic Discourse Analysis

Kushartanti (2007: 104) defines discourse as a linguistic unit that is in a complete position and has the most comprehensive scope, meaning that in the language approach, discourse analysis is also the most complete and most extensive work, more thorough

than just clauses and sentences. In fact, discourse can be larger than paragraphs because a discourse can consist of a number of sections.

Discourse analysis refers to efforts to examine the arrangement of language above clauses and sentences or examine the rules of more complete and broader language units, such as conversation or written discourse. In short, discourse analysis pays attention to the use of language in social contexts, especially the interactions between speakers (Stubbs, 1983:1).

Pragmatic studies mean the study of the use of language concerning its context. Pragmatics is included in external studies, including inference, presupposition, implicature, and a deep understanding of the context that forms the background of the discourse.

D. Deixis Discourse Analysis in the Short Story "Blarak"

1. Persona Deixis

a. "I've wanted to wake you up, but how come it looks cool, I can't bear it. Uh, even the leaves that wake you up... hehehehe..."

The use of persona deixis in the discourse above has two Deixis, namely 'I' and 'sampaan' Deixis. The use of 'I' Deixis in the discourse above is the first form of persona as a speaker. The speaker in the discourse above is Mbah Tuhu. Meanwhile, the second persona deixis is in the form of the word 'sampean', which is intended for the opposite person. Mbah Tuhu's opponent was Seno, who was visiting Mbah Tuhu's house.

The two persona deixis appear as a form of a conversation between Mbah Tuhu and his interlocutor, Seno. In the short story, Mbah Tuhu intends to wake Seno up, but he cannot bear it because he sees Seno sleeping soundly.

b. "Later we all look for blarak to cook..." he said a few moments later.

Third person plural deixis, appears in the use of the word 'we'. Persona deixis is a form of pronoun that expresses Mbah Tuhu and Seno. The short story tells that Mbah Tuhu and Seno plan to find blarak to be burned. Mbah Tuhu indirectly asked Seno to go with Mbah Tuhu to look for blarak as fuel for cooking.

c. "Weeeeeh, hehehe... have you guys come yet? Come on, come in, come in..." Mbah Tuhu uses the word 'you' in the discourse above as a form of personal Deixis. The persona deixis used is the third person deixis. The use of the deixis 'you' is a form of the pronoun Seno and his wife who came to Mbah Tuhu's house.

d. "Yes, just take it, Mbah... It's already fallen, it means our luck, please..."
    "Yes, but I'll stop at Giman's house first..."?"
    "Oh. Yes, ask for permission first. It belongs to him."
    Seno reveals that the fallen blarak is 'our' fortune. The second persona deixis in the plural form, refers to Mbah Tuhu and Seno. This can be seen from the contents of the story when Mbah Tuhu and Seno were alone in the fields, there were no other people. So the use of persona deixis on the word 'we' is a form of persona for Seno and Mbah Tuhu.

The Blarak that Seno found had fallen from a coconut tree that belonged to Giman, so Mbah Tuhu asked that they stop by Giman's house on their way home. In the above discourse, persona deixis on the word 'he' is a form of persona for Giman. This can also be seen in the previous sentence which stated that the blarak that Seno found belonged to Giman. Therefore, the use of the word 'dia' as a form of third-person Deixis refers to Giman, who is neither a speaker nor an interlocutor.

2. Place Deixis

a. "Try to go there...maybe.."
    "Sorry, where?"
    "Mbah Tuhu...he is still our relative..."
    The Deixis of place in the discourse above appears in the use of adverb adverbs of place in the form of the word 'go there'. The use of the word indicates a business, in Mbah Tuhu's house. The location of Mbah Tuhu's home in a village in Cirebon. Thus, it can be seen clearly from the use of place deixis for the word 'to get there' in the above discourse indicating a home in a village in Cirebon.

b. "It's delicious here...do you smell firewood?"
    The word 'here' is also a form of place deixis. This speech was delivered by Seno's wife who felt happy to be 'here'. The use of area Deixis shows the site in Mbah Tuhu's house. In this short story, Seno and his wife have arrived in front of Mbah Tuhu's house, and they are sitting in the hall in front of Mbah Tuhu's house. So, the use of the word 'here' is a personal form of the place, namely at Mbah Tuhu's house.

c. "What vegetable is this, Grandma?"
    "Wow, what, huh? Hehehe..in here, people call it lompong. You know, like taro, but small, it grows by the river..."
    As in the previous discourse, the word 'here' in this discourse is also a form of place deixis. This can be seen from Mbah Tuhu's conversation, which states that the name of vegetables in his village is lompong. The word 'here' indicates his village, which is a form of the comment place. Thus, the use of the word 'here' is a form of place deixis.

3. Time Deixis

a. "Yes, take it, Mbah... it's already fallen, it means our luck, please..."

"Yes, but I'll stop at Giman's house first...“?”

"Oh. Yes, ask for permission first. It belongs to him."

In this short story, only one form of time Deixis is found. The use of time deixis in the discourse above is in the form of the word 'later'. A comment is a form of adverb of the future time. In Indonesian, the term 'later' means the future. So, the use of the word 'later' is a form of time deixis.

CONCLUSION

Discourse is a form of speech used in the use of language in society. The use of discourse in speech is not only in real life but can also be found in literary work, one of which is in short stories. The use of pragmatic discourse in the short story "Blarak" is only carried out in the analysis of persona deixis, place deixis, and time deixis. Based on the study conducted, of the three Deixis analyzed in the short stories, the use of persona deixis has the most frequency of occurrence. In comparison, those that occupy the second position in terms of frequency are occupied by the appearance of place deixis. Time deixis is the lowest deixis frequency of the three analyzed in this short story.

REFERENCES

Arikunto, Suharsimi. (2013). *Prosedur penelitian suatu pendekatan praktik.* Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.

Brown, Gillian dan George Yule. (1996). *Analisis Wacana* (edisi terjemahan oleh I.Soetikno). Jakarta : PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama

Cummings, Louise. (2007). *Pragmatics, A Multidisiplineary Perspective* (edisi tersejmahan oleh Eti Setiawati). Yogyakarta : Pustaka Pelajar.

Kushartanti, dkk. (2005). *Pesona Bahasa: Langkah awal memahami linguistik.* Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Levinson, StephenC. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

Lubis, A. Hamid, Hasan. (1991). *Analisis Wacana Pragmatik*. Bandung: Angkasa.

Nadar, FX. (2009). *Pragmatik & Penelitian Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Schiffrin Deborah, Tannen Deborah, Hamilton Heidi. (2001). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. USA : Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D).* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Yule, George. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.