

Studying Some Illegal Ways of Speaking in Vietnamese Life on The Basis of Pragmatic Theory

Le Thi Thuy Vinh¹, Do Thi Hien² and Tran Thi Minh³

Abstract

Vietnamese language life always contains many interesting illogical expressions. These illogical expressions reflect the way of thinking as well as cultural elements of the Vietnamese. By statistical methods and linguistic analysis, the report presents some illogical expressions in linguistic life and is based on the theory of pragmatics. These will be specific instructions towards effective service for the process of teaching Vietnamese to foreigners.

Keywords: *Pragmatics, Illogical Expressions, Vietnamese Life, Speech Act, Conversation, Implicit Meaning*

INTRODUCTION

The language of a nation is always influenced by cognitive cultural factors in the community. These cultural factors are shaped and crystallized in the thinking development process of that community as well as in the way of reflection in native language. Thus, native thinking is the origin of language and culture, in which language is an instrument to express thinking, culture is value and is the product of native thinking.

Verbal events in life have the ultimate goal of expressing cultural thinking, not merely logical thinking. Cultural thinking is the spiritual product of a nation, a community and has its own distinct mark. Therefore, in order to explain verbal events in life of Vietnamese people, especially verbal events of an illogical nature in Vietnamese language, it is necessary to be based on community cultural thinking. Pragmatics is a subject of synthetic nature that dominates relationship and internal structure of language. Thanks to pragmatics, the events of language can be explained by external factors of language such as culture, ethnicity, psychology, politics, history ... Therefore, the theoretical components of this subject can be used to analyze the mechanism that generates verbal events in communicative life as well as to explain it in the most reasonable way.

In the process of studying verbal events that exist in life of Vietnamese people, we find that, besides verbal events that ensure the logic of thinking, there are also verbal events of illogical nature. To explain the mechanism that generates the illogical nature as well as to prove the logical side of that illogical verbal event, we have used the theory of pragmatics. With that meaning, the report "*Studying some illegal ways of speaking in Vietnamese life on the basis of pragmatic theory*" will help language users to understand in the most specific way of interesting illogical speaking ways in life of Vietnamese people. Therefore, there are specific instructions to help language users reasonably use these ways of speaking in life. This also serves effectively in the process of teaching Vietnamese language and culture for foreigners.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Illogical and Logical Ways Of Speaking

In everyday life, Vietnamese people often speak to each other with sayings like "this person says reasonably, that person says unreasonably", "saying like that is coherent", "saying like that is incoherent, inconsistent"... That reasonableness or unreasonableness, coherence or incoherence, inconsistency is logic and illogical.

¹ Faculty of Philology, Hanoi Pedagogical University 2, Vietnam. E-mail: lethithuyvinh@hpu2.edu.vn

² Faculty of Philology, Hanoi Pedagogical University 2, Vietnam

³ Faculty of Preschool Education, Hanoi Pedagogical University 2, Vietnam

According to the Vietnamese dictionary, logic is understood as "the inevitable and tight order between phenomena and things; the close attachment between ideas, the way of close inference" (Hoang Phe, 2003). The logic expressed in this word of mouth is the product of formal and natural logical thinking. In other words, the illogical or logical ways of speaking we surveyed to document this article are those that are evaluated by the standards of research science of the rules and forms of thinking. Clearly speaking, the criteria for surveying this document is that the rigid and abstract formal logic is different from the community culture language logic. Formal logic has an assessment criterion of trueness/falseness about logic, but language logic is an assessment of suitability/ unsuitability with the cultural context. Thus, the purpose of this article is to take an assessment criterion of formal logic to survey illogical ways of speaking, thereby illuminating the theoretical sides of pragmatics to confirm the community culture logic in these verbal events.

Pragmatic Theory

Pragmatics is a discipline of linguistics that studies language use (including the process of creating and comprehending discourse) about communication factors. Thus, compared to the disciplines of traditional Linguistics such as Phonetics - Phonology, Lexicology, and Syntact, Pragmatics studies language units in a dynamic state. Thanks to that, we can explain many interesting and lively events of language

Pragmatics includes 5 components: reference theory, speech act theory, argumentation theory, conversation theory, and implicature meaning. Here, we focus on three theories: linguistic behavior, conversation, explicit meaning, and implicit meaning. Because these theories will be used to explain illogical speech events in Vietnamese speech.

Speech act theory is the backbone theory of Pragmatics. The first person to discover the behavioral nature of speech was philosopher John Austin in the 60s of the twentieth century. Among the three major types of linguistic acts: "locutionary act", "illocutionary act", and "perlocutionary act", illocutionary acts (collectively called speech acts) are the main object of Pragmatics. Because this behavior is the behavior the speaker performs immediately when speaking. Its purpose lies right in the utterance and its effect is a linguistic effect. Speech acts have two types: direct speech acts and indirect speech acts. Actions in direct speech are actions performed by the target in the words, by the conditions of use. Indirect speech acts are acts in which the speaker performs an action in this speech but aim to make the listener rely on linguistic and extra-linguistic knowledge to infer the verbal effect of an action. other languages.

Conversation theory is also one of the theories that is of great interest in Pragmatics because conversation is the basic, regular, and common communication activity of language functioning. Other forms of administrative activities are explained based on this activity. In conversation, there are also unwritten but socially accepted rules that conversation participants must follow when performing conversational movements. Among the three rules of conversation, which are the rule for taking turns, the rule for controlling the content of the conversation, and the rule governing interpersonal relations and politeness, people often refer to the rule for controlling the content. of conversation with Grice's principle of conversational collaboration. The principle of conversational collaboration was raised by Grice in 1967 and is generally stated as follows:

"Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged".

(Grice, 1975)

The cooperative principle is divided into Grice's four maxims of conversation, called the Gricean maxims—quantity, quality, relation, and manner. These four maxims describe specific rational principles observed by people who follow the cooperative principle in pursuit of effective communication.

The maxim of quantity (The maxim of quantity is to *be informative*. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange); Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

The maxim of quality (the maxim of quality is to *be truthful*. Try to make your contribution one that is true. Do not say what you believe is false. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence)

Maxim of relation (relevance) (*Be relevant*)

Maxim of manner (clarity) (the maxim of manner is to *be clear*. Avoid obscurity of expression — i.e., avoid language that is difficult to understand. Avoid ambiguity — i.e., avoid language that can be interpreted in multiple ways. Be brief — i.e., avoid unnecessary verbosity. Be orderly — i.e., provide information in an order that makes sense, and makes it easy for the recipient to process it) (Grice, 1991)

The theory of explicit and implicit meaning is the sixth component of pragmatics. If the explicit meaning of an utterance is the meaning that is said directly due to the linguistic elements in the utterance and the structure of the utterance (sounds, words, syntactic structure), then the implicit meaning of the utterance is Meaning is not expressed directly in words but must be understood through mental operations (based on context, context, and pragmatic rules). Pragmatics studies the implicit meaning of utterances, specifically the unnatural implicit meaning.

RESEARCH METHOD

Statistical Method

This method is used for statistics of illogical speaking ways in communication life of Vietnamese people. The linguistic data about these expressions includes 85 ways of speaking, which were collected from many sources: in daily word of mouth, in books as well as in the media.

Descriptive Method

Descriptive method is used to describe linguistic aspects in ways of speaking: semantics, grammar and pragmatics.

Method Of Language Analysis

This is a method with characteristic meaning in the process of researching language phenomena. In this report, method of language analysis is used according to a process: from setting up criteria for determining illogical ways of speaking to collection of linguistic data of these ways of speaking, and then using pragmatics theory to classify ways of speaking and clarify the mechanism of creating pragmatics ways of speaking.

3.4. Classification method

On the basis of specific theoretical components of pragmatics, this method is used to classify and illuminate ways of speaking under the light of pragmatics.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Explain Illogical Ways Of Speaking In Life From Pragmatics Side

Explain Illogical Ways Of Speaking From Conversation Theory In Pragmatics.

In life, Vietnamese people often use and also hear such sayings like "*You have no eyes?*", "*You have no mouth?*", "*Where is your mouth?*", "*You have no hands when you always have to beg others?*", "*Your head has no brain?*", "*Do not worry! Everyone has a heart!*" ... These are verbal sayings of Vietnamese words of mouth. If comparing the contents of these sayings with natural logical thinking, its illogical nature can be seen. Because, speaking out an obvious truth, without evidence is considered redundant in communication. Being human, everyone has eyes, mouth, hands, head, heart. Here, the speaker used a way of speaking that violates the motto of quality (a motto proposed by Grice under the principle of conversation collaboration). The motto of quality is generally stated by Grice as follows: Try to make your contribution to be right, especially: do not say anything that you believe is not true, do not say anything that you have no an authentic evidence. Thus, speaking out an obvious truth violates this motto. Of course, it is this violation that makes the Vietnamese way of speaking (mentioned above) appear the implications.

Sayings	Implications
"You have no eyes?"	How you see the road when you crash into other people's vehicle
"You have no mouth?"	Why you do not talk anything? Poor speaking?
"Where is your mouth?"	
"You have no hands when you always have to beg others"	Do you know how to work when you always have to beg others"
Your head has no brain?	Do you know thinking?
"Do not worry! Everyone has a heart!	Everyone has feelings.

To interpret these implications, the Vietnamese people rely on a metonymic meaning transformation mechanism: taking part of the body to indicate the function of that part of body. This has become a common sense of communication, helping Vietnamese people identify the implications of the saying in the correct way.

Thus, the illogicalness in natural language becomes the logic of the community culture language. Just as Sapir said, "Word of saying is a function which is not instinctive, through practice, that has" cultural nature". Grasping this culture thinking, language users will use well forms of expressions of language as well as communication forms in the saying words of the community.

Explain Illogical Ways Of Speaking From Implication Theory In Pragmatics

Implication meaning is the notice information that the speaker gives, this information, although not directly expressed in words, sentences, but can use meaning inference manipulation, based on context, language context and linguistic rules... to grasp. Thanks to the Implication meaning, ways of speaking have deep and powerful expressions; the speaker also shows his/her attitudes, emotions, and behavioral culture in the most delicate and polite way of communication.

In implication theory, there is a rather interesting rule of about using implication words. Specifically, in certain contexts, words with negative lexical meanings have the indications of positive meanings and vice versa, words with positive lexical meanings have the indications of negative meanings.

Examples:

- Ways of speaking that contain words have negative meanings but have the indications of positive meanings such as: This man speaks English *disgustingly!* Study *fishily* like this, who can keep up! Study *terribly* like that who can talk anything?

- Ways of speaking that contain words have positive meanings but have the indications of negative meanings such as: what a *nice* face? how *bright* are your eyes? You *enjoyed* yet? Are you a *hero*? How *positive* you are! Why you come now, it is still *early*? How *good* you are, but?

The above mentioned ways of speaking are considered illogical on the basis of comparing the lexical meaning with the general meaning of the verbal event. Obviously, in order to interpret the meaning of these ways of speaking, if using natural language logic, it is difficult to identify the purpose of the saying. It must be considered under the logic of culture thinking to show its true meaning. Also in these ways of speaking, there are ways of saying that have become a common words of mouth of Vietnamese people. Even though standing independently in a series of words, the communicator still understands its meaning properly like *what a nice face? You enjoyed yet? Are you a hero? ...* Besides, there are also ways of speaking that require clarifying the context in order to correctly deduce the set meaning like *Why you come now, it is still early?, Study terribly like that who can talk anything? ...*

Item	Ways of speaking	Implications
1	What a nice face?	Too ashamed
2	How bright are your eyes?	Blind (confidence)
3	You enjoyed yet?	Suffering
4	Are you a hero?	It is ordinary
5	How positive you are?	Normal, not positive at all
6	Why you come now, it is still early?	It is late!
7	How good you are?	Normal
8	This man speaks English disgustingly	This man speaks English very well
9	Study fishily like this, who can keep up!	Study well like this, who can keep up!
10	Study terribly like that who can talk anything?	Study a lot like that who can talk anything!

In addition, in the Vietnamese language today, especially in the use of Vietnamese language by young people, to indicate to a higher degree that it is impossible to be higher, Vietnamese people often use words with negative lexical meanings to clarify the meaning of the adjective. For example, we have several models that combine the following words: X + *cruelly* (cruelly beautiful), X + *awfully* (awfully pretty), X + *horribly* (horribly hard), X + *terribly* (terribly super), X + *so* (so expensive), X + *so* (pretty), X + *too* (pretty, lovely) ... (X is an adjective). Thus, if the adjective reflects a positive feature of the object, even the adjunct has a negative meaning, this word combination still shows the speaker's appreciation, praise and respect. These are also ways of speaking that are highly emotional although the combination of words is made completely illogical.

Explain Illogical Ways Of Speaking From Behavioral Theory Of Language In Pragmatics

Speaking is a human act, an action of social nature. The language action has similarities with the specific actions of human beings in life and there are also distinct differences because this is a special type of action, language action.

The language action can be performed authentically and correctly with the action target and usage conditions of action (direct language action), but it can also be used inauthentic. That means that the speaker uses this language action but make the listener rely on linguistic and non-linguistic understanding to infer the validity of another language action (indirect language action).

Normally, to identify the validity of the true word of an indirect language action, language users often have to rely on context of usage. However, there are also indirect language actions that have become a speaking "habit" of Vietnamese people, so the deduction of the true meaning of these actions has become "background knowledge" in the "cultural background" of native speakers.

We can see many ways of speaking where there is a contradiction between linguistic sign and behavioral validity such as *Who knew?* (= don't know) (ask to negate); *Only God knows?* (= no one knows (ask to negate); *Who doesn't know* (= everyone knows) (negate to affirm); *Is something wrong to say that?* (= say correctly!) (ask to affirm); *Why don't I come?* (= I come) (ask to affirm), *Did nothing?* (= Don't do) (ask to negate) ... In our opinion, these are ways of speaking featuring cultural colors of native speakers. Therefore, if only based on the words of the linguistic structure, it is impossible to recognize the meaning that the speaker wants to imply. Here, the language user has to both pay attention to the theory of language action and the structure of ways of speaking. For example:

Item	Structure of ways of speaking	Implications
1	Only X knew? (X is a noun implying for an object)	No one knows
2	Everyone X? (X is the verb that indicates action)	Everyone X
3	No X (X is a verb or an adjective)	No X
4	Never X? (X is a verb or an adjective)	-X already!
5	Why do not X? (X is a verb or an adjective)	Obviously X!

Application In Teaching Vietnamese Language For Foreigners

The above-mentioned illogical ways of speaking are those featuring colors of community culture, reflecting culture thinking of Vietnamese people. Therefore, the teaching of Vietnamese language to foreigners in general and the teaching of communication forms in Vietnamese language in particular, according to our opinion, the following issues need to be done well:

- Teaching Vietnamese language is associated with teaching cultural characteristics, cultural thinking of Vietnamese people.
- Teaching Vietnamese language through specific communication forms of Vietnamese people.
- Teaching Vietnamese language units such as words, phrases, and sentences associated with specific usage contexts.
- Enhance memorization and use ways of speaking that have cultural nature because these ways of speaking may not comply with any language rules.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the difference between the logic of natural language and the logic of cultural language, the report has gathered and explained illogical ways of speaking in natural language but logic in cultural language or illogicalness in the correlation between the language sign of the linguistic expression with the true meaning of that expression and the logic of this relationship in terms of the thinking culture. The use of pragmatics theory to deduce the logic has enabled language users to correctly deduce the true meaning of these ways of speaking.

In principle, only native Vietnamese people can fully understand all aspects of culture and society so that they can reasonably use illogical ways of speaking in communication. However, if teaching Vietnamese language is associated with culture, with verbal events, learners can grasp well these ways of speaking, thus aiming to use Vietnamese language as a communication strategy of cultural thinking of Vietnamese people.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Do Huu Chau (2001). *Overview of Linguistics 2, Pragmatics section*. Education Publishing House.
- Nguyen Duc Dan (1996). *Logic and Vietnamese*. Education Publishing House.
- Davis, Wayne (2024). "Implicature". *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Stanford University.
- Grice, H. P (1975). "Logic and conversation". In Cole, P.; Morgan, J. (eds.). *Syntax and semantics*. Vol. 3: Speech acts. New York: Academic Press. pp. 41–58.
- Grice, P. (1991). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard University Press.
- Mey, Jacob (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Blackwell. pp. 76–77. ISBN 978-0631211327.
- Nguyen Van Khang (2012). *Sociolinguistics*. Vietnam Education Publishing House.
- Hoang Phe (2003). *Vietnamese Dictionary*. Danang Publishing House.
- Yule, G (1986). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Blackwell. ISBN 978-1118732298.