

SEMANTICS AND PRAGMATICS IN POETRY : A STUDY ON WILLIAM STANLEY'S *THE UNWRITTEN*, PABLO NERUDA'S *UNTITLED*, AND ANA MARIA IZA'S *FORMULA*

Kustinah*

Abstract : This paper aims at finding out whether literary interpretation produces an effect of pragmatics and semantics as a result of processes of a reading-act. As an effort to get the answer, the writer of this writing analyzes three poems. The first is *The Unwritten* by William Stanley (1927-...), the second is *Untitled* by Pablo Neruda (1904-1973), and *Formula* by Ana Maria Iza. The technique used would be a careful study on each of interpretation through the three poems . The discussion will view the possibilities of pragmatics and semantics sense in those three poems.

The core idea of this article came from Wolfgang Iser who wrote *The Act of Reading* (1987). He believed that a literary text can only produce a response when it is read. It is virtually impossible to describe this response without also analyzing the reading process (1987:ix). Referring to that quotation, this paper will present detailed proces of reading the above three poems and the process of interpretation thus encoding the pragmatics and semantics point of view.

Key-words : reading-act, poetry, pragmatics, semantics

INTRODUCTION

The word of *Pragmatics* is designated the science of *the relation of signs to their interpreters* (Jef Verschueren, 1999 : 6). Logically speaking, signs may refer to symbols; poetry plays with symbols of hidden meaning that is presented in the dictions used by the writer of a poem. Since the object of this article is three poems, so it can be said that along with the interpretation of those poems, one can see the signs; from pragmatics point of view.

Semantics is traditionally defined as *the study of meaning* (John Lyons, 1996 : 3) Related to this statement, Wolfgang Iser (1987: 15) gave an information that New Criticism has changed the direction of literary perception in so far as it has turned attention away from representative meaning and onto the perceptions operating within the work. Talking about meaning, the interpretation of the three poems used by this study is surely lead to a conclusion of the

meaning, how the signs or symbols represent certain meaning. The writer of this paper believes that it will come to an interesting discussion to see the purpose of a literary text to provoke the readers' mind, is powerfully lay in the three poems used.

Meaning is imagistic in character (Wolfgang Iser, 1987 : 8). The writer of this paper assumes that through a reading act upon the characters found in the three poems used, every reader will see various meanings which are dedicated as a clue to interpret the message conveyed by the writer of each poem. The assumption is in line with other statement from Iser (1987 : 20) saying that *the text could only have a meaning when it was read*. See another related statement : *A literary text contains intersubjectively verifiable instructions for meaning-production, but the meaning produced may then lead to a whole variety of different experiences & hence subjective judgements* (1987 : 25). Since literary works are said to be human's experience, the writer

* Program Studi PBSIng, FKIP, Unwidha Klaten

of this paper is agree to say that the selected three poems used in this paper will tell readers about our experiences as human. From literature point of view, a literary work is like *a minor of the manor – the universe*. So, the poems will give a story about the universe with the media of setting of time and place created by each writer of the poems and through characters fictitiously made.

In the discussion, the writer of this paper will explain three things : (1) how does one reading-act of a poem leads to interpretative both pragmatics and semantics, (2) how can a reader classify a literary text as represented meaning, (3) how can an interpretation convey the language use (pragmatics point of view) from a literary text. The writer of this writing will do the following : (1) finding the mental evidences of both pragmatical and semantical sense from the three poems, (2) finding the proof of hidden meaning through the three poems, (3) finding the concluding remark of the interpretation to state the language-use.

DISCUSSION

Wolfgang Iser (1987 : x) stated that theory of Reception arises from a history of reader's judgements. To prove the significance of this quotation to this paper, it can be said that the writer of this paper has a sufficient duration of time concerning with learning experience as her academical background and also teaching-job experience. Yet in other words, everyone can make an assumption that on the analysis, the judgements given by the writer on this paper will be scientifically feasible.

Aesthetic response is set in motion through the reading process; such an analysis, however, provides a framework which enables us to asses

individual realizations & interpretations of a text in relation to the conditions that have governed them (Iser, 1987 : x). The main idea of this quotation informs us that through the reading process, without us realizing, one reader's perception through a literary work appears naturally, automatically.

The reader is bound to resist the orientation of the narrator's perspective (Iser, 1987 : 6). This quotation convinces us that when we are reading a literary work, the power of the diction, all figurative languages used, will guide us to the tone created by the writer of that poems.

The effectiveness of the work depends on the participation of the reader (Iser, 1987 : 6). To sum up the main idea of this quotation, the writer of this article believes that when we are categorized into *the ideal reader*, we can use a literary text, in this case a poem for instance, effectively. To be effective in giving interpretation and understanding upon poetic devices and other features of a fictitious work. Iser said that *The Ideal reader must not only fulfil the potential meaning of the text independently of his own historical situation*. The Ideal Reader, unlike the contemporary reader, is *a purely fictional being* (1987 : 29).

The following are *the types of reader* according to Wolfgang Iser :

1. *The Real Reader* : invoked mainly in studies of the historical responses, i.e. when attention is focused on the way in which a literary work has been received by a specific reading public.
2. *Contemporary Reader* :
 - a The one real & historical, drawn from existing documents
 - b Hypothetical : from social & historical knowledge of the time

- c Extrapolated : from the reader's role laid down in the text.
3. *The Informed Reader* :
- a Someone who is *a competent speaker of the language out of which the text is built up*
 - b *Who is full possession of semantic knowledge that a mature listener brings to the task of comprehension*
 - c *The Informed Reader has a literary competence, represents a self-instructing concept that aims at increasing the reader's informedness, and hence his competence, through self-observation with regard to the sequence of reactions set off by the text*
4. *The Intended Reader* : *as a sort of fictional inhabitant of the text, represents a concept of reconstruction, uncovering the historical dispositions of the reading public at which the author was aiming.*
5. *The Super Reader* : *is like a sort of divining rod, used to discover a density of meaning potential encoded in the text.*
6. *The Idealized Reader* : *it may reveal itself through anticipation of the norms & values of contemporary readers, through individualization of the public.*
7. *The Implied Reader* : *as a concept has his roots firmly planted in the structure of the text, he is a construct & in no way to be identified with any real reader.*
- a *Personification* : a form of figurative language. A technique whereby a writer attributes human qualities to an idea, object, or animal.
 - b *Metaphor* : a form of figurative language in which two seemingly unlike items or situations are compared to one another directly, without the use of *like* or *as*. Poets very often use metaphors to help readers see & feel things the way they do & to give their ideas more impact.
 - c *Repetition* : the recurring of a sound, word, phrase, or line. Poets use repetition to emphasize an idea, create a certain feeling or give a musical quality to their work. An overall pattern of sound is the phrases the poet repeats.

Pragmatics. At the most elementary level, pragmatics can be defined as the study of language use, or, to employ a somewhat more complicated phrasing : the study of linguistic phenomena from the point of view of their usage properties and processes. (1999 : Introduction)

Linguistics is traditionally divided into component disciplines such as phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics.

Semantics, finally, explores the meaning of linguistic units, typically at the level of words (lexical semantics) or at the level of sentences, whether or not they correspond to simple propositions. (1999 : 2). Now we see Linguistics of language-use (the pragmatic perspective).

The linguistic phenomena to be studied from the point of view of their usage can be situated at any level of structure or may pertain to any type of form-meaning relationship. Pragmatics does not constitute an additional component of a theory of language, but it offers a different perspective. (1999 : 2) There are

The following are related quotations concerning with the three poems used by this study, taken from *Spotlight on Literature* (1997) by Candy Dawson et al.

* *Poetic Device* (1997 : 141)

no doubt units of linguistic structure that lend themselves more readily to a *pragmatic investigation* than to *resource-oriented explorations*. This is the case for most *supra-sentential units* such as texts, conversations, or discourse in general. (1999 : 3)

At the level of word meaning, the domain of *lexical semantics*, as soon as a word gets used, more has to be taken into account than what would normally be regarded as its *dictionary meaning*. (1999 : 5) Charles Morris (1938) distinguishes between syntax, semantics and pragmatics in terms of three users or interpreters. Semantics deals with the relations of signs to the objects to which signs are applicable and pragmatics studies whatever relations there are between signs and their users or interpreters. (1999 : 6)

Let us continue with pragmatics and interdisciplinary. Linguistic pragmatics studies *people's use of language, a form of behaviour or social action* (1999 : 6).

Through the selected three poems, this paper will try to expose the behavior of figures poetically created in those poems.

Pragmatics is not only situated outside *the contrast set* to which phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics belong : neither does it fit into the set of *interdisciplinarity fields* such as neurolinguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics and anthropological linguistics. *Neurolinguistics* tries to reveal *the neurophysiological bases* and processes of speaking and listening (and whatever can go wrong in this *domain*). *Psycholinguistics* studies *the relationships between language and the mind in general* (a task to sub areas of which certain

brands of cognitive linguistics are also devoted). *Sociolinguistics* is concerned with *the ways in which social relationships, statuses, patterns, and networks interact with language structure and use*. *Anthropological linguistics* is devoted to *the relationship between language(s) and culture(s)*. (1999 : 7). Just as it was impossible to assign a basic unit of analysis to pragmatics, it is impossible to identify a specific correlational object. Pragmatics is concerned with *the full complexity of linguistic behaviour*. From that perspective, there is no way of addressing, for instance, issues of cognition without taking society and culture abstracted from their *cognitive underpinnings* and *implications*. When looking at the work done under the interdisciplinary labels, actual research practice indeed shows a serious degree of thematic as well as methodological overlap. Summing up, we can now further specify *pragmatics* as *a general cognitive, social, and cultural perspective on linguistic phenomena in relation to their usage in forms of behaviour (where the string 'cognitive, social, and cultural' does not suggest the separability of what the terms refer to)*. (1999 : 7)

To add the above illustration about *what pragmatics* is taken from Jef Verschueren (1999), the following are similar quotations from Jacob L.Mey (1993). What is Pragmatics all about ? It is a science that has to do with language and its users, or some such thing. What could be called a typical pragmatic look at matters of language ? Here is an example of how pragmatics works. (1993 : Introduction).

The Chicago alternative cultural weekly *Reader* had an advertisement in its 21 August, 1992 issue for a downtown cocktail lounge called *Sweet Alice*. The ad carried the text : *I brought some sushi home and cooked it; it wasn't bad*. Now what are we going to

make of this ? Of course this sentence is a joke : everybody knows that sushi is eaten raw, and that you're not supposed to cook it. Cooking sushi may strike one as funny, or stupid, or outrageous, depending on one's point of view. In an informal way, we could say that the above utterance makes no sense. And a linguist might want to add that, since everybody knows that sushi is defined as being eaten raw, a sentence such as the above is wrong. (1993 : 4)

But, one could ask, why use such a silly sentence in an advertisement for a cocktail bar ? This is where pragmatics comes into the picture. Pragmatics tells us it's alright to use language in various, unconventional ways, as long as we know, as language users, what we're doing. So *we can let ourselves be semantically shocked*, if there is a reason for it, or if it is done for a purpose. Now, what could that reason or purpose be ? (1993 : 4)

In this particular case, the joke has a euphoric effect, similar to that of a disarming smile; it invokes the silly state of mind that becomes our privilege after a couple of drinks. The invitation is in fact *a pragmatic act*. (1996 : 4) Whenever you cannot explain a phenomenon in language using regular, accepted linguistic theories, then you must have recourse to something else, something that is supposedly as undefined as it is *tangible*, namely pragmatics. (1993 : 5)

Why do we need Pragmatics ? What does pragmatics have to offer that cannot be found in good old-fashioned linguistics? What do pragmatics methods give us in the way of greater understanding of how the human mind works, how human communicate, how they manipulate one another, and in general, how they use language, in all the ways, and with all the means, and for all the ends they traditionally have done ? (1993 : 7) The answer is : Pragmatics is needed

if we want a fuller, deeper and generally more reasonable account of human language behaviour. Below is an example of pragmatic account, taken from David Lodge's *Paradise News* :

I just met the old Irishman and his son, coming out of the toilet

I wouldn't have thought there was room for the two of them

No silly, I mean I was coming out of the toilet. They were waiting. (1992 : 65)

Many linguists assert that it is *the context* that we must invoke to determine what an ambiguous sentence means. A context is dynamic that is to say, it is an environment that is in steady development, prompted by the continuous interaction of the people engaged in language use, the users of the language. Context is the quintessential pragmatic concept; it is by definition *proactive*, just as people are. (1993 : 8)

The following are related quotations to this paper taken from the work done by John Lyons (1996) about Linguistic Semantic. What is meaning ? Semantics is traditionally defined as the study of meaning; and this is the definition which we shall initially adopt. But do all kinds of meaning fall within the scope of semantics, or only some ? What is meant by *meaning* in this context ? (1996 : 2)

The noun *meaning* and the verb *mean* , from which it is derived, are used, like many other English words, in a wide range of contexts and in several distinguishable senses. (1996 : 3)

Most language-utterances, whether spoken or written, depend for their interpretation to a greater or less degree – upon the context in which they are used. And it is important to remember that the verb *mean* and the noun *meaning* are ordinary words of English in other respects also. (1996 : 4)

Most everyday, non-technical, words and expressions in all natural languages are like the noun *meaning* or the verb *mean* in that they have several meanings which cannot always be sharply distinguished from one another (or alternatively a range of meaning within which several distinctions can be drawn) and may somewhat vague or indeterminate. (1996 : 6)

Semanticists refer to as *a metalanguage – a language which is used to describe language*. Now it is *a commonplace of philosophical semantics* that natural languages (in contrast with many non-natural, or artificial, formal languages) contain their own metalanguage : they may be used to describe, not only other languages (and language in general), but also themselves. (1996 : 7)

We have now explicitly adopted English as our metalanguage. But if we are aiming for precision and clarity, English like other natural languages, cannot be used for metalinguistic purposes without modification. As far as the metalinguistic vocabulary of natural languages is concerned, *there are two kinds of modification* to us : *regimentation* and *extension*. We can take existing everyday words, such as *language, sentence, word, meaning* or *sense*, and *subject them to strict control (i.e. regiment their use), defining them or redefining them for our own purpose*. Alternatively, we can extend the everyday vocabulary by introducing into its technical terms which are not normally used in everyday discourse. (1996 : 7)

The everyday English word *meaning* has *a range of distinguishable, but interconnected, meanings*. It would be open to us at this point to do what many semanticists writing in English do these days : we could *regiment* the use of the word *meaning*

by deliberately assigning to it a narrower, more specialized, sense than it bears in normal everyday discourse. And we could then employ this narrower, more specialized, definition of *meaning* to restrict the field of semantics to only part of what is traditionally covered by the term *semantics* in linguistics, philosophy and other disciplines. (1996 : 8)

As far as the everyday metalinguistic use of the spoken language is concerned, there are certain rules and conventions which all native speakers follow without ever having been taught them and without normally being conscious of them (1996 : 9).

There are many ordinary-language metalinguistic statements which are unambiguous when spoken, but not necessarily when written. We shall see the English word *language* is ambiguous, so that the phrase *the study of meaning in language* is open to two quite different interpretations. (1996 : 10). It should also be emphasized that, *although much of the structure of natural-language utterances is arbitrary, or conventional, there is also a good deal of non-arbitrariness in them*. One kind of non-arbitrariness is commonly referred to these days is *iconicity*. As linguists have been aware for centuries, in all natural languages there are words which are traditionally described as *onomatopoeic*, such as *splash, bang, crash* or *cuckoo, peewit*, etc. In English; they are now nowadays classified under the more general term *iconic*. But these are relatively few in number. (1996 : 13)

Another kind of non-arbitrariness to which semanticists have given increasing attention in recent years is *indexicality*. *An index*, as the term was originally defined, *is a sign which, in some sense, calls attention to – indicates (or is indicative of) – what it signifies (in the immediate situation) and which thereby serves as a clue as it were, to the presence*

or existence (in the immediate situation) of whatever it is that it signifies. For example, smoke is an index of fire; slurred speech may indicate drunkenness; and so on. (1996 : 16)

The term index, as it was originally defined, covered a variety of things which have little in common other than that of focusing attention on some aspect of the immediate physical situation. When one says that smoke means fire or that slurred speech is a sign of drunkenness (in the immediate situation), but that fire is the source of the smoke and that it is the person whose speech is slurred who is drunk. (1996 : 15). The following is the analysis of the three poems.

The First Poem : *The Unwritten* By William Stanley (1927 -)

THE UNWRITTEN

Inside this pencil
crouch words that have never been written
never been spoken
never been thought

they're hiding

they're awake in there
dark in the dark
hearing us
but they won't come out
not for love not for time not for fire

even when the dark has worn away
they'll still be there
hiding in the air
multitudes in days to come may walk through them
breathe them
be none the wiser

what script can it be

that they won't unroll
in what language
would I recognize it
would I be able to follow it
to make out the real names
of everything

maybe there aren't
many
it could be that there's only one word
and it's all we need
it's here in this pencil

every pencil in the world
is like this

Literature is an accepted cultural value (Stein Haugom Olsen, 1978 : ix). When a reader takes up a literary work, he will make an attempt to understand and appreciate it. It has always been acknowledged by those who have cared for literature that at least a part of the reader's judgements on a work, provided he reads it as a literary work, will be concerned with its aesthetic qualities. This research will try to use this quotation by interpreting the lines of *The Unwritten* as follows :

It is generally known that a literary work is strongly influenced by its writer's background. See the following quoted information : William Stanley Merwin was born in Pennsylvania & educated at Princeton & McGill Universities. After graduation, he went to Majorca as a tutor to the Son of the poet Robert Graves. Much of Merwin's work is *about people's inability to seize the present. Time and timelessness* are major themes in his work. (Candy Dawson Floyd, et al, 1997 :15)

Through *personification*, human characteristics are attributed to an object, an animal,

or an idea. Throughout *The Unwritten*, the poet has personified words describing them as engaged in human activities. The examples of personification in the poem : *crouch, hiding, awake, hearing, won't they unroll*. Another poetic device used in this first poem is *repetition*. Repetition is the recurring of a sound, word, phrase, or line. Poets use repetition to emphasize an idea, create a certain feeling, or give a musical quality to their work. Talking about an overall pattern of sound; *The Unwritten* repeats the following phrases : *never been, not for, would I*. This research further will try to find how does that *repetition* emphasize the poet's message about words ?

The views that literature is distinguished by a special type of language, that it expresses and arouses (or *gives insight into*) *emotion*, and that it provides a special type of truth are all found unacceptable for various reason. (Olsen, 1978 : ix). This article, through analyzing this poem, will see truths which both accepted and unaccepted by the writer of this paper's point of view. Now we analyze the first line of the poem. *Inside this pencil*. Why *pencil* ? This article believes that *pencil* refers to a writing tool where we can easily erase the wrong handwriting with a rubber-eraser. Relating to the above quoted statement from Olsen, this first line inserts *an emotion of doubt* because the poet chose pencil, not pen or other tool. Line two, *crouch words that have never been written – crouch*, its contextual meaning means to appear, to arise, to grow. So, this paper believes that this line convey a hidden meaning that *words*, refer to *the voices of the persona* of this poem will *appear*, will *grow quickly* from the previous state of mind which have *never been written* or in other words, *never been heard*. Words are personified as voices or as vice versa.

Literary understanding can be seen as having two stages : *judgements* about *the author's aesthetic intentions (interpretation)* and *appreciation of the aesthetic qualities* of the work (Olsen, 1978 : ix). The writers of this research give an understanding that the theme of the above poem is *a mixture of despair and hope*. Why it says so ? Let's sense the theme by interpreting the lines. The repeated use of the diction *never been*, is clearly *symbolizes pessimistic or afraid or being hopeless*. (*never been written, never been spoken, never been thought*). The writer of this paper assumes that the last two lines stand as the concluding remark and yet gives a contrary idea to being pessimistic. *every pencil in the world* could mean *men* or *the universe*; is like suggest a defensive reasoning that *the persona of the poem is not the only person who has something which is never been written, which is never been spoken and never been thought*. *It is like a response to an unexpected life where people usually only dream, and hope, and sometimes become speechless even unable to propose the desire about the expected things in life*.

Because this paper aims at *finding semantics and pragmatics senses* in the-three-studied poems, let us see now *how literature and language* presented in *The Unwritten*. Any analysis of the way in which we understand literary works immediately runs up against two basic problems concerning the delimitation of the material on which the analysis should be based. The first concerns the group of people referred to by *we* in the previous sentence. A theorist must have some way of determining the membership of the group containing those people whose literary understanding he wants to analyze. The second problem is : what are the criteria by which the

members of the group understand a literary work *qua* literary work ? (Olsen, 1978 : 1).

A reasonable answer to the first question is that the literary theorist should be interested in people who are willing and able to use the concept *literary work* to distinguish a class of utterances – more appropriately referred to as texts – as having *aesthetic properties, an aesthetic dimension, or as constituting aesthetic object.* (1978 : 1). The following are examples given by this paper concerning with using the poetic devices through the first poem to conclude the aesthetic properties or aesthetic dimension. Line 5 of the poem, *hiding*, can be interpreted as *somebody who is not self-confident*, so he hides from something. Line 6, *they're awake in there*. Here, the interpretation is amusing *if we contrast the diction hiding to awake. After hiding, possibly the person now finds his confidence and suddenly awakes.* Line 7, *dark in the dark*, this research gives the interpretation for the word *dark* here as *a misery, or suffering. Dark in the dark could possibly an effort done by the poet, Stanley Mervin, to send a strong impression about the emotion being conveyed. The emotion of feeling like a blind man physically and being unable to cope the reality; as its deeper interpretation.* This appreciation refer to the previous quoted information telling that much of William Stanley Merwin's work is about people's inability to seize the present. Line 8, *hearing us*, feels like talking about other sense which every human possess. The blind man usually has an excellent *hearing* ability. This research assumes that this line is trying to provoke the reader's mind to imagine how sorrowful the persona of this poet feel about his life. This can be seen in the following line; line 9: but *they won't come out*. This line may tell

readers of the poem that *hopes never come out or the courage to fight never exists.*

This paper now tries to see the pragmatic side of this first poem. Based on modern literary theory, *the concept of the sign – that languages are systems, constituted by signs that are arbitrary and differential.*

Ann Jefferson and David Robey (— : 47) stated that a linguistic sign consists in the union of two elements, *a sound-image* (or its written substitute) and *a concept*; for the first *the term signifier* is used, for *the second signified* (*signifiant* and *signifie*). This research sees a recurring of sounds in the first poem. As stated before, Merwin repeats the phrases (as like sounds) : *never been, not for, would I*. Surely this repetition brings certain imagery and tone. The repetition stands as a signifiant and the dictions used stand as its signifier.

The Second Poem : *Untitled* by Pablo Neruda (1904 – 1973)

You sing, and your voice peels the husk
of the day's grain, your song with the sun and sky,
the pine trees speak with their green tongue
all the birds of the winter whistle.

The sea fills its cellar with footfalls
with bells, chains, whimpers,
the tools and the metals jangle,
wheels of the caravan creak.

But I hear only your voice, your voice
soars with the zing and precision of an arrow
it drops with the gravity of rain,

your voice scatters the highest swords
and returns with its cargo of violets :

it accompanies me through the sky

Pablo Neruda was born in a small town in Chile. At 17 he moved to Santiago, where he soon joined a group of experimental poets. In 1924 Neruda published a collection of poems, *Twenty Love Poems and a Song of Despair*, which established him as one of Chile's most promising poets. Besides writing poetry, Neruda held diplomatic positions in Europe and Asia. He was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1971.

The emphasis of pragmatics is on formal reasoning and abstract symbolism (Jacob L. Mey, 1993 : 12). Theoretically speaking, literary works always play with symbols. In poetry, symbols stand in the same position as sensory details. The above poem has stanzas and sounds and speaks for abstract symbols. This research now is trying to give a reasoning along with its interpretation through metaphorical lines of the poem.

A metaphor is a comparison between unlike things, without the use of *like* or *as*; it is seen in the third stanza of the above-untitled-poem by Neruda.

*But I hear only your voice, your voice
soars with the zing and precision of an arrow,
It drops with the gravity of rain,*

Neruda compares the sound of somebody's voice with the energy; as the contextual meaning of *zing*, and the movement of an arrow. Other obvious metaphorical device is when rain is imaginarily stated as having gravity like *earth*. In our logical sense, senses a question, how can an arrow be precisely falls down in the power of rain ?

The poem is filled with sensory details, description that appeal to the reader's five senses helping him or her to see, hear, feel, smell, and taste what the poet describes. The poem provides details that help readers *hear the voice*. The poet writes

sounds on the second stanza; sounds that are loud and jarring, but which nonetheless cannot drown out the voice.

*The sea fills its cellar with footfalls,
with bells, chains, whimpers,
the tools and the metal jangle
wheels of the caravan creak.*

People often find poetry to be the hardest form of literature to analyze, perhaps because their earlier experiences with poetry stressed appreciation rather than understanding (John Sheridan Biays, Jr & Carol Wershoven, 1988 : 193). Based on these two scholars, there is a step-by-step approach to analyzing poetry, to eliminate the bewilderment and confusion so often associated with the form. The steps elaborate the following elements of a poem : theme, ideas, emotions, literary techniques, style, critique. Let's now find the emotions of the second stanza :

The first line, *The sea fills its cellar with footfalls*; the writer of this article interprets *the sea* here as *the depth of something*, that is metaphorically told by Neruda. Maybe the persona of this poem dreamed about something. We can refer this to the diction cellar and footfalls. The sea of course never has a cellar and no human footfalls are able to walk in the sea! We may perceive an abstract symbols or a hidden meaning from this second stanza.

The Third Poem : *Formula* By Maria Iza

To dream,
you don't have to ask permission,
nor cry out,
nor humble yourself,
nor put on lipstick;
it's enough to close your eyes halfway
and feel distant.
Perhaps the night deams
that it is no longer night;
the fish that they are boats;
the water, crystal.
To dream
is a simple thing,
it doesn't cost a cent,
you need only to turn your back
on the hours that pass
and cover over pain,
your ears,
and stay so,
stay
until we are awakened
by a blow on the soul.

The poet Ana Maria Iza has had her poetry published in *Americas*, a monthly magazine published by the Organization of the American States.

This paper is going to see the poetic devices used. In *Formula*, Ana Maria Iza uses personification when she says *Perhaps the night dreams that it is no longer night*. Other examples of personification found in the poem are *the fish that they are boats; the boats, fish; the water, crystal*.

Besides personification, the poet Ana Maria Iza uses metaphor in *Formula*. Metaphor is a form of figure language in which two seemingly unlike items or situations are compared to one another directly, without the use of *like* or *as*. One example from *Formula* is *Life is a dream*. Poets very often use metaphor to help readers see and feel things the way they do and to give their ideas more impact. In *Formula*, Ana Maria Iza creates an interesting

metaphor when she compares the experience of *awakening from a dream to receiving a blow to the soul*.

Now we see the language use in *Formula* to see an effect of pragmatics. Jacob L. Mey (1993 : 12) stated that the emphasis was on formal reasoning and abstract symbolism. This research then caught the following dictions that stand up as abstract symbols to play the sensory details of the poem : line 19 and line 20 : your *ears*, your *eyes*. These two dictions are used poetically by the poet, Ana Maria Iza in giving a sense of provoking : how can the two human senses of hearing; the ears and eyes take the soul which is said to be blown. Semantically meaning, soul is believed to stay soft in every living creature; saturating its physical and spiritual being. But in *Formula*, a blow on the soul makes us awakened, The soul is abstractly set into a dense, yet hard material which can blow something ! We can give an interpretation here that the language use done by the poet Ana Maria Iza in *Formula* is effective enough to provoke reader's mind and let us to her imaginary world.

THE CONCLUSION

The following are the elaboration of the analysis : From The First Poem : *The Unwritten* By William Stanley Merwin (1927-). The mental evidences of both pragmatism and semantical sense from *The Unwritten : From pragmatics point of view* : the poet uses personified words to deliver his ideas. About its language use, the poet uses daily words concerning nouns, verbs and the adjectives applied. *From semantics point of view* : the poet uses repetition to emphasize the idea of people's inability

to seize the present life. The hidden meaning is repeatedly presented through the pattern of *sounds*; *the phrases the poet repeats* inside the poem : *never been, not for, would I*.

From The Second Poem : *Untitled* By Pablo Neruda (1904 – 1973)

The mental evidences on pragmatics and semantics sense : Pragmatically speaking, the poet uses metaphorical words to describe his ideas. In the form of stanzas, Pablo Neruda gives description so that readers are appealed to see, hear, feel, smell and taste his imaginary description on his theme upon his *Untitled*. Seeing from Semantics point of view : the proof of hidden meaning through Pablo Neruda's *Untitled* : The pine trees speak : symbolically saying the power of nature : such pine trees metaphorically compared with human's voice. The assumption here is that the persona of the poem has a voice in his soul and the dramatic effect appear from the contrast of color : the pine trees surely laid with green colour where on line four : *all the birds of the winter whistle* : winters stands for the white snow ! Green and white will be comparing two different seasons. Green may symbolize the beginning of life, where on this season, trees are growing. Winter may symbolizes death, the end of somebody's journey.

From The Third Poem : *Formula* By Ana Maria Iza. The pragmatism side of this poem is the use of personified and metaphorical words. Line 8: *Perhaps the night dreams* – the plural noun of *dream* leads to an interpretation that the persona of the poem dreams every night; whether those dreams come true or not. This interpretation meets the strengthening point in line 9 : *that is no longer night* – the interpretation moves further that those dreams stay or be in the day, not in a night time. It can lead to multiple interpretation. The day means sunlight where human's

hope lay. Night times are moment of contemplation and planting next wishes. Now the semantics sense : see the first seven lines :

*To dream
you don't have to ask permission
nor cry out,
nor humble yourself
nor put on lipstick;
it's enough to close your eyes halfway
and feel distant.*

The seven lines start with a capital letter and ends with a punctuation (full stop). The writer of this paper believes that it has a main idea, like a paragraph in a formal writing. Now let's see the poetic meaning inside those lines : the persona does not need a permission to dream means that dreaming could be an escape when were down in our circumstances; when were failed to reach our goals, or expectation in life. *Nor cry out, nor humble yourself* mean we do not need to hide our identity, no matter our social or even psychological state of mind. This interpretation is taken from the diction *humble*; it inserts a casual behavior; as an effect of a pressure in nearest life or for some persons, a wise attitude despite of a *comfortable* life.

To sum up, the writer of this article concludes that in the three poems, one can see a pragmatic and semantic sense; and being attributed with each of the function. Jacob L. Mey (1993:25) stated that *logic is in essence an abstraction from language*. In an effort to apply that quotation, the writer of this paper believes that the logic of language can be used to comprehend the poetic meaning of a poem; to communicate the theme or ideas to its reader. This paper concludes that the abstraction resulted is as a process of a reading-act.

REFERENCES

- Biays Jr, Sheridan, John, 1988. *Responding To Literature*, USA:McGraw- Hill Inc
- Candy Dawson Byod, et al. 1997. *Spotlight on Literature*, New York : Macmillan, McGraw Hill
- Iser, Wolfgang, 1997. *The Act of Reading : A Theory of Aesthetic Response*, USA: The John Hopkins University Press
- Lyons, John, 1966. *Linguistic Semantic*, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press
- Mey, I. Jacob, 1993. *Pragmatic*, Great Britain : T.J. Press Limited
- Olsen, Haugom, Stein, 1978. *The Structure of Literary Understanding*, UK : Cambridge University Press
- Robey, David; Jefferson, Ann, *Modern Literary Theory*, USA : Barnes & Noble Books
- Verschueren, 1999. *Understanding Pragmatics*, New York : Oxford University Press