

THE NON-OBSERVANCE OF THE CONVERSATIONAL MAXIMS: AN ANALYSIS OF THE DIALOGUES IN ARTHUR MILLER'S *THE CRUCIBLE*

Yuvike¹; Menik Winiharti²

^{1,2} English Department, Faculty of Language and Culture, Bina Nusantara University,
Jln. Kemanggisian Ilir III No. 45, Kemanggisian/Palmerah, Jakarta Barat 11480

ABSTRACT

Article deploys the application of Cooperative Principle in analyzing the dialogues in Arthur Miller's The Crucible. The applied research methods were qualitative and quantitative methods. The dialogue of the play were transferred in the form of excerpts to the computer manually. Then the application of The Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims was analyzed and its occurrences are counted. It is found that The Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims are applied in the play. The categories of The Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims that are applied are flouting the maxims, violating the maxims, and opting out a maxim. The most frequent category of The Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims is flouting quality by using metaphor while the least frequent one is flouting quantity.

Keywords: cooperative principle, non-observance, conversational maxims

ABSTRAK

Artikel membahas penerapan Cooperative Principle untuk menganalisis percakapan yang terdapat dalam The Crucible karya Arthur Miller. Metode penelitian adalah kualitatif dan kuantitatif. Dialog dalam drama dipindahkan secara manual menjadi bentuk potongan dialog. Kemudian, penerapan teori the Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims dianalisis dan kemunculannya dihitung. Ditemukan bahwa the Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims memang diterapkan dalam drama ini, yaitu flouting quality dengan menggunakan metafora sedangkan yang muncul paling sedikit adalah flouting quantity.

Kata kunci: cooperative principle, non-observance, conversational maxims

INTRODUCTION

Plays or dramas have been entertainment for people since centuries ago. Although people might not read plays much in this modern era, but still, they are the 'root' of modern entertainment such as Films, TV dramas, TV series, etc. In written plays, the sentences that form the dialogues among the characters are the soul of the story. Di Gianni (2000:723) mentions the importance of dialogues in plays, "Like fiction, drama relies on dialogue and description, which take the form of *stage directions*, lines describing characters, scenes, or actions with clues to production." In order to appreciate and enjoy the plays well, the dialogues and description must be imagined since they will lead the readers to the world of imagination in their mind.

The dialogues in plays often contain symbolization, idiomatic expression, proverb, etc., that sometimes make the sentences in the dialogues ambiguous, convey implied meanings, too informative, etc. There is a theory called *Cooperative Principle* (CP) that is proposed by Grice as mentioned in Yule (1996). It is against the sentences that are ambiguous, convey implied meanings, too informative, etc. The general rules of the CP that Grice proposes are: "make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage in which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." (Yule 1996: 37) This is a pragmatic rule in conversation which is then elaborated in four maxims:

Quantity: (a) Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange); (b) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Quality:

Try to make your contribution a true one.(a) Do not say what you believe to be false; (b) Do not say those that lack adequate evidence.

Relation: be relevant

Manner: Be perspicuous; Avoid obscurity of expression, Avoid ambiguity, Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), Be orderly.

(cited in Yule, 1996:37).

The rule appears to 'manage' conversations, so that the conversation does not contain too many wrong, irrelevant, and much too long forms of information. Yule (1996:37) says, "It is important to recognize these maxims, as unstated assumption we have in conversation." One example of the cooperative dialogue according to CP is as follows:

"Where is Mary?" (1)

"She is at home, in her room."

The dialogue in (1) is cooperative according to Grice's maxims because it observes every of the maxims above. B gives sufficient information about where Mary is, gives correct information, gives relevant answer to the question of A, and gives perspicuous answer (not ambiguous, orderly, and brief).

Cutting's (2002) Version of The Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims

There is another theory of conversation with CP as the basic theory. It is the *Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims Theory* proposed by Cutting (2002). It is classified into 5 categories:

Flouting the Maxims

Flouting the maxims is defined as when speakers do not seem to follow the maxims but expect the listener to generate the implications, not taking the words at the face value. *Flouting the maxim* is divided into *flouting quantity*, *flouting quality*, *flouting relation*, and *flouting manner*.

Flouting Quantity

Flouting quantity is when the speaker gives less or more information than is needed. There is one example from Cutting (2002:37)

Well, how do I look? (2)
Your shoes are nice...

In (2), A is expected to understand the implicature that only the shoes are nice, which means the others are not. A might expect B to tell about the whole appearance, and B expects A to understand by giving less information.

Flouting Quality

Flouting quality is defined as saying something that does not represent what they think. Here is one example:

May: I think I am the most beautiful girl in the world. (3)
Ben: Yeah, and I am the king of the world.

in (3), May is boasting around. Then Ben's answer does not mean that he is boasting around, too, but he just wants May to stop boasting around by saying something that is really wrong. He wants May to look for the message behind the line, in which Ben is not the king of the world.

In the section of *flouting quality*, it is said that the maxim of quality can be flouted not only by saying something that does not represent the truth, but also by using *hyperbole*, *metaphor*, *irony*, *banter*, and *sarcasm*.

Hornby (1995:586) defines *hyperbole* as an exaggerating language for effect. One example of *flouting quality* by using hyperbole is:

Ann: Johnny Depp is so cute. (4)
Jean: Yes, I can eat him alive.

In (4), Jean exaggerates her utterance by saying that she could eat Johnny Depp alive. In reality, Jean will not eat Johnny Depp alive; she says that to express her admiration to him.

Next, using *metaphor* is to use imaginative phrase or word to describe somebody or something to another object to give emphasis of the shared quality (Hornby, 1995:734). To make it more understandable, below is one example of *metaphor*:

My house is a refrigerator in January. (5)
(Cutting, 2002:38)

The *metaphor* in (5) compares the refrigerator with the speaker's room. Refrigerator is cold, therefore, the speaker means that his/her room is really cold in January.

Another way of flouting quality is by using *irony* and *banter*. Leech (1983) says, "While irony is an apparent friendly way of being offensive (mock-politeness), the type of verbal behavior known as "banter" is an offensive way of being friendly (mock impoliteness)." Here is one example of *irony*:

Mandy is protesting her husband's behavior earlier in a party, "You know, I'm really proud that you told everyone our marriage problem in the party." (6)

Actually, in (6) Mandy is not proud of her husband's behavior. Through *irony*, she wants to emphasize her disappointment to her husband.

Next, this is an example of *banter*:

"My mean and ugly daughter can't give me just one hug?" (7)

Through (7), the speaker does not mean to insult the daughter, but to show the affection and the level of intimacy.

The last way of flouting the maxim of quality is by using *sarcasm*. *Sarcasm* is defined as "remarks that imply the opposite of what they appear to mean and are intended to upset or mock somebody." (Hornby, 1995:1041). Below is one example of *sarcasm*:

"Why don't you ask your beloved moron friend to help you?" (8)

The speaker of (8) does not mean to have a joke, but really intends to hurt the interlocutor.

Flouting Relation

In *flouting relation*, the hearers are expected to imagine the utterance that is not said as the answer to the question. Here is an example of *flouting relation*:

A: So what do you think of Mark?
B: His flatmate's a wonderful cook. (9)
(Cutting, 2002:39)

B's answer in (9) means that she is not too impressed with Mark by not saying anything about mark. Instead, she compliments Mark's flatmate. So, she has implied the answer to the question.

Flouting Manner

The last category in flouting the maxims is *flouting manner*. *Flouting manner* is done by being obscure and often excludes a third party. Here is the example:

A: Where are you off to?
B: I was thinking of going out to get some of that funny white stuff for somebody.
A: OK, but don't be long – dinner's nearly ready. (10)
(Cutting, 2002:39)

The example in (10) is a conversation between husband and wife. 'that funny white stuff' means ice cream and 'somebody' refers to a third party named Michelle. The husband is trying to be obscure because he does not want Michelle, his daughter to know that he is going to go to buy some ice cream for her.

Violating the Maxims

The next category of the Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims is *violating the maxims*. A speaker is said to have violated the maxims by giving the wrong information intentionally, so that the hearer will only know the literal meaning of the utterance. There are four categories of violating the maxims. They are: *violating quality*, *violating quantity*, *violating relation*, and *violating manner*. Here are some examples from Cutting (2002:40) for further explanation:

Violating quality:

Husband: *How much did that new dress cost, darling?*

Wife: *Thirty-five pounds.* (11)

The wife has violated the maxim of quality because the price of the dress is more expensive than the price she has said. It is possible she does it because she does not want her husband to know that the dress costs a lot.

Violating quantity:

Husband: *How much did that new dress cost, darling?*

Wife: *Less than the last one.* (12)

In (12), the wife has violated the maxim of quantity because she does not mention the price of the dress. She has given less information than is needed.

Violating relation:

Husband: *How much did that new dress cost, darling?*

Wife: *I know, let's go out tonight. Now, where would you like to go?* (13)

The wife's answer in (13) is categorized as *violating relation* because her answer is irrelevant to the question. It is obvious that she is trying to avoid the topic.

Violating manner:

Husband: *How much did that new dress cost, darling?*

Wife: *A tiny fraction of my salary, though probably a bigger fraction of the salary of the woman that sold it to me.* (14)

The wife's answer above in (14) has violated manner because her answer is too long and obscure. She probably expects that by saying that, the matter can be avoided.

The other forms of *the Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims* are *infringing the maxim* and *opting out the maxim*. These two categories are without implied meaning and not intentionally done.

Infringing the Maxims

Infringing the maxim is failing to observe the conversational maxims because of the imperfection of the linguistics performance (baby's talk or foreign language learner), impaired performance (nervous, drunk, too excited), cognitive impairment, and incapable to speak clearly. (Thomas cited in Cutting, 2002:41)

Opting Out the Maxims

A speaker is *opting out the maxim* means that he or she is unwilling to cooperate because of certain reasons. Here is one example for opting out the maxim:

Police: *Who is your informant?*

Suspect: *I'm sorry I can't give you the name.* (15)

In (15), the suspect refuses to give the informant's name probably because of ethical reason. Therefore, he refuses to cooperate according to the maxims.

It is believed that *the Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims* in the plays' dialogues make the story more interesting to read. It can be said that the application is one of the ingredients to create interesting plays. Moreover, it is interested to find the categories of *The Non-observance of The*

Conversational Maxims Theory that are used in the play, the implied meanings, and the purposes of applying *The Non-observance of The Conversational Maxims Theory*.

Miller's *The Crucible* is chosen as the object of the analysis for some reasons. The format of this play, which is in the form of dialogues, is very suitable to the theory. Also, the play is a classic one that signals the existence of *the Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims Theory* in the dialogues since old English language in plays is often poetic. The poetic language usually contains implied meanings, ambiguous, too informative, etc. The last reason is the 'tense' feeling that is caused by reading this play. It is really attracting.

RESEARCH METHODS

The source of the data is the dialogues in Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*. The method of data collection is non-experimental by collecting the dialogues in the play that fail to observe the conversational maxims in specific ways. Before analyzing, the first thing that is done is finding the dialogues that fail to observe the conversational maxims in the play. The dialogues are then converted in the form of excerpts manually.

Next the analysis is classified into three sections. They are the sections of flouting the maxims, violating the maxims, and Opting out the maxims. After that, the dialogues from the play that fail to observe the maxims are categorized according to the *the Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims Theory* which is found in Cutting (2000). Then, the implied meaning of the application is generated based on the Conversational Implicature theory and the purpose of the application is the next thing to be analyzed.

The last step is counting the occurrences of *the Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims Theory* that are applied in the dialogues. The occurrence of each category of *the Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims Theory* is also calculated to find the frequencies of the occurrences.

RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

In this chapter, the theory that is used is Grice's theory on *The Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims Theory* as found in Cutting (2000). It is used to categorize the excerpts into the categories of *The Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims Theory*. The analysis is divided into three sections: *Flouting the maxims, Violating the maxims, and Opting out the maxims*. In every section, the excerpts of the dialogues that fail to observe the conversational maxims are analyzed. These excerpts are categorized according to the ways of failing to observe the conversational maxims. Then, the implied meaning of every excerpt is generated and the purpose is also analyzed.

Examples of Data

Flouting the Maxims

This section is about not observing the maxims and conveying implied meaning at the same time. There are five categories in this section: flouting quality by using metaphor, flouting quality by using hyperbole, flouting quantity, flouting relation, and flouting manner.

Flouting Quality by using Metaphor

The excerpts in Table 1 flout quality by using metaphor. It compares two objects with the same characteristics.

Table 1 Using Metaphor in Flouting Quality

Excerpt	Implied meaning	Purpose
(Parris is asking Abigail about what might cause his daughter's illness.) Parris (<i>pointing at Betty</i>): You call this sport? (<i>she lowers her eyes. He pleads.</i>) Abigail, if you know something that may help the doctor, for God's sake tell it to me. (<i>She is silent.</i>) I saw Tituba waving her arms over the fire when I came on you. Why was she doing that? And I heard a screeching and gibberish from her mouth. <u>She were swaying like a dumb beast over that fire!</u> (p. 19-20)	Parris is really suspicious because he thinks Tituba's dance is not just a common dance.	He wants some explanation about what the girls did the night before.

Parris' dialogue flouts the maxim of quality because he uses metaphor to describe what Tituba did the night before. The metaphorical expression underlined in the excerpt conveys an implied meaning that Parris is really suspicious that Tituba's dancing is not just a common dance. He suspects Tituba, Ruth, Abigail, Mercy, Marry, and Betty to have done a witchcraft activity. The activity might cause Betty's illness. Parris' purpose in doing so is to ask some explanation regarding something that the girls did the night before. It might help the doctor to find the cause of Betty's illness.

Flouting Quality by Using Hyperbole

The excerpt in the following table flouts quality using hyperbolic expression because the speaker exaggerates the words to give stronger effect or emphasis on the real meaning.

Table 2 Flouting Quality by Using Hyperbolic Expression

Excerpt	Implied meaning	Purpose
(Parris is investigating Abigail about what she did in the forest with Betty the night before.) Parris: <u>I cannot blink what I saw, Abigail for my enemies will not blink it.</u> I saw a dress lying on the grass. (p. 20)	Parris is very shocked to see a dress lying on the grass.	To emphasize that what he saw is really shocking that he cannot blink his eyes.

In Parris' line, he exaggerates his line by saying that he cannot blink what he saw, but in reality, he surely can blink and what he saw will not make him unable to blink. By exaggerating, he conveys the meaning that he has seen a dress lying on the grass, and it is really unusual, even shocking because he thinks he saw someone naked running in the forest. His purpose is to emphasize on how shocked he is to see a dress lying on the grass that he cannot blink his eyes. He is also really suspicious about that.

Flouting Quality by Using Hyperbole and Metaphor

The following is flouting the maxim of quality by using hyperbole and metaphor at the same time since both applications are found in one excerpt.

Table 3 Flouting Quality by Using Hyperbole and Metaphor

Excerpt	Implied meaning	Purpose
<p>(Excerpt 33) (Proctor is protesting Elizabeth about how she treats him.) Proctor: Spare me! You forget nothin' and forgive nothin'. Learn charity, woman. I have gone tiptoe in this house all seven month since she is gone. I have not moved from there to there without I think to please you, and still an <u>everlasting funeral marches round your heart</u>. I cannot speak but I am doubted, <u>every moment judged for lies, as though I come into a court when I come into this house!</u> (pg 55)</p>	<p><u>everlasting funeral marches round your heart:</u> Always feels sad.</p> <p><u>every moment judged for lies, as though I come into a court when I come into this house!:</u> Proctor is always judged at home as if he is in court.</p>	<p><u>everlasting funeral marches round your heart:</u> To exaggerate the sadness that is having by Elizabeth.</p> <p><u>every moment judged for lies, as though I come into a court when I come into this house!:</u> To say his opinion about the judging in his house.</p>

In his line, Proctor exaggerates the sadness that Elizabeth has as an everlasting funeral that marches round her heart. Since Elizabeth finds out that Proctor has cheated on her, she always feels sad. That is the implied meaning of Proctor's dialogue. Proctor says that because he is still amazed since Elizabeth has not recovered yet from her sadness. He wants Elizabeth to know that he is disappointed and wants her to forgive him.

Besides that, Proctor also compares his house with the court. What he means by comparing his house with the court is that he feels really judged by his wife whenever he is home. It has been like that since he has ended his affair with Abigail. Proctor's purpose in comparing his house with the court is to remind Elizabeth so that she will not judge him anymore.

Flouting quantity

The excerpt in table 4. flouts quantity because the information given is either less or too informative.

Table 4 Flouting Quantity

Excerpt	Implied meaning	Purpose
<p>(Proctor is asking Giles to leave with him because he doesn't like the witchcraft topic.) Proctor (<i>to</i> Hale): I never spoke on witches one way or the other. Will you come, Giles? Giles: No – no, John, I think not. <u>I have some few peer questions of my own to ask this fellow.</u> (p. 41)</p>	<p>Giles is really interested in the witchcraft topic.</p>	<p>To say his interest in witchcraft topic indirectly.</p>

In order to observe the maxim of quantity, Giles should just answer “No – no, John, I think not”, because this answer has given the right amount of information. However, Giles gives too many information by adding something more in his answer that flouts the maxim of quantity. There is an implied meaning in his additional information: Giles is really interested in Hale’s knowledge about witchcraft. Giles purpose of adding more information than is needed is that he wants to say his interest to Proctor indirectly because Proctor does not like the topic.

Flouting relation

The excerpt in the following table flouts relation because the answer given is not relevant to the topic.

Table 5 Flouting Relation

Excerpt	Implied meaning	Purpose
(Hale is investigating Tituba about Betty’s condition.) Hale: Why can she not wake? Are you silencing this child? Tituba: <u>I love me Betty!</u> (p. 46)	Tituba loves Betty, so she is not silencing Betty.	To deny the accusation of silencing Betty by saying that she loves Betty.

Tituba’s answer in the excerpt above is not relevant because Parris does not ask her if she loves Betty. The implied meaning of Tituba’s answer is that she does not do anything bad to Betty. Tituba loves Betty, she will not do anything bad to her. Tituba says her line because she thinks her answer is more convincing if she says that.

Flouting manner

The excerpt in table 6. below flouts manner because their answer is obscure, ambiguous, not brief and not in order.

Table 6 Flouting Manner

Excerpt	Implied meaning	Purpose
(Proctor and Abigail is having an argument) Proctor (<i>shaking her</i>): Do you looking for whipping? (<i>A psalm is heard being sung below</i>) Abigail (<i>in tears</i>): <u>I look for John Proctor that took me from my sleep and put knowledge in my heart! I never knew what pretence Salem was, I never knew the lying lessons I was taught by all these Christian women and their covenanted men! And now you bid me tear the light out of my eyes? I will not, I cannot! You loved me, John Proctor, and whatever sin it is, you love me yet!</u> (p. 30)	Abigail really loves John Proctor	To say how much Abigail loves Proctor.

Abigail's answer in the excerpt above is obscure and a prolixity since Proctor only asks her if she looks for whipping. The implied meaning of Abigail's line is simply that she loves Proctor. She says a prolixity line because she wants to describe how much she loves Proctor.

Violating the maxim

The excerpt in table 7. below violates the maxim of quality because they are intentionally done to give misleading information without implied meaning.

Table 7 Violating Quality

Excerpt	Purpose
(Parris is investigating Abigail about what she did with Betty, Tituba, Ruth, Mercy, and Marry the night before.) Parris: Now, look you child, your punishment will come in its time. But if you trafficked with spirits in the forest i must know it now, for surely my enemies will, and they will ruin me with it. Abigail: <u>But we never conjured spirits.</u> (p. 19)	Abigail does not want to admit her crime.

When Parris is trying to investigate Abigail whether she does the witchcraft activity or not, Abigail is lying. Although she says that she never conjured spirits, but the night before, Tituba, Abigail, Betty, Ruth, Mercy, and Mary did a witchcraft activity. Abigail has tried to kill John Proctor's wife through witchcraft while Tituba has tried to conjure Ruth Putnam's dead sisters. Abigail does not want to confess because the punishment for doing witchcraft is hanged by the neck.

Opting out the maxim

Opting out the maxim is when a speaker refuses to cooperate according to the conversational maxims for certain reasons without implied meaning.

Table 8 Opting out a Maxim

Excerpts	Purpose
(Tituba is asking Betty's condition to Mr. Parris.) Tituba (<i>already taking a step backward</i>): My Betty be hearty soon? Parris: <u>Out of here!</u> (p. 17)	Parris wants to be left alone.

Parris is very sad because Betty is very ill. He wants to be left alone so that he can pray for Betty's health and think clearly about what to do to save his daughter.

The Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims Theory that occurs in the play can be distributed as follows:

Table 9 The Occurrence of The Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims applications in Miller's *The Crucible*

No.	Categories	occurrences	(%)
1.	Flouting the maxims		
1.1.	Flouting quality		
1.1.1.	Flouting quality by using metaphor	22	40
1.1.2.	Flouting quality by using hyperbole	10	18
1.1.3.	Flouting quality by using metaphor and hyperbole	2	4
1.2.	Flouting quantity	1	2
1.3.	Flouting relation	3	5
1.4.	Flouting manner	6	11
2.	Violating quality	6	11
3.	Opting out a maxim	5	9
	Total	55	100

Flouting the maxims consists of *flouting quality*, *flouting quantity*, *flouting relation*, and *flouting manner*. *Flouting quality* consists of *flouting quality* by using *metaphor*, by using *hyperbole*, and by using *metaphor* and *hyperbole*. There are 22 applications (40%) of *flouting quality* by using *metaphor*, 10 applications (18%) of *flouting quality* by using *hyperbole*, and 2 applications (4%) of *flouting quality* by using *metaphor* and *hyperbole*.

The next category in *flouting the maxims* is *flouting quantity*. 1 application (2%) is found in the dialogues of 'The Crucible'. Then, there are 3 applications (5%) of *flouting relation* and 6 applications (11%) of *flouting manner*. *Violating the maxims* is the next category of *The Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims*. There are 6 applications (11%) of *violating quality* from the category of *violating the maxims*. Then, there are 5 applications (9%) of *opting out the maxim*. Therefore, the category of *The Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims* category that occurs most is *flouting quality* by using *metaphor* and the category that occurs least is *flouting quantity*.

There are various purposes of not observing the conversational maxims, but there is a common pattern in *flouting quality* by using *metaphor* and *flouting quality* by using *hyperbole*. In *flouting quality* by using *metaphor*, the purpose is generally to describe something by comparing one thing with another that has the same characteristics. Then, in *flouting quality* by using *hyperbole*, the purpose is generally to make a stronger meaning or emphasis on something by exaggerating it.

CONCLUSION

The important points that are drawn from the analysis are about the categories of The Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims that are applied in the dialogues of Miller's *The Crucible*, the occurrence of the categories of *the Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims Theory* that are applied in the play, and the purposes of not observing the conversational maxims. The applications of *The Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims Theory* are found in the dialogues of Miller's *The Crucible*. *The Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims Theory* that is applied are *flouting the maxims*, *violating the maxims*, and *opting out the maxim*. *Flouting the maxims* consists of *flouting quality*, *flouting quantity*, *flouting relation*, and *flouting manner*. *Flouting quality* is done in three ways, they are: *flouting quality* by using *metaphor*, by using *hyperbole*, and using both *metaphor* and *hyperbole*. In *violating the maxims* category, only *violating quality* is found in the dialogues of Miller's *The Crucible*.

REFERENCES

- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Di Yanni, R. (2000). *Literature: Reading Fiction, Poetry, and Drama*. Singapore: The McGraw Hill Companies.
- Hornby, A. S. (1995). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Pearson Education Limited.
- Miller, A. (1953). *The Crucible*. United States of America: Penguin Groups.
- Yule, George. (1996). *Pragmatics*. London: Oxford University Press.