

A PRAGMATIC STUDY ON CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURES IN FELICIA N. S.'S *HUMOR POLITIK INDONESIA*

Santi Wahyufi Diningsih

santiwahyufidiningsih401@gmail.com

Pascasarjana Universitas Sebelas Maret

Andayani

Pascasarjana Universitas Sebelas Maret

Muhammad Rohmadi

Pascasarjana Universitas Sebelas Maret

ABSTRACT

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics whose focus is on meaning expressed by speakers or writers and interpreted by listeners or readers. The benefit of learning a language through pragmatics is that one can speak words about the meaning intended by others. This will be very interesting if the analysis material used is a humor book. The reason for the author to choose humor books as the material to study was to enrich research related to humor discourse. This paper describes the results of a pragmatic analysis of the implied meaning (implicature) as found in the book *Humor Politik Indonesia*. This study adopted a descriptive qualitative method. The result indicates that the implicatures in the book are expressing satire, expressing request, expressing annoyance, expressing suggestion, expressing reports, rejecting, misleading, mocking, concluding, and criticizing.

Key words: *pragmatics, written discourse, humor, implicature, conversational implicature*

INTRODUCTION

Language is a tool used to interact with each other. In interaction, it is necessary to have a means, namely, how to use language with a set of speech tools. One form of interaction used is to have a conversation. Samsuri (1995) reveals that conversation is an oral interaction with a face-to-face meeting between two or more participants and more than just exchanging information. Based on

Samsuri's statement, it can be seen that a conversation that has occurred is largely determined by the communicators (speaker and listener), age, gender, place of conversation, and context so that there is an interpretation process done by the listener and reader. The interpretation involves what the people intend to say in a particular context and how that context affects what is said. They need to consider several things to organize what they want

to say so as to be adjusted to the listeners.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURES

The term pragmatics was first used by Charles Morris in 1938, focusing on the study of the general form of signs, as well as semiotics (Levinson, 2008). Pragmatics is also related to the research regarding the meaning communicated by speakers or authors and then interpreted by speech partners (Yule, 1996). Fetzer (2012) also explains pragmatics. According to him, it has a lot to do with communicative actions and their felicity ability in context, what can be counted as the underlying actions, what are the conditions needed to be satisfied in performing actions, and how those actions relate to context.

Pragmatics is a study related to the form of language and the user of language (Yule, 1996:4). Broadly, Mey (2001:6) has suggested that pragmatics examine the usefulness of language in human communication that may vary across societies. Society is a determining factor because the communication that occurs is always influenced by meaning. As it is known that the community where a language is spoken serves a controller of the language access. Community here is referred to as context.

Jucker (1998) suggests that pragmatics refers to the study of meaning in interactions that includes the meaning of the speaker and the contexts in which the utterances are issued. In addition, Ninio and Snow (1996) also state that children have pragmatic ability with their use of nonverbal communication.

Based on several opinions reviewed above, it can be concluded that pragmatics is a study that examines how the speakers use the language in communication with the community, and this communication considers the context of speakers and society. In the process of communication, pragmatics is not only limited to spoken

language but also in writing. It can be concluded that pragmatic research is not only limited to speakers and speech partners but also writers and readers. Kridalaksana in Tarigan (2009) suggests that a written discourse is a re-expression of discourse without quoting literally the words used by the speaker using grammatical constructions or certain words, including subordinate, the word that, and so on. Written discourse became known after the discovery of letters. Here letters act as a substitute for the role of language sounds, so usually people say that letters are symbols of sounds. The letters are learned by humans and then used to convey information to others who live far apart. Examples of short written discourses that are commonly encountered are usually advertisements, writings about prohibition, *funny memes* and so on.

Purwo (1990) suggests that pragmatics is a study of utterance meaning bound by the context. Meanwhile, treating language pragmatically is the same as treating language by considering its context, namely its use in communication events.

Nababan (1997) posits that conversational implicature is one of the most important concepts in pragmatics as a branch of linguistics. Conversational implicature was proposed by H.P. Grice in the "William James Lecture" at Harvard University in 1967 to discuss the problem of meaning that cannot be discussed satisfactorily by linguistics. Grice (in Soeseno, 1993) suggests that implicature is an utterance that implies something different from what is spoken. Implicature is a purpose, a desire, or a hidden expression of the heart. Implicature is also interpreted as the intention hidden behind the utterance (Pranowo in Pangesti Wiedarti, 2005). In other words, implicature is created when a person

speaks or writes something that is talked about and written down is not the same as intended.

Implicature is a proposition that implies the utterance of a sentence in a context even though the proposition is not part of what is said (Gazdar, 1979:38). Horn (2008:3) in detail reveals the implicature is a component of the speaker's meaning that has an aspect of what is meaningful in the speaker's speech without being part of what he or she is saying. In other words, implicature has the hidden intention of an utterance.

Implicature is classified into two, namely conventional implicature and conversational implicature (Grice, 1975:45). Conventional implicature is an implicature which is a part of a agreed meaning of the lexical item or expression, not a derived meaning from language use principle. Huang (2012) adds that conversational implicature is the meaning implied or depicted from a conversation, but not mentioned explicitly in the conversation.

The intended meaning in the conversational implicature is one of the most important ideas in pragmatics (Levinson, 2008). First, the implicature stands as a paradigmatic example of the pragmatic explanations of linguistic phenomena. Second, it is an explicit account of how implicature can be interpreted more than what is said.

In order for the conversational implicature to have more rational possibilities, it requires the underlying principles. Grice (1975:47) divides the principles into four maxims, including: quality, quantity, relevance, and manner maxims. The quality maxim is detected from how truthful somebody is when delivering a message. The quantity maxim is related to the amount of information given in a conversation. The maxim of relevance is used to produce the

implicatures related to the topic (Levinson, 2008). Meanwhile, the manner maxim is used so that the speech occurs directly but not excessively.

Grice (in Tarigan, 2009) suggests that in a conversation, it usually requires cooperation between speakers and speech partners to achieve a desired goal. The principles that regulate cooperation between speakers and speech partners in speech acts are called the principle of cooperation. Each speaker must adhere to four conversational maxims as mentioned above, namely maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance and maxim of manner. The rule of the four maxims proposed by Grice (in Tarigan, 2009) is as follows; (1) The maxim of quantity is a provision of an appropriate amount of information, (2) the maxim of quality is an effort made to contribute correctly to the conversation, (3) The maxim of relevance is a form of focusing the attention to the conversation, and (4) The maxim of manner to select the way to express the meaning. With these maxims, a speaker is required to interpret the words used by the interlocutor based on the contexts in which they are used.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research uses a qualitative descriptive approach. Kirk and Miller (1986) suggest that qualitative research is a certain tradition in social science that fundamentally depends on human observation both in its area and in its terminology. The data analysis used here is an *interactive model* of analysis based on pragmatic studies by paying attention to the context of speech in the written discourse in the book *Humor Politik Indonesia* by Felicia N S.

The data were collected by reading the book and recording (in writing) the speech utterances found in the book. After the data were collected; data reduction

was performed. Data reduction is a process performed by selecting, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming "rough" data that arises from written records in the field. Data reduction was performed after all data were collected to identify the qualified data. The selected data that matched the criteria determined by the researcher were grouped and organized so that the conclusions could be drawn and verified. This was done to make it easier to retrieve important data.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings and discussion are presented below.

FINDINGS

The findings can be summarized in the respective data examples below.

Example 1

Humor theme: New Order

Humor title: "*Buruh Tani, Konglomerat, dan Jenderal*"

The humor:

Tersebutlah tiga orang bersaudara: seorang buruh tani, seorang konglomerat (dan seorang jenderal) mengajak mereka makan malam di restoran terkenal di Jakarta. Tapi mereka datang agak terlambat. Begitu masuk restoran, seorang pelayan dengan sopan menemui mereka. Pelayan itu berkata bahwa restoran hampir tutup karena kehabisan bahan- bahanku. "Maaf, kami kekurangan daging impor", kata sang pelayan.

Pernyataan pelayan itu dianggap berbeda.

Buruh tani: "Daging impor itu apa, sih?"

Konglomerat: "Kekurangan itu apa?"

Jenderal: "Maaf itu apa?"

The translation:

[There are three brothers: a farm laborer, a rich man and a general. The rich one invited them to dinner at a famous restaurant in Jakarta. But they came a bit late. As soon as they entered the restaurant, a waiter politely greeted them. The waiter said that the restaurant was about to close because they ran out of food ingredients. "Sorry, we lack imported meat", said the waiter.

The waiter's statement was understood differently.

Farm laborer: "What is 'imported meat', anyway?"

Rich man: "What is 'lack'?"

General: "What is 'sorry'?"]

The results of the above discourse analysis are as follows. The form of the implicature is "asking". In example no. 1 above the farm workers and rich man were not familiar with the utterances spoken by servants while the generals did not understand the utterances of farm workers and rich man.

Example 2

Humor theme: New Order

Humor title: "*Hubungan antara Pancasila dan UUD 1945*"

The humor:

Dalam sebuah penataran P-4 di sebuah kampus, seorang penceramah bingung melihat para peserta terkantuk-kantuk. Untuk menghangatkan suasana, ia memutuskan mengadakan sesi tanya jawab dengan menunjuk mahasiswa secara acak. Pertanyaan pertama, "Bagaimana hubungan Pancasila dengan UUD 45?"

Tak ada yang menjawab. Sang penceramah langsung menunjuk se-

orang mahasiswa yang duduk di pojok belakang. 'Rizal langsung menjawab, "Baik-baik aja, Pak!"

The translation:

[In a workshop for the nation philosophy internalization at a campus, a speaker was confused to see that all the participants are drowsy. To warm up the atmosphere, he decided to hold a question-and-answer session by randomly appointing students to answer. The first question, "How is Pancasila related to the Constitution 45?"

No one answered. The speaker immediately pointed to a college student sitting in the back corner. 'Rizal immediately replied, "Just fine, sir!"]

The results of the above discourse analysis are as follows. The form of the implicature is "misleading."

In the example 2, the speaker asked the students seriously, but the student responded to it in a misleading way as if he was joking with his friends.

Example 3

Humor theme: New Order

Humor title: "Anak Komunis"

The humor:

Di sebuah kelas di sekolah dasar, seorang guru bertanya kepada murid-muridnya.

Guru: "Siapa yang membangun Indonesia"

Murid-murid serentak: "ORDE BARU!"

Guru: "Siapa yang membangun sekolah-sekolah termasuk sekolah kita?"

Murid-murid serentak: "ORDE BARU!"

Tampaknya semua murid kompak menjawab dengan lantang. Tapi,

begitu diperhatikan lebih cermat ternyata tidak semua meneriakkan Orde Baru. Ada seorang murid yang sejak tadi diam saja.

Guru mendatanginya. "Kenapa kamu tidak menjawab seperti teman-temanmu?"

"Sebab Saya PKI," jawab si murid.

"Kenapa kamu PKI?"

"Sebab ayah saya PKI dan Ibu saya juga PKI," jawab si murid

Guru itu merasa simpati kepada si murid. Dengan lembut ia berkata, "Walaupun orang tuamu keduanya PKI, tapi kamu kan tidak harus menjadi PKI. Kalau ayah dan ibumu pencuri, masak kamu mau jadi pencuri," kata Guru.

Si murid menjawab kalem, "Kalau orang tua saya pencuri, tentu saya pilih Orde Baru."

The translation:

[In a classroom of an elementary school, a teacher asked his students.

Teacher: "Who built Indonesia"

Students in unison: "NEW ORDER!"

Teacher: "Who built the schools including ours?"

Students in unison: "NEW ORDER!"

It seemed that all of them agreed and answered aloud. But, as you look closely, it turns out that not all students shouted, 'New Order'. There was a student who had been silent since the beginning.

The teacher came to him. "Why don't you answer like your friends do?"

"Because I am a communist," replied the student.

"Why are you a communist?"

"Because my father was a communist party member and my mother was too," replied the student.

The teacher felt sympathy for him. He gently said, "Although your parents are both communists, you don't have to be a communist. If your father and mother are thieves, then you want to be a thief?" the teacher said.

The student replied calmly, "If my parents are thieves, of course I choose the New Order."]

The implicature is the intention to mislead the readers. In example no. 3, the student managed to mislead the teacher so that he felt sympathy with him.

Example 4

Humor theme: New Order

Humor title: "Hadiah untuk Pahlawan"

The humor:

Seorang jenderal memanggil tiga orang prajurit yang dianggap pahlawan setelah bertugas di Aceh.

Jenderal itu berkata, "Karena ini bukan benar-benar perang, saya tidak bisa memberi kalian medali.

Nah, yang harus kalian lakukan adalah pengorbanan yang diukur dengan menentukan jarak di antara dua titik di tubuh kalian. Saya akan memberikan 100 ribu untuk tiap sentinya. Kita mulai dari kamu," sang jenderal menunjuk salah satu prajurit.

Bisono: "Dari ujung kepala ke ujung kaki, jenderal."

Jenderal: "Bagus. Panjangnya 180 senti, berarti kamu mendapat Rp 18 juta. Lumayan bisa buat beli motor."

Cecep: "Dari ujung jari kiri ke ujung jari kanan, Jenderal."

Jenderal: "Bagus sekali, 185 senti, jadi totalnya Rp 18,5 juta. Lantas kamu gimana?"

Agus: "Dari pundak ke kelingking, Pak"

Jenderal: "Aneh...., tapi baiklah."

Agus: "Tertinggal di Aceh."

The translation:

[A general summoned three soldiers who were considered heroes after serving in Aceh.

The general said, "Since it's not real war, I can't give you guys medals.

Well, what you have to do is to measure the sacrifice that is calculated by determining the distance between two points in your body. I will give 100 thousand for each centimeter. We start with you," the general pointed one of the soldiers.

Bisono: "From head to toe, General."

General: "Good. The length is 180 centimeters, meaning you get Rp 18 million. It's not bad. You can buy a motorcycle."

Cecep: "From the left fingertip to the right fingertip, General."

General: "Very good, 185 centimeters, so the total is 18.5 million. Then, what about you?"

Agus: "From the shoulder to my little finger, General"

General: "It's weird...., but all right. How long?"

Agus: "I left it behind in Aceh, General."]

Example 5

Humor theme: New Order

Humor title: "Rasain Lu"

The humor:

Mamat korban pengusuran penguasa Orde Baru, baru saja bekerja sebagai pegawai rendahan di kantor pos. Ia tampak sangat menikmati pekerjaannya.

Namun tiga hari kemudian, dia dipecat oleh atasannya. Sebab ia kelewat semangat mencap perangko. Sudah lima tangkai stempel sampai patah, logam cap sampai cacat

dibuatnya, karena tiap kali melihat peranko bergambar orang yang pakai peci, Mamat langsung menghajarnya dengan stempel sekuat tenaga, sembari teriak-teriak "RASAIN LU!!"

The translation:

Mamat, a victim of the house demolition done by a New Order ruler, had just got a job as a low-level clerk in the post office. He seemed to enjoy his work.

But three days later, he was fired by his superior because he was too enthusiastic in stamping the letters. He broke five stamps handles, and the metal stamp was deformed, because every time he saw a letter stamp with a picture of a person wearing a fez, he immediately beaten him with all his strength, while shouting "TAKE IT!!"

The form of the implicature is "mocking." In finding no. 5, there is a great hatred towards the figures on the letter stamps so that Mamat hits the figure hard.

Example 6

Humor theme: New Order

Humor title: "Jam Dinding di Neraka"

The humor:

Setelah kiamat, serombongan mantan penguasa di dunia sedang antre menunggu giliran masuk ke gerbang neraka. Mereka dipanggil masuk satu per satu oleh malaikat yang bertugas di sana. Di dinding belakang tergantung puluhan jam dinding sebagaimana layaknya yang terlihat di bandara udara, untuk menunjukkan posisi waktu yang berbeda-beda di seluruh penjuru dunia. Anehnya, jam-jam dinding yang ada di dekat gerbang neraka berbeda-beda kecepatan berputarnya.

Seorang penguasa dari negeri kecil di Eropa kebingungan. Ia bertanya kepada malaikat. Sang malaikat menjawab, "Jam-jam itu menunjukkan tingkat kejujuran Anda sewaktu berkuasa. Semakin jujur, maka berputarnya semakin lambat. Semakin korup, berputarnya semakin cepat. Sebagai contoh, mari kita lihat jam Filipina."

Ferdinand Marcos, mantan penguasa Filipina, langsung pucat wajahnya. "Jam Filipina berputar kencang. Berarti memang benar, Marcos banyak korupsi," kata sang malaikat.

"Tuh, lihat yang warnanya kuning," seseorang berseru kencang, "Jam dari mana itu? Berputarnya lebih kencang dibandingkan jam dari Filipina."

"Oh, itu jam dari Kongo, "sahut sang malaikat. "Tak heran kalau jam itu berputar tidak kalah cepat dari jam Filipina. Mobutu Sesesejo terkenal korup."

Kerumunan orang itu mulai mencari jam-jam dari semua negara. Mereka mencari-cari jam yang berasal dari Indonesia. Setelah lama mencari dan tak ketemu, salah seorang dari mereka memberanikan diri bertanya kepada malaikat.

"Oh, jam Indonesia..., "kata malaikat sambil tersenyum geli. "Kami taruh dapur. Sangat cocok dijadikan kipas angin!"

The translation:

[After the doomsday, a group of former country leaders in the world are lining up to wait for their turn to enter the gates of hell. They were summoned in one by one by the angels who served there. On the back wall hangs dozens of wall clocks just like as seen at the airports, to show

different time positions in all corners of the world. Surprisingly, the wall clocks near the gates of hell vary in speed.

A ruler of a small land in Europe was confused. He asked the angel. The angel replied, "Those hours show your level of honesty while in power. The more honest, the slower the spin. The more corrupt, the faster it rotates. As an example, let's look at the Philippine clock."

Ferdinand Marcos, the face of the former ruler of the Philippines, instantly turns pale. "The Philippine clock is spinning fast. Means it is true, Marcos did a lot of corruption," said the angel.

"Look at the yellow one," someone exclaimed loudly, "Where is that clock from? It spins faster than the clock from the Philippines."

"Oh, that's the clock from Congo," said the angel. No wonder that the clock rotates no less quickly than the Philippine clock does. Mobutu Sesesejo is notoriously corrupt."

The crowd began to search for hours from all over the country. They are looking around for clocks that come from Indonesia. After searching for a long time and not finding it, one of them ventured to ask the angel.

"Oh, clock from Indonesia...," the angel said with an amused smile. We put it in the kitchen. It is very suitable to be a fan!"]

The implicature form is the one with the intention of "satirizing." In finding no. 6 there are satirical remarks directed at the leaders. Everybody will be held accountable in the hereafter for whatever done in the world.

Example 7

Humor theme: New Order

Humor title: "Polisi, Tentara, dan Intel"

The humor:

Kepolisian, TNI, dan badan intelijen saling menyombongkan bahwa merekalah yang terbaik dalam menangkap tersangka teroris. Pemerintah merasa perlu melakukan tes untuk mengetahui siapa yang paling jago.

Masing-masing pihak mengutus timnya yang paling hebat. Dilepaskan seekor kelinci ke dalam hutan. Para peserta harus berusaha menangkapnya. Pemenangnya adalah yang mampu menangkap paling duluan.

Regu intel masuk ke hutan. Mereka langsung menempatkan informan-informan di setiap pelosok hutan itu. Mereka menyanai setiap pohon semak, rumput, serangga, dan seluruh binatang di hutan itu. Tidak ada penghuni hutan yang tidak diinterogasi. Setelah satu bulan penyelidikan hutan secara menyeluruh dan ekstensif, akhirnya regu intel mengambil kesimpulan bahwa kelinci tersebut tidak pernah ada, alias hanya isu.

Tim dari ketentaraan masuk ke hutan. Setelah satu bulan bekerja tanpa hasil, mereka akhirnya kehilangan kesabaran dan membakar hutan. Kemudian mereka melapor bahwa kelinci itu sudah dimusnahkan. Perintah "menangkap" telah ditafsirkan sebagai "memusnahkan", sehingga pemerintah menganggapnya sebagai kesalahan prosedur. Tim tentara pun gagal jadi pemenang.

Akhirnya, tim kepolisian masuk hutan. Hanya selang waktu dua jam, mereka sudah keluar dari hutan sambil membawa seekor tikus putih.

Badan tikus putih luka-luka, nampaknya habis diinterogasi sambil disiksa. Tikus putih itu berteriak-teriak, "Ya..., ya, saya mengaku..., saya mengaku. Saya bukan tikus putih. Saya kelinci."

The translation:

[The police, the army, and intelligence agencies brag at each other that they are the best at arresting suspected terrorists. The government felt the need to conduct tests to find out who was the best.

Each side sent its most formidable team. The government released a hare into the forest. The participants should try to catch it. The winner is the one who can catch it first.

The intelligence squad walked into the woods. They immediately placed informants in every corner of the forest. They questioned every bush, grass, insect, and all the animals in the forest. There are no forest dwellers who are not interrogated. After a month of thorough and extensive forest investigation, the intel squad finally concludes that the rabbit has never existed, i.e., it is just an issue.

The team from the army walked into the woods. After a month of fruitless work, they finally lost their temper and burned the forest. Then they reported that the rabbit had already been killed. The "arrest" order has been interpreted as "killing", so the government considers it a procedural error. The army team also failed to win the contest.

Finally, the police team entered the forest. Only two hours later, they had already walked out of the woods carrying a white rat. The body of the white rat was injured, apparently it was interrogated while being tortured. The white rat clamored, "Yes..., yes, I

confess..., I confess. I'm not a white mouse. I'm a rabbit."]

The implicature is with the intention of "satirizing". White rats are likened to the corruptors of the country. No matter how smart they lie, they will definitely be found out too.

DISCUSSION

Humor is a life activity that is very popular for everybody. Humor can be enjoyed by every social class and can come from different aspects of life. Humor is a way of sharing a good thought either with words or appeal that cause sympathy and entertain. Wijana and Rohmadi (2010) suggest that humorous discourse is formed because of a *non-bonafide process of communication*. In line with this Wijana (2004) states that humor has a central role in human life, namely as a means of entertainment and education so that the quality of human life can be improved. Humor can be used as a tool to express a person's ideas, thoughts, or feelings and make the persons who hear them smile, laugh or amused.

In line with the above opinion Latta (1999) posits that there is a theory that states that humorous laughter not only expresses relaxation but also brings the effect of pleasure. There is a hypothetical mechanism that may deserve more attention that most of the relaxing effects are obtained from laughter. It is proven that hearing and other sensations are obtained from tension in the muscles of the mouth or in the form of abdominal spasms that tend to be very effective for distracting all active tension sources in anxiety.

The humor that is present in the television broadcasts, radio broadcast, magazines, newspapers, and humor books in the society also provides functions and benefits for the continuity of nation-

building. From the above statement, it can be concluded that humorous discourse is the result of a communication process that deviates from the rules of communicating in pragmatic principles, with the aim of making people laugh or in other words only to entertain. The humorous discourse that this paper studies tends to be an entertainment discourse to satire.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion of the findings and discussion above is that the conversations in the book *Humor Politik Indonesia* have the implicatures with the intention for asking, misleading, mocking, and expressing satirical intentions.

REFERENCES

- Fetzer, A. (2012). Pragmatics as a Linguistic Concept. In W. Bublitz & N. R. Norrick (Eds.), *Foundations of Pragmatics* (Vol. 1). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Gazdar, G. (1979). *Pragmatics: Implicature, Presupposition, and Logical Form*. London: Academic Press, Inc
- Huang, Y. (2012). Types of Inference: Entailment, Presupposition, and Implicature. In W. Bublitz & N. R. Norrick (Eds.), *Foundations of Pragmatics* (Vol. 1). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Kirk, J. & Miller, M.L., 1986. *Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research*, Beverly Hills, CA, Sage Publications.
- Latta, R. L. (1999). *The Basic Humor Process*. Mountain de Gruyter: New York.
- Levinson, S. C. (2008). *Pragmatics* (9th ed., Vol. 70). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. *Pragmatics* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Nababan, P. W.J. 1987: *Ilmu Pragmatik (Teori dan Penerapannya)*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Tarigan, Hnery Guntur. 2009. *Pengajaran Wacana*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.