

An Analysis of Maxim Flouting Uttered by the Characters in It Ends with Us Novel

Risnanda

English Department, Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia

Email: risnandailyas@gmail.com

Abstract

In order to deliver successful communication, people have to follow cooperative principles which is proposed by Grice. Nevertheless, in a conversation sometimes people fail to follow these cooperative principles which is called non-observant maxim. It consists of violating, flouting, opting out and infringing. This study focuses on investigating the types of flouting maxim and the analysis of why the characters in It Ends with Us novel flout the maxim. The data were collected through document and analyzed by using qualitative descriptive analysis. The result of this study shows that there were 16 utterances flouting of maxim found in the novel. Maxim of relation flouting was the most uttered by the characters and maxim of quality flouting was the least. No flout of maxim of manner found in the novel. The flout of maxims found consist of 5 (33%) flouting maxim of quantity, 3 (20%) flouting the maxim of quality and 7 (47%) flouting maxim of relation.

Keywords: *Cooperative Principles; Flouting of Maxim; It Ends with Us*

INTRODUCTION

The aim of communication is the interlocutor can comprehend what the speaker is saying in order to avoid misunderstanding. However, people do not only utter their intention directly but also indirectly. The interlocutor is expected to understand what the speaker is saying indirectly. The communication will be considered successfully delivered if the interlocutors understand the message that the speaker delivers.

Conversation is the form of language use where there is an interchange of words, sentences, and several expressions appear when people having a discussion in a particular situation and place. According to Yule (1996), the utterances produced by people do not only consist of grammatical structure but they produced by performing an action to deliver and express the sentences.

In order to deliver successful communication, people have to follow cooperative principles which is proposed by Grice. These cooperative principles consist of maxim of quantity, quality, relation and manner. These four maxims manage how people interact and communicate in the conversation by giving the sufficient information, telling the truth, giving relevant responds and trying not to be ambiguous in order to make the

conversation runs well. Nevertheless, in a conversation sometimes people fail to follow these cooperative principles which is called non-observant maxim. It consists of violating, flouting, opting out and infringing.

When the speaker does not fully break the cooperative principles that is called flout the maxim. It seems in the conversation the speakers do not cooperative. However, they have intended meanings and certain purposes in their utterances. They hope their interlocutor is able to interpret their intention. Grice (1989) points out that there are four kinds of flouting the maxim. They consist of flouting the maxim of quantity, quality, relation and manner. In flouting the maxim of quantity, speaker provide less or more information than it should be. Flouting maxim of quality means the speakers say something untrue intentionally and sometimes they use ironic statement to show positive utterances that implied the negative ones. Whenever the speakers respond their interlocutor irrelevantly, it signifies they have flouted the maxim of relation. They flout the maxim of relation to avoid talking about the topic they do not want to discuss. Lastly is the flouting maxim of manner which the speakers say something ambiguous and unclear purposely.

Previous studies about maxim flouting had been done by Hidayat (2020), Anita (2022) and Nawangsari (2022) with the difference of data sources that come from a movie, talk show and tv series. Hidayat (2020) conducted the research entitled Maxim flouting in David Letterman Show: An Episode with Aishwarya Rai showed that all the four types of maxim flouting were appeared during the conversation in the show. The flouting of maxim appeared in the talk show in order to avoid unrest situation and to give more explanations. The research about flouting the maxim was also conducted by Anita (2022). The study investigated flouting the cooperative principle in the movie entitled I am Sam. The finding indicated that most of flouting maxim done by the characters in the movie was maxim of relation and the least maxim was flouting the maxim of manner. In line with Hidayat and Anita, Nawangsari (2022) conducted the research that aims to find flouting cooperative principle's maxims in Television Series Victorious: Free Shipping. The result of the study showed that there were 2 flouting maxim of quantity and 3 maxims of relation.

Flouting the quality maxims occur not only in spoken form like previous study which found flouting the maxim in the movie, tv series and the talk show, but also in written form, such as a novel. The novel can represent social interaction, and the discourse in the novel can be utilized to study the usage of flouting towards maximization of quality based on the scenario. The study is being carried out to look into the flouting of maxims on the main characters in it ends with us novel. It ends with us novel is used as the target of analysis because of the novel's distinctive utterances that incorporate figurative language, because flouting maxims is generally done using figurative language. throughout this tale, flouting maxims of cooperative in the characters' conversation demonstrates the characters' deep bond throughout their dialogue. Furthermore, the phenomenon of flouting maxims in their utterances indicates how their relationship as friends, family and as lovers. In most cases, people pay greater attention to the sentence form in a speech of spoken language because it elicits an immediate response from the listeners. However, in written language, readers will respond to the message if they understand the major idea of the written text. As a result, the research will investigate the kind of maxims flouted by

the characters and why the characters flout the maxims in it ends with us novel. It is a romance novel that talks about the story of Lily Bloom and her doomed romance with Ryle Kincaid.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Pragmatics

Yule (1996) defines pragmatics as the study of the relationship between language and its users, especially speakers and hearers. According to Yule (1996), pragmatics is the study of language that connects the speaker's communicated meaning. As a result, the hearer must decipher the intended meaning behind the speaker's words, which is dependent on the context. Thus, understanding pragmatics can help people utilize language more effectively since the speaker and hearer must uncover each other's statements and consider the latent meaning behind those utterances.

People can have a better understanding of how language can be utilized to communicate with others and deliver their message by studying pragmatics. Language analysis utilizing pragmatics can help the listener understand the meaning behind the speaker's utterances. It signifies that the speaker's speech may have additional meanings in addition to its denotative meaning. The connotative meaning is best conveyed using pragmatics so that the listener can infer the best possible meaning from the speaker's speech.

The application of pragmatics can be explained both practically and theoretically. Its usage can be described in a variety of ways depending on how one views linguistics and where one places pragmatics within it. Mey (2001) categorizes pragmatic use into two distinct qualities. They are both abstract and practical traits. In an abstract sense, pragmatics is either 'component' linguistics or 'perspective' linguistics, filling in the gaps and adding a pragmatic 'accent' to the components. A practical characterisation appears to answer linguistics function issues, as well as ethnomethodology concerns.

Implicature

Conversational implicature is an intriguing issue covered in pragmatics. Consider the phrase "I'm hungry". This statement suggests that someone is hungry right now. However, when it is said by someone in a different context, it may have a different meaning. Consider the following examples from Kreidler (1998): First, there is a toddler who wants to go to bed; second, there is a beggar who hasn't eaten all day; and third, there is a young man who wants to have supper with a co-worker. Although these three speech occurrences include the same sentence, their meanings are distinct. Consider the following example of a dialogue between two students during a break:

Jimmy : let's go to the canteen!

Sarah : I'm full

Jimmy : ok, I guess I have to go by myself

According to the conversation, someone can linguistically respond to Jimmy's request by stating *let's go, okay, or no*. However, Sarah does not answer directly on this occasion. She prefers to reply it by saying *I'm full*. This utterance indicates that Sarah has been eaten before and now she is full. Jimmy decides to go to the canteen by himself after interpreting what Sarah said because he knows Sarah has been eaten and she does not

want to go to the canteen. This example shows that there is an additional meaning behind the utterance, which is referred to implicature.

The example the conversation shows that what people say is not necessarily the same as what they mean. It indicates that in some circumstances, people may not talk directly in order to deliver the expected meaning of their statements. In other words, a speech contains a hidden message. Conversational implicature refers to this hidden meaning. Grice was the first to coin the term implicature. Grice (1989) explains that the term implicature is used to differentiate between logical and customary meaning. According to Kreidler (1998), To be specific, implicature is a piece of information added a certain context. In addition, implicature is a type of bridge built by the listener or reader to connect one utterance to another, and that the connection is often established unconsciously. Yule (1996) adds that implicature is a prime example of more being transmitted than what is said, but in order for them to be interpreted, some fundamental cooperative principle must first be considered to be in operation. Moreover, Nick (2010) states that Implications of an utterance are what it takes to assume the speaker is thinking and intended the listener to think in order to account for what they are saying. Based on those definitions, it is possible to deduce that implicature is a hidden meaning or additional transmitted meaning discovered in people's utterances.

Implicature was separated into two subclasses by Grice. They are conventional implicature and conversational implicature. Yule (1996) defines that when specific words are employed, conventional implicature is associated with them, resulting in additional transmitted meaning. Yule emphasized that such implicatures are not founded on maxims or the cooperative principle. According to Nick (2010), conventional implicatures: whether or not they adhere to the strict, truth-conditional meaning of the word, they are part of its typical force. Examine the word *but* in *Mary's suggestion to turn left, but I chose to turn right*. The interpretation of this speech is that Mary advised *I turn left*, and *I turned right*, with an implied 'contrast' between the information (left is contrasted with right). Contrast becomes the standard implicature of *but*.

Another type of implicature is conversational implicature. According to Nick (2010), Conversational implicatures are those that appear in specific settings of use but are not part of the word's characteristic or customary force. In addition, Griffiths (2006) states that conversational implicatures are assumptions based on the existence of linguistic standards, such as the universal agreement that communicators should strive to speak the truth. The norm in this context relates to the four maxims of the cooperative principle. Conversational implicature, as opposed to traditional implicature, includes context in comprehending the additional transmitted meaning of an utterance. The meaning is stated implicitly in the utterance. Yule (1996) then classified conversational implicatures into three types: generalized conversational implicatures, scalar implicatures, and particularized conversational implicatures.

Generalized conversational implicatures are those in which people do not need to know how to calculate the additional imparted meaning. According to Yule (1996), Scalar implicature occurs when someone chooses the word scale that is quantitatively and qualitatively most informative and contextually correct to make an utterance. Yule (1996)

emphasized that one point that should be highlighted when using scalar implicature is that when speakers correct themselves on a detail, they usually cancel one of the other scalar implicatures. In contrast to generalized conversational implicatures, particularized conversational implicatures occur when inferences are necessary to determine the imparted meaning.

Cooperative Principles

Cooperative principles are proposed by Paul Grice. These cooperative principles depict how people should communicate and interact with one another. According to Grice (1989), in the conversation, people need to follow the cooperative principles to make the conversation runs smoothly. By using these principles, the listener will directly know the speakers' intention and the meaning of their utterances. Thus, in the conversation, there will be no misunderstanding between the speaker and the interlocutor.

Grice (1975) proposes that there are four cooperative principles which are maxim of quantity, quality, relation and manner. Each maxim has its own specific characters.

1. Maxim of quantity

In maxim quantity, people give suitable information needed by the interlocutor. It means that the information provided will be not too little and not too much. When the speakers follow the cooperative principles in maxim quantity, they will respond their interlocutor by providing the information that is suitable with what they need to hear. Yule (1996) states that the speakers show their cooperativeness in maxim quantity by saying 'I won't bore you with all the details', to cut a long story short and by saying 'as you probably know' to avoid themselves giving too much information.

2. Maxim of quality

The maxim of quality means the speaker deliver the true information. There are two rules of this maxim. The first one is the speaker is expected to give true information. The second one is if the speaker does not have sufficient evidence to be informed to the interlocutor, they are expected not to say it.

Example :

A: I'll ring you tomorrow afternoon then

B: erm, I shall be there **as far as I know**, and in the meantime have a word with Mum and Dad if they're free. Right, bye bye sweetheart.

A: Bye-bye (Cutting, 2002)

From the conversation above, B's response showed that she/he tried to avoid telling a lie to A by saying "as far as I know". It means that she/he is not sure whether she/ he is going to be available when A calls him/her.

3. Maxim of relation

The speaker is expected to say something relevance to their interlocutor. It means that the utterances that the speakers say have to be coherent with the previous utterances delivered by their interlocutor. By applying the maxim of relation, the communication between the speaker and their interlocutor will run smoothly.

Example :

Chris : were you born here?

Lily : no, I moved here from Maine after graduated.

In this conversation, Lily gave the respond that Chris wanted to hear by saying “no, I moved here from Maine after graduated. By saying these words, Lily has followed maxim of relation which means she gives the answer that relates to Chris’ question.

4. Maxim of manner

In maxim of manner, the participants in the conversation have to deliver their utterances clearly to avoid ambiguity and unclear expressions. The rule in this maxim is to avoid ambiguity by saying something briefly.

Flouting Maxim

Cutting (2002) argues that when the speakers seem not to follow the maxim but actually the utterances that they used have implied meaning and the intentionally say that and they want their interlocutor understand the implied meaning. Black (2006) states that the speaker who flouts maxim understand and aware of cooperative principles but they choose to deliver their utterances indirectly. When the speakers flout the maxim, they expect their interlocutors can infer the implicit meaning behind their utterances.

There are four types of flouting the maxim proposed by Grice:

a. Flouting maxim of quantity

Speaker flouts maxim of quantity if they provide information which is too little or too much. The speakers do not intend to mislead the addressee. The speakers want the interlocutor to find the implicit meaning behind their utterances.

Example :

George Costanza’s message on his answering machine: Believe it or not, George isn’t at home. Please leave a message after the beep. I must be out or I’d pick up the phone. Where could I be? Believe it or not, I’m not at home.

George provides more information than it should be because he wants to convince the hearer who probably do not believe his information.

b. Flouting maxim of quality

When the speakers utter something that is not true and say something that do not have sufficient evidence, they considered as the speakers who flout maxim of quality. The speakers who flout maxim of quality usually use hyperbole, metaphor and irony. They flout maxim of quality by exaggerating their utterances.

Example:

On Christmas, an ambulance an ambulance picks up a collapsed drunkard who collapsed on the sidewalk. Soon the drunkard vomits all over the paramedic. The paramedic says: – ‘Great, that’s really great! That’s made my Christmas!

The paramedic utterance by saying ‘great, that’s really great! That’s made my Christmas! Do not imply the true meaning because there is no one will express their pleasure if someone vomit over them. The paramedic flouts the maxim of quantity by using irony expression which express positively but implies negatively.

c. Flouting maxim of relation

The speakers flout maxim of relation when they give irrelevant response but they have the reason why they do that. It is usually because they want to hide the information or they do not want to discuss the topic mentioned by previous

speaker. They try to avoid it by saying something that is irrelevant to what their interlocutor statement or question.

Example:

Father to the daughter: any news about SAT results?

Daughter : ice- cream anyone?

From the conversation above, the daughter tries to avoid his father's question by saying ice cream anyone? she is reluctant to discuss SAT maybe because she has no good news about it.

d. Flouting maxim of manner

When the speakers say something ambiguous or blurred, it means they flout maxim of manner. Sometimes they flout maxim of manner when they want to exclude the third party. They do not want the third party to understand what they are talking about.

Example:

Wife : Where are you off to?

Husband : 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. (Cutting,2002)

In the conversation above, the husband says white stuff that refers to ice cream. He does not want to say it directly because by hearing this he's afraid that his daughter does not want to finish her dinner.

METHOD

This research only focuses on flouting the maxim that uttered by the characters in novel entitled *It Ends with Us*. To describe and analyze the four types of flouting the maxim, the theory of cooperative principles by Grice is used. This research used qualitative descriptive method that is done by describing facts which followed by analysis. all the data were collected through the utterances used by the characters in *It Ends with Us* novel.

FINDINGS

The total chapter of this novel is 35 chapters with epilogue that consist of 271 pages. According to category of maxim flouting proposed by Grice's theory of cooperative principles, it was found that the 16 utterances that uttered by the characters of the novel flout three maxims which are flout maxim of quantity, quality and relation. The percentage of each maxim flouting can be seen on the table below

Table: Flouting Maxim Distribution

| Types of Maxims | Quantity | Percentage |
|----------------------------|----------|------------|
| Flouting Maxim of Quantity | 5 | 33% |
| Flouting Maxim of Quality | 3 | 20% |
| Flouting Maxim of Relation | 7 | 47% |
| Total | 16 | 100% |

Based on the 16 utterances of flouting the maxim in the novel *It Ends with Us*. It was found that 5 utterances (33%) flouts maxim quantity. 3 utterances (20%) represent

flouting maxim of quality and 7 utterances (47%) flouts maxim of relation. However, there was no flout maxim of manner found in this novel.

DISCUSSION

These are some examples of maxim flouting uttered by the characters in *It Ends with Us*.

1. Flouting the maxim of quantity

Datum (1)

Ryle : *why did you need fresh air?*

Lily : ***because I buried my father today and gave an epically disastrous eulogy and now I feel like I can't breathe.***

Before the conversation above happened, Ryle asked Lily why she was on the rooftop and Lily responded by saying *I wanted fresh air*. And then Ryle asked the question "*why did you need fresh air?*" Lily's answer indicates that she gives too much information to Ryle's question. In this term, Lily shows flout of the maxim of quantity by providing too much information. Lily's response showed that she wants to share her frustration and sadness because of the death of his father. Thus, she provides more information than what it was asked.

Datum (2)

Lily : *What brought you to Boston?*

Ryle : ***My residency and my sister lives here. Married a tech-savvy Bostonian And they bought the entire top floor.***

This conversation still happened on the apartment's rooftop. Before this conversation took place, Ryle had asked Lily "*were you born here?*" and Lily answered "*no, I moved here from Maine*". In return, Lily asked the question "*what brought you to Boston?*". Ryle's answer indicates that he flouts the maxim of quantity by providing too much information. He even mentioned about his sister and her husband. By providing too much information in his answer, it shows that Ryle has become more comfortable around Lily.

Datum (3)

Ryle : *why were you alone with him in the bathroom?*

Lily : ***he followed me in there. I know nothing about him now Ryle. I don't know he owned that restaurant, I thought he was just a waiter.***

The conversation took place in the restaurant where Lily and Ryle had dinner. In that restaurant, Lily met his old crush, Atlas. Lily went to the bathroom and Atlas followed her. Ryle went to the bathroom too and found that Lily and Atlas were there. That is why Ryle asked why she was alone with him in the bathroom. Lily provided too much information in her answer than it should be because she did not want Ryle to misunderstand. By giving too much information Lily had flouted the maxim of quantity.

Datum (4)

Ryle : *were you close?*

Lily : ***I don't know. As his daughter I loved him but as a human I hated him***

Before Ryle asked the question *were you close?*, Lily told him that her father died this week and that is why she came up to the rooftop. She said she just needed a good cry. In response to this utterance, Ryle asked the question. Lily's response indicates that she wanted to talk more about her relationship with her father. Thus, she gave more information in her answer.

2. Flouting the maxim of quality

Datum (5)

Ryle : *are you asleep*

Lily : *I guess so*

It is a text conversation where Ryle sent a text message to Lily by asking "are you asleep"? and Lily replied I guess so. The reply was obviously not true because a person who is sleeping cannot reply the message. Thus, Lily flouts the maxim of quality by providing untrue information.

Datum (6)

Ryle : *are you kidding me? You gave the anti-eulogy at your own father's funeral?*

Lily : *I'm not proud of it. I don't think. I mean, if I had my way he would have been much better person and I would have stood up there and talked for an hour*

Ryle : *wow, your kind of my hero. You just roasted a dead guy*

From the conversation above, the context is Ryle asked Lily what eulogy that she had delivered in her father's funeral. Lily said she started her eulogy by saying "I wanted to take a moment to honor his life by sharing with you five great things about my father. The first thing..." and she said nothing after that. That is why Ryle responds her by saying "are you kidding me?". The next Ryle's utterance shows that he flouted the maxim of quality by saying "wow you're kind of my hero. You just roasted a dead guy". This expression is considered irony because he said something in a positive expression that implies negative one. Ryle's expression by saying "wow you're kind of my hero. You just roasted a dead guy" did not mean he praised what Lily had just done in her father eulogy. Instead, he said that to be sarcastic to Lily's action and showed it in a positive expression.

3. Flouting the maxim of relation

Datum (7)

This conversation occurred in the apartment's rooftop after Ryle and Lily met for the first time. Ryle was wondering why Lily was there because Lily said that she did not live there. She said she lived in the apartment across this building. Thus, Ryle ask the question "your boyfriend live here or something"?

Ryle : *your boyfriend live here or something?*

Lily : *you have a nice roof*

From the conversation, Lily's response showed that Lily flouts the maxim of relation by avoiding answering Ryle's question and responds by saying you have a nice roof. Even though the answer seems irrelevant with the question, Lily's answer actually implies that she does not want to answer Ryle's question by answering something that is irrelevant to the question. She did that because maybe she thinks that she did not want to talk about her personal life to someone she just met.

Datum (8)

Lily : you'd work for free?

*Allysa : **I don't really need a job***

This conversation happened in Lily's floral shop. She met Alyssa who just entered the shop and asked if Lily was looking for the new employee because she saw the help wanted sign outside the shop. And then Lily said she did not put that sign maybe it was the sign that had been put by previous owner of the shop. Moreover, she would not hire the employee in the near future because she would open the shop in the next couple of months. Responding to Lily's statement, Allysa said that she loved flowers and she would help Lily for free. That is why Lily said "*you work for free?*". In the conversation above, Allysa did not directly answer yes or no to the question. Instead, she answered I don't really need a job. She floated the maxim of relation. However, by answering "I don't really need a job". Allysa expected Lily to understand her intention of giving the answer that she just wanted to help Lily even without a payment because she loved flowers, she got bored sometimes by just staying at home. And judging from the way she dressed, she is quite wealthy for the one who asked for a job in a floral shop.

Datum (9)

Lily : are we taking separate cars?

*Ryle : **I took an uber here from work***

This conversation takes place when Ryle sent Lily to her car. Lily asks "are we taking separate cars?" Ryle's answer seems did not answer the question. He flouted the maxim of relation. By saying "I took an uber here from work" Ryle expected that Lily would understand that they are going to go with separate cars.

Datum(10)

Allysa : Marshall, are you drunk?

*Marshall : **It's onesie day. You knew that when you dropped us off.***

The conversation above happened through a telephone call between Allysa and her husband Marshall. Allysa called her husband Marshall because she needed a help. She asked him to bring a bag of ice to the floral shop because Lily sprained her ankle. The bag of ice will help to reduce the swollen on Lily's ankle. When she

talked to her husband, her husband's response showed that he was not too focus in answering the question. That is why Allysa asked " *Marshall are you drunk?*". Marshall replied it by saying " *It's onesie day. You knew that when you dropped us off*". Marshall tried to avoid answering the question. Instead, he said "it's onesie day". Onesie day is the day when Marshall goes out with Allysa's brother. On that day they usually wear one set of similar clothes and they go to the bar to drink. By saying that words, Marshall wanted Allysa understand his intended meaning.

Datum (11)

Lily : *When is the last time you've had sleep?*

Ryle : ***I just got off a forty-eight-hour shift***

Ryle came to Lily's apartment to visit her. He knocked on the door and Lily opened the door. When she looked at Ryle's face. She saw the tired look on his face. He has dark circle and puffy eye bags around his eyes. And then Lily asked " *when is the last time you've had sleep?*". She wanted to know what happened to him because they haven't met each other for three weeks. Ryle's response indicates that he did not answer Lily's question however by saying " *I just got off a forty-eight-hour shift*" showed that he did not have enough sleep during the last couple of weeks.

CONCLUSION

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that the characters in the novel it ends with us only use three types of flouts of maxim which are flouting maxim of quantity, quality and relation. The flout maxim of relation becomes the frequent flout of maxim that used by the characters which occur 7 times (47%). They flout the maxim generally because the characters want to avoid to answer their interlocutors' questions. The flouting maxim of quantity is 5 utterances (33%). All the flout of maxim quantity uttered by the characters done by giving too much information because they want to talk more about the topic being asked and the least flouting maxim which appears 3 times (20%) is the flouting maxim of quality. They have the tendency to use this type of flout maxim to avoid talking about something that they do not want to discuss or they do not want to state their intention directly.

REFERENCES

- Anita. 2022. Flouting The Cooperative Principle in I am Sam Movie. *Saliency Journal*. 2(2). P. 58-68. <https://jurnal.stkipgriponorogo.ac.id/index.php/Saliency>
- Black, E.2006. *Pragmatic Stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cutting, Joan.2002. *Pragmatics and Discourse*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Grice, H. Paul. 1975. *Logic and Conversation*. In Peter and Jerry Morgan. *Syntax and Semantics 3rd Ed*. New York: Academic Press
- Grice, H.P. 1989. *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard University Press
- Griffith, Patric. 2006. *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Hidayat, Didin Nuruddin. 2020. Maxim Flouting in David Letterman Show: An Episode with Aishwarya Rai. *Leksema Jurnal Bahas dan Sastra*. 5(2). P. 135-145. Doi: 10.22515/ljbs.v5i2.2322
- Hoover, colleen. 2016. *It Ends with Us*. USA: Atria Books
- Kreidler, Charles W. 1998 .*Introducing English semantics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Nawangsari, Retno Christyowatie. 2022. Flouting of Cooperative Principles' Maxims in Television Series *Victorious: Free Shipping*. Undergraduate Conference on Language, Literature, and Culture (UNCLLE). 2 (1). P. 1-6. Doi: UNCLLE (Undergraduate Conference on Language, Literature, and Culture) (dinus.ac.id)
- Nick, Riemer. 2010. *Introducing Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.