STUDIES OF SOCIOLINGUISTICS: THEORY OF POLITENESS IN ENGLISH AS SECOND LANGUAGE

Asti Gumartifa

English Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,
University of Muhammadiyah Palembang

A B S T R A C T

In the social study of language, linguistic politeness has played a central role. Politeness in speaking English is also part of sociolinguistic and pragmatic learning. Each country has a variety of cultures and language accuracy in communication. Unfortunately, most learners don't speak English based on the sociolinguistics features and it is influenced by the culture, gender, language style, and domain. Therefore, there are still some issues to the practice of politeness linguistics to the English as a second language. The study of qualitative research was used in this study method. The purposes of this research are to inform eight theories of politeness application, the concept of face in politeness, and various types of politeness which are also explained by the division and classification of politeness. To support the students' information about politeness in linguistics, some existing research information is discussed in this research.

Introduction

In Sociolinguistics and Pragmatics, according to Crystal(1987) politeness is a term referring to linguistic elements connected with social conduct norms, such as respect, empathy, courtesy, and separation. According to Khasanah(2019) that politeness in which we're not born with; this is something we must study and be trained into, and no era has had the benefit of teachers handbooks on etiquette and proper attitude to assist us in developing these skills. Similarly, it appears that whether or not a person's behavior is considered polite or impolite is dependent on how that behavior is interpreted in social contact, rather than on the verbal expression used. Additionally, the relation between different people, called 'oneself' and 'others,' is typically associated with politeness.

Besides, Eelen(2014) mentioned that politeness is studied from a pragmatic and sociolinguistic viewpoint in the Anglo-Saxon theory of science. Politeness is mostly focused with the usage of language. It has something to do with pragmatics, which is a phenomenon that indicates a connection between language and the social environment. Furthermore, it is widely agreed that politeness theories are implicated in any of these linguistics areas of study. Eelen(2014) also demonstrates that, despite their differences, the pragmatic and sociolinguistic approaches integrate the field of politeness theory arises to be phenomenon linked to the interaction between society and communication reality. In any case, such agreement is difficult to come by beyond this broad level, because each theory has its meaning of politeness.

It's not as simple as we may assume to define politeness. There is a remarkable amount of disagreement when people are asked what they think polite behavior is. Similarly, when we discuss polite language, we will run into the same issues. We can define the polite language used as the language a person employs to prevent becoming too direct or language that shows respect or regard for others. Therefore,

Khasanah(2019) added that since we've discussed politeness, we've been talking about the speaker's attitude toward the listener; throughout this case, politeness will entail acknowledging the listener's right to be heard.

For a kid, family is the initial source of learning; it is through them that they acquire words. This makes it hard and uncomfortable for kids to speak English in class during the teaching and learning process. Family is a vital component that has a profound impact on the performance of English linguistics in students. Therefore, Hasanah, Pradina, Hadita, and Putri, (2019) argued that the child's capacity use the language to learn cannot be separated from their language background because the parents are the first entity to interact the language to children.

In the social study of language, linguistic politeness has taken center stage. Terms of English, the usage of passive voice defines a polite language, respectful forms of addressing such as Sir and Madam, formulaic words such as please, excuse me, sorry, thank you, and so on. According to Hasanah et al., (2019) that the use of English as a second language in the classroom is hugely affected by sociolinguistics. This is also true of society's general impact on language usage. Languages vary in terms of nationality, religion, status, gender, education level, and age. They also claimed that language is something that people have received since birth. That begins with learning one's mother tongue, which seems to be a natural and common occurrence but differs from second-language acquisition one.

The main goal of this research is to conduct a literature review on the technical term of linguistic politeness. This would talk about some of the most extensively used linguistic politeness models in the literature. It also aims to gloss over the main ideas of many conceptual frameworks, as well as the distinguishing characteristics. Besides, the concepts and types of politeness that will be discussed in this article are as follows.

Research Method

This research uses descriptive qualitative method. It attempts to identify the characteristics of a problem through description, and this approach tries to determine the features of a problem by using a descriptive technique to test objective views by looking at the two or more variables. **Creswell (1998**) described qualitative research as a systematic understanding based on various methods of inquiry that aim to investigate social or human difficulties. The researchers gathered words, presents the informants' points of view in specifics, and investigates the study in an inclusive environment.The goal of this research was to explain the theory of politeness in linguistics. As a result, this research focuses on the various types of explanations and information. Data collected of words information is obtained from the literature by reading properly, comprehensively, and repetitively. The data information is derived from existing information. This research will discuss some theories, types, and concepts of politeness in terms of linguistics.

Result and Discussion
Result
Theories of politeness
1.   Robin Lakoff's Politeness Theory

Lakoff(1990)beginnings in Generative Semantics influence her conceptual design of politeness theory. Her politeness rules can be seen as a component of the a system of pragmatic rules, which she compares to grammatical rules, and similar to

syntactic rules are part of the scope of linguistic theories, the rules of politeness are viewed primarily as a linguistic instrument for obtaining the processes systematically. She proposes two main pragmatic competence principles, each of which is made up of a collection of sub-rules: be clear and be polite. She then adds a series of etiquette guidelines.

The first rule (be clear) suggests that she initializes the conversational rules. The rules of etiquette are in charge here. It means that when individuals are conversing, they would say anything appropriate for the current stage of the conversation. When we speak, our conversations aren't usually made up of a series of unrelated statements. It is a cooperative endeavor that is referred to as the cooperative principle.The second rule (be polite) is made up of three sub-rules: (1) don't impose, (2) provide options, and (3) make a feel good by being pleasant.These laws appear to be simple, but they are ultimately quite complex because the language allows for various ways to describe them. For instance, a passive construction like "Breakfast is served" is more polite than a direct inquiry like "Would you like to eat?" The first phrase follows Rule 1, which is to avoid informing the addressee about his or her wants or needs and is thus interpersonally detached. Speakers can utilize hedges and mitigating statements in Rule 2 (offer options) to enable learners to create and maintain their ideas.

2.   Brow and Levinson's Politeness Theory

Brown Levinson's politeness theory was initially presented in 1978.Their politeness theory is unquestionably the most significant, having received numerous responses, uses, criticisms, adjustments, and modifications. Brown and Levinson's names have become almost linked with concept of politeness, as this is pointless to address politeness without referencing them. Politeness must also be communicated, which both two and more speakers agreed on. It can never be assumed to be operational without the speaker notifying it. According to Penelope and Levinson(1987) that each individual has two distinct sides or desires such as negative and positive. The positive face represents the desire to be liked, approved, respected, and appreciated by others, whereas the negative face represents the need to be uninhibited. In interactions, politeness can be used to demonstrate awareness of some other person's face.

3.   Geoffrey Leech Politeness Theory

The framework for linguistic politeness is portion of a project to develop a model of comprehensive pragmatics or an account of how language is being used in interaction (Geoffrey, 1983). He proposes two additional pragmatic systems in addition to general pragmatics: (1) Pragmalinguistics, which currently account for the linguistically concerned of the pragmatics, a specific source of information provided by a given language for conveying specific illocutions, and (2) sociopragmatics, which analyses and more particular 'local' situation of linguistic use.Leech distinguishes between textual and interpersonal rhetoric. The processibility concept, the clarity concept, the economic concept, and the expressivity concept are the four factors that make up textual rhetoric. Interpersonal rhetoric, on the other hand, is comprised of three sets of principles: the cooperation concept, politeness concepts, and ironic concepts, among others.

4.   Yueguo Gu's Politeness Theory

Yueguo discussed four maxims: self-denigration (lower oneself while elevating others), propriety, delicacy, and generosity. The maxim of self-denigration advises the speaker to denigrate self and exalt others (Yuego, 1990). Approach the partner with an acceptable address phrase, reads the address maxim, which appropriately refers to the

hearer's social status, function, and speech interaction.The maxims of tact and generosity are similar to Leech's, except that they include particular speech acts: impositive and commissives, accordingly. On the other hand, they work in a unique way, motivational rather than communication operational side of motivation that is referred to as the motivational level. This is the real price or advantage of an impositive or commissive for users.

5. Sachiko Ide Politeness Theory

Ide considers politeness to be essential to sustaining good communication. Volition and discernment are the two components of politeness. Violation, or strategic of the speakers' action of verbal expression, entails methods or maxims that the speaker employs to be linguistically polite and make the listener comfortable.As a result, because it entails socio-culturally driven linguistic choices, it is considered political activity. It's a natural, socially adequate response(Sachito, 1984).The use of honorific terms in Japan influenced Ide's creation of discernment. Because it is not dependent on the speaker's free choice and it directly reflects socio-cultural features of the speaker and hearer, the use of honorific form is considered to be absolute.

According to Eelen(2014) that four basic rules have been established: (1) be polite to someone in a higher status; (2) be polite to someone in a position of power; (3) be polite to someone older; and (4) be polite in such a formal situation based on the participants, events, or topics.

6. Shoshana Blum-Kulka Politeness Theory

Politeness, according to Blum-Kulka, is also something extrinsic, hypocritical, and unnatural. It is a disingenuous performance given for the sake of exhibiting great manners or the potential for manipulating the need for politeness (e.g., stating one thing while understanding or seeking to accomplish something quite different).In this situation, classifying behavior as polite will be honest while also being negative. The connection among four important parameters such as social motive, expressive forms, social differentials, and social meanings display a culturally filtered perception.Blum-Kulka claims that in Modern Hebrew, two concepts are comparable to politeness: nimus and adivut.Nimus is commonly employed in formal social etiquette, whereas adivut is also used to demonstrate consideration and a desire to adapt to the addressee.As a result, she stated that comments about rudeness, poor public service, and a lack of personal discipline in public spaces reflect a lack of unambiguous politeness rules as a social-cultural norm.

7. Bruce Frasher and William Nolen Politeness Theory

Conversational Contract, according to Fraser and Nolen, is courtesy.The term "social contract" refers to a set of agreed-upon rights and responsibilities that conversational partners must adhere to. When people initiate a discussion, they generally bring a framework of duties and privileges with them that dictate what they can anticipate from one another. The contract establishes the rights and duties of each member on four aspects: conventional, institutional, situational, and historical(Fraser, 1990). They also claimed that following the rules or norms of the relationship is politeness, and this highlights socially accepted uses. Politeness has nothing to do with strategic communication or making the listener feel so good. Politeness is not considered an inherent feature of some linguistic features of verbal options. Although it is recognized that such verbal options such as Mrs, excuse me, could you please, and so forth.

When a participant breaks the conversational contract, it is considered impolite. When the speaker breaks one or more of the contractual requirements, he or she becomes unfriendly. Disagreement would result unless the rules were broken. Fraser and Nolen, on the other hand, emphasize that civility is entirely at the discretion of the listener. Therefore, Eelen(2014) said that there are none fundamentally (im)polite linguistic alternative, however, what is considered (im)polite relies on the exact phrases used by every speaker and listener at any given time during the conversation.

8. Horst Arndt and Richard Janney Politeness Theory

Since the early 1980s, Richard and Arndt(1992) have established a politeness strategy. They distinguish between social politeness and interpersonal politeness in previous publications."Centralized strategies for gracefully entering and exiting recurring social occasions" is what social politeness refers to.They develop the 'tact' idea of interpersonal etiquette. Tact is a broader definition of helpfulness, as it is linked to both good and negative facial expressions. They propose that tact is a distinct phenomenon with distinct purposes in human communication. Because it deals with people (rather than society) as the defining element of politeness, this approach is classified as interpersonal.

The theory of interactional grammar is also studied by Richard and Arndt(1992)Arndt and Janney. They propose that to acquire the understanding of emotive cues, sincerity condition must be postulated, supposing that speakers are not intentionally giving deceptive messages to deceive listeners. As a result, politeness becomes an issue of sincerity because supportiveness and politeness are comparable in their framework. In addition, Richard and Arndt(1992)also talk about politeness and how it relates to the face. They suggest that interpersonal supportiveness is defined by the maintenance of the interpersonal face, as defined by Brown and Lavinson as "wants for autonomy and social approbation." Positive communications must be accompanied by shows of confidence and involvement, according to interpersonal supportiveness, to avoid giving the sense that they are not good enough.

The Concept of Face in Politeness

Positive and negative facesare present worldwide in human culture. According to Penelope and Levinson(1987) that there are natural utterances that can threaten the face, known as face-threatening Acts (FTA). Togatorop(2019) agreed thata face-threatening act is one that intrinsically affects the addressee's or speaker's face by behaving in contrast to the other's feelings and desires.Penelope and Levinson(1987) mentioned that face is the public self-image that each person wishes to secure for himself, and it consists of two linked aspects: negative and positive face. The negative face reflects the wish to be unrestricted, to be able to act as one prefers, and the need to be admired, approved, and respected by others is significantly included in the positive face.

The speaker or addressee is unconcerned with their interlocutor's feelings or needs, or when the speaker or target does not want what another wants, a positive face is threatened. Positive face-threatening behaviors can harm the speaker or the recipient. A person's positive face is jeopardized when they are forced to be separated from others and their well-being is considered secondary. Then, an individual does not resist or intends to prevent obstructing their interlocutor's independence of conduct, negative face is threatened. It can affect either the speaker or the addressee, and it forces one of its interlocutors to surrender to the other's wishes. Whenever a negative face is

threatened, one's freedom of choice and action is restricted.Penelope and Levinson(1987).

Yule(1996) claimed that when the speaker seeks to free faces of others. Yule, (1996) clarifies that he must consider both their negative and positive face desires. The negative word does not have a negative connotation, but it denotes the complete opposite of positive. When someone needs to be self-sufficient and not be influenced by others, he has a bad face. He has a positive face when he wants to be welcomed by others, to be recognized as a part of the same individuals, and to understand that his or her desires are matched by others. Then, the positive face represents want to be linked, while the negative face represents a desire to be independent (Mansoor, 2018). Order, question, comment, and idea are instances of endangering negative face, which poses a threat to the participant's autonomy. Expressions of disapproval, arguments, indictment, and disturbance provide a threatening positive face that reduces an individual's self-and social policy (Saeed, 2009). According to Matthew(2007) that the following basic approach of politeness might minimize the risk to an addressee's negative face, while improving the positive face.

The Types of Politeness

There are mainly three types of politeness Lakoff(1990). He classified the politeness types such as distance politeness, deferential politeness, and camaraderie politeness.

1. Distance politeness refers to a respectful human strategy that is similar to that of other animals. Animals use physical boundaries to communicate with one another: this is my territory, stay out. Symbolic walls are generally built by humans using symbols. The distance politeness demonstrates that the individuals are on an equal basis. For a long time, it has been the norm in the upper and middle classes throughout the majority of Europe.

2. Deferential Politeness is a cultural trait that can be acquired by a civilization that wants to avoid conflict. Issues can be avoided if individuals assume that everything is stated in communication and what it means is it is up to another individual. Deference politeness implies degrading one or both of the partners' conversation. Many Asian societies are known for their courteous behavior. In the a huge number of civilizations, it is the favored method of communication for women, particularly when speaking with men.

3. Camaraderie is the third category, and it demonstrates that communication and relationship are socially beneficial concepts, with openness being the most important evidence of politeness. Being open and pleasant, according to a social system, is desirable and attractive.

Spolsky(1998) identified four characteristics that influence people's politeness. Linguistic and gender, language patterns, registers and contexts, slang, and unity are all things to consider. These four characteristics influence how politeness is communicated between speakers and listeners.

1.   Language and Gender

According to Spolsky(1998), males and women have different vocabularies. Children tend to choose women's and men's speech as social stereotypes. They believe

that women's conversation is about the family and daily life, whereas men's conversation is about the wider world and financial activities.

2. Language Style

A speaker is highly conscious of the person who is listening. Depending on who they are speaking to, persons could sellect to speak formally or informally (Widyastuti, 2019). When one speaks formally, according to Spolsky(1998), he is engaging in preferred and learned norms of their culture since he is capable to use his language correctly. As a result, Spolsky(1998) highlights the value of linguistic structure in expressing the speaker's viewpoint of self. Therefore, individuals can intentionally decide to utilize language by addressing people with formal or informal terms.

3. Registers and Domain

In terms of language, persons who work in a mining setting will contrast from those who work in geology. As a result, people who work in a specific field may come up with new terminology to describe new ideas (Spolsky(1998). The social context is equally important in determining politeness when speaking. According to Spolsky(1998), there is a common domain that dictates how people speak in social environments. Furthermore, he claims that domains are generally named after a location or activity within the domain. Home and work are two typical domains.

4. Slang and Solidarity

Slang highlighted the value of language in forming social identity. According to Widyastuti(2019) slang is a type of jargon that rejects formal conventions and is frequently used to express solidarity. Slang frequently defies other social norms by employing taboo words. Slang, according to Widyastuti2(019), is employed as a type of personal or in-group communication. People who use slang have social roles as a statement of identity belonging and unity. Furthermore, according to Spolsky(1998), solidarity has a significant effect on language.People often demonstrate group solidarity by using similar languages, such as an accent or word usage.

Discussion

Sociolinguistic and pragmatic are the elements of English as a second language that cannot be separated. Studying linguistics is always connected to the social field. English has been applied appropriately and following the social context. Each country has a variety of cultures and language accuracy in communication. In the application of English, every student must be able to understand the use of English following his or her language knowledge or called linguistics.

Politeness in speaking English is also part of sociolinguistic and pragmatic learning Eelen(2014). Politeness is concerned with pragmatic language use, and it is an occurrence that shows how languages and the social reality are linked. and it is widely agreed that ideas of politeness are implicated in any of these linguistic areas of study. The use of English politely is not simple to be practiced. In other words, there are different opinions regarding the habit of using a language. Therefore, some researchers agreed that the politeness of a language is appropriate behavior in speaking that makes listeners feel comfortable with the communication.

Sociolinguistic is connected to the communication of English. It means every single person who wants to learn English is categorized as a learner. Besides, politeness and sociolinguistic cannot be separated. Sociolinguistic needs English speaking politely in the society. In addition, to speak English is always influenced by the social factors such as nationality, English speaking style and environment, and social English dialect.

On the other hand, Hasanah et al., (2019) said that the use of English tends to be influenced by the sociolinguistic field. They stated that nationality, religion, gender, education level, and age were the sample areas that influenced the use of English. Following English with linguistic rules, it is not impossible that this can be changeable where the language is placed in different social situations. Spolsky(1998) identified four characteristics that influence people's politeness. Linguistic and gender, language patterns, registers and contexts, slang, and cooperation are all things to consider. These four characteristics influence how politeness is communicated between speakers and listeners.

Several scientists stated the theory of politeness, namely the first Robin Lakoff's concluded that politeness rules can be seen as a component of the system of pragmatic regulations, which she compares to grammatical rules, and just as syntactic rules are part of the scope of linguistic theories. Politeness principles are largely considered as a linguistic tool for systematically obtaining procedures. She proposes two main pragmatic competence principles, each of which is made up of a collection of sub-rules: be clear and be polite. Second is Brow and Levinson stated that each person has two different varieties of faces or desires: negative and positive. The positive face represents the want to be accepted, recognized, appreciated, and admired by others, whereas the negative face represents the wish to be unconstrained. The comparison of politeness theory among Robin Lakoff's, Brow and Levinson are always practiced by the learners to speak English. The societies are familiar to the ways of someone's talking clearly, politely and also supported by the face expression. The third is Geoffrey Leech concluded that linguistic politeness is part of a larger project to develop a general pragmatic model or an interpretation of how language is being used in interaction. He proposes two additional pragmatic systems such as Pragmalinguistics and Sociopragmatic. The fourth is Gu which discussed four maxims such as self-denigration (lower oneself while elevating others), address, tact, and generosity. The fifth is Sachico Ide who considered politeness to be essential to sustain good communication. The sixth is Shoshana Blum-Kulka. Blum-Kulka claimed that in Modern Hebrew, two concepts are comparable to politeness: nimus and adivut. The seventh is Bruce Frasher and William Nolen. They argued that there are somerules or norms of the relationship that is called is politeness, and this highlights socially accepted practices. Politeness has nothing to do with strategic communication or making the listener feel so good. The last is Horst Arndt and Richard Janney. They considered that the understanding of emotive cues, a sincerity condition must be postulated, supposing that speakers are not purposefully misleading hearers by sending false signals.

According to Brown and LevinsonPenelope and Levinson, 1987) that there are natural utterances that can threaten the face, known as face-threatening Acts (FTA). They claimed that face is the public self-image that each person wishes to secure for himself, and it consists of two linked aspects: negative and positive face. The negative face reflects the wish to be unrestricted, to be able to act as one prefers, and the need to be admired, approved, and respected by others is significantly included in the positive face. According to Matthew(2007) that The basic strategy of politeness may decrease the risks to an addressee's negative face whereas maximizing the positive face.

There are mainly three types of politeness Lakoff(1990). He classified the politeness types such as distance politeness, deferential politeness, and camaraderie politeness. Distance politeness refers to a respectful Humans have adopted the concept comparable to other animals. Deferential Politeness is a cultural trait that can be

acquired by a civilization that wants to avoid conflict. Camaraderie is the third category, and it demonstrates that communication and relationship are socially beneficial concepts, with openness being the most important evidence of politeness.

Conclusion

People need to learn about using language effectively for a variety of uses in some settings. Communication is more than just deciphering the words in a speech or utterance and then figuring out what someone means. People should think about some social factors, such as who they are speaking with. Therefore, to communicate politely, we should first comprehend a society's social standards.Other aspects, including setting, age, and the involvement of participants, must be considered.Certain social factors have played an influence in forming the politeness of language.Various definitions and perspectives have been given to the concept of politeness. Robin Lakoff, Penelope Brown, Steven Levinson, Geoffrey Leech, Yueguo Gu, Sachiko Ide, Shoshena Blum Kulka, Bruce Frasher, William Nolen, and Hornst Arndt and Richard Janney suggested some of the most commonly used approaches of linguistic politeness in literature.

References

Crystal. (1987). A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics. In *Basil Blackwell*. Retrieved from http://www.esp-world.info/Articles_33/Doc/needs analysis_Jabeen.pdf

Eelen, G. (2014). A Critique of Politeness Theories. In *Jerome Publishing* (3rd ed.). Park Square: Routledge.

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *14*(2), 219–236. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90081-N

Geoffrey, L. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Hasanah, L., Pradina, S., Hadita, A., & Putri, W. C. (2019). Sociolinguistic Influence in the Use of English as a Second Language (ESL) Classroom: Seeing from Onovughe's (2012) Perspective. *Elsya : Journal of English Language Studies*, *1*(1), 28–32. https://doi.org/10.31849/elsya.v1i1.2538

Khasanah, S. (2019). Sociolinguistics Background Determining Linguistic Politeness. *Alsuna: Journal of Arabic and English Language*, *2*(1), 16–29. https://doi.org/10.31538/alsuna.v2i1.252

Lakoff, R. (1990). *Talking Power: The Politics of Language in our lives.* (The Pragma). Glasgow: Oxford University Press.

Mansoor, I. K. (2018). Politeness: Linguistic Study. *Internasional Journal In Social Sciences And …*, *8*(IV), 167–179. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Iman-Mansoor/publication/330741875_POLITENESS_LINGUISTIC_STUDY/links/5c521e69458515a4c74c3c34/POLITENESS-LINGUISTIC-STUDY.pdf

Matthew. (2007). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*. Great Britain: Oxford University Press.

Penelope, B., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universal in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richard, J., & Arndt. (1992). *Intracultural Tact Versus Intercultural Tact*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Sachito, I. (1984). Sociolinguistics Analysis of Woman's use of Honorifics-an analysis of a Housewife's Natural Conversation in Daily Context. *Report of National Speacial Project: Standarization of Language*. Tokyo.

Journey
Journal of English Language and Pedagogy

(2022), 5 (1): 91–100

Saeed, J. (2009). *Semantics* (3th ed.). Singapore: Blackweel Publisher.

Spolsky, B. (1998). *Sociolinguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Togatorop, F. (2019). Politeness Strategies Used in the Conversation between the Students of Finance and Banking Department in Murni Sadar Polytehnic Pematangsiantar. *Journal of English Teaching as a Foreign Language*, *5*(1), 37–48.

Widyastuti, W. (2019). the Analysis of Politeness Strategey Used By the Main Character of Novel "the Sun Also Rises." *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, *1*(2), 118–138. https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v1i2.118-138

Yuego, G. (1990). Politeness Phenomena in Modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *14*(2).

Yule, G. (1996). *Yule, 1996.pdf*. Oxford: Oxford Press.