Lying in Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*: A Pragmatic Study

Hadeel Mahmoud Ibrahim[1] and Juma'a Qadir Hussein[2]
Department of English/College of Education for
Humanities/University of Anbar[1,2]
had19h1006@uoanbar.edu.iq[1]
jumaqadir@yahoo.com[2]

Abstract

Lying is a controversial issue as it is closely related to one's intended meaning to achieve certain pragmatic functions. The use of lying in literary works is closely related to the characters' pragmatic functions as in the case of Miller's *The Crucible* where it is used as a deceptive complex phenomenon that cannot be observed out of context. That is, the use of lying as a deceptive phenomenon represents a violation to Grices's Maxims. Thus, the study aims to qualitatively examine the kinds of maxims being violated, the kinds of violations conducted, the strategies followed in the violations, and the pragmatic functions behind such violations across the different categories of lies. To this end, the (30) extracts found in Miller's *The Crucible* have been all examined following Grice's (1975/1978) Cooperative Principle and Implicature theories. The analysis has revealed that the quality maxim was breached most of the time with a percentage of (96,6~97%), covert violation occupied (66,6~67%) (the same percentages of both prototypical lies and Intentional Deceptive Lies), fabrication was with (83%) and the pragmatic function "to avoid punishment" appears with (46,6~47%). This means that truthfulness was violated beside other maxims, and strategies of fabrication. Such a violation enhances lying, and false-implicature, and intensifies the tragic end for most of the innocent characters. Minor lies are slightly concerned with plot development and events escalation. Finally, the characters lie in order to achieve certain pragmatic functions. However, the most dominant function adopted when lying was to avoid punishment.

Keywords: bald-faced lies, bullshitting, cooperative principle, Grice maxims, implicature, prototypical lies, self-deceptive lies

الكذب في مسرحية البوتقة لآرثر ميلر: دراسة تداولية

هديل محمود إبراهيم[1] و جمعه قادر حسين[2]
قسم اللغة الانجليزية/ كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية- جامعة
الانبار[1,2]
had19h1006@uoanbar.edu.iq[1]
jumaqadir@yahoo.com[2]

المستخلص

يعد الكذب - بوصفه ظاهرة لغوية - موضوعاً مثيرا للجدل؛ وذلك لارتباطه ارتباطًا وثيقًا بالمعنى المقصود من الفرد من أجل تحقيق هدف معين.ويرتبط استعمال الكذب في الاعمال الادبية ارتباطا وثيقا بوظائف براغماتية محددة للأشخاص كما في مسرحية البوتقة لميلر التي استعمل فيها الكذب بوصفه ظاهرة خداعية لا يمكن ملاحظتها خارج السياق المسرحية. إن استعمال الكذب طريقة للخداع يمثل خرقا لقواعد المحادثة لغرايس؛ ولذلك فإن هدف الدراسة الحالية هو التحليل النوعي في تحديد الخروقات في قواعد المحادثة التي تساهم في خلق الكذب وأنواع هذه الخروقات، والاستراتيجيات الناتجة من هذه الخروقات، والوظائف البراغماتية التي تتضمنها الخروقات عبر أنواع الأكاذيب المختلفة. ولتحقيق هدف الدراسة فقد تم فحص المستخلصات الثلاثين جميعها الموجودة في مسرحية البوتقة اعتمادا على مبدأ غرايس التعاوني للمحادثة ونظرية التضمين (١٩٧٨/١٩٧٥). وأظهر التحليل أن مبدأ الجودة قد تم خرقه في معظم مواقف الكذب وبنسبة (٩٦,٦ ~ ٩٧٪)، والخروقات الخفية الضمنية كانت بنسبة (٦.٦٦ ~ ٦٧٪) (نفس النسب المئوية لكل من الأكاذيب النموذجية والأكاذيب الخادعة المتعمدة)، وكانت نسبة استراتيجية التلفيق (٨٣٪)، أظهرت الوظيفة البراغماتية "تجنب العقوبة" بنسبة (٤٦,٦~٤٧٪). وبهذا يكون الصدق قد تم انتهاكه إلى جانب مبادئ واستراتيجيات التلفيق الاخرى. ويعزز مثل هذا الانتهاك الكذب والتضمين الزائف النهاية المأساوية لأغلب الشخصيات البريئة. أما أنواع الاكاذيب الثانوية فتؤثر وبشكل طفيف جدا بتطور الحبكة وتسارع الأحداث. واخيراً: فإن الشخصيات تكذب لتحقيق وظائف براغماتية معينة، الا أن الوظيفة الأكثر شيوعًا هو تجنب العقوبة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الأكاذيب الخادعة للذات، الاكاذيب المكشوفة، الأكاذيب النموذجية، التضمين، المبدأ تعاوني، الهراء، مبادئ المحادثةلغرايس

Journal of the College of Education for Women-University of Baghdad-Iraq
The corresponding author: Juma'a Qadir Hussein

Page 43

1. Introduction

Pragmatics investigates speaker's implied meaning or how one can recognize the meaning of an utterance even if that hidden meaning is not directly stated (Majeed, 2021). People, in their daily interactions, tend to cooperate with one another other, following a set of norms and rules in order to produce their continuous conversation successfully; such rules should be obeyed by both interlocutors. This cooperation is referred to by Grice as Cooperative Principle (henceforth CP); it represents conversational guidelines which instigate proper conversations. Cooperative Principle is further sub-divided into four sub-maxims: QUALITY, QUANTITY, RELATION and MANNER. However, these rules are related to pragmatics, not to the structure of language. They are followed by users' intuitions rather than by the formal rules of language. This is because they are related to language use, not usage. Breaking or violating one rule (maxim) or another deliberately will create and add a liable deceptive flavor to the conversation. By the deliberate violation of some maxims, one understands that the interlocutor has the intention of doing so, whatever the reason behind such a violation. Therefore, the total, deliberate, and intentional violation of the super and sub-maxims is breached under the heading of deception and lying (Abdul Qadir & Juma', 2018).

Lying as a deceptive complex phenomenon cannot be observed out of context within Miller's *The Crucible*. Besides, the kinds of lies cannot either be discriminated out of its contextual environment. To determine whether the utterance contains a lie or not, one should take into account the conversational cooperative exchanges among the characters in *The Crucible*. The textual information helps to figure out the intended meaning, since relying on the literal meaning restricts readers' understanding from comprehending Miller's text.

Accordingly, the study aims to qualitatively examine the kinds of maxims being violated, the kinds of violations conducted, the strategies followed in the violations, and the pragmatic functions behind such violations across the different categories of lies. Based on the objective of the study, the researchers are to answer the following research question: what are the kinds of maxims being violated, the kinds of violations, the strategies followed in the violations, and the pragmatic functions behind such violations across the different categories of lies?

The study implicates a theoretical contribution to the concept of lying from a literary pragmatic perspective. For the theoretical contribution, this study is expected to present a theoretical overview on the concept of lying to enrich the linguistic knowledge within the pragmatic framework of maxim violation. On the other hand, for the practical contribution, readers will obtain valuable examples taken from the play *The Crucible* to be practically analyzed and analytically engaged with the language in use.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Concept of Lying

As a creative phenomenon, language is sometimes used to express 'imaginative' or 'untruthful' events. Language is not always expected to be used for describing truthfulness; language is the verbal tool for telling untruthful things that have never happened before such as telling lies. Lying is the action of uttering false statements produced with the intention to deceive. One of the basic conditions of lying is that the false statements must not be believed by the speaker and the successful lying depends upon the hearer's unawareness or perception for that intention. Deceptive intention is very crucial for an assertion to be classified as a lie (Carson, 2010; Martin, 2009).

Lying is defined by Black (2006) as "the intentional violation of a maxim with an intention to mislead" (p. 25). When someone violates a maxim, according to Chapman (2011), s/he is lying. When someone tells a lie, he simply disregards the conversational maxims deliberately, which is entirely different from flouting it. In flouting, one has no intention to

Journal of the College of Education for Women-University of Baghdad-Iraq
The corresponding author: Juma'a Qadir Hussein

Page **44**

deceive, and so the violation is non-deliberate, leading as a result to different implicated meanings. In line with Black (2006) and Chapman (2011), Ekman (1993) defined lying as a deliberate choice of misleading the target without exposing any notifications of the intent of doing so.

Deception and lying are terms which are often used interchangeably. Some regard deception as a superordinate category by which many other forms are subsumed under including the subcategory of lying while others view lying as a concept that equals deception (Gerwehr & Glenn, 2000). According to the second view, deception is defined as the action which involves misleading others and lying. It is a deliberate action that is done for the sake of misleading others without noticing that the doer is intending to do so. Deliberate or the intentionality in misleading others is a crucial characteristic which distinguishes lying from "deception". Deception does not necessarily require deliberate action or intention while lying has been always deliberate. In the current study, the second view is adopted (Frank & Sveteva, 2013; Harris, 2013). Deception includes variety of fraudulent behavior for tricky and misleading behaviors. Deception and lying are defined in accordance with people's perspectives and perception of such terms in accordance with the situation at which the exchange occurs (Chiluwa & Samoilenko, 2019; Knapp, Vangelisti & Caughlin, 2016).

Consequently, lying must satisfy three basic conditions to be viewed as a lie. In (2013), **Lackey** stated these conditions, as follows: "X lies to Y if and only if (i) X states that P to Y, (ii) X believes that P is false and (iii) X intends to be deceptive to Y in stating that P" (p. 237). The main condition for a lie is the transmission of a false proposition, then intentionality and deception. As a matter of fact, deceptive intention is very crucial for an assertion to be classified as a lie (Chen, 2020). However, not all lies include a deceptive intention. A deceptive intention requires the speaker's awareness of the falsity of his/her propositional utterance which is

pronounced for whatever goal s/he wants to achieve. Thus, when someone pronounces a false statement without his knowledge or awareness of the falsity of his statement, his statement cannot be considered a lie, but just a false proposition (Tollefsen, 2014). Intentionality and intent of deception differ in degrees from one maxim to another; not all violations of conversational maxims hold the same deceptive liable propositional value (Stratman, 2016). Fallis (2012) stated, "you lie if and only if you intend to violate the norm of conversation against communicating something false by saying that thing" (p. 569). Intentionality; therefore, is done with the speaker's intended violation of the maxims designed by Grice's model (Dynel, 2018).

Lying in *The Crucible* is one of the major themes. Lying, as a deceptive complex phenomenon, cannot be observed out of context within Miller's *The Crucible*. Besides, kinds of lies cannot be discriminated out of their contextual environment, and so their effective role and pragmatic functions cannot be recognized within tragedy evolvement. Since lying is a controversial issue, it would be more complex and difficult to be comprehensively understood without understanding the intended meaning within the textual context. The explicit meaning of lying utterances is always untruthful and inaccurate within Miller's play. Lying is done by most characters of the play; all with a distinct intention and goal. Lying; however, is taking many forms and different directions where sometimes some characters lie to one another and even to themselves.

2.2 Goals of Lying

Lying as a deceptive phenomenon is originally initiated for a purpose or a goal (whether a good purpose or bad). These goals are summarized as follows:

1. Protecting others

This goal represents the idea which accompanies one's polite attitudes and reactions towards the opposite addressee within the verbal exchange. Lies which are not necessary to be

Journal of the College of Education for Women-University of Baghdad-Iraq
The corresponding author: Juma'a Qadir Hussein
Page **45**

initiated with a false deceptive intention satisfy the hearer and cheer the hearer, protect others from undesired consequences, and avoid hurting the addressee. Lying may also be a means that children may adopt out of fear of punishment; especially if the punishment is severe or exaggerated (more than what the situation requires). Therefore, the child will realize through his/her experience that telling the truth is something good, and enables him/her to obtain a reward; otherwise s/he will be punished if lying is repeated (Majeed, 2011).

2. Protecting the Self

Protecting the self is the other reason for initiating a liable proposition. It is produced for self-enhancement for the sake of social acceptance. People often lie for multiple goals of self-benefits, such as saving face, convincing the hearer, avoiding conflict with others, and averting punishment for wrong actions.

3. Promoting the Self

Promoting the self is the other case of one's lies which are produced with an intention of impressing others.

4. Hurting others

Finally, the case of the deliberate hurting of others is considered a very serious, intentional and hurtful form of lies. The liar plans to hurt the target by initiating a lie which is instigated from the feel of jealousy or inadequacy (Levine, 2014).

2.3 Kinds of Lies

Lies vary in terms of their intentionality and deception. However, not all kinds of lies have the same degree of deception and intention. Lies are divided according to their standardization into two types: prototypical and non-prototypical. These classifications help the researcher in choosing data and determining the kinds of lie present in Miller's text.

1. *A prototypical Lie*, also labeled as **Intentional Deceptive Lie** (hence IDL) implies that language users communicate things which they are sure to be false with an intention of misleading and deceiving the hearer. This kind of lies requires a covert violation of the conversational maxims, which cannot be recovered by the opposite interlocutor. This category of lies (as cited in Birner, 2012) has at least three conditions which need to be satisfied in accordance with Colman and Kay's (1981) definition. These conditions are as follow:

a. The utterance is in fact false.

b. The speaker is intending the utterance to convey a false belief.

c. The speaker is intending to deceive the opposite hearer by uttering the utterance.

2. *Non-Prototypical Lies* are those which are less valuable and interesting; they are with different intentions and goals, namely bald-faced lies, self-deceptive lies and bullshitting. The violation of conversational maxims is always overt; the hearer is aware of the falsity and deception uttered within a proposition. These kinds are explained as follows:

a. Bald–faced Lies

Bald–faced lies are greatly similar to prototypical lies. In this kind of lies, the three conditions have been fulfilled, though the intention is not directed for deception, but for avoiding consequences of telling the truth. Here, the speaker is trying to assert rather than to deceive. If the person lies about something, and does not confess of his wrong doings, he will be safe that he will not be punished (O'Seanery, 2006).

b. Self-Deceptive Lies

Self-deceptive lies are those which are directed to the speaker's oneself, not the other self. The speaker is sure that he is uttering a deliberate or intentional false proposition. He further does not intend to deceive the opposite interlocutor, but he intends to convince himself (Meibauer, 2014; Martin, 2009; Trivers, 2011).

c. Bullshitting

Bullshitting as proposed by Frankfurt (2005) requires a deceptive intention. It is regarded as a misrepresentation, i.e., a "short of lying" by which bullshitters are not similar to liars in the sense that they are unconcerned about the truth or falsity of whatever they say.

Journal of the College of Education for Women-University of Baghdad-Iraq
The corresponding author: Juma'a Qadir Hussein
Page **46**

Bullshitter's verbal contribution is a kind of saying anything rather than nothing. In accordance with Frankfurt's view, bullshitters indeed have the intention of deceiving in what they are trying to communicate. However, they do not necessarily try to deceive the addressee about their speech content. They simply try to deceive the audience about themselves (showing themselves). Therefore, the intention to deceive may and/or may not be operative along with one's speech since even bullshitters have their own goal of misrepresenting facts (speaking bombastically) (Hardcastle & Reisch, 2006).

2.4 Previously Conducted Studies

In short, the study under investigation is a comprehensive pragmatic analysis of the phenomenon of lying which has not been considered before. However, lying has been studied from different perspectives in the previous studies. For instance, Abdulmajeed and Finjan's (2018) study focused upon the pragmatics of concealment as a deceptive strategy used by Tony Blair's speech about Iraqi war. Concealment, in their study, is viewed as a strategy of deception (not a liable strategy). The data were analyzed depending upon Breaching Grice Maxims, Pragma-Rhetorical Devices, Politeness Strategies, Personal Deixis and Fallacy. They concluded that Tony Blair used this deceptive phenomenon for persuasion. Besides, he used a lot of faked assumptions, outright lying and misleading for evoking fear and sympathy for the listeners to override the idea of war.

Chen, Hu and He's (2013) study investigated lying comparatively. Lying was viewed from two comparative cultural perspectives by applying Speech Act Theory. They compared aspects which influence lying among American English speakers and the Chinese ones. The study concluded that lying is understood better as a scalar notion, rather than as a bivalent one. Besides, lying is usually related to speakers' personal benefits.

In addition, Arculi, Mallard and Villar's (2010) study examined lying from a sociolinguistic perspective. They investigated the users' behaviors when lying, such as the use of hesitant words, speech fillers, speech intervals, interjections and certain lexical items. They concluded that when lying, one would face a cognitive load which requires to fill speech pauses, and hesitations with certain speech fillers, such as the use of hesitant fillers (-um and -oh), which impact speech fluency. They also highlighted that liars need more time when lying than truth-telling in speech. when lying, a person needs much time to give the mind a longer period to conceptualize and formalize a lie with certain changes in the pitch and tone of the speaker.

Tupan and Natalia (2008) conducted a study to investigate the pragmatics of multiple violations when lying. The study did consider the deceptive liable strategies resulted from the violation of each maxim and the kind of lie resulted. The study concluded that CP with its subsequent maxims were deliberately disobeyed to create a deceptive lies for various reasons: saving face, satisfying the hearer, convincing the hearer, cheering the hearer and other social reasons.

As far as the current study is concerned, it investigates lying from a pragmatic perspective by applying CP and Implicature Theory. Lying in *The Crucible* has not been studied before for the sake of examining the types of lies, maxims' violations, the strategies adopted and for the pragmatic functions of lying. The present work further examines lying as a superordinate term that is equals to 'Deception', not a subcategory of it.

2.5 The Pragmatic Function

The pragmatic function is the speaker's hidden meaning s/he aims to convey behind what is communicated. The pragmatic function or what is known as the communicated content is defined by Brisard, Ostman, & Verschueren, (2009) as "the totality of what the speaker wishes to evoke in his/her communication with the addressee" (p. 106). They added that every piece of communication within their daily interactions is shaped by the communicative aims of its

speaker to suit the communicative need of its initiator in a given occasion. Therefore, the speaker adopts a specific strategy to convey his aims and satisfy his needs with. When the communicator intends to lie, he/she retrieves the attention of the hearer towards the addressee, helping him to interpret what s/he aims to convey at the first place. Although the utterance violated the truthfulness standard when lying, the function proposed by its referent is highly accepted. The pragmatic function is, in short, a reflection of one's intention.

2.6 The Adopted Theories
2.6.1 Grice's CP and Implicature Theory

Human communication is a dynamic process of conversational cooperation. Grice viewed cooperation as the ruling element of most of the verbal interactions. Through this element the meaning of an utterance generates an automatic expectation which guides the addressee towards reacting to that message. Grice further highlighted the importance of both the rationality and cooperation of conversational exchanges since they both add a logical meaningful sense to the interaction. Cooperation is introduced in a conceptual framework or structure. Governing the nature of the interactive communication and interpretations are intuitively related to the inferential message which is injected within an utterance (Ariel, 2010). This consequently leads Grice to assume that interactive conversation is fundamentally a cooperative task by which interlocutors rationally and conscientiously get involved and contributed to the verbal exchange they are engaged in (Tipton & Desilla, 2019). Consequently, a conversational exchange basically requires cooperation and negotiation that should be at process when communicating (Rusch, 2021).

Grice defined CP as "make your conversational contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Macagno & Capone, 2021, p. 27). Grice introduced the principle of cooperation which subsumes its four

subcategories namely: Quantity, Quality, Relation and Manner. Grice, in his theory, stated that these rules are seen as guidelines that instigate the successful communication, yet they are not expected to be followed all the time and in every conversational occasion (Al-Mansoob & Alrefaee, 2018). He further added that these rules are seen as guidelines that trigger successful communications. However, they are not expected to be followed all time and in every conversational occasion. Besides, they may not be followed for the sake of expressing an indirect meaning (Jacobsen & Takubo, 2020). These maxims are as follows:-

1. **The Maxim of Quantity**: This maxim explains that one's contribution is conditioned by the informativity that sorts the immediate purpose of the conversational exchange. It involves the following sub-maxims:
 a. Any interactive contribution must provide enough information and must fulfill the informativity requirement that copes with the current goal of the exchange, and
 b. The amount of information should cope with the requirements of the interactive piece of exchange (no more and no less).
2. **The Maxim of Quality**: The super maxim of this category is "try to make your contribution one that is true". It includes two more specific maxims, which are stated as follows:
a. One should not say things that s/he believes to be false, and
b. One should not say things for which s/he lacks adequate evidence.
3. The Maxim of Relation: Under this maxim ,only the single sub-maxim is placed namely; "Be relevant"
4. **The Maxim of Manner**: This maxim is related principally with how to say something. "Be perspicuous" is the super-maxim of this category under which the following sub-maxims are subsumed:
a. "Avoid obscurity of expression"
b. "Avoid ambiguity"
c. "Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)"

Journal of the College of Education for Women-University of Baghdad-Iraq
The corresponding author: Juma'a Qadir Hussein

Page **48**

d."Be   orderly"
(Grice, 1975/1978, p. 45).

2.6.2 Implicature Theory

Speaking of CP and its attendant maxims, they are regarded as the essence of everyday interactions. However, conversational maxims are not always followed, obeyed or observed, since there are many cases by which such maxims are flouted, violated, suspended, infringed or opted. When maxims are not observed, a special kind of meaning is aroused; namely "implicature". In his theory of implicature, Grice proposed that it is a kind of inferential implicit meaning which bridges the gap between maxim flouting and coherence (Thomas, 2011; Grundy, 2008). For instance, if a mother announces a question to her son by noting that:

1. *"Have you done your homework?"* Thomas, 2011, p. 20),

she may receive an answer like:

2. *"My bicycle is broken, mum?"* (Thomas, 2011, p. 20).

At the surface level of meaning, there is no direct nor apparent relevance between the mother's question and the son's response. However, since there is an understanding and cooperation existed between the two parties, there must be a kind of meaningful relationship that holds the two pieces of interaction together. The son has transmitted his message with an intention of giving an acceptable excuse. Such a kind of meaning is called inferential meaning, namely implicature. In this example, the son has inferred that he has not done his school duties and he further intends to divert the original direction of his mother's attention. This kind of meaning is operative where there is a missing link between the utterance, the situational context as well as the shared background knowledge of the communicators (Hussein & Abdullah, 2016; Tipton & Desilla, 2019).

2.7 Gricean Account of Lying: A Pragmatic Perspective

Since lying is essentially an insincere assertion to what believed to be false, insincerity can be formed in different shapes (strategies) due to the intentional violation of conversational maxims. Conversational maxims may be opted, violated, infringed, suspended or flouted to create a special meaningful effect. However, when someone lies, he uses a strategy. Like other acts of speech, lying has many strategic verbal behaviors by which one can accomplish his liable proposition with. These strategies are numerated as: false-implicature, fabrication, half-truth, contrived distraction, equivocation, omission and concealment; each can be resulted from violating a specific conversational maxim.

Quantity violation can produce uncompleted proposition in which the speaker is intending to deceive others by using different strategies, and by presenting unnecessary and distracting information to the audience if it is communicated intentionally. Levine (2014) viewed concealment as a conversational strategy of speaker's deliberate action to conceal (being not informative enough) the most crucial information related to the discourse. The speaker's intentionality conceals the truth excluded from the proposition, communicating as a result only unimportant details in his/her speech. The speaker; however, may conceal the whole truth or part of it. When presenting part of the truth, it overlaps with other liable strategies such as half-truth and omission. Consequently, half-truth is the strategic verbal behavior adopted when no enough information has been supplied. The speaker intentionally manipulates the amount of information included and excluded within uttered proposition. Half-truth simply indicates partial truth or half of it. In cooperative exchange, the speaker is supposed to utter a complete and informative proposition. However, if one or both of these conditions are intentionally missing, the utterance will be holding a liable message. Consequently, half-truth involves hiding the most crucial and relevant information to the addressee. As for omission, it is concerned with the intentional act of the speaker's (or writer's) omission of some words, sentences, utterances or with the whole

incident for misleading others. Omission is a liable strategy, which is widely used in commercial advertising. It involves omitting the material information concerning certain products (Michaelson & Stokke, 2018).

False-implicature and fabrication are strategies which involve the violation of Quality maxim. False-implicature refers to that retrieved message, which is originally initiated to make a false idea or reference. False-implicature describes cases of speaker's indirect meaning, which is intended to be delivered falsely. Lying can be initiated by using false-implicature as well as presupposition (Meibauer, 2014). Fabrication, on the other hand, refers to the way of constructing, forming and creating complete false events and stories. Violating Quality maxim may instigate multiple violations since the speaker does not make his contribution one which is true; the speaker hides the information and is not being informative enough (Levine, 2014).

Violating the relevance maxim can add two deceptive liable effects, false-implicature and contrived distraction. Contrived distraction regards the speaker's intended violation as a distractor to the addressee's attention towards something to mislead his. Examples are the sudden change of the topic, the skipping of some details and a change in the direction of the rational conversation (Dynel, 2018).

Finally, the violations done within the manner maxim limitations can offer equivocation. Equivocation is a conversational strategy where the speaker expresses something ambiguous, holding more than one possible interpretation (one is true and the others are false) (Shuy, 2017). The speaker uses such a technique to push the hearer to adopt the false intended meaning. This strategy is usually by politicians, advertisers, and so forth when they are cycling around the truth without mentioning it. It is worth noting that false-implicature is the most flexible strategy that can be obtained from the violations done within the quantity, quality, relation and manner, respectively. Consequently,

false implicature is originally intended to create a liable proposition (Levine, 2014).

3. Methodology

The present work is qualitative; it aims at descriptively analyzing (30) extracts that carry different types of lies in Miller's *The Crucible*, a classical scripted tragedy written by the American playwright Arthur Miller in 1953. The edition of the play used is 16th in (2011). The theories adopted in the analysis are CP and Implicature. To meet the objective of the study, the researchers are to do the following steps:

1. Explaining some related contextual hints, such as who said the extract? To whom? And in what occasion?

2. Identifying which maxim has been violated in each instance following Grice's theories (1975_1978) of CP and Implicature;

3. Specifying the type of violations in terms of an overt/covert violation based on Birner's classification (2013); An intentional violation is done without hearers' recognition of that violation or without the specification of character's intention when lying). An overt violation happens when the hearer recognizes that the speaker is violating one maxim or another for certain pragmatic functions

4. pinpointing the pragmatic strategies of lying following Levine's (2014) classification of lying strategies.

5. categorizing the type of lies committed adopting:-

a. Birner's (2013) identified types of prototypical lies,

b. Meibauer (2014) classifications of bald-faced lies and self-deceptive lies, and

c. Frankfurt's (2005) type of bullshitting, to determine the kind of lies used by characters in Miller's text.

6. Demarcating the pragmatic functions behind committing each lie adopting Levine's (2014) classifications of the goals and purposes.

5. Tabulating the overall analysis and findings.

3.1 Data Analysis

To meet the objective, which reads: **examining the kinds of maxims being violated,**

the kinds of violations, the strategies followed in the violations, and the pragmatic functions behind such violations across the different categories of lies, consider Table 1:

Table 1
The Thirty Lies with their Pragmatic Analysis

Extract No	Maxim Violated	Kind of Violation	Strategy	Category of Lies	Goal/Reason (Pragmatic Function)
1.	QUALITY, QUANTITY RELATION	Covert	Half-truth Contrived distraction False-implicature Concealment Omission	Prototypical IDL	To avoid punishment
2.	QUALITY, QUANTITY RELATION	Covert	fabrication Omission Contrived distraction	Prototypical IDL	To avoid punishment
3.	QUALITY QUANTITY	Overt	Fabrication Omission Concealment	Prototypical lie IDL	To avoid punishment Save her face and reputation
4.	QUALITY	Overt	Fabrication False-implicature	Non-prototypical (bullshitting)	To convince Mr. Parris Assert implicit false implicature (the existence of witchcraft)
5.	QUALITY	Overt	Fabrication False-implicature	Non-prototypical (bullshitting)	To convince Mr. Parris Assert implicit false implicature (the existence of witchcraft)
6.	QUALITY	Overt	False-implicature Fabrication Concealment Omission	Non- prototypical (Self-deceptive lie)	Asserting implicit implicature (the existence of witchcraft) convincing Mr. Parris with what she says
7.	QUALITY QUANTITY	Covert	Fabrication Half-truth	Prototypical IDL	To deceive Betty (convince her with her implicit false content) avoid punishment
7.	QUALITY QUANTITY	Covert	Fabrication Half-truth	Prototypical IDL	To deceive Betty (convince her with her implicit false content) avoid punishment
8.	QUALITY QUANTITY	Covert	Omission Fabrication	Prototypical IDL	To deceive others avoid punishment
9.	QUALITY QUANTITY	Overt	False-implicature	Non-prototypical (bald-faced lie)	To save his face and reputation from lechery with Abigail protect his wife's feelings
10.	QUALITY	Overt	False-implicature Concealment Half-truth	Non-prototypical Self-deceptive lie	To assert implicit implicature convince Mr. Parris that her babies do not die naturally
11.	QUALITY QUANTITY	Covert	Fabrication	Prototypical IDL	To assert implicit content that she is good, but Tituba corrupts her convince the hearer avoid punishment
12.	QUALITY	Covert	Fabrication Half-truth	Prototypical IDL	To avoid punishment
13.	QUALITY QUANTITY	Covert	Fabrication	Prototypical IDL	To avoid punishment through false confession
14.	QUALITY	Covert	Fabrication False-implicature	Prototypical IDL	To avoid punishment
15.	QUALITY	Covert	Fabrication Concealment	Prototypical IDL	To deceive Proctor and his wife assert an implicit value (Sarah Good is a witch) Avoid punishment through accusing other people

Journal of the College of Education for Women-University of Baghdad-Iraq
The corresponding author: Juma'a Qadir Hussein

Page **51**

			Table 1-Continued		
Extract No	Maxim Violated	Kind of Violation	Strategy	Category of Lies	Goals/Reasons (Pragmatic Functions)
16.	QUALITY	Overt	Fabrication Concealment	Prototypical lie IDL	To deceive Proctor and his wife assert an implicit value (Sarah Good is a witch) avoid punishment through accusing other people
17.	QUALITY	overt	False-implicature Fabrication	Non-prototypical (bald-faced lie)	To assert a false implicature (to implicate that Elizabeth is one of the witches)
18.	QUALITY	Overt	False-implicature Fabrication	Non-prototypical (bald-faced lie)	To assert a false implicature (to implicate that Elizabeth is one of the witches) Convince Proctor that she is innocent
19.	QUALITY QUANTITY RELATION	Overt	Fabrication Omission Contrived distraction	Non-prototypical (bald-faced lie)	To assert a false implicature (to implicate that George Jacobs is sorcerer) convince Proctor that she is innocent of witchcraft
20.	QUALITY QUANTITY	Overt	Fabrication Concealment False-implicature	Non-prototypical (bald-faced lie)	To assert a false implicature (to implicate that Elizabeth is one of the witches) convince Proctor that she is innocent
21.	QUALITY QUANTITY	Covert	Fabrication False-implicature Omission	Prototypical IDL	To protect Abigail from being accused save his face and reputation
22.	QUALITY QUANTITY RELATION	Covert	Fabrication Omission Contrived distraction	Prototypical IDL	To avoid punishment, accuse Proctor's wife of being a witch (hurting her) convince Mr. Danforth about her liable proposition
23.	QUALITY RELATION	Covert	Fabrication False-implicature Contrived distraction	Prototypical IDL	To avoid punishment Accuse Mary of witchcraft (hurting her)
24.	QUANTITY MANNER	Covert	Half-truth Equivocation	Prototypical IDL	To protect her husband's face and reputation
25.	QUALITY QUANTITY MANNER	Covert	Half-truth Fabrication Equivocation	Prototypical IDL	To protect her husband's face and reputation
26.	QUALITY QUANTITY	Covert	Fabrication Concealment	Prototypical IDL	To avoid punishment
27.	QUALITY	Covert	Fabrication	Prototypical IDL	To avoid punishment and to assert her false confession (that she is witched)
28.	QUALITY QUANTITY	Overt	Fabrication Concealment	Non-prototypical (bald-faced lie)	To hurt others, save his face assert the existence of witchcraft
29.	QUALITY	Covert	Fabrication	Prototypical IDL	To avoid punishment
30.	QUALITY	Covert	Fabrication	Prototypical IDL	To avoid punishment

Based on Table 1, the researchers below summarized with examples the type of maxims being violated, identified the type of violations, specified the characters, and demarcated their pragmatic functions behind each violation, pinpointed the strategies used, and listed the categories of lies committed:-

1. Examples on the violations of the quality maxim include the following:-

a. The accusations directed to Elizabeth by Abigail of being a witch in order. Here, Elizabeth wanted Abigail to get executed to get rid of her and to marry her husband.

b. When Mr. Parris investigated Abigail and asked her what Abigail and her group of girls were doing in the forest, and Abigail replied, "*Uncle, we did dance*" (**p. 8**), denying that she was preparing a curse for Goody proctor to get rid of her. Abigail fabricated the action of dancing to avoid being punished. Her lie was

Journal of the College of Education for Women-University of Baghdad-Iraq
The corresponding author: Juma'a Qadir Hussein

Page **52**

prototypical and covert, since her uncle did not notice that she violated the truth.

c. Another example was when Proctor did his false confession, *"I did"* (**p. 125**). Here, when Proctor was asked whether he sold himself for the devil, or not, he answered, I did. His answer represents a prototypical fabricated false confession, breaching the quality maxim intentionally. He did so in order to avoid punishment, since at that time those who regret and confess their guilt would not be punished.

d. Tituba (Mr. Parris's servant) also initiated a fabricated confession, saying *"He says Mr. Parris must be killed"* (**p. 14**). Here, Tituba referred that the devil had ordered her to kill Mr. Parris; a matter which is absolutely untrue (a fabricated event).

e. Moreover, Betty (Mr. Parris's daughter) also communicated such fabricated accusations when the accused girls including Abigail, Tituba, Betty and others were investigated by Mr. Hale to see whether these girls had sold their souls for the devil or not. Out of fear of punishment, she said in a hilarious way, *"I saw George Jacobs with the Devil! I saw Goody Howe with the Devil"* (**p. 42**). Her utterance is a prototypical covert lie.

f. In line with his daughter, Mr. Parris also lied when he said, *"I can only say, sir, that I never found any of them naked, that this man is–"* (**p. 94**). When Proctor told the court that one of the girls was naked, he said so to protect his reputation, and save his face. Mr. Parris denied the action though in Act I, Scene I, he told Abigail that he saw one of them naked.

g. Other characters also used false-implicature strategy to initiate their false inferential message, and the most powerful example is the saying of *"the Devil is loose in Salem"* (**p. 53**) to confirm and implicate that Proctor's wife was one of the devil's followers. In spite of being overt, the lie strongly suggested a false inferred message.

h. In addition, Mrs. Putnam used this strategy a lot to convey a certain message, and to convince the opposite person. One of her utterances was, *"Mr. Collin saw her going over Ingersoll's barn, and come down light as bird, she says!"*(**p. 11**). This utterance was uttered to assert that Betty was witched and Mr. Collin saw her flying, and also to convey false-implicature to Mr. Parris to assure him that there was witchcraft in Salem

2. Cases in point regarding the violations of the quantity maxim are the following:

a. Abigail committed a prototypical lie when he uttered, *"I told him everything he knows now, he knows everything we –"* (*p. 16).* Abigail's utterance is an example of concealment when Abigail concealed the truth, telling Betty that she confessed everything she and her group of girls were doing in the forest to Betty's father. She concealed the truth and she did not confess everything to Mr. Parris.

b. Proctor used the strategy of omission when he told Abigail, *"Aye, but we did not"* (**p. 20**)**,** to omit what actually happened before. He omitted that they had an affair once before.

c. When Abigail said, *"I never sold myself! I'm a good girl! I'm a proper girl!"* (**p. 37**)**,** **she used the** truth-half strategy, *"I never sold myself"* to assert the idea that she never sold herself for the devil. Besides, she used the false half strategy as represented by her utterance, *"I'm good girl! I'm a proper girl",* as she was not a good girl (very malicious and immoral). She was always planning for devilish actions, and practicing lechery with Proctor when she was his servant.

3. To elaborate more about the characters' violations of the maxim of relation, consider the following examples:

a. Abigail's utterance, *"I have been hurt, Mr. Danforth, I have seen my blood running out! I have been near to murdered every day because I done my duty pointing out the Devil's people –and this is my reward? To be mistrusted, denied, questioned like a-"* (**p. 97**) was maliciously communicated when she aimed at deviating the course of the investigation. This extract was said when Mr. Danforth asked Abigail whether she surely saw

the devil or not. She evaded the answer by mentioning fabricated irrelevant information in a contrived distractive manner.

b. A further utterance by Susanna Wolcott, *''I freeze, I freeze!''* **(p. 98**) in which she interrupted the course of conversation to make her fabricated accusation believable. She initiated such an utterance to avoid answering Mr. Danforth's question about what they were doing in the forest. She wanted to assert that Mary Warren was a witch; she was able to send her spirit to prevent them from confessing against her. Both Abigail and Susanna successfully initiated such lies to avoid punishment and hurt others.

4. To clarify more about the violations of the manner maxim, see the following examples:

a. Goody Proctor adopted this strategy when Mr. Hathorne investigated her to assert or negate that Proctor and Abigail's lechery, since this action was confessed personally by Proctor. She did not directly answer the question, but equivocated by saying, *''Your Honor, I -in that time I were sick. And I -My husband is a good and righteous man' ''* (p. 101).

b. A further confession is uttered also by her, *''I came to think he fancied her. And so one night I lost my wits, I think, and put her on the highroad''* **(p. 101)**. This utterance was uttered when Mr. Hathorne asked Goody Proctor about the reason behind dismissing Abigail from her House service. Instead of mentioning that Abigail and her husband had an illicit affair, she equivocated around the answer without directly mentioning the reason.

3.2 Results and Discussion

Based on Table **1**, which shows how the thirty extracts have been pragmatically analyzed to explore the maxims violated, kinds of violations, strategies adopted, categories of lie, and the pragmatic functions behind lying. Results have shown the following:

1. All conversational maxims have been breached in the play using different percentages and strategies, as shown in Table 2:-

Table 2
Conversational Maxims' Frequencies of Violations

No	Conversational Maxim	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Quality	29	96,6~97%
2.	Quantity	16	53%
3.	Relation	4	13%
4.	Manner	2	6~6,7%

As it is revealed in the Table 2, The maxim of QUALITY has been dominantly violated by the characters with a percentage of (96,6~97%). It represents the highest rate of maxims' violations as it has been breached twenty-nine times. The QUANTITY maxim has also been violated (16) times by the characters, i.e., with (53%) percentage. RELATION maxim has often been breached with a percentage of (13%). Finally, the

MANNER maxim has been slightly violated throughout the play with a percentage of (6,6~ 7%).

2. Regarding the number and types of strategies used to do the violations, it has been noticed that seven lying strategies were used in the play namely: fabrication, false-implicature, omission, concealment, half-truth, contrived distraction, and equivocation. Fabrication occupied the highest percentage among the scale of strategies of lying; it appeared twenty-five times in the play with (83%) percentage; lying was almost a fabrication

Journal of the College of Education for Women-University of Baghdad-Iraq
The corresponding author: Juma'a Qadir Hussein

Page **54**

action. False-implicature occurred twelve times with a percentage of (40%) out of the total number of the analyzed data. Concealment took place eight times with (26,6~27%) percentage, since characters tend to conceal the truth wholly or partially for different pragmatic functions. Omission appeared seven times with a percentages of (23%), since the characters intended to omit what was necessary for the investigation committee. Half-truth frequented six times with a percentage of (20%) when the characters hid the half-truth from the investigators to accomplish their lie with. Contrived distraction frequented four times with (13%), since Abigail and the girls adopted this strategy to distract the attention of the investigation committee towards something else. Finally, equivocation had the lowest frequency and percentage among the deceptive strategies; it appeared only two times with (6,6~7%) percentage, as illustrated in Table 2 below:

3. Concerning lies categories, results have shown that prototypical standard lies appeared with (66,6 ~ 67%) percentage, whereas the other kinds of lies (non-prototypical standard lies) had a percentage of (33%). Consequently, covert lies (covert violation) and overt ones had the same percentages of prototypical and non-prototypical lies. Both prototypical and covert lie had a direct relationship with a stream of events and plot development; a matter which led finally to random executions happened to most innocent people. Non-prototypical and overt ones had a little impact, and changed nothing within *The Crucible* events.

4. Highlighting the kinds of lies used within *The Crucible*; the most dominant kind was IDLs, which had the highest percentage (66,6 ~ 67%) with twenty times frequencies. This indicates that the lies were mostly deceptive, false and intentional, with a malicious purpose, for this reason the tragic complexity was intensified. Bald-faced lies were frequented six times, about (20%) percentage as an attempt to deceive the hearer, but these lies were immediately exposed by the hearer. Both **s**elf-deceptive lies and bullshitting appeared with a low frequency (two times for each) with percentages (6,6~7%) for each, since they have very little to do with plot development. Self-deceivers and bullshitters had a very minor purpose to initiate such utterances.

5. Speaking of the pragmatic functions involved when committing lies, it has been shown that various functions instigated lies initiation and these are shown as:

a. **To avoid punishment:** Fearing the legal consequences, most characters lie to avoid punishment (execution which was the only penalty for those practicing witchcraft). This intended function is frequented within the play fourteen times among the analyzed data with (46,6~47%).

b. **To assert implicit content (false-implicature):** False-implicature was one of the pragmatic functions intended to convey a proposition beyond what is said. Characters use this strategy to assert the existence of witchcraft in Salem to achieve further malicious intended goals. It was frequented eight times among the analyzed data with (26,6~27%).

c. **To save one's face (reputation):** Characters tend to lie to save their face (reputation) from being exposed. Fearing that their immoral and illegal actions exposed, they intend to lie. This function is frequented four times with (13%).

d. **To convince someone with the reliability of false proposition:** Characters tend to lie to deceive the opposite character. This pragmatic function is frequented eleven times with (36,6~37%).

e. **To deceive someone:** Characters tend to lie to deceive the opposite character. This pragmatic function was frequented one time with (3%) and used mainly by Abigail.

f. **To accuse others (hurting them):** Some characters plan to lie for hurting others and the

Journal of the College of Education for Women-University of Baghdad-Iraq
The corresponding author: Juma'a Qadir Hussein

Page **55**

most powerful example when Abigail accuses Elizabeth of being a witch to be executed to take her place within Proctor's house and heart. It was frequented five times with (16,6~17%).

g. **To protect others:** In contrast with previous pragmatic functions, a very minor percentage of lies were intended to protect others which were all done by Elizabeth to protect her husband's reputation, name and face. This function was frequented four times (13%).

6. Linguistic communication cannot be easily understood unless one has a global understanding to the contextual environment related to the meaning as well as to the pragmatic function.

7. Obeying conversational maxims can enhance the literal meaning proposed by the actual use of words and sentences, whereas violating these maxims can create a special intended proposition.

8. Linguistic communication cannot be easily understood unless one has a global understanding to the contextual environment related to the meaning as well as to the pragmatic function.

9. Obeying conversational maxims can enhance the literal meaning proposed by the actual use of words and sentences, whereas violating these maxims can create a special intended proposition.

4. **Conclusions**

To answer the research question, what are the kinds of maxims being violated, the kinds of violations, the strategies followed in the violations, the categories of lies involved, and the pragmatic functions behind such violations across the different categories of lies?, the researchers have concluded the following:-

1. The characters violated all Grice's maxims, (quality, quantity, relation, and manner).

2. There have been two types of violations throughout the whole novel, covert and overt. In this vein, it has been concluded that covert violations always accompany prototypical lies (IDLs); a matter, which cannot be easily

traced unless one relies on the context of play to discover its pragmatic function. Only IDLs have been taken seriously by the investigation committee, who dealt with such a kind of lie as having a truthful proposition.

3. The overall strategies adopted by the characters when violating the maxims and committing lies have been (mention number). These include the fabrication, false-implicature, concealment, omission, half-truth, contrived distraction and equivocation.

4. The categories of lies across all types of maxims violations have been limited to prototypical and non-prototypical lies. IDL, which is highly based on fabricated false stories, and involves deceptive, intentional and covert violation of Grice's maxim was the most dominant and powerful category of lying. In addition, bald-faced, bullshitting, and self-deceptive lies all appeared in a very minor rate, having a very limited role (if no role at all) in plot development. This is because they have very little-if nothing- to do, or add to the play's tragic climax.

5. Generally speaking, the pragmatic functions carried out by the characters when lying include the following:-

a. To avoid punishment
b. To assert implicit content (false-implicature)
c. To save one's face (reputation)
d. To convince someone with the reliability of a false proposition
e. To deceive someone
f. To accuse others (hurting them)
g. To protect others

Among all these pragmatic functions, the dominate goal of maxims' violations has been "to avoid punishment". This is because most of the characters' breach of the conversational maxims was due to the fear of the authoritative power and the penalty of execution.

6. Speaking of the relationship between the violation of QUALITY, and the type of violations, it has been found that violating this

Journal of the College of Education for Women-University of Baghdad-Iraq
The corresponding author: Juma'a Qadir Hussein
Page **56**

maxim leads to generate covert intentional lies. In this type of maxim violations, the characters breached the standard of truthfulness of what they communicated in a quiet manner for malicious purposes. Such a covert violation has a powerful dominant role in Miller's plot from the beginning till the end of the play. Moreover, it has also been noted that the surface meaning of utterances has zero truthfulness value, whereas the intended meaning is the decisive one in determining the truth.

7. Regarding the relationship between the violation of QUALITY, and the type of pragmatic strategies used, it has been found that the strategies adopted were limited to the use of fabrication, and false implicature.

8. As for the relation between the violation of QUALITY maxim, and the category of lies involved on one hand and the pragmatic function on the other, it has been concluded that with this maxim violation, all kinds of lies and pragmatic functions were produced.

9. With respect to the relationship between violating the maxim of QUANTITY and the types of violations involved, it has been noticed that both covert and overt have appeared.

10. Concerning the relationship between the violation of QUANTITY maxim, and the type of pragmatic strategies used, it has been concluded that the strategies adopted have been limited to the use of omission, concealment, and half-truth initiation. The characters manipulated the amount of information to be communicated in the conversational exchanges.

11. As for the relation between the violation of QUANTITY maxim, and the category of lies involved, it has been concluded that all lies categories are found when violating this maxim.

12. The relationship between the violation of the maxim of QUANTITY, and the pragmatic functions behind such violations was to conceal information relevant to their situations to achieve some goals.

13. With the violation of the RELATION maxim, the type of violation is characterized by being covert and overt when lying.

14. When violating the RELATION maxim, characters have adopted the contrived distraction strategy.

15. The categories of lies that accompanied the violation of the RELATION maxim have been limited to the following categories: prototypical and non-prototypical lies

16. As for the pragmatic function involved when violating the RELATION maxim, it has been limited to distracting the attention of the investigator. Such a violation takes place only in complex situations in which the characters are characterized with maliciousness.

17. The type of violation when violating the MANNER maxim have been only limited to covert violation.

18. The pragmatic strategy behind violating the MANNER maxim helps add an equivocated liable effect.

19. As for the categories of lies involved when violating the MANNER maxim, they have been found to be limited only to prototypical lies.

20. Finally, the pragmatic function behind violating the maxim of MANNER has been to avoid saying something clear, direct, or unambiguous. That is, the characters equivocated around mentioning the truth.

21. Finally, the pragmatic function behind violating the maxim of MANNER has been to avoid saying something clear, direct, or unambiguous. That is, the characters equivocated around mentioning the truth.

References

Abdul Qadir, I. & Juma', T. R. (2018). Breaking Grice's cooperative maxims in humerous interactions:A pragma -stylistic study of Shaw's "*Major*

Barbara". *Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences*, *43*(1),42-59.

Abdulmajeed, R. K. & Finjan, A. S. (2017). A pragmatic study of concealment in Tony Blair's speeches on Iraq war. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 8(1), 230-256.

Alattar, R. A. S. (2021). A Pragmatic Analysis of Questions and Responses in American Defence Attorneys' Cross-examinations. *Journal of the College of Education for Women, 32*(2), 1-18.

Al-Mansoob, N. & Alrefaee, Y. (2018). *Pragmatic transfer of Yemeni EFL leaners: An interlanguage pragmatic study of Yemenies and Americans*. USA: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.

Arculi, J., Mallard, D., & Villar, G. (2010). "Um, I Can Tell You're Lying": Linguistic markers of deception versus truth-telling in speech. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *31*(3), 397–411. doi:10.1017/S0142716410000044.

Ariel, M. (2010). *Defining pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Birner, B. J. (2012). *Introduction to pragmatics*. New Jersey: Wily-Blackwell Publishing Company.

Black, E. (2006). *Pragmatics stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Brisard, F., Ostman, J., & Verschueren, J. (2009). *Grammar, meaning and pragmatics*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Carson, T. L. (2010). *Lying and deception*: *Theory and practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chapman, S. (2011). *Pragmatics*. Palgrave: Macmillan International Higher Education.

Chen, R., Hu, C., & He, L. (2013). Lying between English and Chinese: An intercultural comparative study. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *10*(3), 375–401. DOI: 10.1515/ip-2013-0017.

Chen, X. (2020). *Critical pragmatic studies on Chinese public discourse*. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Chiluwa, E. I. & Samoilenko, A. S. (2019). *Handbook of research on deception, fake news and misinformation online*. New York: Library of Congress Publishing.

Dynel, M. (2018). *Irony, deception and humor: Seeking the truth about overt and covert untruthfulness*. London: Library of Congress Publishing.

Ekman, P. (1992). *Telling lies: Clues to deceit in the marketplace, politics and marriage*. California: University of California.

Fallis, D. (2012). Lying as a Violation of Grice's First Maxim of Quality. Northeastern University: *Journal of Philosophy,* dialectica, *66*(4), 563-581. DOI: 10.1111/1746-8361.12007

Frank, M., & Svetieva, E. (2013). *Microexpressions and deception*. London: Springer Publishing Company.

Frankfurt, G. H. (2005). *On Bullshit*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Gerwehr, S., & Glenn, W. R. (2000). *The art of darkness: Deception and urban operations*. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation Publishing.

Grice, H. P. (1975/1978). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax & Semantics 3: Speech acts* (pp. 4-5). New York: Academic Press.

Grundy, P. (2008). *Doing Pragmatics*. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Hancock, J. T., Curry, L. E., Goorha, S., & Woodworth, M. (2007). On lying and being lied to: A linguistic analysis of

deception in computer-mediated communication. *Discourse Processes*, *45*(1), 1-23.

Hardcastle, L. G., & Reisch, A. G. (2006). *Bullshit and philosophy: Guaranteed to get perfect results every time*. Chicago: Carus Publishing Company.

Harris, S. (2013). *Lying*. Washington: Four Elephants Press.

Hussein, J. Q., & Abdullah, I. H. (2016). The role of cognitive context in the interpretation of riddles: A relevance theory perspective. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, *24*(Special Issue), 11-20.

Jacobsen, W. M., & Takubo, Y. (eds.). (2020). *Handbook of Japanese semantics and pragmatics*. London: Library of Congress Publishing.

Knapp, M. L., Vangelisti, A. L., & Caughlin, J. P. (2016). *Interpersonal communication and human relationships* (7th Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lackey, J. (2013). 'Lies and deception: An unhappy divorce.' *Analysis*, *73*(2), 236–248. Doi: 10.1093/analys/ant006

Levine, T. R. (2014). *Encyclopedia of deception*. London: SAGE Reference Publishing.

Macagno, F., & Capone, A. (2021). *Inquiries in philosophical pragmatics: Theoretical development*. New York: Springer International Publishing.

Majeed, A. Sh. (2011). Reasons [sic] lying in children from the point of view of teachers. Journal of the *College of Education for Women*, *22*(3) Retrieved from https://jcoeduw.uobaghdad.edu.iq/index.php/journal/article/view/762/700

Majeed, R. M. (2021). "A Pragmatic analysis of personal deixes in lyrical poetry: Ezra Pound's Lyrics, "*Girl*" and "*A Virginal & quot*". *Journal of the College of Education for Women*, *32*(1), 18-25. Doi:10.36231/coedw.v32i1.1475

Martin, C. (2009). *The philosophy of deception*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Meibauer, J. (2014). *Lying at the semantic-pragmatic interface*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Michaelson, E., & Stokke, A. (2018). *Lying: Language, knowledge, ethics and politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miller, A. (2011). *The Crucible*. 16th Edition. London: Penguin Classics Publishing Company.

O'Seanery, C. (2006). *You won't get fooled again: More than 101 brilliant ways to bust any bald-faced liar (Even if the liar is lying beside you!)*. Canada: Finger Tip Press.

Rusch, M. (2021). *A conversational analysis of Alcholi: Structure and socio-pragmatics of a Nilotic language of Uganda*. Cologne: University of Cologne.

Shuy, R. W. (2017). *Language and law*. 2nd Edition. London: Wily Online Library.

Stratman, J. (2016). *A forensic linguistic approach to legal disclosures*. Colorado: University of Colorado Denver.

Thomas, J. (2011). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Tipton, R. & Desilla, L. (2019). *The Routledge handbook of translation and pragmatics*. 1st Edition. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Tollefsen, C. (2014). *Lying and Christian ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trivers, R. (2011). *The folly of fools: The logic of deceit and self, deception in human life*. New York: Richard Dawkins publishing.

Tupan, A. H., & Natalia, H. (2008). *The multiple violation of conversational maxims in lying done by the characters in some episodes of "Desperate Housewives"* (An Unpublished MA thesis). Faculty of Letters, Petra Christian University.

Journal of the College of Education for Women-University of Baghdad-Iraq
The corresponding author: Juma'a Qadir Hussein

Page **59**