

SURANA Exploring the Pragmatic of the Javanese Humor

by Surana Surana

Submission date: 31-Oct-2022 08:25AM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1939713974

File name: SURANA_Exploring_the_Pragmatic_of_the_Javanese_Humor.pdf (244.17K)

Word count: 6919

Character count: 36384



Exploring the Pragmatic of the Javanese Humor

Surana

Universitas Negeri Surabaya

surana@unesa.ac.id

Biodata:

Surana is an Associate Professor in the Javanese Language and Literature Study Program at Universitas Negeri Surabaya (UNESA), Indonesia, holding a Ph.D. in linguistic-pragmatic. His teaching fields particularly center on linguistics, sociolinguistics and pragmatics. His research interests cover pragmatics, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, and literature. He can be reached at surana@unesa.ac.id

Abstract

This article presents findings from a discourse analysis focusing on the pragmatic aspects of Javanese humor. The descriptive method was employed in this study to formulate the pragmatic aspect of Javanese humor, which was done by describing several variables related to the problems examined. This research is presented in the form of descriptions of the data along with example sentences from Javanese humor. The measures used in descriptive methods for this study are **data collection**, classification, **data analysis**, and **presentation of analytical results**. Direct **data** gained from various social media contents were the object of this research, with the data were mainly in the form of dialogue. The study uses online discourse data from various social media. The pragmatic aspects in the Javanese humor were cooperative maxims, namely maxim of quality, quantity, relevance, and maxims of implementation.

Keywords: *pragmatic aspect, humor, Javanese language*

Introduction

Before the age of universal, our information infrastructure, most languages could be considered non-narrative and narrative; after that, they all count as a vehicle for broader purposes. Furthermore, the power of language gives individuals the capability to show how they feel and communicate thoughts and feelings with one another. The words used by the speakers are unrelated to any kind of coding language standard. Speech is spoken face to face rather than being written in a script. partnerships in which people can only care about speech communication, where language is used to get their messages or information also results in other goals, the declaration of self- which includes (1) exposure, (2) interpersonal interaction, and (3) social connection, and (3) social retention (Yule, 2014). Brown and Yule (1996) argue that "anyone can speak their mother tongue. The main function of language is to give information to speakers other than those who already speak it.

"Face-to-to-face" communication is a social activity. To fully engage in communication, everyone should be creating at the same time. It's nearly impossible to have a clear conversation with those who aren't communicating effectively (Chlops, 2019). Communication is reasonable if the listener assumes the speaker is trying to communicate and the communication partner comprehends the communication. Having this in mind, the speaker's mind, the speaker tries to use words and phrases that are relevant to the topic, clear, and compact, and easy to comprehend in his delivery to waste as little time as possible, thereby making interlocution short (Wijana, 1996; Revita et al., 2012; Berowa, 2019; Medriano & De Vera, 2019; Bhargavi & Rasheed, 2020).

The application of pragmatic theory is focused on how language is employed in communication (Revita, 2020). Conversation implicature has a big impact on our communication. An implicature is used to account for differences in what was "not said, but expected to be done" (Anindya et al., 2019; Pratama, 2019; Rett, 2020; Arbain, 2020). According to Grice, the cooperative principles are still relevant when doing business in an institutional setting. Both effective and efficient language as well as shown in the maxims, and the principle must be used in this instance. By extension, the relationship between intent and speech can be best explained by the principle of cooperation. Conversativeness and 4) Maxims of Quality: 1) quantity, 2) relevance, 3) qualities, 4) correct, p! This research is concerned with the principles of cooperative data related to the data obtained from collaborative speakers.

There are two classes of language users, one who uses the language formally and the one who uses it informally (Maddox, 2014; Arbain et al., 2020). Formal situations possess all the properties that may apply to a form of communication, while personal interactions are

comprised of opposite characteristics, but that does not invalidate their usefulness as applications. It can be argued that unofficial communications are more conducive to a relaxed situation; however, they are more pragmatic in their implementation and ready to meet the needs of the moment.

Furthermore, the speech act is divided into two parts: vernacular speech act and ceremonial speech act (Wijana, 2013; Jabeen & Munir, 2020; Rasheed et al., 2020). The ceremonial speech act is a speech act that follows the rules of his statement. Ceremonial speech acts, such as wedding receptions, speeches, and others, are *pranata cara* (translation of master of ceremony in Javanese events), whereas vernacular speech acts can be performed by any member of society in normal interactions. The objects of this study were classified as vernacular speech acts because they lack a standard rule and are nearly identical to the speech acts performed daily.

This research aims to conduct a discourse analysis in dialogues. This type of analysis focuses on examining and analyzing what can be found in books of nature (the written and spoken use of language) and words that show the analysis of language in the interaction between speakers, and that it attempts to examine how language is employed in various social contexts and to acquire social knowledge (Gee, 2014). See the example in this argument:

Petugas : *Sing mbok gawa iku kayu gelap ya?*
Officer : What you are bringing is black timber (illegal), right?
Samin : *Sanes pak!*
Samin (name) : No, Sir!
Petugas : *lha endi buktine?*
Officer : So show me the proof.
Samin : *(njupuk senter terus disorotake kayune) lha niki empun mboten gelap malih, sampun dados kayu terang)*
Samin : *(Taking a flashlight and pointing out to the timbers)*
Here it is no longer black one, it's not bright timber!
Petugas : *Dhasar Samin....!!*
Officer : You Samin!

From the dialogue above, the black timber means smuggled or illegal timber and does not have official papers. That leads the officer to ask Samin to show the proof (the papers of the timber), but here there is a shift of meaning from the true meaning (ambiguous meaning). As stated in

the conversation by Samin above, that the timber he was carrying rather than black wood, but the wood could be bright because it is illuminated by a flashlight. However, according to the official, that was not what he intended, he asked the letters and other permits explaining that the timber is neither smuggled nor illegal.

Concerning the diversity of languages in the public discourse and reference of humor taken, Joos (1967) in Surana (2004) classifies the level of formality into five classifications namely (1) the frozen variety, which is the most official manner, that is used in situations in which service and official ceremonies; (2) official variety (formal), which is used in a variety of formal speeches, such as official meetings or ceremony, and so on; (3) operating mode (consulted), the diversity of languages is used in ordinary conversations in schools, companies, etc.; (4) casual variety, the diversity of relaxed languages used among friends, in conversations, recreation, etc, and (5) familiar variety (intimate), the diversity of languages which is used among certain members of the family or close friends.

Humor discourse that becomes the main focus in this study tends entertaining discourse as it aims to entertain the readers. Readers and listeners might laugh with loose or simply smile by reading the humor (Gurillo & Ortega, 2013). In terms of language, Javanese humor can be categorized in a wide variety of languages as relaxed and intimate communication (Wijana, 2015). This is because the humor is presented as light and simple discourse that aims to entertain. In addition, the emergence of many ambiguous meanings in the discourse of Javanese humor makes its linguistic aspects may vary. To the researchers who are interested to examine this in a discourse analysis study with the problems regarding the pragmatic aspects utilized in humor and want to describe various aspects of pragmatics that exist in the Java language humor, especially cooperative maxim aspects.

Theoretical Bases

Language is verbal communication used by humans to relate to each other (Miller, 2014). The term verbal here implies that language is a sound-system symbol device that is arbitrary and conventional. Language is rich with its diversity or variation actualization, and its manifestations are very broad, varied indefinitely (Blakemore, 2014). In addition, there is a temporary assumption that the use of language in various ways by the people is certainly ¹influenced by many factors both linguistic and non-linguistic factors, e.g. neighborhood, school, social groups, or social status, and even age and gender. The diversity of language use is also influenced by the other person, as well as the current situation of the talks took place, so they can bring a variety of language (Sedivy & Spivey-Knowlton, 2015). In the end, it was

the function of language diversity as a bookmark social class differences as an indication of the situation and speaking, as well as reflect the goals, topics, rules, and mode of use of language (Thomas, 2014).

In the process of communication, there are often several misuses to the language so that the language used is often mocked and often deviated from its original form. The deviation was deliberately done to imply the purpose to convey, such as to criticize, satirize, or against something. Given that the quipping action is taboo or impolite so it appears other written means of screen printing t-shirts as a means shaped as supporting facilities (Thao, et. al, 2020).

When we hear the word of humor, it certainly is not something new anymore as it is easy to access through electronic media such as through television, tapes, and radio, as well as through mass media such as newspapers, magazines or book and comic, as well as in everyday conversation; humor develops according to the situation at that time. Usually, humor discourse often deviates from the rules that apply to create cuteness and fun. It was deliberately done so that readers are able to imagine the discourse and thinking about the content and also the purpose of the discourse (Moalla, 2015). Usually, things are distorted in the humor discourse which is most likely highlighted in the aspects of language and sociocultural. In addition, the focus is on the emergence of humor itself.

Since the object of this study is humor, before reviewing the research the humor as the object to be studied, the first in terms of the underlying rules that will be easier in the process of analyzing the discourse. As the initial preparation should be owned is by knowing the ins and outs of the language itself, those regarding the following aspects (Tabrani, Mbete, Suastika & Mariyah, 2015).

Pragmatic Aspect in Humor

This study discusses discourse analysis (Leech, 2016). The definition of discourse analysis is a new science that emerges a few last decades as most linguists put their attention to it.

Discourse analysis has some characteristics as follows:

1. Discourse analysis discusses the rules of language use in the community, (Rule of Use by Widdowson);
2. Discourse analysis is an attempt to understand the meaning of utterances in context, text, and the situation and (firth);
3. Discourse analysis is a series of utterances through semantic understanding (Beller)
4. Discourse analysis is concerned with understanding the language in speech act languages (What is said what is done by Lobov);

5. Discourse analysis is directed to the issue of functional languages (functional use of language according to Coulthard)

Discourse analysis can be done in various ways in several types of research, and the researchers used analysis study by applying the theory by Grice related to cooperative maxims.

In communication, it seems reasonable to assume that a speaker articulates their utterance intending to communicate something to the listener, and hoping the other person or the opponent he is talking to can understand it. For that matter, the speaker is always trying to keep the conversation coherently and relevant to the context; it should be clear, concise, easily accepted and understood, and following the issues in question or spoken. Finally, it can be argued that each participant said or between speaker and listener must have a principle of cooperation so that the communication process runs smoothly.

Grice argues that to implement the principle of cooperation above (Bilal & Naeem, 2013), each speaker must comply with four (4) maxims of conversation, the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relevance, and maxims of manner. Besides the four maxims above, the relationship among speakers is also said to be composed of several maxims of politeness. In this connection, what each of the participants said must obey some maxims, such as tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim, and sympathy maxim. This last point does not become a focus of discussion in this paper. Next, use language and speak politely demands preconditions consideration of three (3) parameters of pragmatic, i.e. pragmatic parameter form of social distance (distance rating), social status (power rating), and the relative position of speech act (rank rating).

Humor discourse is certainly very different from non-humor discourse Kayam, Sover & Galily (2014). The discourse of humor certainly has fundamental differences with discourses of non-humor. If the non-humorous discourse is produced through a process of communication that is bona fide, while the humor discourse is not; and it is arguably the humor discourse is generated through the creative process. If the principle of cooperation, the principles of decency and pragmatic parameters above are adhered seriously by the creator of the discourse of non-humor, then in the creation of humor discourse and sticker humor discourse, it is certainly believed that those principles are often violated to support the process of creativity creator. The violations were deliberately done by the creators of the humor, including the manufacturer's sticker humor has alignment and alignment concept with the theory of humor, especially the psychological theory, which had been used, such as the theory of the liberation, the theory of contradictions, and the theory of inequality,

Methods

Research Approach

¹In order to solve the problem in the study can be reached by using a variety of methods that are the stage, strategy stems primarily basic methods that include three things namely, (1) data, ¹(2) data analysis (3) the presentation of the results of the data analysis (Starkey, Akar, Jerome & Osler, 2014). The stages are necessary so that research can be systematically arranged following the proficiency level and following the scientific concept. The research method is a method used by researchers to collect research data.

Based on the type of research, this is qualitative research by nature. For data analysis, a wide approach of descriptive analysis was employed. The qualitative method is a procedure that produces descriptive data in the form of written or spoken data in the language of the community.

Data Sources

The data sources are the subjects of where to obtain the data. There is a difference between research objects and data. The research object is to be observed, while the data is a lingual unit containing the ¹object of the research, and the data is also as research material. In this study, the research object is the discourse of humor in the Java language, while the research data is all humor discourse, both oral and written.

Data Collection Technique

Data were obtained directly from the unidentified humor discourse in daily life by the Javanese community. Data were obtained by writing and recording. The data were then classified and verified, before being analyzed.

Data Analysis Technique

After the data were collected, the next stage was that the researchers analyzed the data according to the research problem and objectives. During data analysis, the method used should be according to the nature of the data and research problems and objectives. The pragmatic-matching method with dialogue partners was a decisive tool used to determine the functions of the discourse of humor because humor discourse involves the use of one speaker and listeners. The method of the translational frontier with another language as the determiner tool will be used to determine the meanings of humor discourse. The dressing technique is to determine the levels of class similarity for replaceable synonymous element; expanding technique is to

determine the significance aspect (semantic aspect) of the specified lingual unit, and vanished technique is to determine vanishing levels of the core element. Data analysis was intended to facilitate the researchers to classify the categories of data in linguistic aspects as well as pragmatic aspects. As data analysis has been completed, the data were analyzed following aspects of language used in the discourse and pragmatic aspects which are utilized in humor. For data categorizing stage was followed with analysis.

Findings and Discussion

Pragmatic Aspect Violation

In the humor discourse of “*Sing Lucu*” (The Funny One) to achieve the effect of funny one us by violating the aspect of pragmatic form of the cooperative maxims, which are divided into ³four maxims namely maxim of quantity, quality, relevance, and implementation or manner. Another way to make funny effects is the use of a deviation from the principle of speech acts and principles of civility. The principle is deliberately violated which is intended to cause a funny effect.

To funny effect, this section focuses on certain aspects that are able to cause cuteness or funny effects, which becomes the basis of analyses, namely by violating pragmatic aspects to the principles of cooperation and civility, then the analysis results will be presented based on the maxims which are present in both of these principles.

Violation of Principle of Cooperation

As it is known that the principle of cooperation is divided into ³four maxims, namely maxim of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. The four maxims will be presented based on a finding of violation to the principle of cooperation.

Violation to Maxim of Quantity

Maxim This quantity is closely related to the quantity of the contributions made by each participant in the communication (Leech, 2016). This maxim of quantity expects each speaker to make a contribution in accordance with the needs of what the opponent said (Fox, 2014). So the contribution shall not be less or excessive than the contribution needed by what another participant said.

From the data obtained, what leads to humorous effect in the perspective of the maxim of quantity, the element violates of the principle of the actual quantity. It can be seen in the following discourse:

- (1) *Bapak* : Nur ... sirahe Bapak iki kok sering lara, rasane cekot-cekot. Iku ditambahi apa ya apike?
- Father : 'Nur (name), why is my head in frequent dizzy? It feels throbbing. What kind of good treatment for this?'
- Anak* : Yen apike supaya ora lara lan cekot-cekot sirahe ora diagem wae dhisik, pak.
- Daughter : 'To make it good, without pain and throbbing, it's better you take it off first, Dad.'
- Bapak* : Dhasar dokter gemblung ... wong tuwa dijak guyon. Ya nek ngono aku titip sirahku, simpenen.
- Father : 'Crazy doctor! You make fun an elderly. Alright, I'm entrusting my head to you. Save it!'
- Anak* : Wah ... wah ... Bapak, satu-satu ya pak?
- Daughter : 'Well...well..well... One by one, Dad.'

The speech uttered by the daughter violates the maxim of quantity because the speech by the daughter by quality does not match the expectations desired by the father. Contributions given by the daughter are not in accordance with the proposed expectation by the father. The contribution should be in the appropriate answers to the needs of the father that is about the appropriate medication to treat his headache. Had the daughter at that time contributed tangible suggestion: the medication should be *Paramex*, *Bodrex*, or other headache medication; the speech is actually by the maxim of quantity as the contributions made by the daughter conforms with the required contributions by the father.

Thus, the lingual unit that is excessive contribution does not correspond to the required contribution, namely: "*Yen apike supaya ora loro lan cekot-cekot sirahe ora diagem wae dhisik, Pak*". ('The good thing to avoid the pain and throbbing pain in your head is by taking it off first, Dad'). With such contributions, however, are precisely the elements that bring humor and fun effects in the discussion above.

The following is another example of the violation to the maxim of quantity:

- (2) *Umar* : Dadi cita-citamu pengin dadi pembalap keneng apa pengin dadi pembalap?
Apa kowe rumangsa nduweni bakat dadi pembalap?
- Umar : 'So, your dream is to be a racer. Why do you want to be a racer? Do you think you have the talent of being a racer?'

Amir : *Iya, dhek winginane, nalika ana lomba balapan mangan krupuk, aku dadi juarane!*

Amir : 'Absolutely! Few days ago, when there was a quick contest of eating crackers, I became the champion!'

The element that may lead to the cuteness is the phrase "*Iya, dhek winginane, nalika ana lomba balapan mangan krupuk, aku dadi juarane!*" ('Absolutely! Few days ago, when there was a quick contest of eating crackers, I became the champion!'). The sentence violates the maxim of quantity because such utterance in terms of quantity is not in accordance with Umar's expectation. Amir contributes excessively. If Amir replied with a speech that is tangible: "Yes!", only then this contribution is precisely in accordance with the maxim of quantity because contribution uttered is as expected by Umar.

The excessive lingual unit spoken by Amir shaped *dhek winginane, nalika ana lomba balapan mangan krupuk, aku dadi juarane!*" (...few days ago, when there was a quick contest of eating crackers, I became the champion!') is the element that gave rise to humor in the discourse above.

Violation to Maxim of Quality

Maxim of quality is associated with the quality of the contributions made by participants in the communication (Leech, 2016). This maxim is expecting each of the speakers to say something true; the speakers should say as the contribution which should be based on sufficient evidence (Benton, 2014).

According to the data obtained, it can be seen that the element that can be used as a tool that gives rise to humorous effect and as a means revealer of humor is the violation to the maxim of quality. The following is the example of the violation that leads to the funny effect:

(3) Guru : *Sapa asmane bapaknya Mir?*
Teacher : 'What's your father's name, Mir?'
Amir : *Nami Inggris napa nami Jawi Pak?*
Amir : 'The English name or Javanese name one, Sir?'
Guru : *Apa bapakmu lair neng Inggris. Coba sebutna!*
Teacher : 'Was your dad born in England? Please mention!'
Amir : *Nami Inggris: Lion On the table!*
Nami jawi: Singa di meja!!
Amir : His English name: Lion On the table!

His Javanese name: *Singa di meja* (transl. Lion on the Table)

Guru : *Trondholo !!*
Teacher : *Woa...*

From the data above, it can be seen that the element that leads to humor in discourse is the following sentence. "*Nama Inggris: Lion on the table! Nama Jawi: Singa di meja.*" (His English name: Lion On the table! His Javanese name: Singa di meja (transl. Lion on the Table)).

The sentence above is the answer from Amir, and the speech was the answer to his teacher's question about his father's name. Speech uttered by Amir violates the maxim of quality by giving incorrect answers. The inaccuracy is related to the question raised by the teacher. In the beginning, the teacher did ask Amir about the name of his father, but Amir did not respond to a teacher's question correctly. As the amplifier, the teacher asked a real question by asking again the truth about his father's birthplace of Amir. Initially, the teacher seemed to believe in the spoken utterances by Amir, but at the end of the conversation, Amir did not contribute correctly to the teacher's expectation. Amir's sentence that violates the maxim of quality is contributing to creating humor in the discussion.

Another example of the violation of maxim of quality is as follows:

- (4) *Pedagang* : *Bu, niki tumbasi daginge pitik sae-sae lho.*
Salesman : 'Madame, here it is good chicken meat; buy one!'
Pembeli : *Lha iki kok pupune biru-biru.*
Buyer : 'Then why are there blue marks on the drumstick?'
Pedagang : *Niku soale pitike ngeyel, ajeng dibeleh obah mawon, banjur dicethoti pupune.*
Salesman : 'She was not obeying the butcher before the slaughter; she was pinched by the butcher!'
Pembeli : *Bakul pancen pinter gawe alasan.*
Buyer : 'Sales are the smartest to make excuses.'

The element that causes cuteness discourse over which the sentence spoken by salesman, as follows: "*niku soale pitike ngeyel, ajeng dibeleh obah mawon. Banjur dicethoti pupune*" ('She was not obeying the butcher before the slaughter; she was pinched by the butcher!') The utterance by the salesman violates the maxim of quality which contributions do not fit with the

expectation. The lack of conformity is related to the speech by the buyer towards what is expressed by the buyer. Though the buyer asked the salesman about the state of the drumstick of the chicken meat which does not look like fresh meat chicken, the salesman delivered the speech that is not under the needs of the buyer at the time.

The salesman's speech violates the maxim of quality that contributes to creating humor in the discussion. Moreover, the excessive answer by a salesman answering that did not make sense to a buyer that blue chicken meat due to the pinching.

Violation to the Maxim of Relevance

Maxim of relevance expects each speaker to contribute relevant conversation with speech problems (Leech, 2016). This maxim emphasizes the linkages between all the contents of the speaker so that the language used in the communication can be run effectively.

In this case, the adherence to the maxim of relevance in humor discourse could be indeed found inside the elements, but there is also speech that intentionally violates the maxim of relevance (Douven, 2015). However, it does not mean the violation is unwarranted; this is intentional because it brings the element of humor.

For more information about the violations to this discourse can be seen from the following discourse:

- (5) *Bu Buru* : *Lop, Bapakmu gaweane apa?*
Mrs. Teacher : 'Lop, what's your father's occupation?'
Dolop : *Memegang kepala Bu!*
Dolop : 'Holding head, Ma'am!'
Bu Guru : *Oh, njur Kepala Sekolah apa Kepala Kantor?*
Mrs. Teacher : 'You mean school head master or head of company?'
Dolop : *Kepalanya tiyang kathah Bu. Wong Bapak kula niku*
"tukang cukur" !!
Dolop : 'The head of many people, Ma'am. My father is a barber.'
Bu Guru : *Oalah Lop! Nanging kok ya bener Lop!!*
Mrs. Teacher : 'Ouch! But kind of true!'

From the above data it can be seen that cause of the humor was namely when Dolop gave his speech that was not in accordance with the contribution needed in that moment, as seen on a fragment of discourse: "*kepalane tiyang kathah Bu, wong Bapak kula niku 'tukang cukur!'*"

(‘The head of many people, Ma’am. My father is a barber!’) which is a form of speech violation to the maxim of relevance in the discourse.

It was proven by Dolop’s utterances which are not relevant to the context. The response by Dolop did not correspond to the questions posed by the teacher, which was the true job of Dolop’s father, and the teacher ensured Dolop father’s hold any positions, but Dolop contributed strayed far from utterances spoken by the teacher.

Dolop speech should have been a relevant contribution if he gave appropriate answers to the contributions in question, such as: ‘My father is a school headmaster.’

As Dolop contribution was following the maxim of relevance, however, the cuteness of the discourse will not be visible; because the speech as it was intentionally done to bring the comic effect of discourse to deviate from the ruling maxim of relevance.

In addition to the above example, the following discourse also reveals the maxim of relevance:

(6) *Mas Hendra* : *Sampeyan kok sering umbah-ubah klambi irenng-ireng?*

Mr. Hendra : ‘Why do you laundry all black clothes frequently?’

Mbak Tatik : *O, iku klambine bojoku.*

Ms. Tatik : ‘O, those are my husband’s clothes.’

Mas Hendra : *Bojomu penggawean dhukun, ya?*

Mr. Hendra : ‘So your husband is a physician?’

Mbak Tatik : *Ora, ning anu ... wasit bal-balan.*

Mbak Tatik : ‘No. He is a football referee.’

Mas Hendra : *He ... eh, Mbak Tatik.*

Mas Hendra : ‘Indeed, Ms. Tatik’

From the discourse above, it can be seen that the cause of the funny effect is the sentence uttered by Ms. Tatik, namely: “*ora, ning anu ... wasit bal-balan.*” (‘No. He is a football referee’). In the utterance spoken by Ms. Tatik to reply to Mr. Hendra’s question, as it is analyzed from the principle of cooperation, the contributions made by Ms. Tatik have violated the maxim of relevance.

It was seen that the utterances by Ms. Tatik were irrelevant to the speech given by Mr. Hendra. The spoken lingual unit by Ms. Tatik was not following utterances spoken by Mr. Hendra. If Ms. Tatik simply answered “No, he is not.”, then the contribution is relevant to the speech given by Mr. Hendra.

However, if the speech by Ms. Tatik was under the maxim of relevance, then the element of funny role in the discourse would not appear. Thus the presence of violation to the maxim of relevance is used as the element that brings humor.

Violation to the Maxim of Manner

Maxim of manner expects each speaker to convey things clearly in communication. Maxim of manner also requires that every speaker in one conversation to speak directly, not vague, ambiguous, and there should not be an exaggeration, as well as coherent (Leech, 2016).

In the verbal discourse written in the Javanese language, the object of this research is the proof that this discourse is contained utterances that adhere to the maxim of manner (Baumann, Konieczny & Hemforth, 2014). But there is also a discourse that deliberately violates the maxim of manner. The violation of this maxim is aimed at bringing humor into the discourse.

From the data obtained was found the violation of maxim of manner as follows:

- (7) *“Lampung kuwi papane ana ngendi, Mbah?”* Pitakone bocah cilik sing lagi nggaprap pe-er marang simbahe.”

‘Where is the location of Lampung, Grandma? Question from a little boy who is doing his homework to his grandma.

“Ora weruh. Sing jeneng Lampung wae aku durung nate ngerti kaya apa wujud. Coba takoke Bapak utawa Ibu kana. Menawa wongtuwamu kuwi sing nyinggahake Lampung!” wangsulane Simbah.”

I don’t know. I don’t even any idea how Lampung looks like. Try to ask your dad or mom. Who knows your parent is hiding Lampung.” Grandma answered.

From the discourse above, what causes a funny effect was the sentences uttered by the grandma, especially in answering the little boy. In the event, the little boy was asking about the location of Lampung, it is a city. But the grandma had different perceptions of the question uttered by the boy. Initially, the question was about the possible location of Lampung, but the grandma answered the questions on the assumption that the Lampung is an item, not a place. It was proven by the use of the lingua unit of *“wujud”* (transl. appearance). As the appearance is identical to the form, and it is usually used to declare an item, while the actual Lampung is a province in Sumatra. Therefore speech by the grandma violated the maxim of manner. Such violations occur in the following speech: *“Ora weruh. Sing jeneng Lampung wae aku durung nate ngerti kaya apa wujud. Coba takoke Bapak utawa Ibu kana. Menawa wongtuwamu*

kuwi sing nyinggahake Lampung!” wangsulane Simbah.” (‘I don’t know. I don’t even any idea how Lampung looks like. Try to ask your dad or mom. Who knows your parent is hiding Lampung.’)

Ambiguity is proven from the grandma’s mistakes in capturing the intent of the speech. According to the grandma, a lingual unit of *Lampung* is still associated with child speech in a sentence (1). So according to the lingual unit, *Lampung* is considered by the grandma as goods concerning the little boy’s speech. Such ambiguity contained in the utterance by the grandma is a violation of the maxim of manners of the principle of cooperation. That is what gave rise to humor in the discourse. If the grandma only answered “*Ora weruh.*” (I don't know.), not followed by a subsequent speech, it does not violate the discourse of maxim of manner as the utterance is clear. However, if the grandma did not answer with the element of ambiguity, the discourse usually only serves as a mere discourse that does not contain any function, and there are no elements that may create humor, as the discourse will not be a humor discourse.

In addition to the previous ⁴example of the violation of the maxim of the manner of the principle of cooperation, the following is another ⁴example of a violation of the maxim of the manner of humor discourse humor in the Javanese language (Leech, 2016).

(8) *Dokter mudha : Ibu kenging punapa?*

Young Doctor : ‘What’s the problem, Ma’am?’

Ibu : Kula keguguran dok ...

Mother : ‘I had miscarriage, Doc...’

Dokter mudha : Lha punika wonten tatu-tatu saranduning badan, punika kenging punapa?

Young Doctor : ‘Then the wounds through your body, what happened to you?’

Ibu : Lha inggih, kula wau keguguran, lajeng ditarik-tarik, dados tatu.

Mother : ‘I’ve told you, I had miscarriage, and I was pulled and wounded like this!’

Dokter mudha : Ibu punika ngandheg ingkang kaping pinten?

Young Doctor : ‘How many times are you pregnant?’

Ibu : Kula boten ngandheg kok ...

Mother : ‘I’m not pregnant!’

Dokter mudha : Lhah, wau ngendikane ibu keguguran?

Dokter mudha : ‘You said you had miscarriage!’

Ibu : *Inggih, kula niku kuguguran tembok, amargi griya kula kenging lindhu, tembokipun sami gugur ...*

Mother : ‘Correct, I had miscarriage from the walls at home, due to the earthquake; the walls collapsed...’

Dokter Mudha : *Owalah ... kula wastani keguguran kandhungan ...*

Young Doctor : ‘You mean you had downfall... I thought you had miscarriage of your pregnancy.’

From the data above discourse that may cause ambiguity is the sentence uttered by the Mother. This ambiguity precisely raises the element of humor. The humor discourse that could give rise to the humor contained in the sentence a lingual unit of *miscarriage* (7) which was spoken by the mother. As it is known *miscarriage* is an unintentional end to a pregnancy when the baby is born too early and dies because it has not developed enough, but here is transformed into a miscarriage as if the collapse of the wall (downfall).

The sentences that have been uttered by the mother contain elements of ambiguity and misunderstanding. The ambiguity in the form of a lingual unit of *miscarriage* in some sentences, and the ambiguity contained in the mother’s speech is a violation of the maxim of the manner of the principle of cooperation. From the ambiguity, however, it functions as the element that gives rise to humor in the discourse. If the mother gives a speech directly addressing the intention that she had hit the wall, then there would be no violation of the maxim of the manner in the discourse, as the intention was clear. When the intention is clear, it does not contain elements that can bring humor, so that the discourse will not be a humor discourse.

Conclusion

In the humor discourse of Javanese/“*Sing Lucu*” to achieve the effect of funny one us by violating the aspect of pragmatic form of the cooperative maxims, which are divided into four maxims namely maxim of quantity, quality, relevance, and implementation or manner. Another way to make funny effects is the use of a deviation from the principle of speech acts and principles of civility. The principle is deliberately violated which is intended to cause a funny effect.

Pedagogical Implication

The pragmatic of humor in Javanese has contributed values of how maxim of principles in pragmatic performs how a speaker should select speech acts strategies when communicating.

As the strategies involve planning to speak and using the word choice from which aspects of pragmatic should be regulated, this study implies that teaching pragmatic that involve humor contexts should be defined.

References

- Anindya, B., Revita, I., & Sastra, G. (2019). Conversational Implicature Function between Mitsubishi Car Salesperson and Consumers in Padang. *Langkawi: Journal of The Association for Arabic and English*, 5(2), 140. <https://doi.org/10.31332/lkw.v5i2.1312>
- Arbain, A. (2020). Translating subtitles of becoming Jane Film: A pragmatic approach. *Langkawi: Journal of The Association for Arabic and English*, 6(1), 17–28. [https://doi.org/DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31332/lkw.v6i1.1766](https://doi.org/DOI:http://dx.doi.org/10.31332/lkw.v6i1.1766)
- Arbain, A., Budie, M. A., Nur, D. R., Rohman, A., Ariyanti, A., & Permana, A. G. (2020). Ethnic factors on vocal duration and frequency. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7(19), 402–406. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85090135992&doi=10.31838%2Fjcr.07.19.53&partnerID=40&md5=da3f7ec3c501593e126dd44c6f28fe9f>
- Baumann, P., Konieczny, L., & Hemforth, B. (2014). Conversational implicatures in anaphora resolution: Alternative constructions and referring expressions. In *Psycholinguistic approaches to meaning and understanding across languages* (pp. 197-212). Springer International Publishing.
- Bhargavi, Vasistha & Rasheed, Jabbar, Nareeman. (2020). Pragmatics of Immigration & Identity: Computational Study of Online Discourses, *The Asian ESP Journal*, 16(2.2), 26-50
- Benton, M. A. (2014). Gricean quality. *Noûs*.
- Berowa, A. M. C. (2019). President Rodrigo Roa Duterte in the spotlight: The pragmatic factors and functions of swearing in public discourse. *Asian EFL Journal*, 21(2), 183–204. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85065100412&partnerID=40&md5=85c842d691031ae8aa6d01e67820205d>
- Bhargavi, V., & Rasheed, N. J. (2020). Pragmatics of immigration & identity: Computational study of online discourses. *Asian ESP Journal*, 16(2), 26–50. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85089599259&partnerID=40&md5=eb090ac5e846cd3f0ac680996daa6cbf>
- Bilal, H. A., & Naeem, S. (2013). Probing into the Dialogue of the President of Pakistan: Application of Grice's Maxims. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 5(4), 1.

- Blakemore, D. (2014). Linguistic form and pragmatic interpretation: the Explicit and the Implicit. *The Pragmatics of Style (RLE Linguistics B: Grammar)*, 28.
- Chlopicki, W. (2019). Communication styles: Between deliberate strategy and ambivalence. In *Journal of Pragmatics* (Vol. 153, pp. 15–19). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.08.001>
- Douven, I. (2015). How to Account for the Oddness of Missing-link Conditionals. *Synthese*, 1-14.
- Fox, D. (2014). Cancelling the Maxim of Quantity: Another challenge for a Gricean theory of Scalar Implicatures. *Semantics and Pragmatics*, 7(5), 1-20.
- Gurillo, L. R., & Ortega, M. B. A. (Eds.). (2013). *Irony and humor: From Pragmatics to Discourse* (Vol. 231). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to Discourse analysis: Theory and Method*. Routledge.
- Jabeen, I., & Munir, S. (2020). Implicatures in macbeth: A pragmatic study. *Asian EFL Journal*, 27(5.1), 53–70. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85100103780&partnerID=40&md5=edb5b20da72e344bf651597ddb897f>
- Joos, Martin. 1967. *The Five Clock*. New York: Harcourt Brace World. Inc.
- Kayam, O., Sover, D. A., & Galily, Y. (2014). Humor, Media and the Public Discourse: A case study of Humor and Politics. *French Journal for Media Research*, 1, 1-16.
- Leech, G. N. (2016). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Maddox, W. (2014). Navigating Authority in Coursework and Life: An Unofficial Guide for Fellow Students. *Stylus: A Journal of First-Year Writing*, 5, 5-11.
- Medriano Jr, R. S., & De Vera, P. V. (2019). Dominance Construction in Monologic Political Discourse Based on Selected Public Speeches of President Rodrigo Roa Duterte. *Asian EFL Journal* 23(3) 5-21
- Miller, R. (2014). *Intimate Relationships*. McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Moalla, A. (2015). Intercultural Strategies to Co-construct and Interpret humor. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 25(3), 366-385.
- Pratama, H. (2019). Conversational implicature comprehension strategies used by English learners in Indonesia. *Linguistic Research*, 36(3), 415–458. <https://doi.org/10.17250/khisli.36.3.201912.004>
- Rasheed, N. J., Khalil, H. H., & Neamah, H. K. (2020). Pragmatic analysis of whatsapp status updates in Iraq. *Asian ESP Journal*, 16(52), 5–20.

- <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85096811423&partnerID=40&md5=cc1bfe7ebbcff1d47d516d56e9ae80e>
- Rett, J. (2020). Manner implicatures and how to spot them. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 12(1), 44–79. <https://doi.org/10.1163/18773109-01201105>
- Revita, I. (2020). Politeness strategies of minangkabau ethnic in Indonesia. *Asian ESP Journal*, 16, 13–34. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?partnerID=HzOxMe3b&scp=85099934733&origin=inward>
- Revita, I., Wijana, I. D. P., & Poedjosoedarmo, S. (2012). Permintaan Dalam Bahasa Minangkabau. *Humaniora*, 19(2), 195–206. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.v19i2.904>
- Sedivy, J., & Spivey-Knowlton, M. (2015). 16 The Use of Structural, Lexical, and Pragmatic Information in Parsing Attachment Ambiguities. *Perspectives on Sentence Processing*, 26.
- Starkey, H., Akar, B., Jerome, L., & Osler, A. (2014). Power, Pedagogy and Participation: Ethics and Pragmatics in research with young people. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 9(4), 426- 440.
- Surana. 2000. *Slang dalam Stiker*. Surabaya: Universitas Negeri Surabaya.
- Tabrani, A. T., Mbeti, A. M., Suastika, I., & Mariyah, E. M. (2015). Stereotype Of Madurese Ethnic People Made by Javanese Ethnic People Through Humors. *E-Journal of Cultural Studies*, 8(2)
- Thao, Van, Nguyen; Herman; Napitupulu, Eliza Rorezs; Hien, Nguyen, Thi & Pardede, Hilman. (2021). Code-Switching in Learning via Zoom Application: A Study in an EFL Context, *The Asian ESP Journal*, 17(3.1), 91-111.
- Thomas, J. A. (2014). *Meaning in Interaction: An introduction to Pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Wijana, I. D. P. (2015). On Ethnic Jokes in Indonesia. *Phenomena*, 15(2), 103-110.
- Yamagashira, Hisako. (2001). Pragmatic Transfer in Japanese ESL Refusal. *Kagoshima Immaculate Heart College, English Department*. 4-22-1 Toso, Kagoshima 890-8525. Japan.
- Yule, G. (2014). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge University Press.

SURANA Exploring the Pragmatic of the Javanese Humor

ORIGINALITY REPORT

3%

SIMILARITY INDEX

3%

INTERNET SOURCES

1%

PUBLICATIONS

1%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	repository.ugm.ac.id Internet Source	1%
2	Submitted to University of Leicester Student Paper	1%
3	dyahsihpratiwi.blogspot.com Internet Source	1%
4	Younis Salih Fatah, Noor Mala Bt Ibrahim. "The Importance of Utilizing Pragmatics in EFL/ESL Context", Research Square, 2020 Publication	1%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches < 1%

Exclude bibliography On

SURANA Exploring the Pragmatic of the Javanese Humor

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1zPGoPqltpKM4P5LpVuHTy-rv4zJiAwsD/view?usp=sharing>