

IMPLICATURE OF HUMOROUS UTTERANCES IN USTAD WIJAYANTO'S SERMON ENTITLED *CINTAI AKU APA ADANYA*

Rosiana Rizqy Wijayanti
Universitas Gadjah Mada Yogyakarta, Indonesia
rosianarizqywijaya@gmail.com

Laughter is the best medicine to unleash the negative emotion, such as anger, sadness, and fear. One of the causes when someone laughs is due to humor. We obtain humor not only in comedy shows, joke stories, gags, or comics, but also in sermons. Nowadays there are many Muslim scholars in Indonesia like Wijayanto that insert humor to their sermon. He inserts humor to his sermon for many particular reasons. This research is presented to analyze how the implicature of humorous utterances is created and to describe the aim of implicature in humorous utterances employed in Wijayanto's sermon entitled *Cintai Aku Apa Adanya*. This research used qualitative method of study. It is analyzed descriptively based on Monro's theories of humor, Grice's cooperative principle and Thomas' non-observance maxim. This research's conclusion is divided into two points. First, there are two kinds of humor employed in the data, superiority humor and incongruity humor. The utterances of superiority and incongruity theory flout quantity maxim, quality maxim, relation maxim and manner maxim. Second, the aim of implicature in his humorous utterances is divided into two as well: implicature in superiority theory and incongruity theory. In superiority theory the implicature is aimed to exaggerate and to tease. In incongruity theory the implicature is aimed to give easier examples, to surprise the listener, to refuse something, to ban the listener to do bad deeds, and to frighten the listener. Thus he inserts humor to his sermon because he has particular reasons, and humor in his sermon becomes the introduction before he delivers the message.

Keywords: *Humor, implicature, sermon, Wijayanto*

A. INTRODUCTION

Laughter is the best medicine for people, and it can decrease their stressed-level as well. Laughter on the other hand gives health and increases your quality of life. Laughter is a good way to unleash worry and to attach the happiness. Philosopher John Moreal via Recker stated that laughter happens because you relief and pass your danger (2007). It means you get your comfortable when you laugh. As stated before, the people laugh because they are glad, and one of the happiness is created due to humor. Humor in Oxford Dictionary is 'the quality of being amusing because of action, writing, or speech.' From this general definition of humor, it can be concluded that humor can be found out in TV programs, comics, drawings, speeches, and many literature works. Monro states that humor is not only created in literature but also exist in people's everyday life (1988). Therefore, humor in literature occurs with preparation, and it is distinctive with humor in everyday life that is naturally occurred.

Humor is something read, heard, or seen that at least involves amusement and manifests laughter (Lippit, 1991). This means there is a closed correlation between humor and laughter. According to Chaer the important parts in humor are surprise, shame, unreasonableness, and exaggeration (1988). Humor ended with laughter has many advantages such as giving a sense of power, because humor can turn any kind of situations. Second, humor also can help us cope, because using humor in a difficult situation is the best way to cope the difficulties, to ease the worries, and to get on with life. Third, humor can establish the communication and rapport, because it can break the ice if you are in a group and it becomes the one of the ways to communicate. Fourth, humor can relieve tension, the relief that the people can get because humor is used in a tense situation. Humor increases learning and retention because of humor. The people can memorize it longer and they will learn how they participate in a communication. From those advantages, humor becomes the important part in communication. Therefore, humor in TV or literature has many devotees.

Nowadays, the people can get humor not only in daily life and literary works, but also in sermon. In Islam, sermon is a religious speech given by muslim scholars to deliver any kinds of

lesson based on Al-qur'an. Many muslim scholars include a humor in their sermon. Beside to make the hearer or the audience laugh, they have particular reasons why they deliver it, such as to refresh the situation, to satire the hearer, and many others. Furthermore, one of the Muslim Scholars in Indonesia that always include humor to their sermon is Ustad Wijayanto. He is a Muslim Scholar that always includes humor, criticism, and lesson in his sermon. He appears in many TV programs and channels as well to deliver his sermon. He can combine humor, criticism, and lesson into one part, and it is one of his ability to deliver the good sermon to the audiences. His sermon has utterances that can make the hearers laugh. Even though the sermon relates to the religion, but humor that he used is not only to make the audience laugh, but also to deliver his particular reasons, criticism and lesson. His sermon can be understood easily because he delivers it well too.

B. METHODOLOGY

This research applies the descriptive qualitative method explaining the problems statement. Descriptive research is a research to observe a situation, condition, and issues. "qualitative researches pay close attention to their participants" reactions and to the voice they use in their work as a representation of the relationship between them and their participants" (Catherine & Rossman, 2006). It means that the researcher should report the representation of the participants.

This research uses the primary data from Ustad Wijayanto's sermon entitled *Cintai Aku Apa Adanya*. This sermon was released in MNCTV in 2013 and uploaded in Youtube in April 2014. Primary research is a study based on "original data" when the researchers collect the data themselves (Zacharias, 2012). The data only the humorous utterances in Ustad Wijayanto's sermon entitled *Cintai Aku Apa Adanya* that can be accessed in <http://m.youtube.com/watch?v=03xvXNckZtU>.

According to Ratna, There are several techniques in collecting data, they are sampling, observation, interview, documentation, questionnaire, triangulation, and reading (2010). The method of collecting data in this research is documentation. The documentation method is used to conduct the research that originates in writings (2006). This research is a library research,

and it also uses the content analysis. The research using content analysis is to make a conclusion about style, grammar, layout, illustration of the book (Arikunto, 2006). The data in this research are collected by choosing the humorous utterances that can make the hearers laugh. Then, the humorous utterances are put on the table of analysis. Some of their data are selected for the discussion.

Qualitative data analysis requires dialectic between ideas and data, people cannot analyze the data without ideas, but the ideas must be shaped and tested by the data that are analyzing (Day, 1993). These are the procedure of the analysis: Identifying the important data in Ustad Wijayanto's sermon entitled *Cintai Aku Apa Adanya*; Focusing on the data chosen: humorous utterances; Classifying the data; The utterances are grouped into some theories of humor, superiority theory, incongruity theory or relief theory. The utterances are analyzed by using Grice's cooperative principle and Thomas' non-observance maxims of cooperative principle to find out the implicature of the utterances.

1. Theoretical Background

There are three main theories that will be employed in this research, Monro's theories of humor, Grice's cooperative principle, and Thomas' non-observance maxims.

1.1. Monro's Theories of Humor

Following the history of humor, there are several theories of humor that become the most famous theory. According to Monro, theories of humor can be divided into three types: Superiority theory, Incongruity Theory and Relief Theory (1988). Bergson via Monro stated that superiority theory of humor occurs when the subject looks down on whatever he laughs at (1988). Superiority theory comes from some philosopher like Plato and his student Aristoteles. This theory of humor shows that the people laughs because they see the weakness. When they satirize the other people or exaggerate the weakness, the subjects think that they are higher than the objects (Rakhmat, 2000). For example: A woman goes into a cafe with a duck. She puts the duck on a stool and sits next to it. The waiter comes over and says: "Hey! That's the ugliest pig that I have ever seen." The woman says: "It's a duck, not a pig." And the waiter says: "I was talking to the duck." This joke shows that the waiter thinks that they are

superior to other people. Incongruity theory of humor is often identified as “frustrated expectation”, when the reality is not match with the expectation. Monro also said that humor in congruity theory is “the inappropriate within the appropriate” (1988). Incongruity theory of humor is the idea when people laugh at thing that surprise them. Many jokes in this theory are funny because they involve ideas that run against the expectation. For examples: “Two fish in a tank. One turns to the other and says: Do you know how drive this?” This joke has a funny part in punch line. The reality is out of the expectation. In relief theory of humor, Spencer via Lippit said that laughter can be produced because of “strong feeling of any kind” (1991). When you release your nervousness is an example of relief theory.

1.2. Grice’s Cooperative principle

As stated before humor is something read, heard or seen. It needs words as the main indicator to produce a humor itself. Words as the aspect of language can be received well by the hearers or the readers if the speakers and the writers deliver them well. When the speaker or the writer wants to say something to the hearer and the reader, sometimes they say or write more than the words said or written. As the hearer and the reader, the people should understand whether the meaning behind the words said or written to make a succesful conversation, and the study of utterance meaning is Pragmatics. Sometime the utterance has an implied meaning that is inteded by the speakers. It is called implicature.

The word “implicature” is derived from the verb „to imply” means „to fold something into something else”; hence that which is implied is „folded in” and has to be „unfolded” in order to be understood (Mey, 2001). To find out the implicature of an utterance, the participants of a conversation should go further and understand what is hinted by an utterance. For example, A asks B, *Are you from America?* Then, B answers “No” followed by silence. A should know that B implicates that he/she is not willing to talk any further (Griffiths, 2006). Thus, the participants in a conversation should understand the implicature of an utterance to make an active communication. There are two kinds of

implicature, namely conventional implicature and conversational implicature.

Conventional implicature does not depend on the context. It deals with "the specific words and result in additional conveyed meanings when those words are used" (Yule, 1996). When the linguistic expression are replaced by another, the conventional implicature no longer exists even though the truth condition of the utterance remains (Fauziah, 2011). For example:

"He is an Englishman, so he is brave" It is implicated, but not said, that his bravery is the consequence being Englishman. "She is poor, but she is honest" It is implicated, but not said, that her poverty clashes with her honesty (Cohen, 2008).

The conversational implicature is detachable because it is related to certain linguistic expression. Something implied in a conversation is called a conversation implicature. It needs the participants to interpret and the interpretation very much depends on the knowledge of the context of the situation (Fauziah, 2011). For example:

A: What time is it?

B: The bus just went by. (Mey, 2001)

The context of this conversation should include the fact that there is only one bus a day that it passes by their houses. The participants have the same knowledge about the bus. Thus, to understand the conversational implicature, they have to occur in conversation and they depend on special contexts for their interpretation. The participants will understand what the implicature of the utterance if they also know the formula of conversational implicature (Aryanthi, 2010). The formula of conversational implicature that will make their conversation flows successfully is called cooperative principle.

3.2.1.Cooperative Principle

The speaker and the listener always want to get the successful conversation. It means that they should fulfill the cooperative principle. The cooperative principle is about "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 (Grice, 1996)". Grice also regards that there are for maxim that are the basis for cooperative

principle, namely quality maxim, quantity maxim, relation maxim, and manner maxim. Griffiths states that maxim is “a pithy piece of widely-applicable advice” (2006).

a. Quantity Maxim

The speaker should give appropriate amounts of information, not too little and not too much (2006). According to Grice, the category of quantity relates to the quantity of information to be provided, and under it falls the following maxims:

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

The speaker is not less and over when giving the information. When the speaker needs four screws, the speaker expects the hearer to hand her/him four, rather than two or six (1996). The following example in application:

A: What did you have for lunch?

B: Baked beans and toast.

From that dialog, A asks what B has for lunch, and B gives the answer as informative as possible. It means the participants in that dialog observe the quantity maxim because they give the information as it required. (Cruse, 2000)

b. Quality Maxim

The speaker tries to be truthful when communicating (Griffiths, 2006). According to Grice, under the category of quality falls a supermaxim “Try to make your contribution one that is true” and two more specific maxims:

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

The speaker should give the correct utterance to the hearer. If I need sugar as an ingredient in the cake you are assisting to make, I do not expect you to hand me salt; or if I need a spoon, I do not expect a trick spoon made of rubber. The following example in application:

Jerry: We are interested in a single room. How much will that be?

Receptionist: A single room is \$ 200 a night.

The receptionist in the dialog gives the truthful utterance. It means that the utterance observes the quality maxim (Grice, 1996).

c. Relation Maxim

The speaker gives the contributions that should be relevant to the assumed current goals of the people involved (Griffiths, 2006). Under the category of Relation, Grice places a single maxim, namely, "Be relevant" (1996). It means this maxim asks the speaker to try and to see the information that has been given has the relevance and the coherence. If the speaker is mixing ingredients for a cake, the speaker does not expect to be handed a good book, or even an oven cloth (1996). The following example in application:

A: Where is my box of chocolate?

B: It's in your room.

B gives the relevant answer to A. They talk about the place. It means this utterance in this dialog observes the relation maxim. (Leech, 1993)

d. Manner Maxim

Under the category of Manner, Grice says that to how what is said is to be said, he includes the supermaxim "Be perspicuous" and various maxims such as:

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
4. Be orderly.

It means that the speaker expects a partner to make it clear what contribution he is making. The following example in application:

Jerry: We are interested in a single room. How much will that be?

Receptionist: A single room is \$ 200 a night.

The receptionist in this dialog gives the clear statement. It means that this utterance observes the manner maxim (1996: 27-28).

1.3. Thomas' Non-Observance of A Maxim

The participant in a conversation may fail to observe the maxims. Drawing on Grice, Thomas lists five ways of failing to observe the maxim, namely violating, flouting, infringing, opting out, and suspending maxim (cited in Stykarova, 2009).

1.3.1. Violating A Maxim

The speaker may quietly and unostentatiously violate a maxim (Grice, 1996). Violating maxim is rather considered to be performed of misleading. There are four maxims that can be violated. They are quality, quantity, relation, and manner maxim. For example:

A: *Is there another man?*

B: *No, there isn't another man.* (Thomas cited in Skyravoka, 2009)

B is A's wife. A thinks that his wife is a lover. The content of A's answer asserts the truthfulness, but it is not the whole truth. In fact she is having an affair with another man. This violates the quality maxim because B says something untrue

1.3.2. Flouting A Maxim

The speakers may flout the maxim when they blatantly fail to fulfill it (Grice, 1996). The speaker wants the hearer to look for the meaning beyond the expressed one. The example follows:

A: *How are we getting there?*

B: *We're getting there in Dave's car.* (Thomas cited in Stykarova, 2009)

Here B blatantly gives less information than is required and B's utterance flouts the quantity maxim. B implies that A will not be travelling with them but does not provide the information A needs. A speaker flouts the maxim of quality when he/she blatantly gives more or less information than the situation demands (Levinson cited in Nieto, 2011). A speaker flouts the quality maxim in several ways. First, they may simply say something about which they do not have enough evidence for. Second, they may also flout the maxim by exaggerating, as in hyperbole. Third, they may also flout the maxim by using metaphors, euphemisms, irony, banter, and sarcasm. A speaker flouts the quantity maxim when he/she blatantly gives either more or less information than the situation demands. A speaker

flouts the relation maxim if his/her utterance obviously does not have any relation with the previous one. A speaker may flout the manner maxim if his/her utterance involves absence of clarity, brevity, and transparency of communicative intentions (2011).

1.3.3. Infringing A Maxim

A speaker may infringe a maxim when they fail to observe it with no intention of generating and implicature and with no intention of deceiving. According to Thomas, this could occur because the speaker has an imperfect command of the language (a child or a foreigner), she/he is nervous, drunk or because of some cognitive impairment (cited in Nieto, 2011). The example follows:

Brooks: *Is this a woman's hair?*

Jerry (a bit drunk): *is this..... is this a woman's hair? I mean..... it could be... I suppose, possibly from, uh... from the taxi. It was... I mean, I think, you know, all the people come in and out, I probably sat up in, I guess the woman's hair. I am exhausted.*

1.3.4. Opting Out of A Maxim

Opting out a maxim means that the speaker is unwilling to cooperate in the way the maxim requires (Grice, 1996). This is the case in which the hedges are used. Hedge is when the speakers show their concerns when they are in danger of not fulfilling the principle by giving certain clues (Fauziah, 2011). According to Yule, each maxim has different hedges; the hedges of quality maxim are *as far as I know, I may be mistaken, I'm not sure if it's right, I guess, etc.*; the hedges of quantity maxim are *as you probably know, I won't bore you with all the details, etc.*; the hedges of relation maxim are *oh by the way, anyway, well, I don't know if it is important, not to change the subject, etc.*; the hedges of manner maxim are *this may be a bit confusing, I am not sure if this makes sense, I don't know if this clear at all, etc.* (1997).

1.3.5. Suspending A Maxim

According to Thomas, the speaker does not observe the maxims because there is no expectation on the part of any participant that they will be fulfilled (hence the non-fulfillment does not generate any implicatures). This category may be culture-specific. The suspension of maxim quality can be found in

funeral orations and obituaries, of the maxim of manner in poetry, of the maxim of quantity in the case of telegrams, telexes and some international phone calls and of all three maxims in the case of jokes. It is difficult to find any convincing examples in which the maxim of relation is suspended (cited in Nieto, 2011).

C. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. Findings

The analysis in this research will be divided into two parts, to analyze how the implicature of humorous utterances is created and to describe the implicature in humorous utterances employed in Wijayanto's sermon entitled *Cintai Aku Apa Adanya*. Twenty-two humorous utterances are inserted in this sermon. The theory of humor inserted in this sermon has two types, superiority theory and incongruity theory. In superiority theory, humor inserted in this sermon has implicature, to satirize, to emphasize, to criticize and to exaggerate. Whereas in incongruity theory, humor inserted has implicature to surprise and to give the easy examples. The implicature is created in this sermon by flouting the maxims of Grice's cooperative principle. In superiority theory three maxims are flouted by the speaker such as quantity maxim, quality maxim, and manner maxim. But in incongruity theory, all maxims are flouted by the speaker. The speaker flouts the maxims of cooperative principle because he wants the listeners to find out the meaning behind his utterances. The listeners laugh because they get the meaning behind the humorous utterances inserted in Ustad Wijayanto's sermon. Therefore, the kinds of humor he used are exaggeration, emphasis, satire, criticism, deflection, abbreviation and surprise. All of humorous utterances are inserted in his sermon before he delivers the religious messages.

2. Analysis

2.1. Implicature of Utterances in Superiority Theory of Humor

In superiority theory of humor, the implicature is created because the speaker flouts the maxim of quality, quantity, and manner. The speaker flouts double and triple maxims. By flouting those maxims, the implicature created is to satire, to exaggerate, to criticize and to emphasize. There are 13 humorous utterances grouped in superiority theory of humor.

2.1.1.1. Implicature of Flouting Quantity Maxim and Manner Maxim

This is one of the examples of humorous utterances that is aimed to exaggerate and to emphasize by flouting manner maxim and quantity maxim.

Utterance. *Pokoknya ketika dia masih muda idungnya kemites, matanya cemulek, rambutnya jemambuak, bodinya fiuiit luar biasa. Masih bisa imut-imut. Eh begitu sudah tua jadi..... Amit-amit. Makanya orang itu perlunya cuma empat: sabar, syukur, fikir, dan dzikir.*

(Exactly when she is young, her nose is "kemites", her eyes are "cemulek", her hair is "jemambuak", and her body is "fiuiit" amazing. She is still "imut-imut". But when she is old, she becomes....."amit-amit. Thus the people need to be patient, grateful, thoughtful, and dzikir)

This utterance flouts quantity maxim and manner maxim. Previously Ustad Wijayanto talked that there is no eternal things in this world, like beauty. This utterance flouts quantity maxim because he exaggerates and emphasizes the words he used. Actually the listeners will understand if he says that young women have perfect parts of body, but he puts the words 'kemites, cemulek, jemambuak, fiuiit' to his utterance. This means that women are very beautiful when they are still young. This utterance also flouts manner maxim because when he talks about old women, he said the word 'amit-amit'. In fact, it has ambiguous meaning. It is usually said to refuse the bad things in life, but here the 'amit-amit' is said because it has negative meaning to show that old women are very ugly. The words 'amit-amit' and 'imut-imut' are wordplay that have distinctive meaning. The word 'amit-amit' here is also to exaggerate and to emphasize that old women are not as beautiful as young women. Therefore the implicature in this utterance is to exaggerate and to emphasize the distinction of physical description between young women and old women. This is also said as the introduction before he delivers the message that people must be grateful for everything they have.

Then, this is the example when these double maxims are flouted because the speaker wants to satire, to criticize, and to exaggerate the listeners.

Utterance. *Suami istri harusnya seperti itu, saling menolong. Kalau suaminya capek ya dipijitin. Kalau istrinya keliatan kurang uangnya ya dikasih kartu kredit. Suruh belanja apa yang dimauinya. Suka kan? Biasanya thawaf dari mall ke mall. Masyaallah.*

(Husband and wife must help each other. If the husband were tired, please massage him. If the wife has less money, so please give her the credit card to buy everything she wants. You like it, don't you? They usually "thowaf" from one mall to the other malls. Masyallah.)

This utterance talks that husband and wife have to help each others. This utterance flouts quantity maxim because the speaker informs something more than the hearer needs. '*suka kan? Biasanya thawaf dari mall ke mall. Masyallah*'. It is uttered because he wants to satire and criticize the hearer, especially the women. It can be seen from the word choice. He tries to compare the habit between husband and wife. He thinks that women will be happy if their husband gives them money to go shopping. It is said because he disagrees with the habit of women. This utterance also flouts manner maxim. '*Thowaf*' has ambiguous meaning, and it is derived from arabic language meant walk around *ka'bah* 7 times. Ustad Wijayanto used this word to exaggerate when the women walk from one mall to the other malls for shopping. From this utterance, it is implied that he wants to satire, to criticize, and to exaggerate women's habit to go shopping. This is uttered as the introduction before he delivers the message that he disagrees with shopping habit.

2.1.1.2. Implicature of Flouting Quantity Maxim, Quality Maxim and Manner Maxim

This is uttered by the speaker to emphasize, to exaggerate, to criticize, and to satirize. This utterance flouts triple maxim.

"Orang kalau sudah cinta luar biasa. itu dicubit itu sakit. Kalau yang nyubit pacarnya, nikmatnya luar biasa padahal gosong itu. Tisu bekas aja di laminating. Di ciumin I love you I love you. Padahal penuh ingus. Masyaallah. Rasulullah mengatakan kecintaan di dunia ini tidak

ada yang abadi. Cinta yang abadi adalah cinta kepada Allah dan rasulnya"

(if a person falls in love, it is amazing. It is hurt if someone pinches her/him. But if his boyfriend/her girlfriend pinches her/him, it is very amazing. His/her dirty tissue is laminated. It is kissed. I love you. I love you. Whereas it is full of mucus. Masyallah. Rasulullah says that loving the everything in the world is not eternal, but loving Allah and His Prophets is the eternal love.

In this utterance, the speaker flouts quantity maxim because the speaker talks more than the hearer needs, for instance the speaker said *'His/her dirty tissue is laminated. It is kissed. I love you. I love you. Whereas it is full of mucus.'* The speaker wants to emphasize and to exaggerate his opinion. Then this utterance also flouts the quality maxim. It is shown when he said *'His/her dirty tissue is laminated'*. The listeners understand that it is not true. The speaker just wants to criticize and to satirize the listeners when they fall in love. It also flouts manner maxim by repeating a sentence, for this is to exaggerate and to emphasize the words. This utterance is stated because Ustad Wijayanto talks that nothing is eternal in this world. Its implicature is to satirize, to exaggerate, to criticize and to emphasize that people in this world just see the temporary happiness because nothing is eternal. This is uttered by the speaker before he delivers the message to love Allah and the prophets.

The same implicature of flouting triple maxims is created with the different technique of humor. In this utterance the speaker uses abbreviation to deliver the humor, but for the implicature is to satire, to criticize, and to exaggerate.

"Kalau orang Jogja bilang, jika mau nikah, modalnya hanya M15. Madep mantep moro mangan melu mertua moro tuo mati melumelu marisi morotuo muni-muni mantu minggat. Jadi dia modalnya hanya modal dengkul modal kumis. Yang penting menghapuskan warisan. Jadi waktu menikah ya Allah matikanlah mertua saya. Sebidang tanah ini sudah cukup untuk modal hidup. Jangan. Nikah itu bagaimana orang jadi iffah perwira, bisa menghidupi keluarganya"

(Jogja people said that if someone wants to marry, they just need M15. "Madep mantep moro mangan melu mertua moro tuo mati

melumelu marisi morotuo muni-muni mantu minggat". The most important is the heirs. So when she/he is married, she prays ya Allah please take his/her breath away. A block of the land is enough for me. Don't do it, please don't. Married is how the person becomes the hero to maintain the family"

This utterance flouts quantity maxim because the speaker said more than the listener needs. By saying "*Married is how the person becomes the hero to maintain the family*", it is informative enough. In fact, he utters M15 because he wants to exaggerate and to emphasize what Jogja people's thought before marriage. This utterance also flouts quality maxim by saying '*she prays ya Allah please take his/her breath away*'. It is almost impossible thought by the people. The listeners understand that the speaker said it because he wants to exaggerate his opinion about the people who want to marry because of wealth. This utterance also flouts manner maxim. It is shown by saying the abbreviation M15 and it has ambiguous meaning as well, who Jogja people are, the people who do M15 or the people who meet M15 people. This utterance implies that the speaker wants to satirize, to criticize, to emphasize and to exaggerate that the people should not only think about the material, but also sacrifice everything for their family. This is also uttered before he delivers his message in his sermon.

2.1.2. Implicature of Utterances in Incongruity Theory of Humor

In Incongruity theory of humor, the implicature is created because the speaker flouts the maxim of quality, quantity, relation and manner. The speaker flouts single, double and triple maxims. By flouting those maxims, the implicature created is to surprise, to make the listener more understand, to give the weird examples. There are 8 humorous utterances grouped in incongruity theory of humor.

2.1.2.1. Implicature of Flouting Relation Maxim

This is one of the examples of humorous utterances that is aimed to make the listeners more understand by giving the easy examples. Flouting a single maxim only happened in this utterance.

Presenter: Iya subhanallah ya. Mudah-mudahan tidak ada yang bosan di dalam rumah tangga kita semuanya. Amin yarabbal alamin.

Ustad Wijayanto: Alhamdulillah Harus bervariasi.

Presenter: Variasi?

Ustad Wijayanto: *"Mosok tiap hari karedok terus. Sesekali ya gudeg. Sesekali rendang. Rendangpun bisa didaur ulang-daur ulang. Sampe semakin lama semakin enak."*

("Mosok" she always cooks "karedok". Onetime gudeg, onetime rendang. Rendang can be recycled. Till it will be more delicious.)

This utterance flouts relation maxim because the speaker change the topic to make the listeners find the meaning behind it. He tries to make an analogy between boredom in a household and boredom in food consumption. The first topic comes when the presenter hopes that they never feel bored in to maintain the family. Then, the speaker talks about the variation of food. He says it because he wants to give the easy examples that can make the listeners more understand about maintaining a household. One of the easy examples is to make various foods. Thus it implies that he changes the topic to give an analogy and make the listeners more understand by giving the easier example.

2.1.2.2. Implicature of Flouting Quantity, Relation, and manner Maxim

This is one of the examples of humorous utterances that is aimed to surprise the listener. This utterance flouting triple maxims happened in two utterances.

Utterance. *'Perempuan kalau mau nikah lihat matanya, mata pencaharian maksudnya. Lihat Dulu. Jangan mau'*

(if women want to marry, please see his 'mata', I mean 'mata pencaharian. Please see it first).

This utterance flouts quantity maxim because it is more than the listeners need. Actually he can say *'perempuan kalau mau nikah lihat mata pencahariannya'*. It is more informative because he tries to surprise the listeners by adding additional information. It flouts relation maxim because he deflects the words *'mata'* to *'mata pencaharian'*. It is the word play between the words *'mata'* and *'mata pencaharian'*. He changes it to surprise the

listeners. This utterance also flouts manner maxim because it is not orderly. He does not directly say what he wants to say. Therefore this utterance implies that the speaker wants to surprise the listeners by deflecting the topic of conversation.

D. CONCLUSION

The sermon entitled *Cintai Aku Apa Adanya* by Ustad Wijayanto inserts humorous utterances before he talks about the religious message. He uses two kinds of humor theory, superiority theory and incongruity theory. The humorous utterances in superiority and incongruity theory have different implicatures. The implicatures are created by flouting the maxim of cooperative principle. In superiority theory the implicature such as to satirize, to criticize, to emphasize, to exaggerate is created by flouting the quantity maxim, quality maxim, and manner maxim. In incongruity theory, the implicature such as to surprise the listeners and to give an easy example is created by flouting quantity maxim, quality maxim, relation maxim, and manner maxim. The kinds of humor he used are exaggeration, emphasis, satire, criticism, deflection, abbreviation and surprise. All of humorous utterances are inserted in his sermon before he delivers the religious messages.

References

- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2006. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta. Print.
- Aryanthi. 2010. *The Non-Observance Maxim of Conversation in The Arthur Miller's The Last Yankee (Based on Grice's Cooperative Principle)*. Thesis. Jakarta: Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta.
- Cruse, D. Alan. 2000. *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University.
- Day, Ian. 1993. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A User Friendly Guide for Social Scientist*. Canada: Routledge.
- Fauziah, Jiah. 2013. *Pragmatics Handout*. Yogyakarta: Uin Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta.

- Grice, Paul. 1980. *Studies in The Way of Words*. Berkeley: First Harvard University Press.
- Griffiths, Patrick. 2006. *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lippit, John. (1991). *Philosophical Perspectives of Humor and Laughter*, Durham Theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/6201/>
- Mey, Jacob L. 2009. *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. Denmark: University of Southern Denmark.
- Monro, D.H. "Theories of Humor" *Writing and Reading accross the Curriculum* 3rd ed. Laurence Bahrens and Leonard J. Rosen. Eds. Genview, IL: Scott, Foresmen and Company, 1988.
- Nieto, Ramiro. 2011. *The Role of Conversational Maxims, Implicature, and Presupposition in the Creation of Humour: an Analysis of Woody Allen's Anything Else*. Dissertation. Department of English Phylology, UCM.
- Rakhmat, Jalaluddin. 2000. *Retorika Modern: Pendekatan Praktis*. Remaja Rosdakarya Ratna, Nyoman Kutha. 2010. *Metodologi Penelitian-Kajian Budaya dan Ilmu Sosial Humaniora Pada Umumnya*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Stykarova, Martina. 2009. *Indirectness in Fictional Dialogues as Expression of Extra Meanings Based on Discourse Analysis of Lively's Heat Wave*. Undergraduate Thesis. Masaryk University: Faculty of Art of Art of English Department and American Studies.
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zacharias, Nugrahenny T. 2012. *Qualitative Research Methods for Second Language Education: A Coursebook*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Online Source:

Wijayanto. 2013. A sermon entitled “Cintai Aku Apa Adanya”
<http://m.youtube.com/watch?v=03xvXNckZtU> accessed
in 24 August 2014.

