



THE REALISATION OF VIOLATING COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLES IN SUNDANESE HUMOUR

Dini Hadiani

Politeknik Manufaktur Negeri Bandung

ABSTRAK

To relieve tense, people usually use humour which is a verbal or nonverbal impulse to create a smile or even laugh. Humour can be easily found in our daily lives. It can be used to communicate and create intimacy. This research is focused on analyzing the realisation of violating the cooperative principles and what type of maxims that is usually violated to create humour. The data were taken from humour column in Sundanese magazine Mangle. The humour is analyzed based on Grice's maxim principles. The results show that maxim of quantity is the most violated maxims employed by the speakers even the hearers to create humourous effect. This is considered the easiest way to create and understand humour.

Keywords: *Humour, Cooperative principles, Maxim Principles.*

A. INTRODUCTION

To be able to maintain a smooth conversation, the speaker and the hearer should cooperate to each other. They have to make sure that what they are talking about is connected and related to both of them. The relation cannot be found in an independent sentence. It means that it cannot be found literally in each sentence they produce. This situation is generally referred to as conversational implicatures. It indicates that an implicature is something meant, implied, or suggested which is different from what is said (Yule, 1996 :173).

Grice proposes the key idea of implicature. He finds that in all communication, there is an "agreement" between the addresser and addressee, namely co-operative principle (CP), which says: "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." (Grice, 1975, as quoted in Mey, 2001). Grice's Cooperative Principle of conversation is elaborated in four-sub principles called maxims. They are as follows:

1. *The Maxim of Quality*
try to make your contribution one that is true, specifically:

- (i) do not say what you believe to be false
- (ii) do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence
- 2. *The Maxim of Quantity*
 - (i) make your contribution as
 - (ii) informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange
 - (iii) do not make your contribution more informative than is required
- 3. *The Maxim of Relation*; make your contributions relevant
- 4. *The Maxim of Manner*; be perspicuous, and specifically :
 - (i) avoid obscurity
 - (ii) avoid ambiguity
 - (iii) be brief
 - (iv) be orderly (Levinson, 1983)

In short, these maxims specify what participants have to do in order to converse in a maximally efficient, rational, co-operative way : they should speak sincerely, relevantly and clearly, while providing sufficient information. The maxims are the operational standard needed to be fulfilled for implicature. They work as assumption of cooperation. However, even Grice himself has been aware that these maxims are too ideal to be always followed by utterers in their daily conversations; in fact, people often fail to observe the maxims. Violating cooperative principle will create something absurd. This happens if the information given is exaggerating, invalid, irrelevant, or complicated. This absurd thing is what people use to create humour.

To relieve tense, people usually use humour which is a verbal or nonverbal impulse that potentially cause people to smile or even laugh. Humour can be easily found in our daily lives. It can be used to communicate and create intimacy. For some linguists, these phenomena are the challenges for them to find out the truth. Raskin in Meyer (2000), for example, defines humor as a non-bonafide (NBF) mode of communication, which purpose is not to bring any information contained in the text but rather to create a particular effect, such as: funniness or humor. Non-bona-fide is opposed to bona-fide mode of communication. What he means by bona-fide communication is “in the earnest, serious, information-conveying mode of verbal communication”.

This research tries to reveal the violation of cooperative principles in conversations of *Ha..Ha.. Ha. (Barakatak)* columns in Mangle magazine. What type of maxim that is mostly violated by the speaker and hearer to create humour is the question wanted to be exposed.

Nowadays Sundanese is used widely among the population of West Java. Sundanese is primarily utilized in the family circle, in conversation among friends and intimate acquaintances, and also in public and official places between people who are aware that they both know Sundanese. Sundanese people refer to ethnic group that lives in most West Java area. They are generally branded as people who are polite,



very friendly, honest, easy going, humourous, and so on and so forth. (Faturrahman, 2002). In the writing form, the humours can be read in magazines, books, and columns in newspapers. The most popular magazine in Sundanese is called Mangle. This magazine really supports the movement of Sunda culture because the young generation of sundanese lack their cultural knowledge and values. There are several humour columns in Mangle magazine, but this research focuses on the *Ha... Ha... Ha...(Barakatak)* columns since most of them are in short conversations. This research uses the maxim principles so that the utterances of the speaker and the hearer need to be observed. Conversations in the writing form seem to be the most appropriate type of data to be observed in this research.

II. METHODOLOGY

This research is an analysis of conversation implicature. The data are taken from jokes columns in Mangle magazine that was issued in year 2009 no.2181- 2183. The columns contain many short conversations. The column is named *Ha..Ha..Ha..(Barakatak)*, and it is collected from the readers. This makes the data are very rich to view because they are coming from many Sundanese, not a person. This research tries to analyze the conversations by using the theories of maxim principles and the ways of violating the maxim.

The procedures of this research are:

1. identifying conversations (data) based on maxims principles
2. analyzing the data based on the maxim principles and violation of the maxims
3. categorizing data
4. interpreting data.

Following Thomas (1995), the writer tries to analyze the humour in conversation to find out the realisation of violating cooperative principles based on the maxims.

III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The research obtains data from conversations that have been identified having violation of the cooperative principles. From 60 humour in the column, there are only 21 that can be identified based on cooperative principles especially those which violate the maxims. Based on analysis, the categorization of the findings can be shown as follows:

Table 1. Types of violation the maxims

Conversation	Types of violation the maxims			
	Manner	Quantity	quality	Relation
1				√
2	√			
3		√		
4				√
5				√
6				√
7			√	
8		√		
9	√			
10			√	
11		√		√
12		√	√	
13		√		
14		√		
15	√	√		
16				√
17			√	
18		√		
19	√	√		
20		√		
21			√	
Total	4(16%)	10(40%)	5 (20%)	6 (24%)

Based on the principal theories, we can only guess what the most probable situation in the utterances setting is. So, it is common if an utterance has a clash between two maxim principles or even more. The analysis is already made by the characteristic. If there is a clash, the two maxims, both are all calculated.

From the table, it can be seen that the number of violation the maxims are 25 coming from 21 conversations. Based on the categorization of the principles of maxim, we can calculate that the numbers of violation of the maxims in the conversation are:

1. Quality: 5 times (20%)
2. Quantity: 10 times (40%)
3. Relation: 6 times (24%)
4. Manner: 4 times (16%)

According to the findings, it can be seen that the most common violation of the maxims principles is maxim of quantity. Thomas (1995) said that the maxim of quantity includes two aspects: the interlocutor should make their contributions as informative as is required (for the current purpose of the exchange); They should not



make their contributions more or less informative than is required. Nevertheless, in people's daily communication, the interlocutors often offer too much or inadequate information, that is to say, it deviates from the maxims of quantity.

The following humours are formed through the violation of maxim of quantity (see the appendix).

e.g 1:

Conversation 14

Kondo : "Gawat euy"

Fahim : "Gawat naon?"

Kondo : "Gawat Darurat."

Fahim : "Saha nu Gawat Darurat teh?"

Kondo : "Itu di rumah sakit, aya ruangan Gawat Darurat."

Fahim : "Si kasebelan."

In this conversation *Kondo* violates the maxim of quantity. He tries to mislead his friend by not giving enough information. However, at the end of conversation the implied meaning has been acknowledged by the speaker by giving the clarification.

Conversation 12

"Si Udin asup rumah sakit."

"Boga panyakit naon kitu Si Udin teh?"

"Kangker bejana mah. Ngan teuing kangker rahim, teuing kangker payudara..."

At the end of the conversation, the speaker violates the maxim of quantity by giving more information than is required. However, we also can say that he has violated the maxim of quality because he is not sure about the disease, so he is lack of adequate evidence. But this makes the story funny because the speaker is talking about a man which is impossible to have cervical and breast cancer.

According to the maxim of quality, the interlocutors should offer the true information to others. They should not say what they believe to be false. Neither should they say that for which they lack adequate evidence. The following examples reflect the use of the technique of violating the maxim of quality for humorous purposes.

e.g 2:

Conversation 5

Pamilon : "Panitia, naha teu puguh ngajurian teh?"

Panitia : "Kumaha kitu?"

Pamilon : "Naha nu juara sapedah santey teh bet Mang Sakri? Kapan sidik Mang

Sakri mah datangna ka pinis oge pangpandeurina?"

Panitia : "Ih ari Bapa. Kapan namina oge sapedah santey. Jadi tangtu juarana

oge nu pangsanteyna.”

At the end of the conversation the secondspeaker fails to observe maxim of quantity in giving information about the ways they give judgement on the championship. He violates the maxim of quality. It is a violation the maxim of quality since it is not common in a race for the winner to be the last arrive at finish spot.

Conversation 16

Nyi Iteung keur gede timburu ka Si Kabayan, pedah manggih ngaran Oneng nu diukir dialus-alus dina sulingna.

Iteung : “Kang ngaku siah, ari Oneng teh saha?”

Kabayan: “Itu ari Iteung sok salah sangka.

Oneng teh ngaram hayam adu nu sok dipasangkeun ku Akang.”

Keur kitu kring aya telepon, ku si Iteung diangkat.

Iteung : “Halow...., bade ka saha?”

Muhun. Ari ieu sareng saha?

Oh Muhun.”

Iteung ngalieuk ka Si Kabayan, “Kang, ieu hayam adu hoyong nyarios cenah sareng Akang!”

In the conversation Kabayan violates the maxim of quality because he lies when answering Iteung’s question about Si Oneng. However, Iteung also violates the maxim of quality when she says that “hayam adu” wants to talk to Kabayan.

Conversation 7

“Kuring tas ti KUA, tas nyokot STNK nu ditilang ku polisi poe kamari.”

“Ari kuring mah tos ti kantor pos, nyokot buku nikah..”

In this conversation, both the speaker and the hearer violate the maxim of quality. They offer false information purposely, which thus creates humorous effects.

According to the maxim of relation, the interlocutors should make their contribution relevant. This maxim demands that the hearer should give answers relevant to what the speaker has said in the conversation. The technique of violating the maxim of relation is obviously used in the following humours:

e.g3:

Conversation 20

Pa Guru : “Barudak, cing pangnyieunkeun kalimah make kecap koneng.”

Nina : “Pakulitanana koneng umyang.”

Tuti : “manehna seuri koneng.”

Pa Guru : “Alus-alus, cing maneh Uhe?”



Uhe : “*Si Udin huntuna koneng.*”
Pa Guru : “*Iyy...Sudin ngosok huntu siah!*”

In this conversation the speaker (*Uhe*) violates the maxim of relation. He says something that is not relevant to context.

Conversation 11

Bubun : “*Asa tara katingali ngaronda deui. Ku naon?*”
Bani : “*Embung ah, hayam tatanggana ge geus beak!*”
Bubun : “*Heueuh, nya. Jadi we mun ngaliwet teh tara aya deungeunna!*”

When *Bani* says “*Embung ah, hayam tatanggana ge geus beak!*” he violates the maxim of relation since his response is not relevant with context.

Conversation 6

Incu setan: “*Bah, tadi uing nyingsieunan nu keur ngaradu jeung marabok!*”
Abah setan: “*Na ari maneh kalakuan sok salah bae...*”
Incu setan: “*Kumaha kitu Bah?*”
Abah setan: “*Nya ulah atuh. Sabab eta mah balad urang deuleu...*”
Incu setan: “*Hampura atuh nya Bah!*”

In this conversation, the second speaker (*Abah setan*) violates the maxim of relation, since his response is not relevant to context.

The maxim of manner is different from other maxims in that it relates not to what is said, but rather, to how what is said to be said. The interlocutors should try to avoid obscurity and ambiguity to pass the message. This maxim requires that the conveyed meaning should be adequately clear. The following is the example of violating the maxim of manner.

e.g 4:

Conversation 2

Wawan : “*Beda nya geuning pembajak jaman ayeuna jeung pembajak jaman baheula mah.*”
Agus : “*Kumaha bedana teh?*”
Wawan : “*Heueuh jaman ayeuna mah pakarang nu digunakeun teh mun teu pestol jeung bedil pastina ge bom.*”
Agus : “*Ari pembajak jaman baheula kumaha?*”
Wawan : “*Ari pembajak jaman baheula mah pakarangna teh cukup ku....wuluku we jeung munding.*”

In this conversation, the first speaker violates the maxim of manner. The first speaker tries to mislead the second speaker by giving a statement that has ambiguity ('pembajak'), and he does this on purpose.

Conversation 19

Ujo : "Mo, tatarucingan euy?"

Darmo : "Sok lah, siapa takut."

Ujo : "Ucing naon anu bisa nyanyi?"

Darmo : "Babari lah, ucing geuring euy."

Ujo : "His lain, maneh mah ka dinya wae."

Darmo : "Ucing naon atuh, taluklah."

Ujo : "Ucing Cangkeling Manuk Cingkleung Cindeten atuh."

Darmo : "Tobat!"

In this conversation, Ujo tries to mislead Darmo. The type of the utterance is violating the maxim of quantity and the maxim of manner. It violates the maxim of quantity because Ujo provides less information than is required by giving an incomplete utterance. It also violates the maxim of manner since it gives ambiguity in the word "ucing".

Based on the analysis, it can be said that Sundanese humour in Mangle magazine mostly have a typical of violating the maxim, especially maxim of quantity. Most Sundanese conversations of humour are really on purpose misleading the hearer since it can create the humorous effects.

IV. CONCLUSION

In the written form, Sundanese people seem to be misleading the hearer on purpose to create humour. They often violate the maxims principle in their conversation. This seems to be the easiest way to make and to understand humour. From the finding and discussion, it can be said that the realisation of violating cooperative principles happens in Sundanese humour. They usually violate the maxims to create humorous effect.

V. REFERENCES

- Faturrahman, Taufik. 2002. *Beregejed: Kumpulan Guguyon Sunda*. Bandung: CV Geger Sunten.
- Levinson, S.C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mangle. 2009. *Ha..Ha..Ha..: Barakatak*. August No. 2181- 2183. Bandung.



- Mey, Jacob L. 2001. *Pragmatics. An Introduction*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publisher.
- Meyer, John C. 2000. 'Humor as a Double-Edged Sword: Four Functions of Humour in Communication', *Communication Theory*, Vol. 10. [http: www. Questia.com](http://www.Questia.com) accessed on April 1, 2010.
- Thomas, Jenny. 1995. *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. England: Longman Group Limited.
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.