

Non-Observance Maxims in *Banyumasan* Humor Speech

Wijiasih Eka Pertiwi¹✉

¹ Master of Linguistics, Indonesia University of Education, West Java, Indonesia,

✉ email: wijiasihkap@upi.edu

Received:

January 11, 2023

Revised:

January 16, 2023

Accepted:

January 17, 2023

Published:

February 5, 2023

ABSTRACT

Humorous utterances can cause humor because listeners, readers and audiences find unexpected utterances, attitudes or things, language games and deviations in speech conveyed by a speaker or comedian due to a discrepancy between the concept and the actual situation and exaggerated and unreasonable expressions, so it can cause laughter. In a conversation, what the speaker means often goes beyond what is said. Other implied meanings can be inferred and predicted based on the context. Implicature can occur due to a violation of the principle of conversation. The violation of the cooperative principle has the aim of creating humor in the conversation. There is another basic theory of cooperative principle, namely the non-observance of the conversational maxims theory proposed by Grice (1975). It is one of the pragmatic studies in determining the implied meaning of utterances that contain humor. This study aims to analyze the non-observance maxims found in *Banyumasan* humorous utterances on youtube. The data collection technique in this study was to use a purposive sampling technique, namely by looking for videos that match the research object. The methods used in this research were observation, documentation and transcription. The data analysis technique in this study used descriptive qualitative data analysis techniques and was carried out through three stages according to the data analysis model of Miles and Huberman (1984), namely data reduction, data presentation and drawing conclusions. The results of the study showed that in *Banyumasan* humorous utterances there are several non-observance maxims, including flouting the maxims, violating the maxims and infringing the maxims. From these data, the most common is the flouting of quality maxims. This is because in humorous utterances there are non-observance of maxims that aim to create a funny impression.

Keywords: *non-observance maxims; Banyumasan ; humorous speech; youtube.*

INTRODUCTION

The ngapak dialect has uniqueness and characteristics in its use both in terms of pronunciation, phonemes, word forms and speech. The utterances in the ngapak dialect are different from speech in other Javanese dialects. The utterances of cablaka or blakasuta or thokmelong are the original characteristics of the Banyumas people, who put forward honesty. The original Banyumas people, if they speak words, are always thokmelong (without preamble), so that from the outside they will appear to have no ethics (*unggah-ungguh*), straightforward, and seem impolite. *Cablaka, blakasuta,*

or *thokmelong* are local wisdoms that can only be imbued if expressed in the native language of Banyumas. So, without the ngapak dialect, the *Banyumasan* characteristics will fade. (Rasjid, et al., 2013: 75). In addition, Nurdiyanto and Resticka (2021) in their research stated that another uniqueness that can be seen from the richness of the ngapak dialect lexicon is that not all of them can be interpreted in Indonesian.

With the representation of Banyumas people characteristics, the form of speech in the community does not distinguish status or prioritize forms of equality. This is explained in Nurdiyanto and Resticka (2021) that Banyumas people prefer to use *ngoko* language which seems innocent or as it is. The *ngoko* language holds more egalitarian principles or equality.

Language, culture and humor also have a connection. This can be seen from the representation of cultural identity by looking at the nature, attitude and character of speakers who have funny characters and act silly or have humor and the dialect of the language used can also reflect the characteristics of speakers. As stated by Abdullah (2019: 144) that the language of humor displays or uses the cultural values of a society. For example, the representation of *Banyumasan* culture with the ngapak dialect is described as a character from the Banyumas people who have *cablaka* traits, namely what they are and *mbanyol* which means acting silly or funny (Pawestri, 2019: 262). Therefore, the language behavior of the Banyumas people with the ngapak dialect is influenced by Banyumas culture which is represented by the characters of the people who like to act silly and funny.

In communicating there are speech acts that are expressed through conversation. An utterance in a speech or communication event needs to be linked and included in context. Context is a situation related to communication. In an utterance there is information, message or meaning conveyed implicitly and not expressed directly. In humorous utterances there is also a language play which causes violations of the cooperation principle so that humor will emerge from the humorous utterance. In order to express the meaning of speech in the language use, it can be studied by studying implicature. In pragmatics, implicature studies are used to take into account certain messages that are implicit in communication between speakers and speech partners. Implicature theory was introduced by Grice in 1975 because of problems in meaning that occur in language processes which cannot be solved by semantic theory (Setiawati & Arista, 2018: 74). In a conversation, what the speaker means often goes beyond what is said. Other implied meanings can be inferred and predicted based on the context. Implicature can occur due to a violation of the principle of conversation.

The principle of conversation regulates the conversation process so that it runs smoothly and in accordance with the purpose of communication. This is done so that the speaker wants his speech partner to understand the meaning he is expressing. In addition, speakers are expected to speak clearly, naturally, not convoluted, not ambiguous and not excessive. This principle is called the cooperative principle. Grice (1975) put forward the principle of cooperation consisting of four maxims, namely 1) maxim of quality, 2) maxim of quantity, 3) maxim of relevance and 4) maxim of manner. However, the cooperative principle is often violated by speakers in humorous

speech conversations. The violation of the cooperative principle has the aim of creating humor in the conversation.

There is another basic theory of cooperative conversation, namely the non-observance of the conversational maxims theory proposed by Grice (1975). It is one of the pragmatic studies in determining the implied meaning of utterances that contain humor. So far, there have been several studies related to non-observance maxims, including Oksinia, Jayantini and Sulatra (2021) in their research discussing non-observance with Grice's cooperative principle used in humorous conversational dialogues in the Miranda comedy situation on British television. The results of their research showed that there were four types of non-observance with the principle of cooperation found in the Miranda situation comedy, namely flouting, violating, infringing, and opting out a maxim. From the 80 humorous speech data, there was no suspending maxim and the one that appeared most often was the flouting maxim. In Hasanah's research (2021) which discusses comparisons of the types of flouting of maxims in Madurese humor "Dullatep-Maliyeh" and Javanese humor "Bocah Ngapa(k) Ya" using Grice's theory (1975) and the factors that most influence flouting of maxims in creating humor. The results of her research showed that Madurese humor violates the maxim of quantity, where humor speakers add too much information bluntly and spontaneously, because one of the characteristics of Madurese is expressiveness and spontaneity. Whereas in Javanese humor there were two violations of the dominant maxims, namely relevance and manner. This is due to cultural factors, where the Javanese use indirect speech in communicating, so that if it is used in humor it will cause a violation of the maxim which aims to create a funny impression. Then, Al-Zubeiry (2020) in his research discusses the violation of Grice's maxims in the Arabic comedy Madrasat AlMushaghbeen (School of Troublemakers). His research explained how the violation of the maxims has a humorous effect in comedy plays.

Based on this background, this study focuses on "Non-observance maxims in *Banyumasan* humorous utterances on youtube media". The research uses a pragmatic approach with Grice's theory (1975) which discusses non-observance of conversational maxims. This study describes the forms of non-observance maxims found in *Banyumasan* humorous utterances and implied meanings of *Banyumasan* humorous utterances on youtube social media.

METHOD

This study used a qualitative approach with descriptive methods to find out the utterances of the ngapak dialect used in Banyumas humor, as well as violations of maxims in conversations in the ngapak dialect of humor on youtube social media. Creswell (2008) revealed that qualitative research is research that understands the meaning of individuals or groups of people as a social problem by exploring and understanding in detail a central phenomenon. The data source in this study was obtained from videos on the youtube social media on the *Koplak Story* account. The

media is social media that contains humorous content using the ngapak dialect. The data collection technique in this study was using a purposive sampling technique, which is searching for videos that match the research object. Observation technique was used by observing and listening to the forms of the ngapak dialect used and the conversations that contain humor on the *Koplak Story* youtube account.

In the observation, the instruments used were observation guidelines, checklists, picture recordings and sound recordings. Documentation is a technique used to find data in the form of writing, pictures or work from a person or the public. The data includes notes, biographies, transcripts, magazines, books, sketches and photos related to research. In this transcription process, the researcher simply writes what is stated in the recording as it is and does not correct or interpret sentences (Sugiarti, et al., 2020: 79-80). The data analysis technique in this study used descriptive qualitative data analysis techniques and was carried out through three stages according to the data analysis model of Miles and Huberman (1984), namely data reduction, data presentation and drawing conclusions.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The Non-Observance of the Conversational Maxims

In communicating there is a cooperative principle carried out by speakers and their partners so that the communication process runs smoothly in accordance with the goals to be achieved. However, there are times when speakers fail to fulfill maxims so that it violates the principle of cooperation. This was explained by Grice (1975) in the theory of the non-observance of the conversational maxims. Grice categorizes the theory into five parts, namely: 1) Flouting the maxim, 2) Violating the maxim, 3) Infringing the maxim, 4) Opting out the maxim, and 5) Suspending the maxim.

Table 1. The non-observance of the conversational maxims found in Banyumasan humorous utterances.

No	Type of maxims	Non-observance of cooperative principle				
		Flouting	Violating	Infringing	Opting-out	Suspending
1	Quality maxim	29	10	2	-	-
2	Quantity maxim	20	1	-	-	-
3	Relevance maxim	22	5	-	-	-
4	Manner maxim	16	-	-	-	-
	Total	87	16	2	0	0

From the table above, the types of the non-observance of the conversational maxims found in this study are flouting the maxims, violating the maxims and infringing the maxims.

A. Flouting the maxims

According to Cutting (2002: 37) flouting of maxims occurs when the speaker appears not to follow the maxims but expect the listener to appreciate the meaning implied. Flouting of this maxim is divided into four, namely: 1) flouting of quality maxim; 2) flouting of quantity maxim; 3) flouting of relevance maxim and 4) flouting of manner maxim.

Based on the findings, there are four types of flouting the maxims in *Banyumasan* humorous speech on the *Koplak Story* youtube account. Those floutings are: flouting of quality maxim, flouting of quantity maxim, flouting of relevance maxim, and flouting of manner maxim.

1. Flouting of quality maxim

Flouting of the maxim of quality occurs when the speaker says something that is blatantly untrue or lacks adequate evidence (Thomas, 1995: 67). The context of this speech is that the conversation occurred when the two motorcycle taxi drivers (Jibrot and Abad) were explaining the current weather conditions and then Abad complained about his condition at the motorcycle taxi base. Then Jibrot responded by suggesting something for Abad to do. Jibrot and Abad's conversation occurs at minutes 1:00 - 1:27:

Jibrot: *Wah dina kiyé cerah banget ya bro? Déwék kayané sugih duit kiyé.*

(Wow, it is really sunny today, right bro? It looks like we are going to be rich).

Abad: *Sugih duit, kepriwé maksudé?*

(Rich, what do you mean?)

Jibrot: *Ya maksudé akéh penumpang.*

(Yes, that means a lot of passengers).

Abad: *Iya sih, dina kiyé pancén cerah. Tapi ora secerah atiné aku.*

(Yeah, it is sunny today. But not as bright as my heart).

Jibrot: *Hahaha...atiné ko ora cerah apa? Digosoki Ponds apa Bioré mengko tuli cerah.*

(Your heart is not bright, huh? If you wash it with Ponds or Biore, it will be definitely bright).

Abad: *Cocoté...* (Your mouth...)

Jibrot : *Aja kelalén krim siang wenginé juga di nggo.*

(Do not forget to use the day and night cream too).

Examples of utterances in the conversation above includes the flout of the maxim of quality because the response given by Jibrot is to say something that is blatantly untrue. In this story there is an implicature, Jibrot suggested that Abad may use facial cleansing products to clean Abad's heart, which is not bright. Jibrot considers that the heart is the same as a face that can be washed or cleaned so that it will look bright. But

in fact, the heart can not be washed by using facial cleansing products. So that the speech does not make sense and contains humor.

2. Flouting of relevance maxim

Flouting of the maxim of relation occurs when the speaker makes a response or observation that is very clearly irrelevant to the topic being discussed, for example by suddenly changing the subject or blatantly failing to answer the other person's purpose in asking a question (Thomas, 1995: 70).

The context contained in the utterance is the conversation occurred when the passenger asked the motorcycle taxi drivers (Abad and Jibrot) the cost of the motorcycle taxi fare to the bus terminal at the motorcycle taxi base. The following conversation occurs at minutes 6:43 - 6:46:

- Passenger : *Terminal sepira, mas?*
(How much terminal, bro?)
Jibrot : *Terminal ora di dol, mas.*
(Terminal is not for sale, bro).

Examples of utterances in the conversation above include the flout of the maxim of relevance because the response given by Jibrot is irrelevant to the passenger's utterance. Jibrot's utterance contains implicature by assuming that the terminal is not a thing that can be sold. Meanwhile, the purpose of the passenger's utterance is to ask the cost for taking a motorcycle taxi to the bus terminal.

3. Flouting of quantity maxim

Flouting of the maxim of quantity occurs when the speaker openly provides more or less information than the situation requires (Thomas, 1995: 69). The context contained in this speech is that the conversation occurred when the two motorcycle taxi drivers (Abad and Jibrot) were talking with passengers at the motorcycle taxi base and asked where the passenger wanted to go. The following conversation occurs at minutes 6:06-6:27:

- Jibrot : *Mas, emangé rika arep dijugna maring ndi sih mas? Kancané inyong kuwé siap mas arep digawa maring ngendi baé. Arep mendaki gunung, lewati lembah sungai mengalir indah, ya siaplah pokoké.*
(Bro, where do you want to be taken? My friend is ready to take you anywhere, if you want to climb the mountain through a beautiful flowing river valley, he is ready anyway).
Abad : *Mendaki gunung lewat di lembah, dénéng kaya laguné ninja hatari?*
(Climbing the mountain through the valley, how come is it like ninja hatari song?)
Jibrot : *Hatari ninimu! Ujar-ujaré ulih-ulih kang kondangan apa? Sing bener kuwé hatori ndol ondol.*
(Hatari, your grandmother! Do you think it's a gift from the invitation? The truth is hatori, ndol ondol).

Examples of utterances in the conversation above include the flout of the maxim of quantity because Jibrot blatantly provides more information than what Abad wants to hear. Then Abad gave a response that climbing the mountain past the valley was the song of the ninja hatari, but Jibrot's story contained an implicature by stating that hatari was the name of a snack or snack that was usually obtained from invitations. So that the speech creates humor.

4. Flouting of manner maxim

Flouting of the maxim of manner occurs when the speaker gives a response to his speech in a extremely long-winded and convoluted also the speech becomes ambiguous or unclear (Thomas, 1995: 71). The context contained in this speech, Sobret is collecting debts from his friend, a farmer who is working in the fields. The following conversation occurs at minutes 10:47 – 11:30:

Farmer : *Wong sawah koh diburu baé guli nagih, Bret.*

(People are in the fields just being chased to collect debts, Bret).

Sobret : *Inyong kuwé maring ngénéh agi menyelamatkan rika sekang dosa, Kang.*

Lah, nyarutang mbok kewajibané rika. Siki wis jatuh tempo.

(I'm here to save you from sin, Kang. Pay off your debts. Now that's due).

Farmer : *Dosa kepriwé? Dosaku apa?*

(What sin? What is my sin?).

Sobret : *Lho, angger rika ora njalana kewajiban kuwé ya mbok dadi dosa. Sini!*

(Well, if you don't carry out your obligations, it's a sin. Here!).

Farmer : *Ah dasar ora kalian baé.*

(Indeed you are easy to give debt).

Sobret : *Rika kuwe ngger ora diburu meng sawah, kaya welut, lunyu. Angel di cekel.*

(If you are not chased into the rice fields, you are like an eel, slippery.

It's hard to hold).

Examples of utterances in the conversation above includes the flout of the maxim of manner because he said the meaning of his utterance at length and not briefly so that his demand contained an implicature as an act of demanding. Sobret's meaning is to demand that his friend immediately pay his debts to him and liken his friend to an eel because it's very difficult when it's time to pay the debt bill.

B. Violating the maxim

The speaker violates the maxim by intentionally giving wrong information, so that the listener will only know the literal meaning of the utterance. Cutting (2002:40) reveals four categories of violate maxims, namely: (1) violating of quality maxim, (2) violating of quantity maxim, (3) violating of relevance maxim, and (4) violating of manner maxim.

Based on the findings, there are four types of violating the maxims in *Banyumasan* humorous speech on the *Koplak Story* youtube account. These violations are violating of quality maxim, violating of quantity maxim, and violating of relevance maxim.

1. Violating of quality maxim

Violation of the maxim of manner occurs when the speaker tells a lie and gives wrong information. The context in this speech is the husband who just came home asked to make sweet tea but the wife said that all kitchen needs run out. The husband felt confused and only had fifty thousand rupiah then gave it to his wife for the necessities of life. The following conversation occurs at minutes 2:05 – 2:33:

Husband : *Ma, kiyé kur nana duit séket éwu. Dicukup-cukupna ya nggo telu dina. Sukur-sukur kena nggo seminggu.*

(Ma'am, I only have fifty thousand in cash. Saved it for three days. It will be grateful, if you can save it for a week).

Wife : *Iya pak, nggo setaun bé téyéng.*
(Yes sir, for a year is also possible).

Husband : *Duh senengé duwé bojo kaya ko. Wis ngelésak, ayu, pinter masak, irit maning. Arep nggo tuku apa sih ma, duit séket éwu nggo setaun?*

(I'm so happy to have a wife like you. You are calm, beautiful, good at cooking, also housewifely. What do you want to buy, fifty thousand for one year Ma'am?).

Wife : *Arep nggo tuku kalénder 2016.*
(Want to buy a 2016 calendar).

Examples of utterances in the conversation above includes violating the maxim of quality because to cover up her annoyance, the wife lied and said if fifty thousand can be used for a year, but what she meant was buying a calendar which is usually written in one year.

C. Infringing the maxim

A speaker who does not intend to create implicatures and does not intend to deceive, fails to comply with the maxims is said to “infringe” the maxims. In other words, disobedience stems from imperfect linguistic performance rather than from a speaker's desire to produce conversational implicatures. This type of violation can occur because the speaker has imperfect mastery of the language (a small child or a foreign learner), because the speaker's performance is impaired in some way (nervous, drunk, excited), because of some cognitive impairment or simply because the speaker is constitutionally unable to speak properly clear, to the point (Thomas, 1995:74).

Based on the findings, there is infringing the maxim in *Banyumasan* humorous speech on the *Koplak Story* youtube account. This is caused by speaker who is experiencing depression so that speakers speak unclearly. The context in this story is

that Mr. Katir, who is depressed, unconscious and has lost his memory, talking ramblingly to Mr. Andung, Mr. Kodar and Mr. Sirun about his family situation. The following conversation occurs at minutes 24:53 – 25:25:

- Mr. Katir : *Kiyé ngapa maning? Bupati maring ngénéh arep ngoméih nyong apa? Urusan bocah minggat, sing siji bali nggawa anak, ora genah mbuh sapa bapané, ora ana urusané karo pemerintah.*
(What else is this? Is the regent here to scold me? The business of the children leaving, one comes home with a child, it is not clear who the father is, it has nothing to do with the government).
- Mr. Andung : *Katir! Sing éling, please!*
 (Katir! Be conscious please!)
- Mr. Katir : *Ora nana urusané juga karo ulama! Apa maning petugas pajak!*
(It has nothing to do with Ulama either! Also with revenue officer!)
- Mr. Kodar : *Petugas pajek? Maksudé inyong apa?*
 (Revenue officer? You mean, is it me?)
- Mr. Andung : *Maksudé kuwé ndéan, majeki kopi.*
 (Maybe, that means, asked for coffee tax).

Examples of utterances in the conversation above includes infringe the maxims because Mr. Katir is depressed and has lost his memory like a madman so that everything he says is not clear or to the point so that he infringes the maxims.

CONCLUSION

There are several conclusions that can be drawn in this study. First, the three types of non-observance of conversational maxims found in Banyumas humorous utterances are flouting, violating and infringing maxims. Second, flouting of quality maxim is the most frequently occurring data. This is because the utterances spoken by the speakers do not make sense so that they can cause humor. Furthermore, someone tends to disobey or violate the maxim because he deliberately lies so that his speech can have a humorous effect. Finally, the speaker infringes the maxim because he is experiencing cognitive impairment so that his speech is not clear.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah. (2019). Bahasa ngapak sebagai sarana kontruksi budaya Jawa. *Buletin Al-Turas* Vol. 25 No. 2 November 2019, hal. 141-162.
- Al-Zubeiry, H. (2020). Violation of Grice's maxims and humorous implicatures in the Arabic comedy Madrasat Al-Mushaghbeen. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(2), 1043-1057.

- Aziz, Z. A., Mustafa, F. & A'la, P. N. (2019). Flouting maxims as a sense of humor in Indonesian speech acts. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 4(2), 2019.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: A research book for students*. New York: Routledge.
- Creswell, J.W. (2008). *Educational research : Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Grice. H.P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Grice. H.P. (1975). Logic and conversation. *Reprinted from syntax and semantics 3: Speech arts, Cole et al, "Logic and Conversation"*, pp 41-58, 1975.
- Harared, N. (2015). Non-Observance of the Maxims in Diary of a Wimpy Kid. *Journal of English Language and Culture – Vol. 5 No. 1 January 2015*.
- Hasanah, H. (2021). Pelanggaran maksim dalam menciptakan humor: studi perbandingan antara humor Madura dan humor Jawa. *Sawerigading*, Vol. 27, No. 2, Desember 2021: 205—218.
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1984). Drawing valid meaning from qualitative data: Toward a shared craft. *Educational Researcher*.
- Munthe, D. E. & Ambalegin. (2021). Non-observance maxims in “sonic the hedgehog” movie. *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya*, Volume 9, Nomor 1, Tahun 2021.
- Nurdiyanto, E., & Resticka, G. (2021). Sociopragmatics competence in the characteristics of Banyumas community blakasuta. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 3(1). doi:<https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v3i1.28-45>
- Oksinia, B.Y., Jayantini, I.G.A.S.R., & Sulatra, I. K. (2021). Verbal humour created by non-observance of cooperative principle in Miranda. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching* Volume 5, Number 1, pp: 80-89, June 2021. DOI: 10.30743/ll.v5i1.3582
- Pawestri, A.G. (2019). Membangun identitas budaya *Banyumasan* melalui dialek *ngapak* di media sosial. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 19(2), 255-266. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/bs_jpbsp.v19i2.24790.
- Rasjid, A.A., Hidayat, A., & Trianton, T. (2013). *Banyumas: Fiksi & fakta sebuah kota*. Solo: Beranda Budaya dan bukutuju.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: studies in the theory of speech acts*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Setiawati, E., & Arista, H. D. (2018). Piranti pemahaman komunikasi dalam wacana interaksional (Kajian pragmatik). Malang: UB Press.
- Sugiarti, Andalas, E. S., & Setiawan, A. (2020). Desain penelitian kualitatif sastra. Malang: UMM Press.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. New York: Routledge.