



**THE IMPLICATURE OF HUMOR UTTERANCES IN
*HUMOR LUCU ALA GUS DUR***

A THESIS

**In Partial Fullfilment of the Requirements for
the Sarjana Degree Majoring Linguistic in English Department
Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University**

Submitted by:

ANNA SALISAH KHUSNITA

A2B009042

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
DIPONEGORO UNIVERSITY**

SEMARANG

2013

PRONOUNCEMENT

The writer certifies that this thesis is definitely her own work without copying any results from other researchers in other degrees of any universities. I am completely responsible for the content of this final paper. The writer also confirms that she does not cite the material without mention the reference

Semarang, 3 December 2013

Anna Salisah Khusnita

MOTTO AND DEDICATION

*Success is a state of mind
If you want succes,
Start thinking of yourself as a success*

Dr. Joyce Brother

*Avoid the crowd
Do your own thinking independently
Be the chess player, not the chess piece*

Ralph Charell

*This paper is dedicated to
My beloved family and
to everyone who helped me accomplish this paper*

VALIDATION

Approved by

Strata 1 Thesis Examination Committee

Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University

on 10 January 2014

Chair Person

Dr. J. Herudjati P., M.Sc.

NIP 19530327 198103 1 006

First Member

Second Member

Dr. Deli Nirmala, M.Hum

NIP. 19611109 198703 2 001

Dra. Wiwiek Sundari, M.Hum.

NIP 19590607 199003 2 001

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer prises to Allah SWT who has given health, spirit, inspiration and protection, so the writer can finish this thesis successfully. On this occasion, the writer would like to thank all those people who have contributed to the completion of this thesis.

The deepest appreciation and gratitude are extended to Dr. Deli Nirmala, M.Hum as my advisor who has given her continuous guidance, helpful correction, moral support, advice, and suggestion.

My deepest thank also goes to the following:

1. Dr. Agus Maladi Irianto, M.A, as the Dean of Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.
2. Sukarni Suryaningsih, S.S, M.Hum, as the Head of English Department in Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.
3. Dr. Nurhayati, M.Hum, as Head of Linguistics Section of English Department in Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University
4. My beloved academic advisor Sukarni Suryaningsih, S.S, M.Hum who gives her support and love.
5. All of the writer's beloved lecturers in the English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University
6. All my beloved academic officers and librarians in Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University
7. My beloved parents, Abah and Umi who never tired to pray and support me morally and spiritually.

8. My beloved sisters (Siti Hamidah, Lu'luul Wafiroh, and Lina Khilmiya), brother in law (Ma'mun Ridho) and my nephew (Muhammad Nusron Jazila) who always give smile and love.
9. Abah Yai Drs. KH. Dzikron Abdullah and Bu Nyai Hj. Umairoh as the leader of PP. Addainuriyah 2 Semarang for their prayer.
10. My future partner Nur Ilham Luthfi Bariklana for his motivation, help and love.
11. The writer's beloved best friend (Afrin, Anmar, Dea) that always give assistance and support.
12. All my beloved new family in Addainuriyah 2 Semarang (Mbak Lala, Mbak Leily, Dek Mala, Dek Nikmah, Dek Uswah, Mbak Ulfa, Mbak Ulel, Mbak Ida, Ibu Hanik, Mbak Naelur and Dek Ana Wiji).
13. All my beloved friend in Addainuriyah 2 Semarang
14. The writer's beloved friends in English Department Year 2009

The writer realizes that this thesis is still far from perfect. Thus, she will be glad to receive any constructive criticism and recommendation to make this thesis better. Finally, the writer expects that this thesis will be useful to the reader who wishes to learn something about the impicature

Semarang, 3 December 2013

Anna Salisah Khusnita

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	i
PRONOUNCEMENT	ii
MOTTO AND DEDICATION.....	iii
APPROVAL	iv
VALIDATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
ABSTRACT	x
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Problem of the Study.....	2
1.3 Purpose of the Study	3
1.4 Previous Studies	3
1.5 Organization of the Writing	5
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	6
2.1 Definition of presupposition	6
2.1.1 Conventional Implicature.....	7
2.1.2 Conversational Implicature	7

2.2 The Cooperative Principles	8
2.2.1 The Maxim of Quantity	8
2.2.2 The Maxim of Quality	9
2.2.3 The Maxim of Relation	9
2.2.4 The Maxim of Manner	10
2.3 Speech Act	10
2.3.1 Types of Speech Acts	10
2.3.1.1 Locutionary Act	11
2.3.1.2 Illocutionary Act	11
2.3.1.3 Perlocutionary Act	12
2.3.2 Kinds of Illocutionary Acts	12
2.3.3 Kinds of Speech Acts Based on Several Aspects of Speech Act	13
2.3.3.1 Direct and Indirect Speech Act	13
2.3.3.2 Explicit and Implicit Performative Utterance ..	13
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHOD.....	14
3.1 Types of Research	14
3.2 Data, Population, and Sample	14
3.3 Method of Collecting Data.....	15
3.4 Method of Analyzing Data.....	16

CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS	17
4.1 The Implicature of Gus Dur’s Utterances	18
4.1.1 Representative Illocutionary Act	18
4.1.2 Expressive illocutionary Act.....	23
4.1.3 Directive Illocutionary Act	28
4.1.4 Commissive Illocutinary Act.....	33
4.2 The Function of the Implicature in Gus Dur’s Utterances	37
4.2.1 Creating the Humor Effect	38
4.2.2 Hinting Someone	40
4.2.3 Criticizing the Government	42
4.2.3 Mockery Someone	44
4.2.5 Warning the Readers	46
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION.....	48
5.1 Conclusion	48
5.2 Suggestion.....	49
REFERENCES	
APPENDIX	

ABSTRAK

Setiap tuturan yang dibuat oleh penutur biasanya mengandung maksud tertentu yang tidak disampaikan langsung oleh penutur. Oleh sebab itu penulis mempunyai ketertarikan untuk menguraikan maksud tertentu yang tidak diucapkan langsung pada tuturannya. Dalam skripsi ini penulis menggunakan tuturan humor Gus Dur dalam buku *Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur* sebagai bahan dari analisis. Pentingnya dari analisis ini yaitu untuk mengetahui makna implisit yang terkandung dalam tuturan Gus Dur dan menunjukkan fungsi dibalik penggunaan makna implisit tersebut. Untuk mengetahui makna implisit dalam tuturan tersebut, penulis menggunakan teori *implicature*. Batasan dalam penelitian ini yaitu penggunaan teori *implicature* yang difokuskan pada *cooperative principle* yang dikemukakan oleh Grice.

Tujuan penulisan skripsi ini adalah untuk mengungkapkan makna implisit dari tuturan yang terdapat dalam buku *Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur*. Tujuan lainnya yaitu untuk menunjukkan adanya pelanggaran-pelanggaran maxim yang dilakukan oleh penutur dan mengetahui fungsi dari penggunaan makna implisit dalam tuturannya.

Data yang digunakan dalam skripsi ini yaitu tuturan-tuturan yang diambil dari buku *Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur* yang ditulis oleh Acep Yori. Metode pengambilan sample menggunakan metode purposive sampling dan teori Sudaryanto yaitu *Padan method*. Dalam menganalisis data tersebut, penulis menggunakan teori *Implicature* dari Grice.

Hasil analisis menunjukkan bahwa terdapat pelanggaran-pelanggaran maxim yang dilakukan oleh penutur untuk menghasilkan makna *implicature* dalam tuturannya. Makna *implicature* tersebut bisa diklasifikasikan menjadi 4 macam berdasarkan tindak ilokusinya, yaitu *representative illocutionary act*, *expressive illocutionary act*, *directive illocutionary act*, dan *commissive illocutionary act*. Berdasarkan analisis makna *implicature* dalam tuturan tersebut didapat bahwa makna implisit yang disampaikan oleh penutur mempunyai fungsi tersendiri yaitu untuk memberikan efek humor, menyindir seseorang, mengkritisi pemerintah, mengejek seseorang, dan mengingatkan pembaca.

Keyword: *Implicature, cooperative principle, representative illocutionary act, expressive illocutionary act, directive illocutionary act, dan commissive illocutinaryact.*

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the study

Most of people have a variety of strategy in interacting with each other. One of the communicative strategies is the use of humor that is a type of speech act. In communication, humor can provide us with enjoyment that sometimes we do not consider what humor is accomplishing in our conversation. For example, we easily understand the essence of a joke, but we rarely investigate what communicative function of the joke in the relationship. Consequently, we miss the important clues that humor can offer. Thus, when humor can be viewed as an interactional strategy, it becomes possible to explore some function and the implicit meaning in the humor. Based on this background, the writer is interested in analyzing the function and the implicit meaning in the humor utterances.

Pragmatics is the linguistic branch that has connection with this case. One of the pragmatic studies that according to analyze the people's utterances is implicature. Implicature can be used to analyze the humor utterances. In the implicature, the speaker does not only produce an utterance but also has an intended meaning. On the other hand, what the speaker says is different of what the speaker means. Thus, the speaker and the hearer should be cooperative for successfull in communication. In consequences, the implicature can be used by the writer to analyze the implicit meaning of the humor utterances. Besides, by

finding the implicit meaning of the humor utterance, the writer can determine the function of using the humor in the utterances. In this research, the writer focuses in analyzing the data by using implicature theory of Grice (1975).

In the humor utterances, there is some intended meaning delivered indirectly by a speaker. The speaker tries to convey the intended meaning by using the implicit utterances. The implicit utterances have some functions in a conversation. By the implicature analyses, the writer will find out the implicit meaning of the humor utterances. After finding the implicit meaning, the writer will investigate the function of using the humor utterances. The writer is interested to analyze the humor utterances that are presented in “Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur”. The writer’s reason for choosing the humor utterances in this book to be analyzed is that many controversial statements produced by Gus Dur. By using the controversial statements, Gus Dur tries to criticize the issue of social, religion, political, culture and other that can entertain the reader. By analyzing the controversial statements, the writer wants to inform what are the implicit meanings based on the implicature in the utterances. Furthermore, the writer wants to show the function of using the implicature of the utterances.

1.2. Problem of the Study

The research problem in this thesis that is analyzed is what types the implicatures of the utterances produced the speaker is. Furthermore what the maxim violation produced by the speaker is also the problem of this research. The

other problem in this thesis is what the functions of the utterances are based on the implicature analysis.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

There are some purposes of analyzing the implicature of the utterances produced by Gus Dur. The purpose of this research is to elaborate the types of implicatures of the utterances produced by Gus Dur. Moreover, the writer also wants to show that the speaker violated the maxim in using the utterances. The other purpose of this thesis is to find the function the implicature of the utterances based on the implicature analysis.

1.4. Previous Study

Related to the topic in thesis, there are some previous studies found by the writer. There are three previous studies that discuss the implicature. From three previous studies, all of data are analyzed using Grice's implicature theory.

From three previous studies, there are two previous studies that have the same type of data and the research problem. The both writer uses TV scripts as the data and focuses on describing the conversational implicature. The first research is written by Angelina N. Horo in 2007. The title of her research is *Implicature of The Character's Utterances In The Movie "10 things I Hate About You"*. The purpose of this thesis is to describe the conventional and conversational implicature and to explain the cause of conversational implicature in the

character's utterances which is caused by violating of maxims. The second research is written by Ade Kristianus Kaloeti in 2012 entitled *Particularized Conversational Implicature In TV Series "NCIS: Season 2"*. The purpose of this research is to identify the implicate meaning which contains particularized conversational implicature, to identify how the victims, suspect, and witness manage to derive the implicature and to identify the reason of main character using particularized conversational implicature utterances in TV Series NCIS: Season 2.

In 2006, there is a thesis entitled *Implicature Analysis on comic Strip "Kartun Benny Dan Mice" Published On Sunday edition of Kompas Daily* that is written by Rianti Andargini. The purpose of this thesis is to describe the context in the story of the "Kartun Benny dan Mice", to find the violation of Grice's cooperative principle and to determine kinds of speech acts of the utterances.

Those three previous studies are analyzed with the implicature theory by Grice. The analysis of those previous studies focuses on the conversational implicature and the violating of maxims. In this thesis the writer also uses the implicature theory from Grice. To make it different the writer does not only discuss the implicature of the utterances but also explain the function of using the implicature in the utterances. The writer also uses a humor book as the data because there are only few previous researches that use a humor book as the data that is analyzed using the implicature theory. The purpose of this thesis is not only to show the implicature of the utterances but also to elaborate the function of the utterances by the implicature theory.

1.5. Organization of the Writing

This chapter fall into five chapters, there are:

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter includes background of the study, problem of the study, purpose of the study, previous studies, and organization of the writing.

CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter describes the definition of implicature, kinds of the implicature, the cooperative principle, and kinds of maxim.

CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter contains types of research, data, population, and sample, data collection method, and data analysis method.

CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS

This chapter explains the implicature of the utterances used by Gus Dur and the function of using the implicature.

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

This chapter consists of conclusion of the whole discussion and suggestion for further study.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter discusses the explanation of the theories connected with implicature. There are some theories used to analyze the data. They are speech act theory, implicature and cooperative principle. The following are the explanation.

2.1.1 Definition of Implicature

Implicature is the component of pragmatic. For the meaning of implicature, there are some linguists who propose the meaning of implicature. According to Yule (1996: 31), implicature is described as what the speaker said is different of what the speaker is actually meant. Agreeing with that opinion, Grice shows that implicature is an intent that is implicated by an utterance with notice the context. In other words, then implicature studies about the intention of an utterance that is suited with the context. From those estimations, it can be concluded that there is an implicit meaning by saying an utterance. Furthermore, the meaning that is intended by the speaker is different literally with the speaker's utterance.

2.1.2 Conventional implicature

Conventional implicature does not occur in conversation, it based on the special context in interpreting an utterance (Yule, 1996:45). Levinson (1983: 127)

has four specific words of conventional implicature: but, even, therefore and yet. There are some specific words that are shown that the conversation includes in the conventional implicature. The example of the conventional implicature can be shown on the type *pbut q*. ‘But’ shows that the information in *p* is ‘contrast’ with the information in *q*(Yule, 1996:45). Yule gives example [23]:

[23] a. Mary suggested black, but I choose white

b. $p \ \& \ q$ ($+>p$ is in contrast to q)

From the example above, the statement shows that ‘Mary suggested black’ ($=p$) is contrasted, via the conventional implicature of ‘but’, with my choosing white ($=q$).

2.1.3 Conversational Implicature

In conversational implicature, between the speaker and the hearer do not have special background knowledge of the context in creating a conversation (Yule, 1996: 40). It is expected that the hearer will be cooperative with the speaker’s utterance without background knowledge of the context. We can see in example [7]:

[7] Charlene: I hope you brought the bread and the cheese.

Dexter : Ah, I brought the bread

From the example above, Dexter only say that he brought the bread. Dexter intends that Charlene can interpret that what is not mentioned was not brought. In

this case, Dexter has conveyed more than he said. That is called a conversational implicature.

2.2 The Cooperative Principle

Cooperative principle is usually applied in conversation in order to make a cooperative conversation. To analyze the strategy used by the speaker, Grice (1975) mentioned four maxims of cooperative principle, i.e. maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner (Grice in Yule, 1996:37). Grice said that the speaker always intends to be cooperative while speaking. However, sometime the speaker is not bound by any maxims in producing an utterance. In this case, the implicature can be found, because the speaker tries to be cooperative in delivering his/her intent by violating the maxim. On the other hand, the implicature in an utterance can be identified by violating the maxim.

2.2.1 Maxim of Quantity

The maxim of quantity insists the speaker to give information that is needed and not to give uncompleted information. In this case, the speaker should avoid the information that is not needed and exaggerate. It means that the participant is hoped to state utterances that are required.

According to Grice, the speaker is expected to give adequate information as informative as is required and hope to not give the more informative information

(Yule, 1996: 37). In case the given information contains more than is required, it is called as the violation of maxim.

2.2.2 Maxim of Quality

The maxim of quality requires the speaker to provide information that can be justified the truth. The speaker is expected to not utter a false case; even the case cannot be proven the truth. In the maxim of quality, the speaker is required to give the utterances that have a factual truth. In uttering something, the speaker is insisted to say the fact based on the real situation which happened. The fact must be supported by the adequate evidence. The speaker is expected to not say the utterance that are the false and cannot prove the truth (Grice in Yule, 1996: 37)

2.2.3 Maxim of Relation

The maxim of relation shows that the speakers try to make their utterances in order to be related with the context. Besides, the hearer should be cooperative with the context of the speaker. Therefore, both the speaker and the hearer are expected to give the relevant contribution about something which is uttered.

2.2.4 Maxim of Manner

The maxim of manner is connected with the problems in using language. By using the language, the speaker must utter something directly, clearly, and

unambiguously. According to Grice, the speaker provides the perspicuous and orderly utterances, and avoiding the ambiguity and obscurity expression (Yule, 1996: 37).

2.2.5 Speech Act

Speech act can be described that by saying an utterance, the speaker does not only deliver a statement, but also do an action. Austin (1962) proposes that saying an utterance, the speaker does not only produce utterances gramatically but also perform action via utterances. According to Yule (1996: 47), speech act can be proposed as doing action by saying an utterance which is the speaker hopes that the hearer can be recognized what the speaker intend. The activity of saying an utterance with a specific intention is called a speech act.

2.2.6 Types of Speech Act

In *How to Do Things with Words* (1967:101), Austin argued that there are three types of speech acts i.e. locution, illocution, and perlocution.

2.2.6.1 Locutionary Act

According to Searle in Renkema (1993: 23) locutionary act is the act of saying something, meanwhile Yule (1996: 48) says that locutionary act is the basic act of utterance. The locutionary act occurs when the speaker uses his/her organ of speech to produce sounds that is an utterance. In other words, locutionary act is

the act of using the speaker's organ of speech to produce utterance (Yule, 1996: 48). For example:

(6) I promise to stop smoking

In the utterance (6) when the speaker uses his/her organ of speech to say the utterance is called locutionary act.

2.2.6.2 Illocutionary Act

Yule (1996: 48) says that most of people do not only produce a well utterance without the certain purpose. Actually, the people form utterances with some kind of function. The function includes informing, asserting, questioning, commanding, promising, apologizing, warning, etc. Those functions are generally known as the illocutionary force. The utterance (6) is as the example; in producing the utterance the speaker is not only telling that the speaker states something that is a promise to stop smoking but also binding himself to what he said. In the utterance (6), it also means that the speaker make a promise, which commits him/her in the future action of stop smoking. The action which is performed in that utterance is the act of promising.

2.2.6.3 Perlocutionary Act

Yule (1996:47) says that perlocutionary act is the act of producing an utterance with a function to have an effect to the hearer. It deals with the hearer or reader's effect after hearing or reading the utterance. The effects includes being happy, say, angry, discouraged, etc. for example, utterance (6) has two effects to

two hearers. If the utterance is stated to his/her friend who does not smoke, he/she will probably be happy. Nevertheless, if the utterance is stated to cigarette seller, he/she will probably be sad. The utterance (6) has the perlocutionary force of pleasing which makes happiness to friend and depressing which make sadness to the cigarette seller.

2.2.7 Kinds of Illocutionary Act

Searle in Levinson (2003: 236) proposed that there are five types of illocutionary acts that can perform in speaking, by means of the following five types of utterance:

1. Representatives, which commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition (paradigm cases: fact, asserting, concluding, description, etc.).
2. Directives, which are attempts by the speaker to get the addressee to do something (paradigm cases: warn, suggestion, order, command, requesting, requisitioning).
3. Commissives, which commit the speaker to some the future course of action (paradigm cases: refusal, promising, threatening, and offering).
4. Expressive, which express a psychological state (paradigm cases: pleasure, sorrow, like, dislike, thanking, apologizing, welcoming, wishing, and congratulating).
5. Declarations, which effect immediate change in the institutional state of affairs and which tend to rely on elaborate extra-linguistic institution

(paradigm cases: excommunicating, declaring war, christening, firing from employment).

2.2.8 Kinds of Speech Acts Based on Several Aspect of Speech Acts

2.2.8.1 Direct and Indirect Speech Act

Based on the basic structure, sentences or utterances can be identified as direct utterances and indirect utterances (Yule, 1996:54). Direct speech acts are the speech act that perform their function in a direct way, whereas, indirect speech acts are the acts accomplished by using language in indirect ways.

2.2.8.2 Explicit and Implicit Performative Utterance

Speech acts may be explicit or implicit. According to Austin (1967:64), explicit performative can be characterized by verbs that explicitly state the action. On the other hand, implicit performatives need an expansion to make them explicit. To make it explicit, it is important to know something about the situation, mood, tone of voice, adverbs and adverbial phrases, connecting particles, gesture, etc.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHOD

In this chapter, the writer discusses the research method used in this thesis. The discussion divides into four section. Those section are type of research, data, population, sample and source of the data, method of collecting data, and method of analzing data.

3.1. Type of Research

In this research, the writer uses the desecriptive method, because the writer describes the data analyses based on the implicature theory in Gus Dur's utterances to find out the result of the research. Sudaryanto (1993: 5) proposed that descriptive method is the reseach conducted by the fact or phenomena that is empirically exist on the speakers. On the other hand, the descriptive method shows the result of the research based on the writer's attitude or point of view to the use of language.

The writer also uses the qualitative method to analyse the data. The writer makes concluision through the collected data that are described before. Moreover, the qualitative research method emphasize on analysis with scientific approach.

3.2. Data, Population, and Sample

There are two kinds of data source namely primary and secondary data. The primary data is gained when the researcher collects the information directly from

the source, while, the secondary data is gained when the researcher collects the information by the secondary part (Wasito, 1992:69). In this research, the writer uses the primary data since using the humor book as the data source to be analysed. The data is taken from the book *Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur* that is written by Acep Yori. The book is the collection of jokes from Gus Dur who criticism the issue of social, political, religious, culture and others that has the humor effect.

The population in this research is the whole utterances that include the function of implicature in the book *Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur*. The writer collects the title that has utterances including the fuction of implicature. There are 40 titles in this book including the fuction of the implicature.

In analysing the data, the writer only uses some utterances from the populatuion. The writer only takes the utterances which contain the types of implicature as sample. In determining the sample, the writer usues purposive sampling technique in this research. It is because the writer determines the sample based on types of illocutionary speech act. Thus, there are 22 samples of data that will be discussed in this thesis.

3.3. Method of Collecting Data

The writer collects the data in *Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur*, in the form of book. In this case, the writer uses documentation method. The documentation method is a method of collecting data in form of notes, transcript, book, etc (Arikunto, 2010: 274). Thereafter, the writer uses note taking technique to collect the data. The

procedures of collecting data are collecting the whole data in *Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur*, classifying the data based on the types of implicatures, and preparing the samples to be analyzed.

3.4. Method of Analyzing Data

To analyze the data in this research, the writer uses *Padan* method from Sudaryanto since the determiner device of this research is an outside factor of the language itself (Sudaryanto, 1993:13-14). This method is used to show the meaning that is contained in the utterance that is produced by speaker. The writer interprets the speaker's utterance and determines the implicature of the utterance. In analyzing the data, there are some steps that is done by the writer before starting to analyze the data to show the sequence of analyzing data. They are showing the utterances that includes the implicature, identifying the implicature meaning of the utterances in the data, analyzing the maxim violation that happen in the uttrances, analyzing the implicature of the utterances based on the implicature analysis and showing types of the implicature in the utterances.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS

In this chapter, the writer analyzes the utterances that are produced by Gus Dur. From the implicature analysis, the writer classifies kinds of implicature into four types; they are representative illocutionary act, expressive illocutionary act, commissive illocutionary act, and directive illocutionary act. In the representative illocutionary act, the writer found the implicatures of the utterances that indicate expressions of describing a religious teacher, conclusion of using the word 'Al', and fact about the honest policeman. In the expressive illocutionary act, the implicatures that are found are the expressions of dislike to a president, wishing for progress of Indonesia and sorrow a president to situation of Indonesia. In the commissive illocutionary act, the expressions of warn to obey a regulation, suggestion to be a winner and request to appreciate a president found in the data. While in the directive illocutionary act, the writer found the expressions of refusal to the boast of president, offering a food, and threatening to stop smoking.

By the implicature analysis in those utterances, the writer found some implicit meanings that are delivered indirectly by the speaker. By using the implicit meaning, the speaker has some functions in producing the utterances. The functions are creating the humor effect, insinuating someone, criticizing the government, mocking someone and warning the reader.

4.1. The Implicature of Gus Dur's Utterances

The implicature is indicated as the implicit meaning of an utterance that is produced by speaker to deliver a specific message. It should be cooperation between the speaker and the hearer in order to the message can be interpreted. Besides, there is a cooperative principle that should be followed by the participant. To fulfill the principle of conversation, the participant has to observe the sub principle called maxims. The maxims are the quantity maxim, the quality maxim, the relation maxim, and the manner maxim. In case the speaker violates the maxims, the implicature meaning will be found in the utterance. The writer analyses the maxim violation to find out the existence of the implicature meaning of those utterances. From their functions, the writer can classify the implicatures of those utterances into five types. They are declarations, representatives, expressive, directives, and commissives. Actually, when the speakers violated the maxim in an utterance, they try to deliver the implicature meaning in the utterance for avoiding the face threatening act to the hearer.

4.1.1. Representative Illocutionary Act

Representative Illocutionary act is one of general function types of speech acts. In the representative illocutionary act, the speaker represents what he/she believes about something for being true or false. The speaker can be assumed that he used the representative speech act if he/she implicitly expressed his belief. The statements that include the representative illocutionary act are statements of fact,

assertion, conclusion, and description. The writer found some implicature meanings that are categorized as the representative speech act. They are the expressions of ‘description’, ‘conclusion’ and ‘fact’. As the example in the data [1], [2] and [3], the speaker expresses his belief to be true or false.

[1] “Loh kenapa anda berkerumun di sini?”
Mereka terlihat sangat fasih berdoa, apalagi pakai serban, mereka itu pasti kiai”

In the data [1], the speaker asks the group of hajj by saying “*Loh kenapa anda berkerumun di sini?*”, because he looks a strange something that they did. He does not only ask them, but he wants to express his curiosity. By saying “*Mereka terlihat sangat fasih berdoa, apalagi pakai serban, and mereka itu pasti kiai*” the hearers want to express their admirations to someone who is in front of them. The hearers believe that someone who speaks Arabic is praying. They confirm his statement that someone who speaks Arabic and also wears a turban is a religious teacher. Whereas, as we know that not all of the people who wear a turban and speak Arabic are religious teacher. This conversation indicates that we should not judge someone easily before proving the thruth. The description from the personal’s point of view may be a false perception.

In this conversation the hearers violated the quantity maxim. They provide information that has not been to be true. Besides, they give evidence that less adequate to support this statement. They thought that their statements are true. However, not all of people agree with their statements, moreover they consider that their statements are false. The hearers give the evidence based on their own interpretations that not everyone agrees with their statements.

The writer found that the implicature meaning of the conversation is the hearers try to describe that a religious teacher is someone who speaks Arabic and wears turban. The utterance “*Mereka terlihat sangat fasih berdoa, apalagi pakai serban, mereka itu pasti kiayi*” indicates a ‘description’. From the implicature meaning, the hearer’s statement can be categorized as the representative illocutionary act that is a ‘description’. They describe something based on their knowledges. The representative illocutionary act is kinds of speech acts that states what the speaker believes to be the case or not, for example conclusions, assertions, and descriptions.

[2] Speaker : “sampean tah ini radio Islami dari mana?”
 Hearer : “Lha..., itu bacaanya ‘all-transistor’, pakai ‘Al’”

From the data [2], the speaker wants to know how the hearer can say that it is Islamic radio. By saying “*sampean tahu ini radio Islami dari mana?*” the speaker tries to express his curiosity to the hearer’s assumption that there is Islamic radio. Thereafter, the hearer gives respond to the speaker’s question by saying “*Lha..., itu bacaanya ‘all-transistor’, pakai ‘Al’*”. From the answer, the hearer believes that the word ‘Al’ shows that it is Arabic language. The hearer assumes that the word that uses Arabic language is associated with Islam. Therefore, the hearer concludes that the radio that uses the word ‘All-transistor’ is Islamic radio. The conversation above indicates not to conclude something from the personal’s point of view. Furthermore, we should not be connected the Arabic language with the Islam religion.

In the data [2], the hearer violated the relation maxim. The word ‘All-transistor’ cannot be connected with ‘Islamic radio’ by Grice theory. The hearer

cannot give the information that is assumed as the true statement by everyone. Moreover, the statement can be considered as the false statement. It means that not everyone agrees with the hearer assumption.

The implicature meaning of the conversation in data [2] is the hearer concludes that the word ‘Al’ refers to Arabic language. The utterance “*La... itu bacaannya ‘All-transistor’, pakai ‘Al’*” shows that the utterance contains the expression of ‘conclusion’. The words that use Arabic language must be connected with Islam. From the assumption, we can decide that the hearer uses the representative illocutionary act because he gives a ‘conclusion’ based on his knowledge.

- [3] “Menurut Gus Dur di negeri ini hanya ada tiga polisi yang jujur; pertama, patung polisi, kedua, polisi tidur, ketiga, polisi Hoegeng (mantan Kepala Polisi RI)
“Lainnya?” Gus Dur hanya tersenyum

In the data [3] Gus Dur stated that there are only three honest police in this country. By saying “*pertama, patung polisi, kedua, polisi tidur, ketiga, polisi Hoegeng (mantan Kepala Polisi RI)*”, he tries to give evidence to his statement. From Gus Dur’s statement, the writer tries to interpret what the speaker’s means. Gus Dur explained that the first honest policeman is ‘*patung polisi*’ or ‘*a police statue*’. As we know that ‘*patung polisi*’ or ‘*a police statue*’ is not a policeman but it is only a statue. The statue cannot speak, so it is impossible that the statue will lie. Thereafter, the second honest policeman is ‘*polisi tidur*’ or ‘*a bump*’. In Indonesia the words ‘*polisi tidur*’ are used to call a bump in the middle of the road which is used to slow the speed of vehicles. Because of its function to slow the speed of vehicle that is like a policeman and it is like a policeman that is lying, so

it is called as *'polisi tidur'*. Afterwards, *'polisi tidur'* also cannot speak, so it will never lie. How the two police can lie, if they cannot speak. Gus Dur gives two examples of honest police with inanimate object. On the last honest police, he gives the example of human. Gus Dur tries to express that any police who truly be honest in this country. The last honest policeman is *'Hoengeng'*. He is an ex-policeman in Indonesia. As he becomes first police chief in Indonesia, he is regarded as the most honest policeman. He is known as an honest police, discipline, simple, and hardy refusing bribe. He bravely exposed the truth. However, at this time, he does not become the policeman and he passed away. When Gus Dur is asked about the other honest police besides the three police, he is only smile. The writer interprets that Gus Dur's smile shows that there are no other honest police. From Gus Dur's utterance, it can be interpreted that there are no the honest police excepting the three police.

From the data [3] there is the maxim violation that is produced by Gus Dur. When he is asked about another honest policeman, he is only smile. It shows that Gus Dur violated the quantity maxim because he does not give information that is required by the speaker. He only gives a smile that cannot be used as an answer to the speaker's question. The smile is not the answer that is required by the speaker.

Based on the data [3], it indicates that there is a statement of 'fact' in his statement "*hanya ada tiga polisi yang jujur; pertama, patung polisis, kedua, polisi tidur, ketiga, polisi Hoengeng (mantan kepala polisi RI)*". The speaker wants to express what he believes to be true. In this case, Gus Dur gives the fact that the honest police are only *'patung polisi'*, *'polisi tidur'*, and *'Hoengeng'*, so it means

that there are no the honest police in this period. From the implicature meaning, the utterance of Gus Dur is included in the representative illocutionary act which is the speaker states what the speaker believes to be true or false.

4.1.2. Expressive Illocutionary Act

The expressive illocutionary act can occur when the speaker states his/her psychology state or expresses his/her feeling. This expression appears when the speaker feels thank, wish, apologize, dislike, sorrow, etc. In the data, the expression that is included in the expressive illocutionary act can be found. The writer shows three examples of the data that belongs to the expressive illocutionary act. The examples can be seen in the data [4], [5], and [6]:

- [4] “Saya Cuma minta satu hal saja, Bapak presiden,” kata sang penolong
 “Katakan saja apa itu?” Kata Pak Harto
 “Bapak sebaiknya tidak jadi presiden lagi” jawab sang penolong

In the data [4], the speaker has a wish that should be done by Suharto. By saying “*Saya Cuma minta satu hal saja, Bapak presiden,*” the speaker hopes that Suharto will do what the speaker ordered. Thereafter Suharto says “*Katakan saja apa itu?*” it shows that Suharto will fulfill the speaker’s demand. However, the speaker gives the answer that may not be expected by Suharto by saying “*Bapak sebaiknya tidak jadi presiden lagi*”. The speaker’s answer indicates that he hopes that Soeharto will not be a president again. The statement shows that the speaker dislikes with the leadership of Soeharto. Moreover, he doesn’t want Suharto be a president again. In the conversation above, it indicates that the speaker dislikes the policies that are created when Soeharto became a president, so the speaker wants a

new president who will change the policies. It may be indicated that Soeharto cannot provide a good change since he had become the president; his leadership period must be stopped.

Based on the utterance that is delivered by the speaker, it shows that the speaker violated the quantity maxim. The speaker does not give the answer as informative as that is required by Soeharto. Soeharto does not want the answer that actually imposes his reputation. The speaker should give the answer that is hoped by Soeharto. The speaker can answer “*Saya ingin anda memberi saya uang 10 juta*” or “*saya ingin anda membelikan saya mobil*”. Soeharto hopes the answer that provides an advantage to the hearer.

From the conversation above, the implicature meaning that is implied in the utterance is the speaker has a ‘dislike’ for the president by banning him to be a president. The statement “*Bapak sebaiknya tidak jadi president lagi*” indicates that the speaker dislikes Soeharto becoming the president, and hopes that he stops from his leadership. The implicature shows that the speaker uses the expressive illocutionary act which is the speaker expresses his dislike to the president.

- [5] Speaker : “Nah, lalu ada pemikiran gila, supaya Inggris dan Amerika memberikan sesuatu kepada kita”.
 Hearer : “Bagaimana caranya?”
 Speaker : “Kita nyatakan perang melawan Inggris dan Amerika”.

In the data [5], the speaker tries to express his idea about how to order American and British give something to Indonesia. As we know that American and British are the developed countries. They give many influences to the countries around the world. As well as Indonesia wants to get a huge influence from the both countries to become a developed country. Afterwards, the hearer

shows his curious by saying “*Bagaimana caranya?*” In the question, it shows that the hearer hopes that there is the best idea to get a positive influence from American and British. However, the speaker has the answer that may not be suited with the hearer’s hope by saying “*Kita nyatakan perang melawan Inggris dan Amerika*”. From the answer, it appears that the speaker’s answer is not accorded with the statement before. How the both countries will give something to Indonesia, if the people declare the war to them. It will only give damage to Indonesia. However from the speaker’s answer, the writer tries to get the implicatruue meaning from the statement. From the statement, the speaker assumes that when Indonesia people do war with the both country, it will make Indonesia becoming a developed country. In case, we can see the other countries which had been ever colonized by the both countries, in the future, they will easily be a developed country. It is because the both country give the positive effect to the country which is colonized, like the regular law systems. Therefor, the speaker wish Indonesia will have the same chance when Indonesia people declare the war with them. The conversation above shows that Indonesia is as the developing country must learn from the country that was colonized by American and England for becoming the developed country.

From the speaker’s answer, it appears that the speaker violated the quality maxim, because the speaker’s idea may not necessarily be true. It is only an estimate of the speaker by seeing the experiences of the other countries. Therefore, there is no the real action to prove the speaker’s statement. It is possible that the speaker’s statement will be false. Besides, the speaker also

violated the relation maxim because he gives the irrelevant statement between the first statement with the following statement.

From the data [5] the utterance indicates the expression of ‘wishing’. The utterance “*Kita menyatakan perang melawan Inggris dan Amerika*” indicates that Indonesia can be the developed country like the countries that are colonized by the both countries. However, the speaker wants to express what he hopes to be come true as what he is expected. In this case, the speaker hopes that American and British colonize Indonesia, so Indonesia will get the positive impact on developing Indonesia government. From the implicature meaning, the utterance can be classified into the expressive illocutionary act which is the speaker expresses what he feels.

[6] Bill, “Boleh saya tahu apa yang Anda bisikkan sehingga anjing saya menangis begitu sedih?”
Gus Dur,” Saya bilang, kasihan Indonesia, rakyatnya banyak yang miskin, janganakan untuk membeli BBM, untuk makan sehari-hari saja mereka sangat kesulitan.”

From the conversation above, Bill expresses his curiosity about the expression of his dog that looks sad. He asks Gus Dur because the dog looks sad after Gus Dur whispered the dog. By asking “*Boleh saya tahu apa yang Anda bisikkan sehingga anjing saya menangis begitu sedih?*” Bill tries to find the answer of his curiosity. Hereafter, Gus Dur answer that he told about the condition of Indonesia people by saying, “*Saya bilang, kasihan Indonesia, rakyatnya banyak yang miskin, janganakan untuk membeli BBM, untuk makan sehari-hari saja mereka sangat kesulitan.*” Gus Dur whispered to the dog that Indonesian are poor. They are difficult to buy the daily food. It is very poor condition, so the dog is also concerned about the condition of Indonesia. Afterwards, from Gus Dur’s

statement implied that the increase of the fuel price makes them more miserable. From the Gus Dur's statement, it shows that Gus Dur is aware to the condition of Indonesian that is very poor. He expresses his sorrow by telling about the condition to the dog. The dog is concerned with this condition, human should be more concerned about that. Gus Dur's statement indicates that he hopes the condition of Indonesia will be better.

In the data [6], there is the maxim violation that is produced by Gus Dur. He gives the answer that is not relevant with the question. How the dog can look sad when he heard about the very poor condition of Indonesian. The dog will be difficult to understand what the Gus Dur said. Gus Dur violated the relation maxim, because he gives the irrelevant information. He tells about the condition of Indonesia people, it will be difficult to the dog can feel what the Indonesia people felt. Moreover, it is impossible that the dog looks sad because of the condition of Indonesian. Gus Dur also violated the quantity maxim because he gives the information more informative by saying "*jangan untuk membeli BBM*".

The data [6] indicates the expression of 'sorrow'. In the statement "*Saya bilang, kasihan Indonesia, rakyatnya banyak yang miskin, jangan untuk embeli BBM, untuk makan sehari-hari saja mereka sangat kesulitan*" Gus Dur expresses his sorrow to the condition of Indonesia people. He realized that the people are very poor. In addition, the increase of the fuel price that makes their conditions more concerned. Gus Dur tries to express his feeling to this condition. He reveals his expression by showing the expression of dog. A dog that does not

have mind can feel sympathy to this condition, we are as human that have mind and feeling should be more sympathy to this condition. They should more care to this condition and try to improve this condition to be better. From the implicature meaning that is produced by Gus Dur can be concluded that the utterance belongs to the expressive illocutionary act which is the speaker expresses his/her feeling.

4.1.3. Directive Illocutionary Act

Directive illocutionary act is created by the speaker when he/she expresses a statement which is the speaker wants someone do something. Therefore, the speaker hopes that the hearer does what the speaker wants, with such words as: command, order, ask, invite, insist, request, suggestion, and warn. In the data, the writer found the utterances that include directive illocutionary act. The utterances consist of the meaning of ‘warn’, ‘suggestion’, and ‘request’. We can see the utterances in the data [7], [8], and [9]:

- [7] “Apa kamu tidak melihat gambar itu? itu kan gambar becak tak boleh masuk jalan ini,” bentak Pak Polisi
 “Oh saya melihat Pak, tapi itu kan gambarnya becak kosong tidak ada pengemudinya. Becak saya kan ada yang mengemudi, tidak kosong bearti boleh masuk,” jawab si tukang becak

From the data [7], the police give a warning by saying “*Apa kamu tidak melihat gambar itu? Itu kan gambar becak tak boleh masuk jalan ini,*” It shows that the conversation happens in a pedicab-free area. The police point a picture. We can guess that the picture is a symbol for banning a pedicab to enter in the area. The police indicate that the pedicab driver violates the rule. Unfortunately, the pedicab driver gives the different perception to the warning. He interprets that

it is only the empty pedicab that is banned to enter in the area. It is evidenced by saying *“Oh saya melihat Pak, tapi itu kan gambarnya becak kosong tidak ada pengemudinya”*. The pedicab driver assumes that he does not violate the rule. He believes that what he did is right because he is taking a passenger. He confirms his statement by saying *“Becak saya kan ada yang mengemudi, tidak kosong berarti boleh masuk”*. The conversation above shows that it is the picture of Indonesian's attitude. They dare to argue the police warning and do not want to admit their faults.

To determine the implicature in the conversation above, we have to identify whether the utterance violates a maxim or not. Based on the analysis, we can decide that the pedicab driver violated the quality maxim. He says an utterance that is not yet known to be true. He utters the utterance that has lack adequate evidence. The pedicab driver also violated the quantity maxim, since he gives the more information by saying *“tapi kan gambarnya becak kosong tidak ada pengemudinya. Becak saya kana da yang mengemudi, tidak kosong berarti boleh masuk,”* actually the police do not want that answer, he only wants the pedicab driver can understand the purpose of the picture.

The utterances above indicate that the speaker gives a 'warn' to the hearer. By saying *“apa kamu tidak melihat gambar itu? Itu kan gambar becak tak boleh masuk jalan ini”* the speaker hopes that the hearer does something after noticing his warning. In the conversation, the police warn the pedicab driver that entered in a pedicab-free area. He violates the rule about banning a pedicab to enter an area. The police hope that the pedicab driver does not enter to the pedicab free area.

The speech act that is found in the conversation is the directive illocutionary act. The directive illocutionary is kinds of speech act that has function to produce an effect to the hearer, for example to commands, order, request, and warn, etc.

[8] “Apa sih rahasia kemenangan Anda?” tanya wartawan
 “Mudah saja,” jawab si pelari Suriah, enteng. “Tiap kali bersiap-siap akan start, saya membayangkan ada serdadu Israel di belakang saya yang mau menembak saya.”

In the data [8], the speaker asks the hearer about the secret of his winning in running race. In the question, it shows that the speaker knows that the hearer won the running race. Moreover, he asks the hearer by saying “*Apa sih rahasia kemenangan Anda?*” The hearer assumes that it is an easy effort by answering “*Mudah saja,*” it is not difficult to be a winner in running race. Thereafter, the hearer gives the secret about his winning by adding “*Tiap kali bersiap-siap akan start, saya membayangkan ada serdadu Israel di belakang saya yang mau menembak saya.*” Evidently, the secret of his winning is the speaker imagine that he is pursued an enemy. From the hearer’s utterance, it shows that hearer suggests a runner to imagine that there is the enemy who is pursuing us, and then it will motivate hi/her to run faster. The corversation above indicate that we should have strategy to be a winner in a competition.

From the conversation above, the hearer violated the quantity maxim. He gives information that more informative than is required by saying “*Mudah saja*”. The speaker should answer with the informative answer by saying “*saya membayangkan ada serdadu Israel di belakang saya yang mau menembak saya*”. It is enough to answer the speaker’s question. The speaker does not need more

information from the hearer. He only needs the answer about the secret of the hearer's winning.

The implicature of the utterance that is delivered by the hearer is he suggests the readers to imagine that there is an enemy who is pursued them if they want to win running race. The utterance "*tiap kali bersiap-siap akan start, saya membayangkan ada serdadu Israel di belakang saya mau menembak saya*" shows that the utterances include a 'suggestion' to the speaker or the reader. From the implicature meaning, it shows that the utterances include a 'suggestion' to the speaker or the reader. From the implicature meaning, it can be classified to the directive illocutionary act which is the hearer requires someone to do something that is ordered. The speaker expresses what he wants to be done by the hearer. The expressions are to command, request, suggestion, etc.

[9] "Lo, kok Cuma sedikit saia terjemahannya?" Tanya Gus Dur kepada si penerjemah. "Apa sih yang Anda katakan?"
 "Ya, saya Cuma bilang, Presiden Abdurrahman Wahid ini sedang melucu. Lalu saya bilang, harap semua hadir tertawa."

In the data [9] Gus Dur wonders to the translator who translates his speech. He feels that he talked more, but the translator only translates his speech less. He asks about his wonderment by saying "*Lo, kok Cuma sedikit saja terjemahannya?*" From his question, it shows that Gus Dur spoke up more than its translation. Gus Dur wants to find the answer to his wonderment by asking "*Apa sih yang Anda katakan?*" from the second question, it looks that Gus Dur truly curious to the translator's statement. The translator gives the answer by saying "*Ya, saya Cuma bilang, Presiden Abdurrahman Wahid ini sedang melucu. Lalu saya bilang, harap semua hadir tertawa.*" The translator explains that he said to the audience that

Gus Dur is joking, so he asks the audience to laugh. From the answer, it can be interpreted that Gus Dur's wonderment also comes up because the audience laugh to his statement. Gus Dur assumes that how the audience can laugh if the translation of his statement less than what he said. In fact, the translator asks the audience laugh because he told that Gus Dur is joking by saying "*harap semua hadirin tertawa*". The statement of the translator contains a 'request' to the audience. The statement of the translation contains the meaning that we should be appreciating a president, although sometime we disagree with his politics.

The maxim violation that is produced by the speaker is the quality maxim. The translator gives information that does not believe to be true or false. He states that the statement of Gus Dur is funny based on the translator's point of view. It is possible that Gus Dur assumes that his statement is not funny. On the other hand, the audience does not necessarily agree with the translator's point of view. Moreover, the audience disagrees with the translator. The translator should not ask the audience to laugh because of his point of view to Gus Dur's statement. The request cannot be proven the truth and the translator cannot give evidence that support his point of view.

The data [9] indicates the expression of a 'request'. The statement "*President Abdurrahman Wahid ini sedang melucu. Lalu saya bilang, harap semua hadirin tertawa*" shows that the translator asks to the audience to laugh to Gus Dur's statement. The translator has a request to the audience to believe on his assumption that Gus Dur's statement is funny. Moreover, the audience is asked by the translator to agree with his assumption and to laugh on what Gus Dur said.

The request is expressed by speaker by saying “*harap semua hadirin tertawa*”. The translator tries to convince the audience that Gus Dur’s statement is funny by saying “*Presidan Abdurrahman Wahid ini sedang melucu.*” It shows that the translator assumes that Gus Dur is joking, so he asks the audience to laugh. From the implicature meaning of the utterance that is produced by the translator, it is included in the directive illocutionary act which is the speaker states the statement that contains hope someone do something to his statement. On the other hand, the speaker’s expression contains a request which should be done by the speaker.

4.1.4. Commissive Illocutionary Act

Commissive illocutionary act appears when the speaker stated a statement that should be committed in the future. The speaker expresses his intend to be done in the future. It means that the speaker makes a commitment. The expressions that show a commissive illocutionary act are promise, threat, refusal, pledges, agree, offer etc. From the data, it is found that there are some utterances that include in the commissive illocutionary act. They are the illocution act to ‘refusal’, ‘offering’ and ‘threatening’. The expression is illustrated in the data [10], [11], and [12]:

[10] Bill : “*Lihat! Hebat bukan?*”
 Gus Dur : “*Gitu aja kog repot. Saya yang baru ketemu saja bisa lebih baik dari itu*”

From the data [10], Bill asks about his ability. He tries to convince that he did the great something by saying “*Lihat! Hebat bukan?*”. Bill’s question is a statement that needs a confession from someone. From the Bill’s utterance, it sounds that Bill hoped that Gus Dur will agree with his statement. Bill trusts that

Gus Dur admits his ability. However, Gus Dur gives the different answer with what Bill wanted. Gus Dur answered “*Gitu aja kog repot. Saya yang baru ketemu saja bisa lebih baik dari itu*”. From Gus Dur’s statement shows that Gus Dur refuses Bill’s statement by saying “*Gitu aja kog repot*”. Gus Dur assumes that it is an easy effort. He boasts that he can do effort that is greater than Bill. The conversation above indicates to not be a arrogant person when the person has power.

From the conversation above, it shows that there is the maxim violatin that is uttered by Gus Dur. Gus Dur violated the relation maxim by saying “*Gitu aja kog repot*” and quantity maxim by saying “*Saya yang baru ketemu saja bisa lebih baik dari itu*”. Bill only needs the answer “yes” or “no” from Gus Dur. However, Gus Dur does not provide the answer that Bill needed. It appears that the answer is irrelevant to the question. He also gives the answer that is not needed by Bill.

Based on the analysis above, we found that the utterances indicate that Gus Dur gives a ‘refusal’ on Bill’s statement by saying “*Saya yang baru ketemu saja bisa lebih baik dari itu*”. We can conclude that the speech act that is created in the conversation is included in the commissive illocutionary act. The commissive illocutionary act is the illocutionary act that is tied to a future action, for example to refusal, promise, pledges, agree, disagree etc. in the conversation, Gus Dur tries to refuse Bill statement because he assumes that it is an easy effort, even he can do better than him.

- [11] Ada seorang wanita muslim yang baru aja pergi ke Amerika. Oleh orang sana, dia ditanya: “Mam, do you like salad?”
Lalu si wanita menjawab: “Yes, five time a day”

In the data [11], American asks a Muslim whether she likes salad by saying “*Mam, do you like salad?*” In this question, there are two interpretations that we can be concluded. The speaker wants to offer salad to hearer or the speaker only asks what the hearer like salad or not. However, there is misunderstanding between the speaker and the hearer. In the statement ‘Salad’ refers to kind of an American food. Thus, the speaker probably offers a food to the speaker. However, a Muslim interprets the word ‘salad’ as ‘salat’. In Islam, ‘salat’ is a pray that is performed five times a day. Therefore, the Muslim answers the American’s question “*Yes, five times a day*”. The Muslim thinks that American asks whether they like ‘Salat’.

We can analyze that there is a maxim violation in the conversation above. The Muslim violated the relation maxim by stating “*Yes, five times a day*”. Actually American offers a food to the Muslim. There is no cooperation between American and Muslim. It creates an irrelevant conversation between speaker and listener.

From the data [11], the utterances indicate that the speaker makes an ‘offering’ to the hearer by saying “*Mom, do you like salad?*” The implicature meaning that is found in the conversation is American offers kind of American food that is Salad. Afterwards, the speaker will give Salad if the hearer receives his offering. However, Muslim assumes that the word ‘salad’ is ‘salat’ which is a pray in his religion. The speech act that is created by participant is the commissive illocutionary act. In the commissive illocutionary act, the speaker uses an expression that results an action which is committed in the future.

[12] “Lho, kamu ini gimana, sekarang coba hitung sudah berapa ribu batang yang kamu habiskan. Sudah berapa tahun umurmu diperpendek oleh rokok itu.”

Sambil menyulut sebatang lagi, Bung Yas menimpali, “Ya, tapi kalau saya enggak merokok, besok saya bisa mati.”

In the data [12], the speaker warns the hearer about the danger of smoking. He explains that by smoking, it will make his body unhealthy. It can cause the death. The speaker asks the hearer to calculate how many cigarettes that is consumed by the hearer and how long he can survive with his bad habit. The speaker feels sympathy to the bad habit of the hearer by saying “*Lho, kamu ini gimana, sekarang coba hitung sudah berapa ribu batang yang kamu habiskan.*” The statement shows that the speaker deplores what the hearer did. The speaker assumes that the hearer spends much money to buy many cigarettes. It is not very useful when he uses his money only to buy a cigarette. Afterwards, the speaker also warns the hearer about the danger of smoking by saying “*Sudah berapa tahun umurmu diperpendek oleh rokok itu.*” The statement indicates that the speaker gives warn to the hearer about the danger that threatens his self when he often smoke. The speaker explains that smoking can cause the death. However the hearer gives the answer by saying “*Ya, tapi kalau saya enggak merokok, besok saya bisa mati.*” From the answer the hearer tries to find a defense on what he did. He believes what he did is true because by smoking he feels that he can life longer. The hearer threats the speaker if he prohibits him to stop smoking, he will pass away. The hearer assumes that his life dependents on the cigarette. The death will be a threat to the hearer if he does not smoke. The statement of the hearer contains a threat to the speaker that bans him to smoke. He believes that by

banning him to smoke, it makes his life shorter. The warning above is also referend to the reader that smoking is not good for healt, so stop smoking.

From the conversation above, there is the maxim violation that is used by the hearer. He violated the quantity maxim because he gives information that believes to be false. The hearer does not have an evidence to justify his statement. Most of people may assume that the hearer's statement is false. How the people can justify the hearer's statement if it is clear that smoking is not good for health. It is impossible based on the hearer's statement; smoking can make his life longer. The hearer's statement will be true if the statement is responded by smokers. However, the truth is only a defense to their bad habit in order to be allowed to smoke.

The hearer's statement indicates the expression of a 'threat'. The implicature meaning that is found in the statement "*Ya, tapi kalau saya enggak merokok besok saya bisa mati*" is the hearer threatens the speaker to not ban him to stop smoking. The reason is he will pass away if he stops smoking. In this case, the hearer expresses his intends to threat the speaker in order to not forbid him to smoke again. From the implicature meaning, the utterance of the hearer can be included in the directive illocutionary act which is the speaker expresses his intends.

4.2. The Function of the Implicature in Gus Dur's Utterances

The speakers have some purposes why they use the implicature meaning in their utterances. Based on the implicature analyses of Gus Dur' utterances, there are some function that will be explained in the following discussion. The function are creating the humor effect, insinuating someone, criticizing the government,

mocking someone and warning the reader. From those function, the main point is that the utterance that are produced by Gus Dur has function creating the humor effect. The writer can find the function of the utterance by analyzing the implicature meaning of the data. In the data Gus Dur does not deliver the purpose of his statement directly, he uses the implicit meaning to avoid a face threatening act. Gus Dur tries to lessen the possible threat by using the implicatur meaning.

4.2.1. Creating the humor effect

The first function of implicature in the data is to create the humor effect. This function is the most function that is shown in the data. There are many humor effects that are found in the data, but the writer only takes two data to be analyzed. They are the data entitled “*Kiayi berhape tapi males sms*” in the page 109 and “*Eternit*” in the page 72’. The data are shown below:

[1] “Nah ada kiai yang kalau di-sms, tidak dibales, tetapi balesnya langsung menelepon. Lalu, diberitahu santrinya Pak Kiai, kalau di-sms balas saja pakai sms lagi. Nggak perlu menelepon. Tapi, kiainya menjawab, ah, saya malu karena tulisan saya jelek.”

From the data [1], we knew that the student commands his teacher to replay a message with a message too. However, his teacher answered “*ah, saya malu karena tulisan saya jelek*”. We can interpret that the teacher thought that he must write a message by his hand to replay a message. Whereas we know that we should not write by our hand to replay a message. We only type some word, and then send the message. The implicature of teacher’s answer is he assumes that he has to replay a message by writing. The teacher uses the implicature meaning by

violating a maxim. The answer of the teacher is irrelevant with the student's demand. The teacher violated the relation maxim. However, the violation that is created by the teacher produces a humor effect. The humor effect is created because of the irrelevant respond.

- [2] “Kapan-kapan Gus Dur harus ke sana, soalnya sudah lengkap dengan eternitnya,” kata teman Gus Dur
 “Eternit?” Tanya Gus Dur
 “Itu yang pakai ada komputernya,” jelasnya lagi.
 “Ohh....Internet,” jawab Gus Dur

From the data [2], Gus Dur's friend boast his Islamic dormitory building to Gus Dur by saying “*Kapan-kapan Gus Dur harus ke sana, soalnya sudah lengkap dengan eternitnya,*” He wants to prove his statement by asking Gus Dur to see the building. However, because he does not have many knowledge about technology development or he just has known about that word, so he is wrong in using the word ‘*internet*’ becoming “eternit”. Therefore, Gus Dur repeats the word “eternit” to show his hesitation to that word. Afterwards, his friend adds his statement to explain what he means by saying “*Itu yang pakai ada komputernya*”. Gus Dur can guess what his friend means by answering “*Ohh....Internet,*” He connects the word ‘eternit’ with a computer, and then he can conclude that his friend's meant is internet. The implicature of the conversation above is Gus Dur's Friend boast his Islamic dormitory by showing that there is internet there. However he is false in using the word ‘internet’ becoming ‘eternit’. He adds the word ‘*komputer*’ in the following statement. It shows that the implicature meaning that want to be created by speaker is he want to ‘inform’ that there is internet in his Islamic dormitory. By his mistake in using the word ‘intenet’ becoming ‘eternit’, it makes the hearer

assumes that his statement is funny because of his ignorance. It is prove that function of the implicature is creating a humor effect.

4.2.2. Insinuating someone

There are some data which have function to insinuate someone. The speaker insinuates someone indirectly. The speaker hopes that the insinuation will be understood by the intended someone. The data that has function to insinuate someone can be shown in the data [3] entitled “*Dulu DPR Seperti Anak TK Sekarang Seperti Playgrou*” in the page 64 and data [4] entitled “*Buto Cakil Pembayar Demonstran*” in the page 51.

[3] “DPR dulu TK sekarang playgroup,” kata Gus Dur

In the data [3], Gus Dur says “*DPR dulu TK sekarang playgroup,*” We try to analyze first the statement “DPR dulu TK”. In the statement, Gus Dur expresses his opinion about the attitude of House of Representative member. He states this statement after seeing DPR member who beats each other in the council about BBM in 2004. He judges that the DPR is like TK children because what they did same as what the children always do. Afterward, Gus Dur assumes that “*DPR sekarang playgroup*”. As we know that the children in playgroup is younger than the children in TK. We can conclude that members of House of Representative now are worse than the members of House of Representative in period 2004. The implicature of the statement above contains an ‘insinuation’. Gus Dur’s utterance is created to hint the member of House of Representative in this time period. In

Gus Dur's statement also includes an expectation that the members can improve their attitude in solving a problem. They can be wiser in dealing with a problem.

[4] “supaya rakyat tentram, mbok ya (para elit politik) itu kalau berantem caranya yang cerdas lah. Rakyat seperti kita ini kan juga perlu tahu. Bukan begitu, Gus?”

“Sebelum tahu istananya, harus tahu dulu siapa demonstrannya,” jawab Gus Dur.

“ya sebelum tahu demonstrannya, harus tahu dulu siapa yang membayari.”

From the data [4] the speaker comments about how to act to be political elites. The speaker assumes that they are less intelligent in expressing their anger. They often do action that should not be done by political elites. The speaker believes that if the political elites do action more intelligent, so the people will think more intelligent too. The political elites are demanded to act wiser in dealing with politics, because the peace of the people depends on the behavior of political elites. The assumption is delivered by the speaker by saying “*supaya rakyat tentram, mbok ya (para elit politik) itu kalau berantem caranya yang cerdas lah. Rakyat seperti kita ini kan juga perlu tahu*”. Thereafter, Gus Dur gives response by answering “*Sebelum tahu istananya, harus tahu dulu siapa demonstrannya*”. From the utterance, Gus Dur tries to remember the speaker that before we becomes a president by mentioning the word “istana” that refers to the family of president, we should know the demonstrator that often demonstrate about the policy of the president. Gus Dus adds his statement by saying “*ya sebelum tahu demonstrannya, harus tahu dulu siapa yang membayari*.” By saying the utterance, Gus Dur assumes that there is someone that pays demonstrator to demonstrate. Possibility, Gus Dur supposes that the polilital elites pay the dremonstator to their own political interests. The utterance that is delivered by Gus Dus contains

the implicature meaning that because of the political interests from the political elites, they want to pay the demonstrator to demonstrate the policy of government for imposing the government. Gus Dur's utterance includes a 'insinuation' to the political elites who often pay the demonstrator. Gus Dur hints the political elites in order to be noticed by them. They can be more intelligent and wiser in taking an action.

4.2.3. Criticizing the government

The next function of the implicature meaning in the data is to criticize the government. There are many data that has this function because of the existence Gus Dur in politics. The data [5] entitled "*Peternak Lebah Ala Gus Dur*" in the page 103 and data [6] entitled "*Panglima Al Paraguay*" in the page 47.

[5] "kita ini setiap tahun masih mengimpor 350 ribu ton lebah dari luar negeri," tutur Gus Dur
 "Lah, orang-orang yang berdemo itu, daripada mendemo menteri-nya mbok lebih baik beternak lebah, supaya kita tidak mengimpor lagi!" pinta Gus Dur

In the data [5], Gus Dur criticizes the phenomena of the demonstrator's activity. He compares with the government's program. He says "*kita ini setiap tahun masih mengimpor 350 ribu ton lebah dari luar negeri,*" This statement is uttered by Gus Dur to show that our country imports something which we should not import it. Afterward Gus Dur adds his statement "*Lah, orang-orang yang berdemo itu, daripada mendemo menteri-nya mbok lebih baik beternak lebah, supaya kita tidak mengimpor lagi!*" the purpose of the first statement is to realize that there is more important activity that can be done by demonstrator. Gus Dur assumes that if they choose breeding bees than do demonstration, so the

government will not import bees from the other country. Gus Dur utters the statement to criticize the people who can only claim the government's program without making an effort to contribute to the success of the government program.

[6] “Negara bapak itu aneh ya. Tidak punya laut, tapi punya panglima seperti Bapak.” Tanya staf Al Brasil
 Dengan kalem sang tamu pun menanggapi, “Negeri Anda ini juga aneh, ya. Hukumnya tidak berjalan, tapi merasa perlu mengangkat seorang menteri kehakiman.”

From the data [6], the speaker criticizes a country that does not have sea but it has a naval commander. He tries to find the answer by asking “*Negara bapak itu aneh ya. Tidak punya laut, tapi punya panglima seperti Bapak.*” The utterance is not only a question but also a criticism. The speaker thinks that a country does not need a naval commander if it does not have sea. From the phenomenon, it will appear a question, what the mission of the naval commander is. The speaker presumes that it is a curious phenomenon. However, the hearer can answer with a criticism too by answering “*Negeri Anda ini juga aneh, ya. Hukumnya tidak berjalan, tapi merasa perlu mengangkat seorang menteri kehakiman.*” The hearer gives the answer that is also to critics the speaker's country. The speaker also assumes that a country does not need a justice minister if the law cannot be applied. He thinks that it will be same as a country with a justice minister or not if the law cannot be applied. Thereafter, it appears a question, what is done by the justice minister, so the law cannot be applied. The implicature meaning of the utterances is it is better that a country does not have ministers than it has ministers but they do not do their job well. The utterances include a ‘criticism’ to the government that does not do their job well. From the data [6], there is an

expectation that government should more selective in choosing a minister in order to improve development of a country.

4.2.4. Mockery Someone

There are some statements that delivered by speaker to mock someone. In fact, there is the data that shows that speaker mocks hi/her own self. The purpose of using the implicature meaning to mock someone is to avoid a face threatening act. Moreover the speaker mocks someone by the implicature meaning to do a save saving act. The data can be seen in the data [7] entitled “Iklan Gratis” in the page 85 and the data [8] entitled “Pasangan Yang Ideal” in the page 15.

[7] “bahkan ketika ditanya lebih ganteng siapa antara Gus Dur dan Gus Pur. Gus Dur mengatakan Handoyo seperti iklan film foto yang bermoto “seindah warna aslinya”, tapi Gus Dur memplesetkannya menjadi, “ lebih indah dari warna aslinya,” kata Gu Dur.

From the data [7], Gus Dur gives a confession that Gus Pur more handsome than him. He expresses his opinion when he is asked about who is more handsome between Gus Dur and Gus Pur. Gus Pur is a similar character with Gus Dur who is played by Handoyo in a political parody named Republik Mimpi. Gus Dur says “lebih indah dari warna aslinya,” The word “warna aslinya” refers to Gus Dur. Meanwhile the correct sentence in an advertisement is “*seindah warna aslinya*”. Gus Dur assumes that “*Gus Pur lebih indah dari warna aslinya*”. It means that Gus Pur more handsome than Gus Dur. In the data 9, Gus Dur utterance contains a mockery that refers to him. The mockery is created by Gus Dur because physically Gus Pur has more perfect physical than Gus Dur. As we know that Gus is blind and he cannot walk.

[8] “After Gus Dur was pointed President and Megawati Sukarnoputri Vice President last year, Wahid said in front of an open microphone, “this is an ideal team-the President can’t see and the Vice President can’t talk”.

The data [8] shows that there is a ‘mockery’ to President and Vice President. Wahid said that “the President can’t see”. From the statement, the speaker utters an utterance based on the fact when he said that the President cannot see. As we know, that Gus Dur is the only president who can’t see. Although it is the fact, it is not appropriate if the statement was addressed to the president. The speaker assumes that someone who cannot see is doubted his ability to lead a country. However, the mockery of the speaker also appears when the speaker says “the Vice President can’t talk”. Whereas we know that Megawati as Vice President can speak fluently. From the statement, it does not mean that the speaker assumes that Megawati can’t speak in the fact. However the speaker considers that Megawati is a passive person. She often silences in addressing a problem. Whereas, in politics, someone is required to be able speak up. She should be able to comments or respond to criticism or claim of the people. The implicature meaning that is delivered by the speaker is the President and Vice President do not have an ability to lead a country because both of them have weakness in themselves. When the speaker says ‘an ideal team’, it does not a positive argument but otherwise. It does not mean that they are an ideal team to cooperate in leading a country, but they are an ideal team because of their weakness. The purpose of the utterances is to make a ‘mockery’ to the president and vice president because of their weakness.

4.2.5. Warning the readers

The last function of using implicature meaning in the data is to warn the readers. This function is delivered by the speaker to remember the readers about a positive case that may be forgotten by them. The data [9] entitled “”Iri dengan Sopir Metromini” in the page 98 and the data [10] entitled “Pikiran Porno” in the page 31 are the examples of the data that has function to warn the readers.

- [9] “Pak kenapa kog saya yang presiden sekaligus juru dakwah mendapatkan yang lebih rendah dari seorang sopir metromini?” protes Gus Dur
 Dengan tenang malaikat menjawab, “ Begini Gus, saat anda ceramah, anda membuat orang-orang semua ngantuk dan tertidur, sehingga melupakan Tuhan. Sedangkan pada saat sopir metromini mengemudi ngebut, ia membuat orang-orang berdoa.”

From the data [9], the conversation indicates a ‘warning’. Gus Dur tells about what the reprisal for a preacher and a metromini driver hereafter. In the conversation Gus Dur insisted about his reprisal that is worse than a metromini driver by saying “*Pak kenapa kog saya yang presiden sekaligus juru dakwah mendapatkan yang lebih rendah dari seorang sopir metromini?*” He thinks that as a preacher, he should get the better reprisal than a metromini driver. Evidently, the seraph has a logic answer to respond Gus Dur’s assertion by answering “*Begini Gus, saat anda ceramah, anda membuat orang-orang semua ngantuk dan tertidur, sehingga melupakan Tuhan. Sedangkan pada saat sopir metromini mengemudi ngebut, ia membuat orang-orang berdoa.*” From this answer, we can conclude that the conversation above has ‘a warning’ to the reader that the people who has a good profession, it should not get better reprisal too, because if we do the good activity in human’s points of view is not same as God’s point of view.

[10] “Al Quran itu kitab suci yang paling porno. Ya kan bener, di dalamnya ada kalimat menyusui. Berarti mengeluarkan tetek. Ya sudah, cabu kan??
 “maksudnya, itu ayat jadi porno kalau yang baca lagi punya pikiran ngeres. Kalau nggak, ya udah. Bearti beres.

From the data [10], Gus Dur gives a statement that may make the reader curious. He says that “Al Quran itu kitab suci yang paling porno”. The reason of the statement is explained by Gus Dur by saying “*Ya kan bener, di dalamnya ada kalimat menyusui. Berarti mengeluarkan tetek. Ya sudah, cabu kan??*” The utterance shows that the content of Al Quran contains the porn words. Gus Dur tries to show that there is the word ‘menyusui’ in Al Quran to prove his statement that Al Quran is a porn book. However, Gus Dur adds a statement to justify his statement before. Gus Dur explains the meaning of his statement before by saying “*maksudnya, itu ayat jadi porno kalau yang baca lagi punya pikiran ngeres. Kalau nggak, ya udah. Berarti beres.* We can interpret that Al Quran can be a porn book depends on the reader’s mind. The implicature of the utterance is Gus Dur expresses his judgment in viewing a phenomenon. Gus Dur tries to change the people’s mind in looking at a social phenomenon in different point of view. The phenomenon that is considered to be a false case, it can be a true case if we want to see from the different point of view. Gus Dur’s statement provides a ‘warn’ to the reader in order not to be negative thinking before knowing the meaning of a statement. Besides, the statement suggests the reader not only think with one point of view, but also from another point of view.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

5.1. Conclusion

In a conversation, sometime a speaker produces an utterance containing something more than it simply sound. It is called implicature. Implicature is the expression that has more than the words of the expression means.

In finding the implicature the writer interprets the conversation in the book *Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur*. The writer also uses Grice's theory of Cooperative Principle. From the theory the writer found only three maxim violations that are the maxim violation of quality, quantity, and relevance. The writer cannot find the maxim violation of manner in the data. The writer found that the implicit meaning was created because the participant violated the maxim. Sometimes there is more than one maxim violation that is created by speaker in one conversation.

From the implicature analysis, the writer found four types of implicature classification; they are representative illocutionary act, expressive illocutionary act, commissive illocutionary act, and directive illocutionary act. There is one illocutionary act that is not found in the data that is the expression of declaration illocutionary act. In the representative illocutionary act, the writer found the implicature of the utterances indicating the expression of description, conclusion, and fact. In the expressive illocutionary act, the implicature that are found are the expression of dislike, whising and sorrow. In the commissive illocutionary act, the expression of warn, suggestion, and request found in the utterances. While in the

directive illocutionary act, the writer found the expression of refusal, offering, and threatening in the utterances.

After finding the implicature of the utterances, the writer found that there are some functions that are produced by the speaker in using the implicit meaning. The functions are to create the humor effect, to insinuate someone, to criticize government, to mock someone, and to warn the reader.

5.2 Suggestion

The writer analyses the data using Grice's theory because it makes it easy for the writer to find the implicature of the utterances. Actually, there is more appropriate theory to analyse the implicature of the utterances. The theory is the relevance theory of Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson. The writer hopes there is another research that will use the theory to find the implicature of the utterances.

REFERENCES

- Andargini, Bianti. (2006). *Implicature Analysis on Comic Strip "Kartun Benny dan Mice"*. Thesis. Diponegoro University, Semarang.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi. (2010). *Prosedur penelitian*. Jakarta: Rhineka Cipta
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do Things with Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Cumming, Louis (1999). *Pragmatics, A Multidisclipinary Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- George, Yule. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Handayani, Nita Dian. (2011). *Humor In Jalan Pinggir Criticism Column In Silaturahmi Rubric Suara Muhammadiyah Magazine*. Thesis. Diponegoro University, Semarang.
- Horo, Angelina N. (2007). *Implicature of The Character's Utterances In The Movie "10 Things I Hate About You"*. Thesis. Diponegoro University, Semarang.
- Kaloeti, Ade Kristianus. (2010). *Particularized Conversational Implicature In TV Series "NCIS:Season 2"*. Thesis. Diponegoro University, Semarang.
- Levinson, Stephen C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Renkema, Jane. (1993). *Discourse Studies an Introductory Textbook*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co
- Sudaryanti. (1993). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan Secara Linguistik*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Trimmer, Joseph F. (2003). *A Guide to MLA Documentattion*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Wasito, Hermawan. (1992). *Pengantar Metodologi Penelitian: buku panduan mahasiswa*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama
- Wijana, I Dewa Putu (1996). *Dasar-Dasar Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: ANDI Yogyakarta
- Yori, Acep. (2009). *Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Bagong.

APPENDIX

Tables 1

The implicature of the utterances in Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur

No	Types Maxim Implicature	The maxim Violation	Utterances
1	Representative Illocutionary Act		
	a. Description	Quantity Maxim	“Loh kenapa anda berkerumun disini?” “Mereka terlihat sangat fasih berdoa, apalagi pakai serban, mereka itu pasti kiayi”
	b. Conclusion	Relation Maxim	Speaker: “sampean tahu ini radio Islami dari mana?” Hearer: “Lha..., itu bacaannya ‘all-transistor’, pakai ‘Al’”
	c. Fact	Quantity Maxim	“Menurut Gus Dur di negeri ini hanya ada tiga polisi yang jujur; pertama, patung polisi, kedua polisi tidur, dan ketiga polisi Hoengeng (mantan kepala polisi RI) “Lainnya?” Gus Dur hanya tersenyum
2	Expression Illocutionary Act		
	a. Dislike	Quantity Maxim	“Saya Cuma minta satu hal saja, Bapak Presiden,” kata sang penolong “katakana saja apa itu?” Kata Pak Harto “Bapak sebaiknya tidak jadi Presiden lagi” kata sang penolong
	b. Wishing	Quality Maxim and Relation Maxim	Speaker: “Nah, lalu ada pemikiran gila, supaya Inggris dan Amerika memberikan sesuatu kepada kita”. Hearer: “Bagaimana caranya?” Speaker: “Kita nyatakan perang melawan Inggris dan Amerika”
	c. Sorrow	Relation Maxim and Quantity Maxim	Bill, “Boleh saya tahu apa yang Anda bisikkan sehingga anjing saya menangis begitu sedih?” Gus Dur, “Saya bilang, kasihan Indonesia, rakyatnya banyak yang miskin, jangankan untuk membeli BBM, untuk makan sehari-hari saja

			mereka kesulitan
3	Directive Illocutionary Act		
	a. Warm	Quality Maxim and Quantity Maxim	“Apa kamu tidak melihat gambar itu? Itu kan gambar becak tak boleh masuk jalan ini,” bentak Pak Polisi “Oh saya melihat Pak, tapi itu kan gambarnya becak kosong tidak ada pengemudinya. Becak saya kan ada yang mengemudi, tidak kosong berarti boleh masuk,” jawab si tukang becak
	b. Suggestion	Quantity Maxim	“Apa sih rahasia kemenangan Anda?” Tanya wartawan “mudah saja.” Jawan si pelari Suriah enteng “Tiap kali bersiap-siap start, saya membayangkan ada serdadu Israel di belakang saya yang mau menembak saya”
	c. Request	Quality Maxim	“Lo, kok Cuma sedikit saja terjemahannya?” Tanya Gus Dur kepada si penerjemah. “Apa sih yang anda katakana?” “Ya, saya cuma bilang, Presiden Abdurrahman Wahid ini sedang melucu. Lalu saya bilang, harap semua hadirin tertawa.”
4	Commissive Illocutionary Act		
	a. Refusal	Relation Maxim	Bill: “Lihat! Hebat bukan?” Gus Dur: “Gitu aja kok repot. Saya yang baru ketemu saja bisa lebih baik dari itu”
	b. Offering	Relation Maxim	Ada seorang wanita muslim yang baru aja pergi ke Amerika. Oleh orang sana, dia ditanya: “Mam, do you like salad?” Lalu si wanita menjawab: “Yes, five time a day”
	c. Threatening	Quantity Maxim	“Lho, kamu ini gimana, sekarang coba hitung sudah berapa ribu batang yang kamu habiskan. Sudah berapa tahun umurmu diperpendek oleh rokok itu.” Sambil menyulut sebatang lagi,

			Bung Yas menimpali, “Ya, tapi kalau saya enggak merokok, besok saya bisa mati”
--	--	--	--

Table 2

The function of Implicature in Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur

No	Functions of Implicatures	Utterances	Page	Title
1	Humor	“Nah ada kiai yang kalau di-sms, tidak dibales, tetepi balesnya langsung menelepon. Lalu, diberitahu santrinya Pak Kiai, kalau di-sms balas saja pakai sms lagi. Nggak perlu menelepon. Tapi, kiainya menjawab, <i>ah, saya malu karena tulisan saya jelek.</i> ”	109	Kiayi berhape tapi males sms
2	Humor	“Kapan-kapan Gus Dur harus kesana, <i>soalnya sudah lengkap dengan eternitnya,</i> ” kata teman Gus Dur “eternit?” Tanya Gus Dur “itu yang pakai ada komputernya,” jelasnya lagi “Ohh... Internet.” Jawab Gus Dur	72	Eternit
3	Insinuation	“ <i>DPR dulu TK sekarang playgroup,</i> ” kata Gus Dur	64	Dulu DPR seperti anak TK, sekarang seperti Playgroup
4	Insinuation	“Supaya rakyat tentram, mbok ya (para elit politik) itu kalau berantem caranya yang cerdas lah. Rakyat seperti kita ini kan juga perlu tahu. Bukan begitu, Gus?” “ <i>sebelum tahu istananya, harus tahu dulu siapa demonstrannya,</i> ” jawab Gus Dur “ <i>ya, sebelum tahu demonstrannya, harus tahu dulu siapa yang membayari.</i> ”	51	Buto Cakil Pembayar Demontran
5	Criticism	“kita ini setiap tahun masih mengimpor 350 ribu ton lebah dari luar negeri,” tutur Gus Dur “Lah, <i>orang-orang yang berdemo itu, daripada mendemo menterinya mbok</i>	103	Peternak Lebah Ala Gus Dur

		<i>ya lebih baik beternak lebah, supaya kita tidak mengimpor lagi!</i> ” pinta Gus Dur		
6	Criticism	“Negara bapak itu aneh ya. Tidak punya laut, tapi punya panglima seperti bapak.” Tanya staf Al Brasil Dengan kalem sang tamu pun menanggapi, <i>“Negeri Anda ini juga aneh, ya. Hukumnya tidak berjalan, tapi merasa perlu mengangkat seorang menteri kehakiman.”</i>	47	Panglima Al Paraguay
7	Mockery	“bahkan ketika ditanya lebih ganteng siapa antara Gus Dur dan Gus Pur. Gus Dur mengatakan Handoyo seperti iklan foto yang bermoto <i>“seindah warna aslinya”</i> , tapi Gus Dur memplesetkannya menjadi, <i>“lebih indah dari warna aslinya,”</i> kata Gus Dur	85	Iklan Gratis
8	Mockery	“After Gus Dur was pointed President and Megawati Sukarnoputri Vice President las year, Wahid said in front of an open microphone, <i>“this is an ideal team-the President can’t see and the Vice President can’t talk.”</i>	13	Pasangan Yang Ideal
9	Warn	“Pak kenapa kok saya yang Presiden sekaligus juru dakwah mendapatkan yang lebih rendah dari seorang sopir metromini?” protes Gus Dur Dengan tenang malaikat menjawab, <i>“Begini gus, saat anda ceramah, anda membuat orang-orang semua ngantuk dan tertidur, sehingga melupakan Tuhan. Sedangkan pada saat sopir mengemudi ngebit, ia membuat orang-orang berdoa.”</i>	98	Iri dengan Sopir Metromini
10	Warn	“Al Quran itu kitab suci yang paling porno. Ya kan bener, didalamnya ada kalimat menyusui. Berarti mengeluarkan tetek. Ya sudah, cabu kan?” <i>“maksudnya, itu ayat jadi porno kalau yang baca lagi punya pikiran ngeres. Kalau nggak, ya udah, berarti beres.”</i>	31	Pikiran Porno

