

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Framework

In this chapter, the researcher discusses about some theories which are related to the study “ An analysis Flouting and Violating Maxims in Comedy of *Yuk Keep Smile*”.

2.1.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the science of language seen in relation to its users. That is to say, not the science of language in its own right, or the science of language as seen studied by the linguists, or the science of language as the expression of our desire to play schoolmarm, but the science of language as it is used by real, live people, for their own purposes and within their limitation and affordance (Mey, 1993:5). Pragmatics starts out from an active conception of language as being used. It is concerned with a study of meaning communicated by a speaker and interpreted by a listener. Generally, it is a study of language usage in communication, in studying language; one cannot ignore the situation in which the speech is uttered. There is a close relationship between an utterance and its situation by the pragmatics approach.

Levinson (1983) states that the term of modern pragmatics was firstly introduced by Charles Morris and it was concerned with semiotic, the study of sign. Morris distinguishes three distinct fields of study, namely: (a) Syntactic, that

is the study of the formal relation of signs to one another, (b) Semantics, that is the study of the formal relation of signs to the objects to which the signs are applicable, (c) Pragmatics, that is the study of the relation of signs to interpreters (Levinson, 1983:1). Geoffrey Leech (1983) develops pragmatics in a wider term. He uses the term of general pragmatic as a study of linguistics meaning. Leech argues that one cannot really understand the nature of the language itself unless he understands pragmatic, how language is used in communication. In addition, Levinson defines that pragmatics is the study of the relation between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding (1983, p:21).

Pragmatics is considered as the study of linguistics meaning which is related to context. The term 'pragmatic' deals with both context dependent aspect of language structure and principles of language usage and understanding that have nothing or little to do with linguistic structure. It is later explained that as a science, pragmatics is the study of relation between language and context that is the basic account to an account of language understanding (Leech, 1983:10). The importance of pragmatic is obvious. In interpreting any utterance, linguists must always be concerned with pragmatics. It is because an utterance should be comprehended in relation to the context of situation and the context of culture in which it is delivered. If the context of situation and the context of culture are ignored, the interpretation emerges can be very different. It is clear that in understanding language expression, pragmatics should be involved. From the description, it can be concluded that in studying pragmatics, one should emphasize the relation between language and context which language is used.

2.1.2 Conversational Implicature

An English language philosopher, HP. Grice (1975:56) outlined an approach to what he termed ‘conversational implicature’ or CI. He was the first to systematically study cases in which what a speaker means differs from what the sentence used by the speaker. In other words, as clarified by Thomas (1995: 56) that the Grice’s theory is an attempt at explaining how a hearer gets from what is said what is meant. From the level of expressed meaning to the level of implied meaning.

Grice (1975: 46) divides CI into two varieties, conventional and conversational. Conversational implicatures include all non- truth- conditional aspects of what is conveyed by an utterance solely due to the words or forms the sentence contains.

Example:

Jane is poor but happy

Conversational implicatures indirectly associated with the linguistic content of utterances. According to Grice, to the fact that participants in a conversation are constrained by the common goal of communication to be cooperative.

A: I don’t think I will be here in 10 years.

B: That what I said. That what she said.

A: I never know. I just say it. I say stuff like that, you know. The lighter the tension when things sort of get hard.

B: that's what she said

2.1.3 Cooperative principles

In identifying and classifying the phenomenon of implicature, Grice develops a theory designed to explain and predict conversational implicatures. He also sought to describe how such implicatures are understood. The general principle is called the Cooperative Principle (CP) which Grice (1975: 45) presents in the following terms: Make your contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.

In realizing the CP, Grice (1975: 46) suggests that contribution to talk should be guided by four maxims as subordinate rules or sub-principles of CP. They are maxim of Quantity, maxims of Quality, maxim of Relation and maxim of Manner as follows:

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

Quality : do not say what you believe to be false. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Relation : Be relevant

Manner : Be perspicuous, avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, and be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), be orderly.

In short, these maxims specify what participants have to do in order to converse in maximally efficient, rational, co-operative way: they should speak sincerely, relevantly and clearly, while providing sufficient information (Levinson 1983: 102).

2.1.3.1 Maxim of Quantity

Maxim of Quantity relates to the amount of contribution to the coherence of conversation. Grice (1975: 48) clarifies that the maxim of Quantity has sub-maxims: “make your contribution to the conversation as informative as necessary!” and “Do not make your contribution to the conversation more informative than necessary!”. Maxim of quantity, where one tries to be as informative as one possibly can, and gives as much information as is needed, and no more.

2.1.3.2 Maxim of Quality

Maxim of Quality suggests to the speakers to valid contribution with certain evidences. Grice (1975: 50) suggests that a conversation should be genuine and sincere and speak the “truth” or facts. He formulates this maxim as. “Do not say what you believe to be false!” and “Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence!” On the other words, both sub- maxims require the conversational members only say the truth.

2.1.3.3 Maxim of Relation

Maxim of Relation suggests that utterances should be relevant to the context of the conversation. In Grice's (1975: 69) outlines, that speakers should 'be relevant', say things related to the current topic of the conversation. Grice (1975: 69). Example:

Anne : You really love me?

Jack : I like Fishing, and love football very much.

Jack is changing the topic. Therefore, he tends to flout the maxim of relation. The implication is Jack doesn't want to respond to Anne, perhaps he has problems discussing his felling or the answer is "No".

2.1.3.4 Maxim of Manner

Maxim of Manner suggests that speakers have to try presenting meaning clearly, concisely orderly, and avoid ambiguity and obscurity of expression (Grice 1975: 69). And breaks it down into four subordinate:

- a. Avoid obscurity of expression
- b. Avoid ambiguity
- c. Be brief (avoid unnecessary wordiness)
- d. Be orderly

Shortly, this Manner requires the speakers to speak directly, orderly, not ambiguous and not exaggerating.

2.1.4 The Non-observances of the Maxims

However, there are many occasions, when people fail to observe the maxims, for example, they are incapable of speaking clearly or because they deliberately choose to lie. According to Grice in Jenny Thomas, there are five ways of failing to observe a maxim, they are:

2.1.4.1 Flouting Maxim

That is not to say that people always follow these maxims of conversation. When the speaker appears not to follow the maxims but except hearer the meaning implied, it can be said they are 'flouting' the maxims. Just as with an indirect speech acts, the speaker implies a function different from the literal meaning of form, when the flouting maxim, the speaker assumes that the hearer knows that their words should not be taken at face value and they can infer the implicit meaning (Cutting, 2002: 37). By providing a description of the norms speakers operate within a conversation, Grice makes it possible to describe what types of meaning a speaker can convey by flouting one of these maxims. This flouting of a maxim result in the speaker conveying. In addition to the literal meaning of his utterance, an additional meaning.

To flout maxim of the conversation is go against the command of a certain maxim in order to achieve a certain end, which is understood by the listeners. All these flouting happen without much awareness, at least most of the time. In fact, it is done constantly.

a. Flouting Maxim of Quantity

The speaker is considered flout the maxim of quantity seems to give little or too much information. For example:

A: Well, how do I look?

B: Your shoes are nice...

B does not say that sweatshirt and jeans do not look nice, but he knows that A will understand that implication, because A asks about his whole appearance and only told part of it.

b. Flouting Maxim of Quality

The speaker flout the maxim of quality may do it in several ways. They may quite simply say something that obviously does not represent what they think. First, example "I think you would be happier in large or a small college". That statement flout maxim of quality if he knows the hearer, in case a student, would understand what he was getting at, and hear that message behind his words.

The speaker may flout this maxim by exaggerating as in the hyperbole (a very strong exaggeration), such as "*I'm Starving*". The utterance is a well established exaggerating expression. No speaker will expect their hearer to say ' I don't think you are dying of hunger- you don't even look thin'. Hearers would be expected to know that the speaker simply meant that they were very hungry. Hyperbole is often at the basis of humor.

By using a metaphor, the speaker can flout this maxim too. The one is considered using the metaphor, if he/ she is comparing between two objects without using the world like or as. Consider the following example: *'my house is a refrigerator in January'*. Hearers would understand that the house was very cold indeed. Metaphors are conceptual means and cultural community (Mey, 1993: 62). Conventional euphemism can also put in this category too. When people say *'us there anywhere I can powder my nose?'* has meaning as *'I need toilet'*.

By using irony a speaker can flout the maxim of quality. As Leech (1993: 144) says,

“While irony is an apparently friendly way of being offensive (mock-politeness), the type of verbal behavior known as ‘banter’ is in an offensive way of being friendly (nock- impoliteness)”.

In the case of irony, the speaker expresses a positive sentiment and implies a negative one. If a student comes down to breakfast one morning says, *'if only you knew how much I love being woken up at 4 am by alarm'*, she is being ironic and expecting her friend to know that she means the opposite. Banter expresses a negative sentiment and implies positives one, it sounds like mild aggression, as in a game of chess, one person may say joking to another *'what a mean cowardly trick!'* referring to a particular clever gambit.

The other way to flout this maxim is by using sarcasm. Sarcasm is a form of irony that is not friendly, in fact it usually to hurt, such as in *'This lovely undercooked egg you've given me here, as usual. Yummy!'*

c. Flouting Maxim of Relation

If the speaker flout the maxim of relation, they expect the hearers will be able to image what the utterance did not say, and make the conversation between their utterance and the preceding one. Thus in:

A: I am out of petrol

B: There is garage round the Conner

B is flouting the maxim of relation by answering with utterance whose literal meaning to be irrelevant. However, B intends to deliver a message that there is a garage around the corner which is probably open and selling petrol, B flouts maxim of relation to think A would get the message behind it.

d. Flouting Maxim of Manner

A: "Let's get kid something"

B: "Ok, but I veto I-C-E-C-R-E-A-M-S"

(Levinson, 1983: 101)

The context of the conversation above, the speakers are in place where many kids in there. The conversation above flouts the maxim of manner because B's answer is certainly not the clearest way of saying it. B breaks the maxim of manner (be perspicuous) by spelling out the word ice cream and it raises by implicature. Since the kids cannot spell, she tells A that would rather not say the word ice cream directly in front of the children, in case they will ask their parents to buy some.

2.1.4.2 Violating Maxim

A violation happens when a speaker quietly and unostentatiously violates a maxim. Grice states in Jenny that if a speaker violates a maxim, he will be liable to mislead (1995: 72).

a. Violating Maxim of Quantity

Maxim of Quantity : quantity of information, make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange, do not make your contribution more informative than is required. Violation Maxim of Quantity occurs when a speaker gives more or less information than the situation requires. If a speaker violates the maxim of quantity, he/she does not give the listener enough information to know what is being talked about, because he/she do not want the listener to know the full picture. To create humor the speaker violate maxim with give simple answer and not informative, example:

A: Who is Mrs Rina's husband name?

B: Mr. Jenggot

In this case B answer the question with a simple word, because B usually call Mrs. Rina's husband Mr. Jenggot, but B answer is not informative for A and this is make the situation funny.

Other way to violate maxim of quantity is give information more required and informative, example:

C: Want you marry me?

D: Yes, I want too, if you have a car with regtangle wheel!

In this case D answer more informative and make the situation funny because D add funny sentences to answer C question.

b. Violating Maxim of Quality

Maxim of Quality: be truthful, only say what you believe to be true, only say what you have evidence for. Violation Maxim of Quality occurs when the speaker says something which is untrue or for which he or she lack of adequate evidence information, for reasons best known to her. If a speaker violates maxim of quality, he/she is not being sincere and giving the listener the wrong information. To create humor the speaker violate maxim with say something nor true, not logic. For example:

F: last week Sidoarjo gets flood

G: yes because Sidoarjo get a big sale rain

In this case G answer is not logic and false but it make the conversation

being funny.

c. Violating Maxim of Relation

Maxim of relation: relevance, make your contribution relevant to the interaction, indicate any way that it is not. Maxim of relation tend to violate when the speaker gives a response which is very irrelevant to the topic which is being talk or tend to changing the topic in the conversation. To create humor the speaker violate maxim with give unrelevance answer, for example:

H: welcome to our home

I: the wall looks like stawberry cookies

In this case I answer is not relevan, and I say another topic of H topic.

From I answer we can look humor sense.

d. Violating Maxim of Manner

Maxim of manner: be clear, avoid unnecessary prolixity, avoid ambiguity, be brief. Maxim of manner violation happens when the speaker gives an ambiguous statement or the statement that he or she gives is not orderly. After that, maxim of relation may be violated if the speaker tends to exaggerate the statement. One way to create humor is to violate the maxim of manner with an ambiguous answer.

Example:

J: what do you think about the movie?

K: it was interestingly done sir

K's answer creates a violation of the maxim of manner because of ambiguity.

2.1.4.3 Infringing Maxim

It happens when a speaker who, with no intention of generating an implicature and with no intention of deceiving, fails to observe a maxim. In other words, the speaker has a lack of ability to express his intention (Thomas, 1995: 74). For instance, *We do not want no education.* (double negative)

2.1.4.4 Opting Out Maxim

Speaker opts out of observing a maxim by indicating unwillingness to cooperate in the way the maxim requires. The speaker deliberately implicates the truth in order to obey the rules or ethical codes (Thomas, 1995: 74). For example, *The Conservative M.P., Teddy Taylor, had been asked a question about talk he had with Colonel Gaddafi:*

‘Well, honestly, I can’t tell you a thing, because what was said to me was told me in confidence’ (Thomas, 1995: 75).

Mr. Teddy opts out the first maxim of Quantity in order to preserve confidentiality. He explicitly informs that the maxim cannot be satisfied.

2.1.4.5 Suspending Maxim

It is hiding the truth because of the cultural code (Jenny T, 1995:75). This non-observance of maxims is rarely occurred. For instance, in Indians: Mentioning a late person's name might evoke evil spirits and bring bad luck.

2.1.5 Humor

The term of humor is from Latin word 'humor' meaning 'the fluid of the body' (Encyclopedia Americana, 1991: 562). In ancient, medieval and Renaissance period, man's temperament is considered normal when the humors (fluid) of his body are in balance. When his body does not own proper humor fluids, the condition leads abnormal temperament. And the abnormality is balanced by laughter. In modern usage, the term 'humor' is used to denote

'anything comic or anything that makes people laugh' (Encyclopedia Britannica, 1970: 841). Humor as a stimulant could touch the feeling of its participants. Humor can be used as a tool to express idea, thought, and feeling so it will touch humor's objection. It can also serve as a self-defense mechanism in confrontation without vulgar words or physical contact. In addition, it can be used to reduce mental stress and relax one's mind. However, not all laughable things are humor.

People may laugh at an incident on the street, at weird people, or at a wrongdressed lady in a party, but they are not humor. Being purposely made

should be the criteria of humor. Therefore, humor can be better defined as anything that is purposely made to make people laugh (Audrieth,1998:3-4).

There are two kinds of humor; they are verbal humor and non-verbal humor. The verbal humor exploits some verbal elements such as words, phrases, and sentences; while the other makes use of behavior, kinesics, and so forth.

According to Anthony L. Audrieth (1998:5-19), humor is defined as ‘the mental faculty of discovering, expressing, or appreciating the ludicrous or absurdly incongruous. Ludicrous is an adjective meaning amusing or laughable through obvious absurdity, incongruity, exaggeration, or eccentricity. He gives some types of humor, namely adviser, anecdotes, antonymism, aside, banter, blend word, biogram, blue humor, blunder, blunting, bonehead, boners, bon mot, bull, burlesque, caricature, the catch tale, chain, Confucian saying, conundrum, cumulative, double blunder, epigram, exaggerism, extended proverb, fool’s query, Freudian slip, gag, goldwynism, the hecklerism, hyperbole, irony, joke, the little Willie, malapropism, marshallism, mistaken identity, nonsenism, parkerism, parody, pendulum, the personifier, the practical joke, pun, recovery, the relapse, repartee, reversible, round, sarcasm, satire, situational humor, slanting, spoonerism, switching, tall tale, twist, wit, the typographical error, under statement, wellerism, wise crack, wit, and word play.

However, not all types of humor are found in the comedy show, especially for the types which exclude any context of situation. These types of humor usually are just formed by funny words which need no certain knowledge of background situation to understand the meaning of the humor. They also

involve no participants and dialogue in them. Here, the researcher will only use the types of humor which include certain situation as a base to get clearer understanding about the meaning of the humor. In this case, the humor will involve some participants which connected in a conversation with certain context of situation. The other types which only use a link of words with no participants and situation will be excluded. The types of humor which will be used are as follow:

- (1) Partical Joke, jokes are put into action. The trick is played on others and the humor comes from what is going on, and oral form
- (2) Recovery, combination of errors and intelligence, when people do errors and to overcome the mistakes and save himself he make corrections quickly, this is the humor
- (3) Repertee, includes clever replies. A common form of humor is insulted, flouted
- (4) Switching, common form of humor is a major part of a change story, or deviate from what is being discussed
- (5) Wisecrak, form any intelligent comments about a particular thing or other

2.1.6 YKS- Yuk Keep Smile

Yuk Keep Smile is a comedy show in Trans TV, it showed at 8.00- 10.30 pm everyday. YKS has some of artist they are Olga, Rafi, Cinta, Denny, Wendy, Soimah, Bopak, Chand, Taraa and others. The researcher choose 3 parts episode for this study.

- Cinta Laura jadi Guru Bahasa Inggris- YKS 21-12-2013

- Olga jadi guru Bahasa Inggris- YKS 26-12-2013
- Denny jadi Guru Table Manner- YKS 26-12-2013

2.2 Related Studies

“Humor analysis in Opera Van Java Trans 7” by Trio Lukman Hakim
2012

Humor analysis in Opera Van Java use Maxim by Grice (1975), and code switching and code mixing theory by Wardaugh. In his thesis he found four kinds of Maxim flouted and two kinds of code switching. He also makes an analysis about the factors influencing code switching, i.e. participant, purpose, and place.

“Humor analysis in Empat Mata Talk Show” by Diah Asa Utari 2007

She concerned the research with the phenomenon of Empat Mata humor from its type of humor, development, and socio- cultural aspect. The purpose of the study was to reveal the phenomenon of Empat Mata humor from its type of humor, development, and socio- cultural aspect.