The Implicature of Humor Utterances in *Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur*

Anna Salisah Khusnita

Abstrak

The utterances produced by the speaker usually contain the certain meaning that is delivered indirectly by the speaker. Thereafter, the writer is interested to investigate the certain meaning that is delivered indirectly by the speaker. In this thesis, the writer uses the humor utterances of Gus Dur in the book *Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur* as the object of the analysis. In analyzing the data, the writer uses the implicature theory by Grice. Limitation in this research is the use of the implicature that is focused on the cooperative principle by Grice. The purpose of the research is to elaborate the implicit meaning of the utterances in the book *Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur*. The other purpose of this research is to show that there are the maxim violations created by speaker and to know the function of using the implicit meaning in the utterances. The implicit meaning can be classified to 4 types based on the illocution; they are *representative illocutionary act, expressive illocutionary act, directive illocutionary act, dan commisive illocutionary act*. Based on the analysis of the implicature meaning in the utterances, the writer found that the implicit meaning that is delivered by speaker has the functions, that are to give a humor effect, insinuate someone, criticize the government, mockery someone, and warn the reader.

Keyword: *Implicature, cooperative principle, representative illocutionary act, expressive illocutionary act, directive illocutionary act, dan commisive illocutinaryac.*

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

1.2.1. What are the implicature types of the utterances produced by the speaker in *Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur*?

1.2.2. What are the maxim violations produced by the speaker in *Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur*?

1.2.3. What are the functions of the utterances based on the implicature analysis?

1.3.   Purpose of the Study

1.3.1. To elaborate the types of implicatures of the utterances produced by speaker

1.3.2. To show that the speaker violated the maxim in using the utterances

1.3.3. 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. From three previous studies, all of data are analyzed using Grice's implicature theory. The analysis of those previous studies focuses on the conversational implicature and the violating of maxims. 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 analayzed 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.

2. Review of the Literature

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. 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 intend by violating the maxim. On the other hand, the implicature in an utterance can be identified by violating the maxim.

2.1.2 Maxim of Quantity

The maxim of quality 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.

2.1.3 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 (Gris the false and cannot prove the truth (Grice in Yule, 1996: 37)

2.1.3. 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. 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).

2.2.2. 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).

3. Research Method

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. The writer also uses the qualitative method to analyse the data. The writer makes conclsuion through the collected data that are described before.

3.2. Data, Population, and Sample

3.2.1. Data

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.

3.2.2. Population

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.

3.2.3. 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 uses documentation method in collecting the data in this thesis. Thereafter, the writer also uses note taking technique to collect the data. The procedures of collecting data are collecting the whole data in *Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur*, classifaying 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.

4. Analysis

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 massage. It should be cooperation between the speaker and the hearer in order to the massage 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
[1] "Loh kenapa anda berkerumun di sini?"
    Mereka terlihat sangat fasih berdoa, apalagi pakai serban, mereka itu pasti kiai"
>> In this conversation the hearers violated the quantity maxim. They provide information that has not been to be true.
>> 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 knowledge.

[2] Speaker   : "sampean tah ini radio Islami dari mana?"
    Hearer   : "Lha…, itu bacaanya 'all-transistor', pakai 'Al'"
>> In the data [2], the hearer violated the relation maxim. The word 'All-transistor' cannot be connected with 'Islamic radio' by Grice theory.
>> 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 decides that the hearer use the representative illocutionary act because he gives a 'conclusion' base 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
>> From the data [3] there is the maxim violation that is produced by Gus Dur. Gus Dur violated the quantity maxim because he does not give information 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 Hoegeng (mantan kepala polisi RI)"*. 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
[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
>> 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.
>> From the conversation above, the implicatrure 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 dislike 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".
>> From the speaker's answer, it appears that the speaker violated the quality maxim, because the speaker's idea may not necessarily be true.
>> 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. 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, jangankan untuk membeli BBM, untuk makan sehari-hari saja mereka sangat kesulitan."
>> In the data [6], there is the maxim violation that is produced by Gus Dur. Gus Dur violated the relation maxim, because he gives the irrelevant information.
>> The data [6] indicates the expression of 'sorrow'. In the statement *"Saya bilang, kasihan Indonesia, rakyatnya banyak yang miskin, jangankan untuk embeli BBM, untuk makan sehari-hari saja mereka sangat kesulitan"* 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
[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.
>> 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.
>> 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. 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."

>> From the conversation above, the hearer violated the quantity maxim. He gives information that more informative than is required by saying "*Mudah saja*".

>> 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.

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

>> 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.

>> 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 statetment. 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.

4.1.4. Commissive Illocutionary Act

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

>> 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*".

>> 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 commisive illocutionary act.

[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"

>> 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*".

>> From the data [11], the utterances indicate that the speaker makes an 'offering' to the hearer by saying "*Mom, do you like salad?*" The speech act that is created by participant is the commissive illocutionary act. In the commisive 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."

>> 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'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 threats the speaker to not ban him to stop smoking. 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

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

>> The implicature of teacher's answer is he assumes that he has to replay a massage 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 Gu Dur
"Eternit?" Tanya Gus Dur
"Itu yang pakai ada komputernya," jelasnya lagi.
"Ohh….Internet," jawab Gus Dur

>> 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
[3] "DPR dulu TK sekarang playgroup," kata Gus Dur

>>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."

>> 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
[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 menterinya mbok lebih baik beternak lebah, supaya kita tidak mengimpor lagi!" pinta Gus Dur.

>> 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."

>> 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
[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.

>> 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 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

[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."

>> 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.

>> 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.

5. Conclusion

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, commisive illocutionary act, and directive illocutionarytion 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 commisive illocutionary act, the expression of warn, suggestion, and request found in the uttarances. While in the directive illocutionary act, the writer found the expression of refusal, offering, and threatening in the uttarances.

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 creat 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 easy to the writer finding the implicature of the uttarancces. Actually, there is more appropriate theory to analyse the implicature of the uttarances. The theory is the relevance theory of Gan Sperber and Deirde 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 Penletian 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.