

THE FLOUTING OF MAXIMS RELATED TO ITS IMPLICATURE IN COMIC STRIPS

By

Jaufillaili

Swadaya Gunung Jati University

jaufillaili@yahoo.co.id

ABSTRACT

Humors are often used in a communication process. It is usually used as a medium for conveying messages intended for criticism. Through humor, people are capable to laugh at others who receive the messages as well as themselves in more objective ways. Since humors contain some specific messages, most of them usually break the rule of Maxim created by Grice. This article highlights the maxim broke by humors.

Keywords: flouting, maxim, jokes/humor, communication

Rationale

Communication is a popular concept that has been offered as a cure-all for most of society's ills. It is almost impossible to pick up a newspaper, or even take part in a conversation, without hearing the word communication. Every problem, personal or public, serious or trivial, has become a problem of communication, and everything we do, intentionally or not, is thought to communicate some hidden meaning (Trenholm, 1991:16).

Hidden meaning is usually contained in our daily conversation when we communicate to other people, and deliberately or not, sometimes we use jokes to deliver hidden messages in our conversation.

Humor or joke plays an important role in human life. It can lessen our burden and refresh our mind. We usually use humor or jokes to give certain information that might hurt the recipients

or cause the uncomfortable situation both to the speakers and listeners. Humor, joke, or even laughter can break the ice and neutralize the frozen conversation, like what Grotjahn says about laughter:

"Laughter [...] can be used to express an unending variety of emotions. It is based on guilt-free release of aggression, and any release makes us perhaps a little better and more capable of understanding one another, ourselves, and life. What is learned with laughter, learned well. Laughter gives freedom and freedom gives laughter" (qtd. in Raskin, 1985:9).

Humor or joke is considered as one of the useful communication tools in delivering information or feeling, especially criticism. Criticism conveyed through jokes or laughter is usually felt less painful than that delivered through conventional way.

Throughout the centuries, humor or jokes are also used as attraction to entertain people, such as drama, movie, advertisement, and so on. If people laugh at a particular performance, it means that they enjoy it. However, different people will not find something equally funny. It depends on their knowledge, culture, and experience. Raskin in his book *Semantic Mechanism of Humor* suggests that when somebody laughs, he or she finds the audial or visual stimulus funny (Raskin, 1985:1). It can be formed in funny situations, funny stories, even funny thoughts occur in daily life. He also states that:

Dealing with humor means dealing with universal human trait. Responding to humor is part of human behavior, ability, or competence, other parts of which comprise such important social and psychological manifestations of *Homo sapiens* as language, morality, logic, faith, etc. (Raskin, 1985:2)

Besides, through biological perspective, Koestler defines humor as:

In all its many-splendoured varieties, humor can be simply defined as a type of stimulation that tends to elicit the laughter reflex. Spontaneous laughter is a motor reflex produced by the coordinated contraction of 15 facial muscles in a stereotyped pattern and accompanied by altered breathing. Electrical stimulation of the main lifting muscle of the upper lip, the zygomatic major, with currents of varying intensity produces facial expression ranging from the faint smile through the board grin to the contortions

typical of explosive laughter (qtd. in Chiaro, 1992:5).

Based on the quotations above, the writer concludes that humor or joke is something, one considered funny, which makes him or her laugh.

Humor or jokes are created in various ways. One of them is a comic strip. The *Born Loser* is one of the humorous stories in the form of comic strips, published daily in newspaper. Attardo (1994:60) assumes that a large number of jokes usually break or flout one (or more) maxims. And to support the understanding of the flouting of maxims, the writer is also going to discuss the implicature of the jokes.

Based on the explanation above, the writer has taken *The Flouting of Maxims Related to Its Implicature in Comic Strips* as the title of her research.

Formulation of the Study

In her research, the writer analyzed the conversational jokes or humorous utterances taken from the characters in *The Born Loser* comic strips based on pragmatics perspectives (the flouting of maxims and implicature) and theories of humor (incongruity-based and disparagement-based theories of humor). Based on those perspectives, the writer examined the research questions as follows:

1. How are the maxims flouted through commenting on irrelevant aspects?

2. How is the implicature creating the humorous effect of the jokes?
3. How is the theory of humor related to the jokes?

Theoretical Review

The theories used in this research is theory of the flouting of maxims, theory of conversational implicature, and theories of humor (incongruity-based and disparagement-based theories of humor)

Maxims

There is a set of over-arching assumptions guiding the conduct of conversation. These arise, it seems, from basic rational considerations and may be formulated as guidelines for the efficient and effective use of language in conversations to further co-operative ends (Levinson, 2000:102)

Those guidelines are well known as The Cooperative Principles, which touch on four areas of communication described by Maxims or general principles underlying the cooperative and effective conversation. Grice states these principles as follows (Black, 2006:23):

Maxim of Quantity:

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

Maxim of Quality:

Try to make your contribution one that is true.

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate of evidence.

Maxim of Relation:

Be relevant.

Maxim of Manner:

Be perspicuous

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief.
4. Be orderly.

Those maxims above suggest what participants have to do in order to communicate honestly, relevantly, and clearly while providing sufficient information.

Conversational Implicature

Mey (1993:99) defines a conversational implicature as something, which is implied in conversation, that is, something that is left implicit in actual language use.

There are two kinds of conversational implicatures. First is generalized conversational implicatures. These implicatures are those that arise without any particular context or special scenario being necessary. Consider the example below:

- (a) *I walked into the house.*
- (b) *The house was not my house.*

(Taken from Levinson, 2000:126)

In the example above when someone says (a) then he/she shall be taken to implicate (b). Thus, there seems to be a generalized conversational implicature from such expression.

Second is particularized implicatures, which do require such specific contexts. Let us consider the example below:

(a) *The dog is looking very happy.*

(b) *Perhaps the dog has eaten the roast beef.*

(c) Q : *What on earth has happened to the roast beef?*

A : *The dog is looking very happy.*

(Levinson, 2000:126)

The sentence (a) will only implicate (b) if (a) occurs in the particular sort of setting, which is illustrated in (c). According to Grundy (1995:45), the differences between generalized and particularized implicature will turn out to be a very important one for this reason: if all implicatures were particularized, one could reasonably argue that the single maxim of relation, was sufficient to account for all implicature. On the other hand, generalized conversational implicature has little or nothing to do with the most relevant understanding of an utterance.

According to Levinson, conversational implicature plays a principle role in linguistics theory. It is important that we understand its properties and thus we have some sound ways in distinguishing implicatures from other kinds of

semantic and pragmatic inferences. Implicatures exhibit the following four major distinguishing properties:

(i) *Cancellability (or defeasibility)*

An inference is defeasible if it is possible to cancel it by adding some additional premises to the original ones. Consider the example below:

(a) *If Socrates is a man, he is mortal.*

(b) *Socrates is a man, therefore,*

(c) *Socrates is mortal.*

(Levinson, 2000:114).

If the two premises (a) and (b) are true, then whatever else is true or false, (c) is true (Levinson, 2000:114).

(ii) *Non-detachability (or inference based on meaning rather than form)*

By this, Grice means that the implicature is attached to the semantics content of is said, not to linguistics form, and therefore implicatures cannot be detached from an utterance simply by changing the words of the utterance for synonyms (qtd. In Levinson, 2000:116).

(iii) *Calculability*

Implicatures should be possible to construct an argument showing how from the literal meaning or the sense of the utterance on the one hand, and the cooperative principle and the maxims on the other, it follows that an addressee would make the inference in

question to preserve the assumption of co-operation (Levinson, 2000:117).

(iv) *Non-calculability*

It means that implicatures are not part of the conventional meaning of linguistics expressions.

Based on the explanation above, therefore, the analysis of this research will only take the latter kind of implicature, namely conversational implicature.

Incongruity-Based Theory of Humor

The idea of this theory was introduced first time by Schopenhauer. He states that:

The cause of laughter in every case is simply the sudden perception of the incongruity between the concept and the real objects, which have been thought through it in some relation, and the laugh itself is just the expression of this incongruity (qtd. In Raskin, 1985:31).

Various researchers then, characterize this approach with *inappropriateness*, *paradox*, and *dissimilarity*. Some of them have emphasized that two incongruent components are brought together, synthesized, and made similar. Beattie gives statements related to this theory as follow:

Laughter arises from the view of two or more inconsistent, unsuitable, or incongruous parts, or circumstances, considered as united in complex object or assemblage, or as acquiring a sort of mutual relation from the peculiar manner in which the mind takes notice of them (qtd. In Raskin, 1985:32).

For further understanding, let us consider an example below:

"Is the doctor at home?" the patient asked in his bronchial whisper.

"No." the doctor's young and pretty wife whispered in reply, "Come right in."
(American, 20th century, qtd. In Raskin, 1985:32)

It is obvious that the patient in this joke wants to see the doctor. The invitation to come in when the doctor himself is not in seems inappropriate or incongruous to such a situation, however, for adult people, this weirdness can be highly congruous in certain sense. In the example above, the fact that the doctor's wife is young and pretty actually is not important at all to the initial situation. The fact that the patient whispers is explained by his illness. The fact that she whispers, while left unexplained, will not necessarily puzzle the hearer too much.

According to Raskin, however, the incongruity of the invitation in this joke switches things over immediately, and the situation of adultery is imposed on the hearers who will fail to get the joke if they do not recognize that new situation. The two situations are similar to the extent that they overlap. Their overlap is related to the invitation to come in which would have been the same also if the doctor had been at home.

The two overlapping scripts are perceived as opposite in a certain sense. However, it is this oppositeness, which creates the punch line of the

joke. Chiaro (1992:48) states the punch line (the surprise in jokes) as follows:

The punch is the point at which the recipient either hears or sees something which is in some way incongruous with the linguistic or semantic environment in which it occurs but which at first sight had not been apparent.

Related to the statement above, Ritcher gives comments that a favorite definition of joking has long been the ability to find similarity between dissimilar things that is hidden similarities (qtd. In Raskin, 1985:32).

Rothbart and Pien define four different possibilities resulting from the combination of two categories of incongruity and two categories of resolution (qtd. In Raskin, 1985: 33):

1. *Impossible incongruity*: elements that are unexpected and also impossible given one's current knowledge of the world.
2. *Possible incongruity*: elements that are unexpected or improbable but possible, for example, a dignified man slipping on a banana peel.
3. *Complete resolution*: the initial incongruity follows completely from resolution information.
4. *Incomplete resolution*: the initial incongruity follows from resolution information in some way, but is not made completely meaningful because the situation remains impossible.

Disparagement-Based Theory of Humor

This approach is based on *hostility, superiority, malice, aggression, derision, or disparagement*. Thomas Hobbes claims that:

The passion of laughter is nothing else but sudden glory arising from sudden conception of some eminency in our selves, by comparison with the infirmity of others, or with our own formerly: for men laugh at the follies of themselves past, when they come suddenly to remembrance, except they bring with them any present dishonour (qtd. In Raskin, 1985:36).

A long time before Hobbes, Plato maintains that malice or envy is at the root of comic enjoyment and that we laugh at the misfortunes of other for joy that we do not share them (qtd. In Raskin, 1985:36). There are several experts more such as Cicero, Bain, Hegel, Fischer, Suls, etc. who give statements to this class of theory. Most of them agree that disparagement-based theory of humor based on the observation that we laugh at other people's infirmities, especially those who are our enemies.

There are some different terms of this theory such as superiority theory, vicarious superiority theory (introduced by Zillman and Cantor). All of them are focused on humor communication in which one party is disparaged or aggressed by another party (Raskin, 1985:37).

Method and Technique of Study

The method used to analyze the jokes or humorous utterances in this research is a

descriptive method. John W. Creswell says that qualitative research is **descriptive** in that the researcher is interested in process, meaning, and understanding gained through words or pictures (1994:145).

The writer searches the data from an English newspaper, **The Jakarta Post**, published during the period of July 2008 – March 2009. There are 50 comic strips entitled *The Born Loser* taken as the data.

In this research, the data obtained are analyzed using Grice's Theory of Cooperative Principle and Maxims, Grice's Theory of Implicature and Theories of Humor (Incongruity-Based Theory and Disparagement-Based Theory of Humor). The steps in analyzing the data are as follows:

- The writer takes the selected editions of *The Born Loser* comic strips as a source of data.
- All data are classified into four groups of flouts exploiting maxims and several groups of flouts necessitated by a clash between maxims.
- Having finished with the flouting of maxims, the writer provides a range of implicatures from the humorous utterance and takes one of them which is the most appropriate for the punch line of the jokes.
- The next step of analysis is to classify each data based on general theories of humor (incongruity-based theory and disparagement-based theory).

- At the end of the analysis, the writer draws some tables for the research findings, including kinds, numbers, percentages of flouting maxims, and classification of humor theories.

Findings and Discussions

The followings are some examples of data analysis taken from the writer's thesis:

• Flouts Exploiting the Maxim of Quantity

Data A-2

Gladys : *Time for bed!*

Wilberforce : *Aw, can't I stay up late? It's Saturday!*

Gladys : *That depends on how late you mean – ten-thirty, eleven, eleven-thirty, Midnight?*

Wilberforce : *How about till midnight-thirty?*

(*The Born Loser*, **The Jakarta Post**, February 28, 2009)

In data A-2 above, Wilberforce's mother, Gladys, asks her son to go to bed. Wilberforce wants to stay up late since it is Saturday. His mother, then, gives him choices about the time; ten-thirty, eleven, eleven-thirty, or midnight? Wilberforce's last utterance – '*How about till midnight-thirty?*' is the punch line of the joke which provokes laughter. The punch line of the joke (Wilberforce's last utterance) flouts the maxim of **quantity** since Wilberforce does not make his contribution as informative as is

required. His mother gives him choices, but Wilberforce does not take any choices given by his mother. He answers ‘...midnight-thirty’ which is not available in the option.

In line with the explanation above, several implicit meanings may be derived from Wilberforce’s last utterance as follow:

- Wilberforce does not understand the time
- Wilberforce wants to stay up longer than the usual time given by his mother
- Wilberforce always stays up late on Saturdays

When we take a look at Gladys’ second utterance – ‘*That depends on how late you mean – ten-thirty, eleven, eleven-thirty, midnight?*’ it shows Wilberforce that the longer time is marked by the word ‘thirty’. The longest time given by his mother is ‘midnight’, so Wilberforce says, ‘*How about till midnight-thirty?*’ It means that he wants to stay up longer than the time given by his mother. Based on the situation on data A-2, the most appropriate implicature is point (b).

Wilberforce uses uncommon term ‘midnight-thirty’ in his utterance, however it provokes readers’ laughter. The use of the uncommon term is incongruous with the question, since there is no ‘midnight-thirty’ in the time-list. Commonly people will say ‘twelve thirty’.

In line with the explanation above, the conversational joke in data A-2 is categorized into the **incongruity**-based theory of humor.

• Flouts Exploiting the Maxim of Quality

Data B-6

Brutus : *So then, I told him...*

(Mother Gargle is yawning)

Brutus : *Does my conversation bore you?*

Mother Gargle: *Let me put it this way – if you were on TV,*

I’d be reaching for the remote!

(*The Born Loser*, **The Jakarta Post**, October 16, 2008)

In data B-6 above, Brutus is telling something to his mother-in-law, Ramona Gargle. As we know that, mother Gargle does not like Brutus. Although Brutus is talking to her, she shows him that she is not interested in listening his story. When Brutus asks her whether his conversation bores her, mother Gargle answers, ‘*Let me put it this way – if you were on TV, I’d be reaching for the remote!*’ Through her utterance, actually mother Gargle wants to tell Brutus that his conversation is really boring. But she does not tell the truth about it. Mother Gargle’s utterance, at the last line of the joke, flouts the maxim of **quantity**.

Mother Gargle’s utterance in data B-6 considers Brutus as if he is on TV. And when he is on TV, mother Gargle will be reaching for the remote. She does not tell further what she is going to do with the TV remote. But soon readers read her utterance and understand the implied meaning, they will laugh.

In line with the explanation above, readers may derive some implicit meanings, as follows:

- a. Brutus' conversation is interesting
- b. Brutus' conversation is boring
- c. Brutus should be on TV to tell his story

The most appropriate implicature of data B-6 is point (b) Brutus' conversation is boring. Mother Gargle's utterance at the last line of data B-6 is the punch of the joke. It causes readers' laughter.

The relationship between Brutus and Ramona Gargle, as his mother in-law, is not harmonious. Although Brutus has tried to be so nice to her but she still hates him. From their relationship and from mother Gargle's utterance at the last line of the joke, we know that mother Gargle disparages Brutus. Therefore the joke in data B-6 is categorized into the **disparagement**-based theory of humor.

• Flouts Exploiting the Maxim of Relation

Data C-8

Rancid : *Surprise – a new, ultra-lightweight laptop to take in the field!*

Rancid : *Make sure you load all the company data from your desktop computer on to it.*

Brutus : *Gee Chief, won't all that data make the laptop too heavy?*

(*The Born Loser*, **The Jakarta Post**, March 9, 2009)

The conversation in data C-8 takes place in the office. Rancid Veeblefester – Brutus

Thornapple's boss, is showing Brutus a new ultra-lightweight laptop. He, then, gives it to Brutus and asks him to load all the company data from his desktop computer on to it.

The character of Brutus in this comic is considered as an inferior, not a smart one. So, when his boss asks him to load all the company data from his desktop computer on the new laptop, soon Brutus thinks that there are too many data of the company that will make the laptop heavier and it will not be considered as an ultra-lightweight laptop anymore. As we know that no matter how many data are put into the laptop, the laptop's weight will not change. It will remain the same. Brutus' last utterance in data C-8 flouts the maxim of **relation** since it is not relevant with what Rancid has said in the previous utterance.

At a glance when we read the joke in data C-8, we might assume that Brutus is thinking that all data on the desktop are the books, letters, documents, etc., which are on his real desk. So, if they are loaded on the new laptop, it will be too heavy. But if we think further, although Brutus is not considered as a smart person, it is quite impossible for him, who has worked for years in the company, if he does not know the term 'data', 'load', and 'desktop'. Therefore from Brutus' utterance, readers may derive some implicit meanings, as follows:

- a. Brutus is not able to load the data
- b. Brutus does not want to do his boss' instruction

- c. Brutus does not understand the instruction
- d. Brutus wants to make his boss a little bit upset

Based on the situation described in data C-8, the most appropriate implicature is (d) since Rancid – Brutus relationship, as a boss and an employee, is not good. In this case his boss is so proud of the new ultra-lightweight laptop, so Brutus wants to tease him by saying, ‘*Gee Chief, won’t all that data make the laptop too heavy?*’

Brutus’ utterance at the last line of the joke seems irrelevant with the previous utterance said by Rancid. This irrelevancy brings the conversation into the incongruous situation. Based on the explanation above, the joke in data C-8 is categorized into the **incongruity**-based theory of humor.

• Flouts Exploiting the Maxim of Manner

Data D-2

Waiter : *Our special, today, is three alarm chili.*

Brutus : *Sounds good. Does anything come with that?*

Waiter : *Heartburn*

(*The Born Loser*, **The Jakarta Post**, Oct 21, 2008)

In data D-2, Brutus is going to have meals in a restaurant. The waiter’s first utterance ‘*Our special, today, is three alarm chili*’. The underlined phrase above is the name of the special menu of the restaurant. When Brutus asks ‘... *Does anything come with that?*’, the waiter, then answers ‘*Heartburn*’. The waiter’s second utterance flouts maxim of manner, since the term ‘*Heartburn*’ is ambiguous. The term, first, may

refer to the effect when eating the hot food (three alarm chili) or the second, it may refer to the name of other food which is usually served with the main course –three alarm chili.

The punch of the joke is the waiter’s second utterance –‘*Heartburn*’. From this utterance, readers may get the following implicatures:

- a. Heartburn is the name of the food served together with the main course –three alarm chili.
- b. Heartburn is the effect felt by those who are eating ‘three alarm chili’.

Based on the situation on data D-2, the most appropriate implicature is (a), namely, ‘heartburn’ is the name of the food served together with the main course –three alarm chili. Soon the implicature is understood by readers, it provokes laughter.

At a glance, the waiter’s second utterance seems incongruous with Brutus’ utterance. Readers may also interpret ‘heartburn’ as a disease or something like that. The incongruity will provoke laughter soon after it is understood by readers. Since the term ‘heartburn’ actually refers to the food served with the main course –three alarm chili. In line with the explanation above, the conversational joke in data D-2 is based on the **incongruity**-based theory of humor.

Conclusion

To know clearly the distribution of the maxims and the classification of humor theories of the fifty data collected, the writer draws the following tables:

Table 1 Classification of the data based on the Maxims and the Humor Theories

No	Data Code	Flouting Maxims				Classification of Humor Theory	
		Quan (A)	Qual (B)	Relation (C)	Manner (D)	Incongruity-Based Theory	Disparagement-Based Theory
1	A-1	✓	—	—	—	✓	—
2	A-2	✓	—	—	—	✓	—
3	B-1	—	✓	—	—	—	✓
4	B-2	—	✓	—	—	—	✓
5	B-3	—	✓	—	—	✓	—
6	B-4	—	✓	—	—	—	✓
7	B-5	—	✓	—	—	—	✓
8	B-6	—	✓	—	—	—	✓
9	B-7	—	✓	—	—	✓	—
10	B-8	—	✓	—	—	✓	—
11	B-9	—	✓	—	—	—	✓
12	B-10	—	✓	—	—	—	✓
13	B-11	—	✓	—	—	—	✓
14	B-12	—	✓	—	—	✓	—
15	B-13	—	✓	—	—	✓	—
16	B-14	—	✓	—	—	✓	—
17	B-15	—	✓	—	—	✓	—
18	B-16	—	✓	—	—	✓	✓
19	B-17	—	✓	—	—	—	✓
20	B-18	—	✓	—	—	—	✓
21	C-1	—	—	✓	—	✓	—
22	C-2	—	—	✓	—	✓	—
23	C-3	—	—	✓	—	✓	—
24	C-4	—	—	✓	—	✓	—
25	C-5	—	—	✓	—	✓	—
26	C-6	—	—	✓	—	✓	—
27	C-7	—	—	✓	—	✓	—
28	C-8	—	—	✓	—	✓	—
29	C-9	—	—	✓	—	✓	—
30	C-10	—	—	✓	—	✓	—
31	D-1	—	—	—	✓	✓	—
32	D-2	—	—	—	✓	✓	—
33	D-3	—	—	—	✓	✓	—
34	AB	✓	✓	—	—	✓	—
35	AC	✓	—	✓	—	✓	—
36	AD	✓	—	—	✓	✓	—
37	BC-1	—	✓	✓	—	✓	—
38	BC-2	—	✓	✓	—	✓	✓
39	BC-3	—	✓	✓	—	✓	—
40	BC-4	—	✓	✓	—	✓	—
41	BC-5	—	✓	✓	—	✓	✓
42	BC-6	—	✓	✓	—	✓	✓
43	BD-1	—	✓	—	✓	✓	—
44	BD-2	—	✓	—	✓	—	✓
45	CD	—	—	✓	✓	✓	—
46	ABC-1	✓	✓	✓	—	—	✓
47	ABC-	✓	✓	✓	—	✓	—

	2						
48	ACD	✓	—	✓	✓	✓	—
49	BCD	—	✓	✓	✓	✓	—
50	ABCD	✓	✓	✓	✓	—	✓
TOTAL		9	31	23	10	37	17

We can also observe the exact number of flouts which exploit a maxim and flouts necessitated by a clash between maxims in table 2 below:

Table 2 The Total Numbers of Flouts which exploit a maxim and Flouts necessitated by a clash between maxims

FLOUTS EXPLOITING MAXIMS				FLOUTS NECESSITATED BY A CLASH BETWEEN MAXIMS											
A	B	C	D	A	A	A	B	B	C	A	A	A	BC	ABC	
				B	C	D	C	D	D	B	B	C	D	D	
										C	D	D			
2	18	10	3	1	1	1	6	2	1	2	0	1	1	1	

Note:

1. A : Maxim of Quantity
2. B : Maxim of Quality
3. C : Maxim of Relation
4. D : Maxim of Manner
5. AB : Maxim of Quantity – Quality
6. AC : Maxim of Quantity – Relation
7. AD : Maxim of Quantity – Manner
8. BC : Maxim of Quality – Relation
9. BD : Maxim of Quality – Manner
10. CD : Maxim of Relation – Manner
11. ABC : Maxim of Quantity – Quality – Relation
12. ABD : Maxim of Quantity – Quality – Manner
13. ACD : Maxim of Quantity – Relation – Manner
14. BCD : Maxim of Quality – Relation – Manner
15. ABCD : Maxim of Quantity – Quality – Relation – Manner

Based on the explanation above, the writer draws the following conclusions:

1. The maxims in the jokes are flouted through commenting on irrelevant aspects, such as Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. The jokes marked by letter A only, are flouted the maxim of Quantity since they are less informative than are required. The maxim of Quality are flouted in the jokes since most data marked by letter B are lack adequate of evidence. All data marked by letter C are flouted the maxim of Relation since they are not relevant and most data marked by letter D are flouted the maxim of Manner since they are ambiguous.
2. The implicature is creating the humorous effect of the jokes by hiding similarity between dissimilar things – that is hidden similarities.
3. The jokes focus on the incongruous utterances among the characters and the disparagement of other characters considered as the enemy or the weak one. We can observe the characters' utterances to decide whether the jokes are categorized into incongruity-based or disparagement-based theories of humor as discussed in the previous pages.

References

- Attardo, S. (1994). *Linguistics Theories of Humor*. Ed. Victor Raskin, Mahadev Apte. Berlin: Mouton
- Black, E. (2006). *Pragmatics Stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Chiaro, D. (1992). *The Language of Jokes: Analyzing Verbal Play*. London: Routledge.
- Cresswell, J. W. (1994). *Research Design: Qualitative & Quantitative Approaches*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Dukut, E. M. (2001). Comic Strips: "A Reflection of the American Spirit." *Celt*. Vol. 2 (67-77)
- Gazdar, G. (1979). *Pragmatics: Implicature, Pressure and Logical Form*. London: Academic Press.
- Grundy, P. (1995). *Doing Pragmatics*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principle of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. (2000). *Presumptive Meaning: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicatures*. Cambridge: The MIT.
- Mey, J. L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Raskin, V. (1985). *Semantic Mechanism of Humor*. Vol. 24 Dordrecht: D.Reidel.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction*. New York: Longman.
- Trenholm, S. (1991). *Human Communication Theory*. 2nd ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Wray, A., et al. (1998). *Projects in Linguistics*. London: Arnold.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. 5th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

About the Author

Jauffillaili is currently working as the Head of the Dept. of English Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Educational Sciences (FKIP), Unswagati University, Cirebon. She completed her undergraduate program and earned B.A. in English Education from Unswagati University and Master in Linguistics from Padjadjaran University, Bandung. In addition to working as the Head of the department, she is also teaching linguistics courses. Her main research interest is in linguistics and language learning.