



INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
LINGUISTICS & CULTURAL STUDIES

This

CERTIFICATE

is awarded to

M. Dalyan Tahir

for having participating as a

PRESENTER

in The First International Conference on Linguistics and Cultural Studies 2019
organized by the Faculty of Cultural Sciences Hasanuddin University
virtual conference held on November 1-2, 2019 at Arthama Hotels Makassar



Prof. Dr. Akin Duli, M.A.
Dean, Faculty of Cultural Sciences
Hasanuddin University



DIMENSIONS OF HUMOR UTILIZATION AMONG THE BUGIS ETHNIC

By:

M. Dalyan, Muhammad Darwis, Ade Yolanda Latjuba, Munirah Hasyim,
Hunaeni Hunaeni, Ashima Cakka Mayura

m.dalyan1964@gmail.com, hamdarwis@gmail.com, aylatjuba@gmail.com

Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Hasanuddin University Perintis Kemerdekaan Km 10, Tamalanrea, Makassar
90245, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The problem of this study begins with the observation of the rise of Bugis ethnic humor on various occasions. That fact, is very different from the stereotypes nuanced "hard" embedded in the ethnic Bugis. This study aims to describe the dimensions of the use of humor in accordance with the values and local culture of the Bugis community. The data is a Tongeng (Lecco-lecco Ada) Bugis Lise community. Data analysis was performed using content and context analysis techniques while still considering semantic and pragmatic aspects to explore the meaning of linguistic elements and the problem of differences in responses or logic games between participants. The results of data analysis show that Bugis ethnic humor according to the context of the situation suggests the following dimensions of usefulness; (1) Entertainment, (2) Education, (3) Self-defense, (4) Self-introspection, (5) Eliminating formality, (6) Smoothing social relations, (7) Demonstrating Speech Skill, (8) Persuading, (9) Beat Friend Talk.

Keywords: Humor, dimensions of benefits, ethnic Bugis

A. Introduction

Historically jokes have been a part of human culture since at least 1900 BC. This was discovered by the discovery of a note about a ridiculous joke by the Sumerians which was said to be the oldest joke on earth. The latest discoveries from an ancient document titled "Philogelos" (Lovers of Jokes) have given a new perspective on the position of jokes in human life. The Greek humor document, written by Hiorekles and Philagrius around the 3rd or 4th century AD contains about 260 jokes. Seeing this rapid development until the 19th century, it can be concluded that humor has indeed become a part of culture and has a central role in human life (Yulianto, 2010: 16; Wijana, 2003: 3)

Humor is not only known in the world of entertainment, but also in the world of politics, education, religion, association. In fact, humor exists in every ethnicity, as is the case with the Buginese who live in Lise Village, Panca Riajang District, Sidrap Regency. This group of people, known for their expertise using 'Tongeng' the accuracy of words' and *Lecco-lecco Ada* 'play on words' in everyday communication. That is reflected in the motto of the Lise "lebbi maté temmanré namaté temmappao (u)" 'better not to eat than not talk' (it is better to die not to eat than to die not to speak). According to them, a person who cannot speak means to die. Maybe his mind is dead, his steps are dead. In fact, it's possible to die in the sense of not living. As long as humans are still able to talk, it means that they are not dead. If he just doesn't eat, he can still try to survive anyway. At least he can talk to ask others for help to meet their needs. Therefore, speaking expertise is considered important by the Lise community (Pertiwiningsih, 2000: 5).

The naming of the speech types in the *Tongeng* is conceptual for the Lise community. The term *Ada Tongeng* is translated as 'word accuracy'. *Ada Tongeng* is a unique form of speech because of its witty nature. The accuracy of the interpretation requires several conditions, namely (1) harmony of taste, (2)

ways of thinking quickly, (3) right, (4) knowledge and understanding of a broad and deep context, (5) seem humorous. A *Tongeng* is a form of speech that contains anecdotal matters. Anecdotal nature that can be attached to the character, how to solve problems, goals, and emotional expression that is summarized as the contents of an anecdote (Tarone, 1988: 45-46).

There is an assumption by the non-Lise Bugis community that, it is necessary to be careful when talking to Lise people, especially if you want to ask something, such as the following speech:

A: *Dek ga muitai bolana Pak Desa?*
(You didn't see the village sir?)

B: *Iye, dek uitai.*
(Yes, I didn't see)

That said, the question was asked by a stranger (A) to a resident of Lise Village (B). The question was spontaneously answered by *dek uitai* 'I did not see' deck, even though the questioner had confirmed that the speech partner knew the village head's house. Oddly, such an answer is justified by every resident of Lise. It is different, if the word *muwitai* is replaced by the word *muwissengi* 'you know'. Thus, the root of the problem is the word *ita*. In the analysis, such words are seated as the 'nucleus' nucleus which is driving the formation of antics and semantic relations. If related to the context, the word can reveal a number of linguistic phenomena. Whatever code they use to convey that there are tongs remains valid as there are tongs that they have known from generation to generation as part of culture. Culture is attitude, attitude is the soul that continues to manifest in a form that may be different (Atmowiloto, 1989: 8).

The different principles of perspective can create the impression of "wrong" towards someone. Likewise, something happened to *Ada Tongeng* version of the Bugis community in Lise. Other Bugis consider this kind of speaking to be childish, regarded as an attempt to attract excessive attention, but sometimes the context also fits. The Bugis refer to such behavior and manner of speaking as *konok-konokeng* (Pertiwingsih, 2000: 5).

Each unit of information has a core tonic which is the largest melodic movement and implies the most prominent meaning as the center of information (Halliday, 1992: 31). Basically, there are not all elements of *Ada Tongeng* contain humor. The cuteness only lies in a certain part that distinguishes the character of the speech between other daily utterances. That part is the core *Ada Tongeng*. In the example above, the words in bold (*ita*) are what is meant by the core there is *Ada Tongeng* because that is the part that stimulates the occurrence of a *Ada Tongeng*.

Based on the background described above, the following research problems can be formulated; what are the benefits of humor for the Bugis ethnicity in lise village, Panca Lautang district, Sidrap district? This research theoretically aims to describe the benefits of humor for the Bugis ethnicity in Lise Village, Panca Riajang District, Sidrap Regency. The results of this study, are expected to provide benefits in discourse analysis courses especially studies of humorous discourse on Bugis languages. In addition, it is also expected to be able to broaden students and society in general in thinking logically to express statements and utterances of humor for the benefit of daily education.

B. Theory

1. Discourse Analysis

Zelling Harris (1952) published his thoughts related to Discourse Analysis. He was interested in the contribution of linguistic elements in the expanded text (McCarthy, 1991: 5). In that case, Harris was influenced by Malinowsky's concept of the relationship between the text and his social situation. His attention was not focused on the study of discourse, but on the expansion of the study of syntactic transformation theory. Pike in Hoey (1983: 2) is aware of the importance of analysis of greater unity of sentences.

Discourse analysis is a branch of linguistics with a new and integrated outlook. The analysis does not stop at monologue texts, but also handles various forms of conversation discourse in verbal communication from various cultures (Cahyono, 1995: 230). Discourse analysis is the study of language above the level of sentences or clauses, in the use of language in certain social contexts, and interactions between speakers of languages (Stubbs, 1987: 1). The study is a study of various language functions that require pragmatic analysis tools. Context, the interconnectedness of discourse between supalimatal and

supracalimat discourse needs to be considered for the sake of communication accuracy (Tarigan, 1987: 24). Language study is not enough to master formal forms of language, but also mastery of language forms related to the purpose and content of communication, both verbal and nonverbal communication (Wahyuni, 2018: 248). In discourse analysis, social context is seen as a factor that influences the form and meaning of speech (Kripendorff, 1991: 23).

Discourse analysis is developed by the principles of local interpretation and analogies. The first principle can guide understanding so as not to get out of context. The second principle, is a guide to interpreting discourse based on a discourse that is well known or mastered (Wahab, 1990: 60). The results of the use of the principle of local interpretation are determined by the knowledge and ability of discourse analysis. By using this principle, listeners are expected to immediately understand the new discourse from various aspects. The listener's experience is similar, allowing him to determine the speaker's intent.

The nature of the discourse is very contextual, meaning that a discourse can not be separated from the culture of the community that produced the discourse. To be able to analyze a discourse, we need various tools both related to linguistics, and those related to things outside of linguistics. The analytical tools commonly used can be syntactic - which certainly cannot ignore semantics - and is pragmatic. Tools that are syntactic include; reference-inference, cohesion-coherence, topics, themes, and so on. Analysis tools that are pragmatic and useful in this study are knowledge of the world, presuppositions, implicature, and context of the situation as its glue.

Prejudice is what the speaker assumes is true and counts as what the listener knows. Presuppositions are the basis of the same interparticipant footing (Brown & Yule, 1996: 29). The term is parallel to the 'forecast' presupposition in English. Presuppositions are used in situations or exclusive sentences with meanings different from what is said, and must be analyzed based on the type of logical relationship with the statement. (Crystal, 1987: 244).

The implication comes from to imply "wrap something in something else" which is derived from the Latin *plicare* "wrap" (Mey, 1993: 99). The term is used to interpret the intent of the speaker who does not directly state the desired thing (Palmer, 1986: 173). Implications are interpretations of the meaning of discourse by the listener. Implications are divided into conventional and conversational implicatures (Brown & Yule, 1996: 31). 1. Conventional implicature, that is implicature in accordance with agreement (knowledge) 2. Conversational implicature, very conditional in nature.

Knowledge about the world is the knowledge that speakers of a language have about social and cultural interactions to sustain interpretation. The process of interpreting discourse is based on the principle of simple analogies on past experience. The experience of the world is permanent, but it develops and has adaptability. For example, experience about the world of meetings remains in the form of efforts to find word agreements from the guests. The development, somewhere may be held at night with an agreement of 80% of the audience due to certain considerations. Human experience and knowledge is very much, so it needs to be selected according to what the discourse needs.

Schemata is a way to realize the limits of knowledge according to the reality of language called the structure of conjecture. Schemes do not belong to the text, but rather to humans to create and interpret discourse; for example interpretation of location, time, involvement, etc. Its form is a permanent prototype, active, so it can develop in a variety of discourse subjects. As a complex and conventional structure of high level knowledge, schemata function as a ladder to reach ideas in compiling and interpreting experiences. The disadvantage, if researchers pay less attention to the speaker or speaker factor (Brown & Yule, 1996: 247-250).

The context of the situation can change the meaning of speech, so it should be seated as an umbrella variable determining the meaning of discourse. The context of discourse that helps interpret the meaning of speech is the situation of discourse. Contexts can be grouped, into linguistic or contextual contexts and nonlinguistic contexts. The nonlinguistic context is divided into physical groups (place, time) and socio-psychological groups; for example the participants' inner states, relationships between roles, etc. (Suyono, 1990: 20).

2. Humor

Humans are not just *homo sapiens*, humans are *homo ludens* who have a sense of humor. All human activities are games (Huizinga, 1990: vii). Playing is one of the permanent elements in all levels of

human life, pervading, and enlivening other fields of culture. Sense of humor in humans, is an overflow of feelings as outlined in the form of a joke or anecdote that can make humans smile or laugh. Sense of humor is a gift from "The Creator". Therefore, be happy for those who have it. According to Yulianto (2010: 22) with a tumor, the human brain rests for a moment to enjoy a pleasant entertainment while increasing the number of endorphins that can relieve pain naturally in the human body.

Something funny will make someone laugh. Therefore, everything that makes someone laugh must be funny. Thus, it can be concluded that humor is a symptom or stimulation both from within and from outside us towards something that makes us smile, tickle, and laugh mentally, attracting the attention of many people because of the peculiarities and irregularities that they cause. Stimuli that arises must be mental stimulation for laughter, not physical stimulation like a stir that brings a sense of amusement but not due to humor. Someone who feels the stimulation of humor will smile or laugh, giving rise to positive energy that makes him happy. Tension and worry will disappear or melt because of happiness (Suaib et al., 2019: 128).

Manser in Rahmanadji (2007: 215) divides the theory of humor into three groups, namely (1) the theory of superiority and disparaging, that is, if the laughing person is in a super position; while the object being laughed at is in a position of degradation (underestimated or insulted). Someone laughs when something is ridiculous and out of the ordinary. Ridiculous is defined as something that violates the rules or something that is very ugly. Jokes that make laugh, also contain a lot of hatred. Jokes always arise from mistakes or mistakes that are tempting and angry. We can laugh out loud when we see a comedian falling, stepping on his friend's feet and making various mistakes and stupidity; (2) theories regarding imbalance, hopelessness, and dissociation. funny feelings arise because we are faced with a situation that is completely unexpected or out of place suddenly, as a change in a situation that is expected. Hopes are confused, we are led to a totally different mental attitude. An example is the sense of humor that arises because we see cartoons that depict someone who is fishing and falls into a river or pond because his fishing line is pulled by a fish, (3) a theory of relief from tension or relief from pressure. Humor can arise from lies and deception. Humor can appear in the form of sympathy and understanding. Humor can be a symbol of relief from tension and pressure; can be a layman or elite expression; it can be serious like satire and cheap like street humor. When natural inner impulses get restrained, they can be released or loosened, for example through sex jokes, humorous insults or curses, feeling bursts into laughter.

In addition to the main function of language as a communication tool, language or discourse also functions for entertainment, supporting the needs of socializing, problem solving, expressing feelings, etc. (Grimes, 1975: 185). Philosophers and doctors state that humor and laughter can affect the physical and psychological. Humor has many functions, not only for health, but also for education and social functions. The function of humor proposed by Danandjaja (1986), namely: (1) as a means of social protest, (2) as a means of education, (3) as a means of entertainment and (4) as a medium to improve morals or morals. Attardo in Suaib et al. (2019: 129) explain the various functions of humor in social management and communication as follows; (1) as social control, (2) raising social norms, (3) as a face-seeker tool, (4) building a common foundation (5) intelligence. Humor requires extra processes so as to produce and understand humor is a form of intelligence, (6), humor as a regulator / management of discourse, (7) humor serves to strengthen social bonds, (8) humor serves as a tool to improve tense and rigid situations.

C. Method

This research is a qualitative descriptive study because it tries to describe the function of humor in *Ada Tongeng (Lecco-lecco Ada)* spoken by the people of Lise Village, Panca Riajang District, Sidrap Regency. Data collection techniques are the techniques of proficiency, listening, recording, and note taking from the oral conversation of Lise Village residents. The data and sample are anecdotal oral conversations determined purposively based on the many cultural contents of thought and social institutions supporting *Ada Tongeng*. Data analysis techniques in this study were conducted by (1) sorting out records and records containing *Ada Tongeng* as data, (2) classifying *Ada Tongeng* data according to its proximity to the researcher, as well as translating it. (3) identify the core parts of *Ada Tongeng*, (4) along with that, the structure of *Ada Tongeng* is analyzed thoroughly by using analysis tools and the context of the discourse mentioned above in the context of the speech situation concerned to obtain a description of

the actual function of *Ada Tongeng*, (5) The analysis uses two methods; (a) informal presentation methods are formulations that use ordinary words (Sudaryanto, 1993: 168).

D. The Humor Function for Buginese Ethnics

The humor function identified in this study is the main function and additive function contained in *Ada Tongeng*.

a. Entertainment

This fairytale setting (C006) is the period of Sidrap still controlled by a *datu* or king mentioned in K. 2; ... *akdatuangé Sidénréng* ... This discourse tells the twists and turns of Datu Sidenreng's voyage. During the voyage there were some thrilling events, but they were also ridiculous. According to the context, there are three events in the discourse. The first and second place occurred on the Makassar-Sidenreng voyage namely, in K. 1 ... *ko mélo lo Juppandang* ... *mallopimik* and K. 7 *mattengngangi lolok kappalaké* The third event occurred in the hometown of the perpetrators according to the information K. 24 *lettukna taué ku kampongé* ...

\ref C006 AMBO LESANG NA DATUE

- K.1 ero riolo ko melok lo juppandat taue mallopimik
(In the past, if we wanted to go to Ujungpandang, only take a boat)
- K.2 engkaro seddi wettu akdatuangnge sidenreng melok lo juppandang
(At one time, what Sidenreng needed at that time was going to Ujung Pandang)
-
- K.5 naakkada matuk ko loloknai lopic ku tasike na mitako bale
(He said, later when the ship has sailed in the sea and you see fish)
- sipakkua ajak ga makkampareng
(acting like this, don't reprimand)
- K.6 iko ambok lesang engkalingai ero
(You ambo Lesang, hear that!)
- K.7 ku tengngana tasike matengngangi lolok kappalake engkanai
(While the ship sailed in the middle of the sea came a few tails)
- lumba-lumbae mappakue:
(dolphins like this and this)
- K.8 pura nappitang ulunna nappasi
(After showing the head,)
- borina silellunglellung
(then reveals his butt, chasing each other)
- K.9 makkadanai ambok lesang hem namo
(Say Ambo Lesang, hem, though)
- mucua borimu dek ubatibatiko muasekgi
(You tilt your butt, I will not care, you will!)
-
- K.13 metteki datue panrei balangoe panrei balangoe ambok lesang
(Cried the king, feed the anchor, feed the anchor Ambo Lesang!)

-
- K.24 *lettukna taué ku kampongngé matteruk*
 (Arriving at the group in his village, immediately)
- ambok lesang tunu bembek nappasi tunu*
 (Ambo Lesang burns goats as well)
- rebbanna sibawa bola bolana punna bembeke*
 (the cage, follows the owner's house)
- K.25 *jaji mapparapei pakkampongngé*
 (As a result, report villagers)
- K.26 *makanre apie malingngi Ambok Lesang mattunu bolai*
 (There is a fire, crazy is Ambo Lesang, he set fire to the house)
- K.27 *makkada ambok lesang dek*
 (Ambo Lesang replies, ah no)
- K.28a *makkadami arungngé ko tolettuk salamak*
 (That's the king's order, if we arrive safely)
- K.29 *lesu salamak*
 (Home safe)
- K.28b *tomattunu bembek*
 (We burn the goat)
- K.30 *hahaha*
 (ha ha ha.)
- K.31 *jaji upajokkami parentana arungngé*
 (So I only carried out the king's order)

Consecutive below will be discussed the core of the discourse according to the sequence of events. The word *makkampareng* in the example (C006 K.5) by the speaker is translated as 'rebuke' which contains the meaning of 'issuing words or inviting talk'. Even though idea K.5 can paraphrase by ignoring, not responding, etc., it still does not utter words. While the speaker interpreted *makkampareng* narrowly as 'not reprimanding by issuing certain words'. According to custom, rebuking something because of his behavior is by issuing words for example; wow, funny, don't behave, ugly, etc.

The speaker is careful not to say the same words as above. But the dolphin with all his behavior attracted his attention too, so that there was a conflict between the desire to rebuke and not. The middle way, saying words other than that particular type, that is, ... *dek ubati-batiko* as contained in K.9.

The core of *Ada Tongeng* is the second associated with the emergence of dolphins. As a result of reprimands on the behavior of these fish, came a big wave hit their ship. The king immediately ordered Ambok Lesang to drop anchor metaphorically namely, K.13 ... *panréi balangoé* ... This second time also Ambok Lesang was again misinterpreted.

The concept of *panréi balangoé* is to lower the anchor and work for it to hook something. If the anchor has stuck to something, it can be likened to eating, in the sense of being functioning. By Ambok Lesang, the order was interpreted as feeding the anchor caught in the underside of the ship by throwing all the supplies outside the deck of the ship. As a result, the ship's side starved.

After the wave subsided, the king vowed that if he could arrive safely in his village, he would invite his entourage to eat grilled goats together. Once the entourage arrived, he ordered Ambok Lesang to burn goats. Again, Ambok Lesang misinterpreted as proven in K.27 ... *dék*, K.28 *makkadami arungngé* ..., and K.31 *upajokkami jaji* ...

The third core interpretation procedure is not much different from the second. The king's order *mattunu bémbék* was interpreted by Ambok Lesang to burn the goat alive. Incidentally he got a goat in his cage. Of course the goat became chaotic. The cage and the owner's house went up in flames. Burning goats in that context should be interpreted as 'cooking goats by burning'.

Intrinsically the text states that the participants involved in it consist of 3 people. Successively they were Datu Sidenreng (K.2 ... *akdatuangé Sidénréng ...*), Ambok Lesang (K.6 *iko Ambok Lésang ...*), and villagers (K.25 ... *mapparapei pakkampongé*).

The main character of this discourse is Ambok Lesang. It is said that he was one of Lise's favorite servants of Datu Sidenreng. Ambok Lesang is loved by the king because of his stupid behavior that often makes the atmosphere more lively.

Although the Lise people admire their intelligence, they do not settle for the possibility of a fool in their group, so that such tales emerge. Intrinsically, the discourse functions aside for introspection by laughing at oneself. If seen in the context of the fairy tale itself, the discourse only reflects the atmosphere of daily communication. In the fairy tale the character of Ambok Lesang looks dumb, but funny. The element of entertainment lies in the effect and the nature of Ambok Lesang above.

b. Educate

This discourse tells of a resident of Lise who is intelligent and skilled at assembling languages. One time he was asked to help the judge get the recognition of some thieves who supposedly came from Lise. Thus the full text;

\ref C007 TAMA MANEPPANGAE

.....
K.11 makkadai datue ollirekkak to accana lisek suroi alena baja
(The king says, call me a smart person from Lise, tell him tomorrow)

sibawangngi hakingnge ku pengadilang tutui iero pangae barak
(accompanying the judge in court to ask the thieves to)

weddingngi mangaku
(he confesses)

.....
K.14 makkadanai to accana lisek iko pangae tama manenno mai melok
(Cried the Lise scholars earlier, you thieves, come in all here,)

ipateruk sidangnge
(trial will resume)

K.15 iero tamana maneng pangae
(Enter all the thieves mentioned earlier)

K.16 limai kapang
(About five people)

K.17 makkadanai to accana lisek tatettekni palue pak haking
(Say the scholar from Lise, please tap on the judge's hammer!)

.....
Actually the judge already had enough evidence to apply the articles of theft to the Lise people. Just need recognition to decide the case. But the thieves are very good at evasive. Luckily there was a *to acca* from Lise helping to break the talk of the thieves.

The Lise people called as *accana Lise* (C007 K.11, K.14, K.17) suddenly exclaimed, ... *iko pangaé tama* ... (K.14). The remark was suddenly made at the recess session as implied in K.14 ... *ipatteruk trialé*. He deliberately designed his message so that it could be set as a trap so that people do not have time to think long. In a situation where they are not yet fully aware of the situation, the speakers fulfill the call of the speaker as a thief, because they are indeed thieves.

The judge's difficulty at that time was probably because he did not understand Lise's culture. If it really was a thief from Lise, surely it would not be difficult to make him confess. There seems to be a blurring to the origin of this story. However, this is not an issue that will be discussed in this study. Extrinsicly, fairy tales can serve as role models for young people about the benefits of speaking skills, in addition to entertainment as its main function. In other words, the tale serves as a means of educating. Intrinsicly, the discourse becomes a means to defeat the interlocutor.

c. Self-defense

One of Lise's tips so people don't get sleepy while patrolling is playing dominoes. The game is not for gambling, so it does not lead to seriousness. Such atmosphere is always enlivened by a variety of light jokes between players, even the audience often commented.

\ref A005 PAKDOMENGNGE

- K.1 *ha cocokni cocoknihatu cekkini la wedek*
 (Now, good, good, will check on Wede)
- K.2 *ajakna muakpau*
 (Be quiet!)
- K.3 *makkadamakha cekkini*
 (I just said I'd check it)
- K.4 *la wedek mangingngi makkoro*
 (Si Wede is bored being treated so)
- K.5 *set tettokko ko melokko*
 (Stand you up if you want!)
- K.6 *hahaha*
 (Ha, ha, ha)

The term "Czech" is used to refer to victory in a domino game. The word *cekkini* (A005 K. 1) can mean 'will check', or 'will check if it meets certain requirements'. Simultaneously the utterance also means 'how to meet the requirements to win'. You do this by guessing the partner's card. The concept of 'how' is a burden on La Wéde's mind, because the position of the card on the mat and the contents of the card held by him is open to win the cross bars. Therefore he needs to concentrate.

In dominoes, the position of the above cards is expected to win absolutely. After the position is obtained, all that remains is to close the β , so that they can check the bar with α . The problem is guessing the card the partner is holding. What card elements are the same as the card? If he guesses that his friend is holding an α card, then his team wins. That is the difficult implementation.

Conversations in domino games allow everyone to participate. However, the speech intensively involved only two people as an indophoris agent. K. 2 reinforces the existence of someone else. That person is a speaker who is a spectator of the game. The other is La Wéde himself as mentioned in K. 1 and K. 4.

In the context of the situation of the speech event above, it appears that *Ada Tongeng* happened unexpectedly. The situation just developed, including the anger of La Wéde. As a result, speakers feel the truth is threatened, so they need to be defended with K. 3 *makkadamaka* check. K. 5 is La Wéde's angry response, responded by his friends in K. 6 as ridiculous. However, the participants did not intend to be funny, so *Ada Tongeng* did not function to be funny.

The game is not meant to gamble. Each party should not need to be too ambitious to win. Therefore, aggravation in such qualities need not occur. If that happens, then for Pakdomeng, it is a very ridiculous event.

d. Self-introspection

Playing is fun for children. At that time, a 9-year-old girl intended to play kite with her friends. Even though the weather and wind were suitable for flying a kite, the kite couldn't fly, so the child nagged.

Involving this discourse is only a child who is divided as 2 egos. The number of egos of the speech participants is known from the core metaphorical nature (K. 4). He is making a statement to convey to himself as he is aware of mistakes, so no answers are needed. The reality in the proposition, the context of the situation and world knowledge, shows that the concept of meaning is not in the form of interrogative. Other people who happen to hear their words also only function as an exophoric agent. The completeness of this explanation can be checked in data B003.

\ref B003 KALAJANG IYAREGA PANIK-PANIK

K.1 perna saya mengantar anak mahasiswa mencari data wattu
(I once took a student boy to search for data)

K.2 kita melewati lapangan
(When we pass the field,)

ada ananak sedang bermain layang-layang
(there are children playing kites)

K.3 salah satunya mengomel karna layang-layangna
(One of them grumbles because of his kite)

tidak mau naik tinggi tapi hanya berputar-putar
(don't want to go high but just spin around)

K.4 katanya kalajangsaro uwebbu magai
(He said, it feels like I made a kite why)

napanik-panik jajinna
(the propeller is finished!)

K.5 ha ha ha
(Ha ha ha.)

At the core of this data bar (B003) is the *kalajangsaro uëbbu*, the magic-panic magician of his snacks. The meaning of the said utterance is obtained indirectly, meaning that if you make a kite, then the result must be in the form of a kite, not a propeller. Means something is wrong. That is the meaning that should be very different from the straightforward meaning of the expression of ego1. The metaphorical nature of ego1's utterance is interpreted by the ego as being different from the form of the meaning of its birth. Ego2 already knew that nobody made kites, but produced propellers.

The above sentence is packed as a question for myself 'why my kite can't fly'. Even though the meaning of the inner structure that can be visualized here is in the position of the statement 'the way I make a kite is wrong, so that it can only spin like a propeller'. The meaning is immediately printed on the soul of the speaker's ego along with the emergence of awareness about the mistakes of making kites. If the proposition takes the form of an interrogative, naturally the speaker is unable to make a witty grunt.

The meaning of 'making α why is β ' if it is supported by cultural comparisons between ethnic groups in similar contexts, is a humorous act. In general, before people question the cause of an error, they must first be aware of the error. In this example case the awareness is expressed in K. 4 which is the core of *Ada Tongeng*.

By paying attention to the speaker's coordinates, it appears that the child does not need an answer. If K. 4 is still placed as an interrogative sentence, then the question is rhetorical. In his grunt he

did not question anything to himself, or anyone else. Such grunts are ridiculous. Especially if the grunt was raised by a small child.

The error is more or less certainly cause disappointment and resentment. For that, the child needs to stabilize feelings in order to erase the negative emotions. That funny grunt is certainly not just to be funny, but it is prioritized to entertain yourself so that it is free from disappointment. Making *kalajang* but producing panic is stupid. The act was worth laughing at. If the deed was carried out by the perpetrator, of course what he laughed at was himself. Such words, is a way of introspection in a relaxed but highly qualified.

e. Remove Formality

One time, Lise Village was visited by a member of the district level DPR. As usual, the group of representatives of the people went around looking for input and accommodate complaints from residents. In his review, they arrived at a duck farm. The poultry sector in general is a sector that is quite prominent in Lise. Not surprisingly, the sector is their concern.

Involving this discourse consists of two people, namely between a DPR member and a duck farmer on the basis of the phrase ... *anggota dépééré ... papiara itiké ...* (K. 1). The average chicken farmer there also breeds tens to hundreds of ducks as part-time. There are also residents who specialize in duck farming, but its development has not matched chicken farmers. That is why one of the DPR members visited a duck farm to find out what was the obstacle. Although they both base on the same proposition about your *tellokna tassiaga*, the approach underlying the meaning is different. As a result, the meaning of the clause was removed from its original meaning.

\ref B007 ITIK MATELLOK SEDDI

K.1 makutanai anggota depeere ku papiara itike tassiaga tellokna
(A member of Parliament asks the duck breeder, what is the egg)

itikmu iyek
(your duck?)

K.2 seddimi pak
(Only one sir!)

K.3 magainaangka
(Why so!)

K.4 pekku carana pak
(That's right sir!)

K.5 itikku mattellok tasseddi-seddimi
(My ducks only lay eggs one by one)

Tassiaga tellokna itikmu in the context above should be interpreted as 'how many duck eggs your farm produces in a day', not 'how many of your own eggs in a day'. The meaning given by members of the DPR is adjusted to the coordinates of the interlocutor and the location of the event. That context occurs in the situation of the DPR's review to hear the aspirations of the people, especially poultry farmers. According to world knowledge, the question of the number of eggs in the context must be interpreted as the number of eggs that can be produced in a day. The number of ducks a breeder does not necessarily equal the number of eggs he gets a day. Therefore the relevant DPR member needs to ask. The breeder in his own way interprets the question as 'how many eggs are each of your eggs in a day'. The implication about the meaning of the speaker is obtained from the answer to (B007 K. 2) ... *séddimi ...*

DPR delegation visits are generally official. The official atmosphere often feels less familiar and rigid which is considered less pleasant. To get rid of these feelings, a duck farmer tries to change the atmosphere at what is considered appropriate by being funny. That conclusion is proven in K. 4 *itikku mattellok tasseddi-seddimi*. The sentence was in the form of breeders' explanations about ... *séddimi ...* (K. 2).

f. Streamlining Social Relations

In everyday society it is not uncommon for someone to face other people who are still unfamiliar to him. At that time excessive caution will emerge and the atmosphere becomes rigid. Finally, the atmosphere is like being a nuisance which results in a process of social interaction being hampered. For this reason people try to set the atmosphere according to their wishes so that their relationships with others run smoothly. The method is by joking. For example, the discourse of D004 is quite appropriate in this point.

\ref D004 TIDAK SEMUA

- K.1 mengapa alasan jawabanmu begini dik
(why is the reason for your answer this little sis!)
- K.2 itu juga betul bu
(That's right too mam!)
- K.3 memang tidak semua orang lisek pintar mallecco-lecco ada
(Not everyone is Lise smart malecco-lecco ada)
- K.4 sebab ada bayi dan orang bisu dia kang tidak bisa bicara.
(Because there are babies and mute people they can't speak)
- K.5 Hahaha
(Ha ha ha!)

Between speakers and speakers do not know each other before (D004 K.1). The two of them suddenly had to communicate intensively in a relatively normal atmosphere, so that the speaker had difficulty expressing thoughts in order to be put into the questionnaire. To facilitate communication, the speaker is invited to sit outside the room accompanied by a field worker who is relatively of the same age.

In that situation, a friendly atmosphere, social distance and age can reduce their awkwardness. The speaker starts feeling relaxed filling out the questionnaire. Meanwhile, relaxed and intimate dialogues between them began to sound. Thus, it is clear that the tongeng (K. 4) functions as a means to facilitate social relations by being funny. The cuteness lies in the odd and odd answers when filling out the relevant questionnaire (K.5).

g. Demonstrating Speech Skill

In general, relations between neighbors in the Lise community are very close. In fact, many of them are still related. Thus, it is not surprising if someone suddenly goes to a neighbor's house and goes straight to the kitchen. It is as if the neighbor is putting himself together to eat with the host.

\ref A010 LAWAK BALE

- K.1 makkadai tauwe mupojiga manre lawak, lawak balewe
(Someone once asked, do you like lawar, fishar lawar!)
- K.2 makkadaka iyak dek upojiwi manre lawak balewe
(Then I said, I don't like eating fisharade.)
- K.3 makkadai taue magari dek mupojiwi
(Asking that person again, why don't you like it?)
- K.4 makkadakak dek nengka uwita bale mallawak kang
(I say, because there really is no fish making lawar right?)
- K.5 lawak taumi
(Only humans make lawar)

The concept of the name of processed foods in the archipelago that is related to the discourse can be formulated as; certain cooking methods and often added information about the main ingredients, and

vice versa. Examples (A010) Fishar, grilled sweet potato, etc. In the above discourse, the concept of thinking about the names of processed foods is found; bale comedy; a. how to cook comedy with bale main ingredients, b. how to cook *lawak* by *balé* or tau. The concept in point (b) is a factual error according to the speaker, and according to the convention is a composite system error. In the case of *lawak bale*, the speaker analogizes it with other types of compositions. The types of compositions related to the composite version of the narrator include: - *anré tau* 'food for people, food used for people, the results of manual work', - *sarang wani* 'beehive', - *ékbu masina* 'machine work'.

Seeing the fact that language is so complex, the analysis which only adheres to semantic theory is inadequate to be used to explain the linguistic phenomenon. The data presented above points to the fact that language is loaded with pragmatic aspects which include;

a. Presumption in *lawak baléwé*. Each party knows that the other party also knows the meaning of the *lawak balé* according to knowledge about the world of the Lise people.

b. It is impossible to reach the speakers' *upojiwi manré lawak balé* because they are uprooted from their conventions. Speakers can finally understand it after it is explained as implied in K. 4 ... *nengka uita balé mallawa kang ...*

The interpretation of the Petatur version is actually not quite right because it does not pay attention to the community's language system. Meaning that violates the convention can finally be accepted and understood through a search of the context of the situation and world knowledge about cuisine that has been discussed above, and will be completed in the next discussion.

The above discourse involves most of the people of Lise. He acts as a speaker. The conversation partner is also a Lise person. He is a reliable person in terms of language. In that case, no one doubts his ability. As a result, if someone can not imply his intentions, he tends to regard it as a deficiency. Instead of checking the truth. Starting from that, so that all speech speakers are accepted as full truth.

Thus, the speaker has indirectly demonstrated language skills. His explanation of why he did not eat *lawak bale* would not want to make people laugh, so that in it showed the function to be funny in order to enliven the atmosphere of eating.

h. Persuade

Saturday the Lise market became the center of economic activity and transactions in the village and its surroundings. Not surprisingly, there are found various types of speech acts in between, namely starting from just greeting greetings to serious gossip. However, the most utterances are certainly those of bargaining. One of the utterances is as mentioned below.

\ref D007 DEK MEMENTO NAMARINGENG

K.1 siaga gollatak seddi pak
(How much is your sugar, sir?)

K.2 maringeng
(Light!)

k.3 ah dek mataneksatu
(Ah no, that's so heavy!)

K.4 apak eppakkak onnang palessoki pole ku otoa
(Because the four of me dropped it off the car earlier)

While asking about the price of sugar, the buyer pet a sugar. According to him, sugar is light. The word *maringeng* (D007 K. 2) is contrasted with the word *matanek* (K. 3) in that context it can be interpreted as 'not light'. The purpose of the statement is to bring down the merchant's mentality so that he does not offer sugar at too high a price. The trader apparently has a reliable blade to "fend off" the attack. It does not refer to the size of the sugar scales one by one which may include light sugar. However, it refers to the size or scale of the overall merchandise sugar (K.3 & 4). Although in the context of such bargaining, the concept of knowledge about the world of the Lise people will not refer to the size of the sugar scale as a whole.

The function of the discourse is to persuade buyers to keep buying the sugar they offer. The trick is to joke to show the seller's hospitality. The seller does not need to be offended by the buyer's reproach.

i. Beat Talking Friends

This discourse tells of two people who were guarding their respective fields. At that time, light rain happened to never stop. The desire of one person to smoke.

\ref C009 GUTTUK NA BILLAK

K.1 padato ero kang engka makbali galung tapik
(There are also stories about people next to a rice field, but)

ero makbali galungnge tania to lisek
(The neighbor is not a Lise person.)

.....
K.4 kang itu billake to makkada heng ah billaki
(If there is lightning, we usually say 'hem', wow lightning!)

.....
K.6 tapik ero pakarekareke paccobicobie
(Whereas the bully or the mocker)

bali galungna sininna makuae heng heng
(the neighbor always chimed in. hem, hem)

K.7 kang dekna tuo tulu lallakmi bawang papada billake
(It doesn't turn on, it's always just flashes like lightning)

K.8 natulu makkadatonai heng heng
(He repeats the answer, 'hem', 'hem')

.....
K.11 sisenna makkadasi heng pua nalappessangi
(After he says 'hem' again, he hits!)

K.12 naakkada naleppak ruppana
(The story goes to his face)

K.13 naakkada dek guttuk itu
(He said, no, that's the thunder)

K.14 guttuk taniaana billak
(It's thunder, it's no longer lightning)

.....
The discourse involved two speech participants. The phrase in (C009 K.1 ... *tania to Lise* shows that one of the participants is not a Lise person. Morphem ... *tapik* ... (K. 1) implies that of the two neighboring rice fields one is the opposite of *tania to Lise*. seated as a speaker, another person, a speaker, is someone from the Lise people.

Wet air makes the surrounding objects moist, including matches, making it difficult for speakers to light their cigarettes. The situation caused his friend to faze. Because he was constantly harassed, he finally got angry and responded with a severe blow. The drizzle was accompanied by continuous lightning with thunder. The community considers thunder as a dangerous natural phenomenon and lightning is the

signal. The habits of the people of Lise and its surroundings always respond to lightning with a *dehaman* (*heng*) sound.

Lighters that only emit sparks when ignited, likened to lightning by speakers. For this it needs to be addressed with *heng* (K. 4, 6, 8, 11). The sound of a *heng* that is constantly touted when people have not yet succeeded in lighting a match, can certainly be considered a mockery. The sound of the *heng* can be paraphrased more or less like that; 'Hu ..., can not be lit, just like lightning only'. Because they are always ridiculed, the speaker looks for an opportunity to get back at him. When the speaker tries to light the match again and is greeted with a *heng*, his friend's face is slapped. According to the sticky speaker, the loud noise was likened to the thunder that followed after lightning.

Ada Tongeng that serves to beat the talk of others. You do this by replying to mock friends. Because the speaker was ridiculed that his attempt to light a match only sparks fire like lightning, he replied with a patch. That way the bully can't do anything anymore. The way to reply to the taunt is in K. 12 ... *naleppak ruppana*, K.13 ... *dék guttuk itu*, and K. 14 in *taniana billak*. The main thought intertwined in these sentences is the view that lightning does not need to be feared, but there will be thunder that follows and is very dangerous.

A. Conclusion

The benefit dimension is that the Lise community is not as complicated as what is assumed by the non-Lise community. As with other verbal utterances, to be able to understand and determine its function correctly, it is necessary to review all aspects of its supporters, such as the context and context that is behind it. Based on the results of data analysis, nine types of discourse functions are established, namely (1) Entertainment, (2) Education, (3) Self-defense, (4) Self-examination, (5) Eliminating formality, (6) Smoothing social relations, (7) Showing the ability to speak, (8) Persuading, (9) Beating the person you're talking to.

B. Suggestions

The results of this study are still preliminary research about *tongeng* as oral discourse. There are still many shortcomings and limitations that can be addressed by using a sociolinguistic or language sociology approach. The object of this research is still full of social problems. For the general public, it is necessary to explain the nature of the existence of *tongeng* so that misunderstandings that occur so far can be resolved. In addition to these things, awareness is also needed to the Lise community that there is a *tongeng* owned is not something that is embarrassing, but is the uniqueness of their linguistic system. If there are *tongs* seated as *lécco-lécco* there, it actually shows their intellectual property to be proud of. With *lécco-lécco*, it is hoped that humans will be able to develop their intelligence through language.

REFERENCES

- Atmowiloto, A. 1989. "Sastra Jawa: Kekuatan Sukma, Bukan Raga". *Kompas*. Tanggal 16 April Jakarta.
- Brown, G & G. Yule. 1996. *Analisis Wacana : Discourse Analysis*. Terj. I Sutikno. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Cahyono, B.Y. 1995. *Kristal-kristal Ilmu Bahasa*. Surabaya: Airlangga University Press.
- Crystal, D. 1987. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Danandjaja, James. 1986. *Folklor Indonesia: Ilmu Gosip, Dongeng, dan lain-lain*. Jakarta: Pustaka Grafitipers.
- Grimes & Grimes. 1987. *Language of South Sulawesi*. Ujungpandang: SIL.

- Halliday, M.A.K & Hasan, R. 1992. *Bahasa, Konteks, dan Teks*. Disunting oleh M. Ramlan. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Hoey, M. 1983. *On the Surface of Discourse*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Huizinga, Johan. 1990. *Homo Ludens: Fungsi dan Hakekat Permainan dalam Budaya*. Diterjemahkan oleh Hasan Basari. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Krippendorff, Klaus. 1991. *Analisis Isi. Pengantar Teori dan Metodologi*. Terj. Farid Wajidi. Edisi I. Jakarta : Rajawali Press.
- McCarthy, M. 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, J.L. 1993. *Pragmatics. An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Palmer, F.R. 1986. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pertiwiningsih, Esti. 2000. *Fungsi Ada Tongeng: Analisis Wacana Lisan To Liseé*. Tesis Program Pascasarjana Universitas Hasanuddin Makassar.
- Rahmanadji, Didiek. 2007. *SEJARAH, TEORI, JENIS, DAN FUNGSI HUMOR. BAHASA DAN SENI, Tahun 35, Nomor 2, Agustus 2007*. <http://sastra.um.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2009/10/Sejarah-Teori-Jenis-dan-Fungsi-Humor.pdf> (14 Oktober 2019).
- Stubbs, M. 1987. *Discourse Analysis. The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Oxford: Blackwell Ltd.
- Suaib, Ema. Zainal Rafli. Liliana Muliastuti. 2019. Tipe dan Fungsi Humor dalam Acara Indonesia Lawak Klub di Trans 7. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra* Vol. 10 No. 1 hlm. 123—136. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332783058 Tipe dan Fungsi Humor dalam Acara Indonesia Lawak Klub di Trans 7/link/5cc995f6299bf120978c385c/download](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332783058_Tipe_dan_Fungsi_Humor_dalam_Acara_Indonesia_Lawak_Klub_di_Trans_7/link/5cc995f6299bf120978c385c/download)
- Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa : Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan secara Linguistik*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Suyono. 1990. *Pragmatik: Dasar-dasar dan Pengajaran*. Malang: YA 3.
- Tahir, M. Dalyan dan Hunaeni. 2016. *Wacana Narasi Bahasa Bugis*. Makassar: Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Tarigan, H.G. 1987. *Pengajaran Wacana*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- Tarone, E. 1988. *Variation in Interlangue*. London: Great Britain.
- Wahab, A. 1990. *Butir-butir Linguistik*. Surabaya: Airlangga University Press.
- Wahyuni, Sri. 2018. Humor dan Pesan Moral Teks Anekdote pada Buku Ajar Bahasa Indonesia Kelas X SMA Kurikulum 2013. *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra dan Pembelajarannya*. Vol. 7. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333720847 HUMOR DAN PESAN MORAL TEKS ANEKDOT PADA BUKU AJAR BAHASA INDONESIA KELAS X SMA KURIKULUM](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333720847_HUMOR_DAN_PESAN_MORAL_TEKS_ANEKDOT_PADA_BUKU_AJAR_BAHASA_INDONESIA_KELAS_X_SMA_KURIKULUM)

M 2013 HUMOR AND MORAL MESSAGE OF ANECDOTAL TEXTS IN INDONESIAN
LANGUAGE TEACHING MATERIALS FOR THE TENTH GRADE O

Wijana, I dewa Putu. 2003. Kartun: Studi tentang Permainan Bahasa. Jogjakarta: Ombak.

Yulianto, Diyan. 2010. Belajar Inggris dengan Humor-humor *Gokil*. Jogjakarta. Diva Press

Attachment 1
The Humor Function for Ethnic Bugs

No.	Function				No. Data
	Extrinsic		Intrinsic		
	Main	Additive	Main	Additive	
1.	Entertainment	-	13	14	C006
2.	2	-	Educate	7	C007
3.	2	-	Beat the interlocutor	6	C009
4.	Self-defense	-	-	-	A005
5.	Shows cleverness of speech	1	-	-	A010
6.	Eliminating formality	1	-	-	B007
7.	Persuade	-	-	-	D007
8.	Facilitate social relations	10,1	-	-	D004
9.	2	Introspection	-	-	B003