

Pragmatic Analysis on G.M. Sudarta's Caricatures in Kompas Newspaper

Slamet Supriyadi

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sebelas Maret University of Surakarta, Indonesia
pripus.lppmuns@yahoo.co.id

Abstract

The research aims at describing (1) the types of speech act and implicative, and the dominating speech act in the texts of caricatures by G. M Sudarta, (2) the practice of cooperative principles and politeness principles, and (3) the understanding of the readers and caricaturists on the social function practiced in caricature discourses. The whole processes of the data analysis were carried out through interactive model. Many of the caricatures are used mainly to put forward constructive ideas on prevailing issues and to put forward humorous function. The types of speech act practiced are commissive, expressive, verdictive, assertive, directive, and performative. The dominating speech act found is directive. Based on the forms of speech act used, types of speech act practiced by the caricaturist are direct type of speech act. In the practice of cooperative principles, the caricaturist violates the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. Politeness principles practiced by the caricaturist observed the maxims of tact, agreement, sympathy, and modesty. Finally, the readers and the caricaturist often have different understanding on the social function of caricature texts. They have different understanding and interpretation on the meanings embedded in both the texts and pictures of the caricatures in relation with constructive criticisms.

Keywords

pragmatics; speech acts;
language; implicature;
society



I. Introduction

Caricature as an image filler in the rubric of newspaper opinions is an effective instrument to evoke readers' emotions, senses of nationalism, solidarity, hatred, even racial intolerance. However, most critics actually quite often presented in witty which lead people insinuated getting smiley amused. Many interpret that joke pictures in the mass media only express humor, without implicitly reflect any social criticism, a mere cartoons; and joke pictures that carry messages of social criticism as often seen in every newspaper opinion space the so called caricatures, which this, according to Sudarta is „certainly, is not true“, accordingly cartoons are all images of humor, including caricatures, outwardly meant at mocking [Sudarta, 1987, p. 49]. Pramono [1996, pp. 49] argues that in fact caricatures are part of opinion cartoons which later misunderstood. The caricature with specific messages, criticism, etc is an opinion cartoon. In other words, the cartoon with specific messages of social criticism on every published newspaper is a political cartoon or editorial cartoon, which is another editorial version in the humorous version. This is what is commonly called caricature [Sudarta, 1987].

Indeed, between cartoons and caricatures is like an animal and an elephant. Cartoons are animals, while caricatures are elephants. Cartoons are not only caricatures, there typically gag cartoon, animated cartoon, strip cartoon, opinion cartoon, and others. Caricature is derived from the root word *caricare* is excessively a photo or someone portrayal form. This deformation can mean humiliation or respect [Pramono, 1996, p. 48-49; check out Wijana, 2004, p. 7].

The aforementioned opinions conclude that caricature is part of a cartoon depicted in a fictitious or deformed form of a particular character which purpose is to insinuate, criticize, and appeal, suggesting something to the target object. If we wish to contextually observe from the readers „perspective as Easterners, respectively the Indonesians, one he/she is being targeted for the caricature would feel insulted. However, many Westerners prefer to be caricatured instead of being photographed. Former Presidents of the United States, Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan, i.e., were very proud of their large and high crested teeth. They assume that when they were caricatured, they gain more respect by people who do the caricature [Sobur, 2004, p. 139].

Caricature is part of the publisher's opinion outlined in particular form of images. Initially, the caricature was only an illustration, but in subsequent developments, more people use it a means to express subtle criticism, for it express criticism in in witty and interesting images. A caricature takes distinctive functions, one of which is to create satire, criticism or warning. The caricature is the result of the selection process for a thousand kinds of events. It also reflects the degree of the writer's soul and environmental freedom to assert thought and criticism.

Bearing its fundamental role as a media to express criticism and satire addressed to create criticism and satire. In addition, caricature can significantly function to educate, ridicule, insinuate, encourage, suggest, order, laugh, entertain with witty responses to an event, and others. Deliberately, this media function as a social mirror in which everyone can find themselves in it, both personally and socially in the life arena of society.

A caricature may consist of both image and text which are inseparable and integrated each other. The caricature linguistically is interesting to be explored, especially those related to (a) the type of speech acts, implicature and the dominant type of speech act; (b) the cooperative principles and politeness; (c) the linguistic aspects may refer to the coherence between themes, linguistic units, and images; in addition to (d) social functions of the caricature. In case we wish to explore caricature in terms of the social function, it functions to express criticism, information, education, morality, politics, ideology, defense and security, entertainment, and, more importantly, criticism and allusions to enhance criticism.

There are not many studies that discuss caricatures linguistically and highlight pragmatic aspects as the most probable component to be studied. Jaspers [2011] examines ethnographic data from a number of ethnic minority students in secondary schools who utilize linguistic structures to form "ambiguous agencies". Accordingly, students produce explicit linguistic caricatures (disguises, self-taunts, masks) that clearly allude to social scenes. Ibrahim [2014] examines Grice's maxim as a parameter in some Caricatures in Iraqi TV. His study concludes that Grice's principles have been observed unless quality maxims are deliberately made for humorous or sarcastic reasons, looking for conversational implications through irony or metaphor. All caricatures analyzed appear as a reflection of the current socio-pragmatic events in this country, so that their works are interrelated with caricatures as recognizable media discourse genres, and related to caricatures as TV media subgenres.

Being an observer of the society's attitudes and address them to socially relevance case, in many of his works, G.M. Sudarta shows his high sensitivity to potential social phenomena or events and creatively addressed them in caricatures form. The use of G. Sudarta's caricatures as the object analysis of this study is based on consideration. Additionally, Sudarta's works have been recognized by many of Indonesia people for he has rewarded with various awards, both from within and outside the country. Based on background, a problem can be formulated, among others; (1) what are the types of speech acts use, implicature and pragmatics on the caricature discourse, in addition to the dominantly use of speech acts types and the underlying reasons for such dominant type of speech act by G.M. Sudarta's caricature discourse; (2) how are the cooperative principles and politeness principles used in G.M. Sudarta's caricature discourse, and (3) how is the reader's understanding and caricaturist(s) about the residing social functions in G.M. Sudarta's caricature discourse?

II. Review of Literature

2.1 The Concept of Caricature

Noerhadi in his article entitled "*Kartun dan Karikatur sebagai Wahana Kritik Sosial*" [cited in Wijana, 1995], defined caricature as a form of humorous response in visual imagery. The concept of cartoons is strictly distinguished from the caricature. Cartoon characters are fictional created to present social comedies and humorous visualization. Meanwhile, caricature figures are mock figures through distortions which essence is to emphasize certain perception to reader, often time this is called portrait caricature [Wijana, 1995, p. 8].

Basically, caricature can be categorically distinguished into two types, namely the verbal and nonverbal caricatures. Verbal caricature is a caricature which in terms of the visual drawings uses verbal elements such as words, phrases and sentences, in addition to there are the distorted character's images, while nonverbal caricatures incline use images as spoken language, this enables intended messages successfully meant to the readers.

Caricature is commonly created as an individual's reaction to particular life events either socially or politically. Caricature in essence is a media of open interpretation where the meanings can only be revealed through deeply seeking to the facts behind the created caricature. To be able to achieve the aforementioned targets, there is the need to carefully and sharply conduct observation and linguistic study to the surrounding conditions to explore the implicit meanings of the illustrated caricature [Dakiade cited in Sudarta, 1980, p. viii].

Because of its characteristics that always feed a funny sense, many functions can be carried out by caricature art, including criticizing, insinuating, mocking, suggesting, commanding, laughing, entertaining, and joking, responding to an actual event in society. In a caricature discourse, ideas, roles, thought, and typical media used are in utterances form. The typical utterances used in pragmatic perspective are the so called speech act. Therefore, the utterances produced are a product of speech acts, i.e., "Is your hair not too long?" is interpretable as both question and command [Wijana, 2004: 49]. According to Searle [1969], pragmatically there are at least three types of action produced by a speaker in a language use, namely the act of saying something (locutionary act), the act of doing something (illocutionary act), and the act of influencing the interlocutor (perlocutionary act). The three types of actions are referred to as the act of saying something, the act of doing something and the act of affecting someone [Wijana, 2004, p. 1; cf. Austin, 1955, p. 108].

Kreidler (1998) distinguished 7 types of speech acts utterances, among others; (a) assertive (b) performative, (c) verdictive, (d) expressive, (e) directive (f) commissive (g)

phatic (utterance). The two linguists' opinions above are essentially identical; the difference only lies in declarative, representative and phatic utterances. The declarative according to Searle is essentially similar to Kreidler's performative acts. Additionally, Kreidler added that phatic utterance is beyond Searle's types of speech act. It concludes that Kreidler's speech act is more detailed than Searle's.

2.2 Language Function in Caricature

Any language and anywhere has complex rules and functions, in other words it is multipurpose [Maryaeni, 2001]. These functions include telling, explaining, answering, asking, insinuating, expressing one's feelings; complaining, angry, joking, etc. [cf. Van Ek, 1998: 28-41]. Each speaker is expected to be able to apply the rules, both grammar and communication and communicative functions. Hymes [1974] suggested that each speech event can be fully comprehensible in case the speaker pays attention to the speech component acronymed with SPEAKING (scene/setting, participants, ends, act of sequences, keys, instrumentalities, norms, and genres).

The language of caricature is inseparable from the rules and functions described above because the caricature's function is to communicate with all levels of reading society. The use of verbal language in caricatures is essentially to establish communication between artists, while the appreciators in this case are newspaper readers.

2.3 Language Function in Caricature

In the non-humorous speech, there is the typical presupposition made by the speaker and the interlocutor being required to act fairly. Both parties should contribute things in accordance with communication needs. They will try to interact as informatively as possible by fully implementing the cooperative principles and politeness principle, and carefully considering pragmatic parameters [Wijana, 2004: 4]. The use of language in communication involves several aspects. These aspects are: (1) the thing being communicated, (2) the purpose of communicating, (3) the person invited to communicate, and (4) where the communication takes place. These aspects of communication are in line with what suggested by Austin [1962]. The common use of language is inseparable from such aspects. In addition to these aspects in a common use of language for communication, the cooperative principles are realized in several maxims, among others; (1) maxim of quantity, (2) maxim of quality, (3) relevance of maxim, and (4) the maxim of manners. Pragmatically, those four maxims any speaker or language interlocutor should obey in every communication to achieve the rational communicative goals [Grice, 1975, p. 45-47; Parker, 1986, p. 23; Wardaugh, 1986, p. 202; Sperber & Wilson, 1989, p.33-44; Gazdar, 1979, p. 45-49; Yule, 2006, p. 35-37]. Grice [cited in Wijana, 1996, p. 46-53] suggested that to carry out the cooperative principle, each speaker must obey the four conversational maxims, namely the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manners.

2.4 Pragmatic Concept

Levinson [1983, pp.9] in his book entitled "Pragmatics" provides limitation for the notion, "pragmatics is the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language". Pragmatics is a language study that studies the relationship between language and its context. There are two types of contexts, which are social and societal contexts. Social context is a context arises as a result of interaction between community members in a particular social and cultural society.

Societal context is the context in which the determining factor is the position (rank) of community members in social institutions in a particular socio-cultural society. Thus, the societal context rises due to power (force), while the underlying factor for social context is caused by solidarity [Rahardi, 2000: 48; cf. Haryono, 2004: 16; cf. Cutting, no year: 52]. To interpret speech utterances, the speaker's uses a means-end analysis strategy, while the speech partner's task uses heuristic analysis strategies. The heuristic strategy seeks to identify the pragmatic force of a speech by formulating hypotheses and then testing it based on available data. In case the hypothesis is not tested, a new hypothesis will be made [Leech, 1993, p. 61].

III. Research Method

Based on the problems proposed above, this study emphasizes more on problem and meaning process (speech act), the typical research method use is descriptive qualitative research. The data source used the entire G.M. Sudarta's caricature published by Kompas newspaper, Kompas published book, G.M. Sudarta's caricature on the internet site published by Kompas and the caricaturists' data of caricature (objective factors). The data sources concern understanding of the social functions of a caricature used by the caricature's creators (genetic factors), while data sources concerning the understanding of community's functions used by informant of the data sources consisting of, lecturers of Fine Arts, FISIP Communication lecturers, Fine Arts teachers, Fine Arts students, and public readers of the Kompas newspaper (affective factor). The sampling technique used in this study was purposive sampling. The analysis technique used is contextual analysis technique, which connects the caricature text with its non-lingual context, because the meaning is pragmatically determined by things extra-lingual depending on the context [Edi Subroto, 1992, p. 55; read Haryono, 2004, p. 77]. In addition, in analyzing caricature drawings, the semiotic analysis was used; therefore, the material described in caricatures is interpretable by semiotic analysis. To analyze the caricaturist's factors (genetic factors), factors in terms of the works and texts forms (objective factors) and readers (affective factors), additionally this study also used Sutopo's holistic critical analysis [1995].

IV. Discussion

4.1 The Types of Speech Acts and Implicature Used in G.M. Sudarta's Caricature

In G.M. Sidarta's caricature there were found six speech acts, they are the commissive, directive, performative, expressive, verdictive, and assertive speech acts. The commissive speech acts are the typical speech acts the speaker to carry out a series of activities. Among the commissive speech acts verbs are those of approving, asking, offering, rejecting, promising, and swearing. These verbs are prospective and are related to the speaker's commitment to future actions. The caricaturists use the commissive speech acts discourse in their caricatures, the following describes the data.

- (1) A. *Kasus Ambon akan ditindak tegas! Gas! Gas! Gas!!!*
B. *AKAN!*

The directive speech acts are speech acts in which the speaker tries to ask the speech partner to do the act or not to do the act. So, the directive speech acts use you as the perpetrator, both present and not. Directive speech acts are prospective, which means that a person cannot have someone else to commit an act in the past. There are three types of

directive speech acts, namely command, request, and suggestion. The caricaturist mostly use directive speech act discourse in his caricatures, the example is as follow.

(2) ... *kita ganti menu saja ... tidak usah tergantung pada beras ...*

Performative speech acts are acts speech forms that cause things to be officially named. Performative speech utterance becomes valid if it is produced by someone in authority and is generally acceptable. Usually there are certain conditions that must be met performative speech acts. First, the subject of the sentence must be *saya* or *kami* (In Eng. I or we). Second, the verb must be in present form. Most importantly the speaker must be well-recognized by public with his authority on producing a statement in addition it should be produced in its relevant situation. Performative speech acts occur in formal situations and relate to official activities. Performative speech verbs, among others are the acts in utterances of betting, declaring, baptizing, nominating, punishing, declaring, and announcing. The caricaturists in his caricature use performative speech acts discourse as described in the following data.

(3) A : ... *Tarif naik! semua jadi naik!*

B : *Kalau sudah naik kapan turunnya ya Pak ...?*

If the expressive speech act concerns what the speech partner has done, the expressive speech act began from the prior activity or the speaker's failure or it may be the result or failure. The expressive speech acts are retrospective and involve the speaker in the action. Among the verbs of expressive speech acts are acknowledging, sympathizing, forgiving, condolences, and being concerned. The following are the types of expressive speech acts found in caricatures.

(4) "*Selamat datang sobat ...*"

Verdictive speech acts concern the expressed utterances which reflect assesment on others'actions, more specifically the speech partners. This assesment covers the acts in speech such as summarizing, evaluating, complimenting, forgiving. Among the verbs of verdictive speech acts are accusing, judging, responsible, and grateful. These verbs are paradigmatically expressed as in "*me ... you*", "*above ... because*". This speech act shows the speaker's evaluation on his prior actions, which is retrospective. The data below is the verdictive speech act found in caricature.

(5) A : *Produksi tekstil dalam negeri melimpah... tapi kok masih impor dengan IJIN KHUSUS*

B : *Untuk KEPENTINGAN KHUSUS kok pak ...*

Assertive speech acts concern factual data, the existing knowledge of either has occurred or has not occurred. The assertive verbs include the act of saying, announcing, explaining, showing and reporting. This assertive speech act can be justified the truth. The following data is the assertive speech act.

(6) ... *saya baru saja masuk ... perkara belum jelas ... belum lagi diperiksa ... sudah keduluan dipermak oleh sesama tahanan ...!*

From the analyzed caricature data, the type of speech acts which is dominantly used in G.M. Sudarta's caricature discourse is directive speech act. The directive speech acts were found more dominantly than any other types of speech acts, this is due to the caricature itself was intentionally addressed to refine and improve the situation through criticism. Things to reflect is the nature of caricature is equal to evaluating and reflecting, hoping for,

encouraging, in addition to having the party being criticized to take action according to the critic's request, in this case the caricature is represented by the caricature image. The directive speech acts have been relevantly used bearing in mind the pragmatic forces reflected from the verbs use imply suggestions, requests, and orders to the speech partner (target of criticism) as a characteristic of a caricature.

4.2. Cooperative Principles and Politeness Principles in Caricature

In G.M. Sidarta's caricature there was found violation against several maxims of cooperative and politeness principles. In terms of the cooperative principle, the violation were found on the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manners. The maxim of quantity requires every speech participant to contribute as much or as much as needed by his speech partner. Violation of the maxim quantity observed in G. Sudarta's caricature discourse exemplified in the following discourse.

(7) ... Paak ...! Yang merdeka bukan hanya Bapak ... Saya juga!!

The Maxim of quality requires every conversation participant to state the truth. The conversational participants' contribution should be based on adequate evidence; however, the caricaturist through the caricature violates the maxim of quality. This can be seen in the following discourse.

(8)...Yang pasti ... dengan beras semakin mahal ini ... Bapak diuntungkan apa tidak ...?!

The maxim of relevance requires that every participant in a speech make a relevant contribution to the problem in speaking. In the caricature discourse, there were found violations against the maxim of relevance. This is intentional done for it reflects purpose to say through violating this maxim. One of the samples can be seen in the following data.

(9) A: ... Sekarang orang-orang tidak lagi takut korupsi ya pak...bahkan bangga dan pamer...!

B: ... Manabisa takut! ... dengan tanda-tanda zaman. Musibah yang bertubi-tubi. Tsunami, gempa, banjir, longsor, badai, wabah flu burung, kelaparan, gizi buruk, kecelakaan bus, pesawat, kapal kereta api dsb, sampai gunung mau mau meletus saja cuek apa lagi ... Peka!

The maxim of manners requires each participant to speak stick to the point, not ambiguous, multiply interpreted, redundant, and coherent. By observing this maxim, the speaker is required to provide clear information, not excessive and not even ambiguous. Thus, the speech partner can interpret the speech contents more easily, therefore communicative process between speaker and the speech partner successfully runs without obstacles. That the caricaturist through his caricature violates the maxim of manner, exemplified in the following discourse.

(10) ... Ibu dulu tidak cari jodoh orang asing? ... Nanti kan saya bisa main sinetron!

Meanwhile, Leech suggested that the cooperative principles provides a comprehensive explanation of the relationship between meaning and power. Such explanation is quite sufficient, especially to solve the arising problems in semantics which focuses on the truth-based approach. However, the cooperative principles cannot explain why people often use indirect means in conveying their intentions. Additionally, the cooperative principles in nature cannot explain the relationship between meaning and power in non-

declarative sentences. To overcome this weakness, Leech proposes another principle beyond the cooperative principles, which is the politeness principle [Leech, 1993: 80]. The politeness principle has a number of maxims, they are the tact maxims of generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy.

The politeness principles observed by G.M. Sudarta in his caricature discourse, are the tact maxim, agreement, sympathy, and the maxim of modesty. These were the typical maxims by caricaturist which have been relevantly used according to the contexts of situation, social and culture and pragmatic parameters. In the analyzed caricature discourse, the politeness principle of maxims generosity and approbation were not applied in the caricature due to the nature and characteristics of the caricature itself. The maxim of generosity requires the speech participants to respect others.

4.3. Readers and The Caricaturist's Understanding on Social Functions

The social function of the caricature according to the caricaturist's point of view, all the illustrated content was meant to intrigue a better improvement, for there were occurring wrong things in social lives of the society, i.e., the illustrated cases of Pasuruan incident, Lapindo Mudflow. A caricaturist is keen to observe the symptoms and events being discussed in the society and describe those events through his creatively illustrated characters in caricatures form.

The caricature's social function additionally needs to be seen from the point of view of lecturers of communication department. Accordingly, the social function of a caricature is not different from the media function in general, namely the function of transmitting certain values, the entertainment function, the supervisory function, and the critical function. For the lecturers of communication department, the social function of a caricature is indifferent from the media function in general, where it functions as a media transmitting particular values, the entertainment, the supervisory function, and the critical function.

The caricature's social function is observable from the students' perspective. According to the reader / student, the caricature holds several functions; first, it functions as social criticism, suggestion, and comparison between works, education, and humor. The fine art lecturers share their own views with regard to social functions of the caricature, which accordingly, the caricature has several functions. Those functions are to criticize, provide enlightenment, compare between works, educate and amuse readers with its entertaining sense. The readers (Kompas daily subscribers) may share a special view about the caricatures. Among the readers are in agreement that caricatures have several functions, among others, the functions of entertainment, criticism, control, advice, and educative functions.

4.4. G.M. Sudarta's Caricature Discourse

Based on the ways in which the messages in caricatures being delivered, G.M. Sudarta used more direct speech acts, it means that in case the utterance is intentionally functioned as a command sentence, the contents are also meant to have someone to do something. Likewise, if the speech produced in caricature is in question form, it possibly means to ask something. However, often time the caricaturist used the indirect speech acts to express other purposes, i.e., the question sentence is intended not to ask, but to command. On the basis of the utterance meanings of G.M. Sidarta's caricature, additionally, he used literal speech act where the meaning is synonymous to utterance that composed it. In addition, the caricature also used the type of non-literal speech act, that is, where the speaker expresses meanings on the contrary to the literally expressed utterances.

The implicature use in caricature discourse reveal the hidden mission behind the created caricature, it implies an indirectly critic and things by which the caricaturist implicitly desire for can be a reflection to object being referred to. In terms of the cooperative principles, caricaturist violated the cooperative principles, among the violated maxims are the maxims of quantity, quality, manners and relevance. The violation against the maxims used in caricature discourse was not only meant to confuse or complicate the reader's understanding, however, it was meant to criticize the object being addressed to, more specifically, to government policies which role is considered less defending the weak people's interests. The typical violation on the maxims is because the caricaturist intentionally would like to produce humorous satire sense, it is evidenced by some of words choice used in caricatures which semantically evoke the reader(s)' sense of humor.

The politeness principles are observed in G.M. Sudarta's caricature discourse, among others; the tact maxim, agreement, approbation, and modesty maxim. These maxims were observed by caricaturists and are relevant to their contexts of situation, social and culture. In terms of the politeness principles, the maxim of generosity and the approbation were not observed in G.M. Sudarta's caricature discourse. This is primarily caused by the nature of caricature itself, whereas from the pragmatic perspective, the G.M. Sudarta's caricature discourse observed the politeness principle with typical parameter of social distance. This is because the speaker and speech partner are determined based on familiarity parameters, differences in age, gender, and sociocultural background and the level of social status distance based on the asymmetric relationship between the speaker and the speech partner in the speech context.

The linguistic aspects implemented in caricature discourse are phonology, words, phrases, sentences, and discourse. In case we seek to observe G. Sudarta's caricatures from the integrated aspect between the linguistic aspects, themes, lingual units, images, and picture showed a significant coherence. The icons presented through images are integrated and related to one another and enable the reader(s) to reflect the unified mutual sustenance meanings.

Based on social function perspective, both caricaturist and reader(s) share different understandings. From the caricatureist's perspective on social function of a caricature, any caricature essentially holds a basic social function, specifically the critical function to convey the enlightenment and refinement mission towards the odd symptom or something went wrong in society that urgently needed significant improvement. The issue of whether the criticism is followed up or not followed up by the party being the target of criticism, for caricaturists is not a big deal. The important thing for caricaturists is that their only job is to offer opinions to be resolved and by the reader, especially the target of his criticism. From the reader's understanding of social functions, a caricature has broader and more detailed functions, namely the critical function, the lighting function, the suggestion function, the control function, the supervisory function, and the entertainment / humor function.

Based on the social function perspective as informed by informants in research and language experts, the caricatures as part of the newspaper opinion segment, serves a main function, namely the functions of criticism and entertainment / humor. The verbal caricature concerns the elements of text / discourse and image / visual elements that integratively should sustain each other and clarify the intentions and messages of the caricature. To clarify this, the intention reflected in the picture, the caricaturists emphasize the need for textual elements to complement the visual elements. The caricature discourse which uses linguistic aspects

cover the phonological aspects, words, phrases, sentences, and discourse as aspects to explain the purpose of utterances reflected from the caricatures.

In terms of the phonological aspects, caricaturists invite the possible reader(s) to be more aware of the verbal symbolic purposes expressed in sound form, as exemplified from the sound imitation of a gun exploitation and gecko sound to explain the text duplication. In addition to the phonological aspects, the created caricature emphasizes linguistic aspects in the phrases form of proprietary construction phrases, amphiboly phrases, alternative coordinative phrases, and phrases with the same attributes. The caricaturist also used other linguistic aspects such as polysemy, homonymy, hyponymy, idiomatic, and antonyms meanings. The caricaturist additionally observed the linguistic sentential aspect of contradictory sentences and compound sentences where all the presented meanings are conflicting.

Many of the caricature found from the data were the creatively composed sentences in a single utterance in discourse form. The discourse that discusses language and speech should co-exist in a unified set of situations of the completed use. The meaning of a language is in a series of contexts and situations, as Firth emphasizes [cited in Syamsuddin, 1992], that language is only meaningful in its context of situation. Thus, the discussion on discourse is basically concerns the relationship between contexts reflected in the text.

V. Conclusion

Caricature is an image which serves function as a medium of criticism and entertainment / humor. This was reinforced by caricaturist and caricature readers' understandings about the social function addressed in the caricature. Several caricatures created by G.M. Sudarta consists of an integrated form of images and text, inter-themes, linguistic aspects, images, and pictures. G.M. Sudarta's caricature is considered coherent and has a unified meaning, and appears holistical as a caricature.

In part of sustaining the unified meaning, the typical linguistic aspect of speech acts used in the caricatures were commissive, expressive, verdictive, assertive, directive, and performative. The phatic speech acts were apparently not observed by caricaturist, since it does not fit with the nature of speech act nuanced with criticism, while speech acts which dominantly used linguistic aspects found in G. Sudarta's caricatures is the directive speech act type.

Based on the research analysis and discussion, caricature is an image that holds the main function, especially to create a sense of criticism which offers a better improvement in addition to entertain (humor). G. Sudarta's caricature consists of pictures and text that all of which have already been integrated each other, namely between themes, linguistic aspects, images, and picture. Both are coherent and share a unified meaning in varied contexts including ideological, political, economic, social, cultural, defense and security, and education contexts. The linguistic aspect of caricature texts, caricaturist violates the cooperative principles of the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manners. The violation against the maxims in the caricature discourse were not only meant to confuse or complicate the reader's understanding, however, it aims at criticizing the target of criticism through speech utterances that violates the cooperative principles, this was done to evoke more humorous and entertaining senses.

The politeness principles observed in G.M. Sudarta's caricature discourse are the maxims of tact, agreement, sympathy and modesty. Several maxims observed by caricaturists in his caricature speech act discrouse were those relevant to the the readers' contexts of

situation, social, and cultural targets and critics. The politeness principles of the maxims of generosity and approbation were not used in G.M. Sudarta's caricature discourse, due to the nature of caricature itself. Thus, the discourse / text in caricature can clarify and unite the text and images in one complete meaning. In understanding the social functions of a caricature, between caricaturists and readers there is a slight difference in understanding in interpreting the meaning reflected in caricature texts and images, namely in terms of the suggestion function.

References

- Austin, J.L. (1955). *How to do Things With Words*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do Things With Words*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barthes, R. (1988). *The Semiotic Challenge*. New York : Hill and Wang.
- Budiman, K., [2005], *Ikonisitas. Semiotika Sastra dan Seni Visual*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Buku Baik
- Christomy, Tommy, [2001], "Pengantar Semiotik Pragmatik Pierce: Nonverbal dan Verbal" dalam *Pusat Penelitian Kemasyarakatan dan Budaya Lembaga Penelitian Universitas Indonesia*, Bahan Pelatihan Semiotika: 7-14.
- Cook, Guy, [2000], *Language Play, Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cutting, Joan. [No Year], *Pragmatics and Discourse, A. Resource Book for Students*, London and New York
- Gazdar, Gerald, [1979]. *Pragmatics: Implicature, Presupposition and Logical Form*. New York: Academic Press.
- Grice, H.P. [1975]. "Logic and Conversation", *Syntax and Semantics: Speech Act*. New York: Academic Press.
- Haryono, Purwo, [2004], *Tindak Tutur dalam Wacana Rapat Dinas Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah Kabupaten Klaten*. Tesis Program Studi Linguistik Minat Utama Linguistik Deskriptif. Surakarta: Pascasarjana UNS.
- Hymes, Dell, [1968], "On Communicative Competence", dalam *Prise dan Holmes (ed.)*, *Sociolinguistics*. England: Pinguin Books, Ltd.
- Ibrahim, R. K., [2014], A Socio-pragmatic Study of Some Caricatures in Iraqi TV. *Media Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4, [21], 2014, <https://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/RHSS/article/download/15815/16628>
- Jaspers, J., [2011], Talking like a „zerolingual“: Ambiguous linguistic caricatures at an urban secondary school. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 2011: 1264–1278, doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2010.05.012
- Jumanto, [2006], "Komunikasi Fatis di Kalangan Penutur Jati Bahasa Inggris." [Disertasi Program Pascasarjana Fakultas Ilmu Pengetahuan Budaya], Universitas Indonesia Jakarta.
- Kreidler, C.W., [1998], *Introducing English Semantics*. New York: Routledge.
- Kridalaksana, Harimurti, [2001], *Kamus Linguistik*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka.
- Rahardi, K.R., [2000], *Imperatif dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Rahardi, K.R., [2003], *Berkenalan Dengan Ilmu Bahasa Pragmatik*. Malang: Penerbit Dioma.
- Kurniawan, [2001], *Semiologi Roland Barthes*. Magelang: Yayasan Indonesia Tera.

- Lechte, J., [2001], *50 Filsuf Kontemporer ; dari Strukturalisme sampai Posmodernitas*. Penerjemah A. Gunawan Admiranto. Yogyakarta : Kanisius.
- Leech, G.N. [1993]. *Prinsip-prinsip Pragmatik* [Trans. AM.D.D Oka]. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Levinson, Stephen. C., [1983], *Pracmatics*. London, New York, New Rochell, Melbourne Sydney: Cambridge University Press.
- Parker, Frank., [1986], *Linguistics for Non-Linguistics*. London: Taylor and Francis Ltd.
- Pramono, [1996], *Kartun Bukan Sekedar Benda Seni Prisma 1*. Januari halaman: 406-440.
- Rohmadi, M., [2004], *Pragmatik Teori dan Analisis*. Yogyakarta: Lingkar Media.
- Searle, J.R., [1969], *Speech Acts : An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge U.P.
- Segers, Rien., [2000], *Evaluasi Teks Sastra*. Penerjemah Suminto A. Sayuti. Yogyakarta : Adicita Karya Nusa.
- Sobur, Alex, [2004]. *Semiotika Komunikasi*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D., [1989]. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Subroto, Edi. [1992]. *Pengantar Metode Penelitian Linguistik*. Surakarta: UNS Press.
- Sudarta, G.M. [1980]. *Indonesia 1967 – 1980*. Jakarta: Penerbit PT. Gramedia.
- Sudarta, G.M. [1987]. “*Karikatur: Mati Ketawa Cara Indonesia*”. Jakarta: Prisma 5, Mei, pp.49-56
- Sudjiman, P. & van Zoest, A. [(ed),1996]. *Serba-serbi Semiotika*. Jakarta : Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Sutopo, H.B., [1995], *Kritik Seni Holistik Sebagai Pendekatan Penelitian Kualitatif* (Pidato Pengukuhan Guru Besar di Universitas Sebelas Maret). Surakarta: Sebelas Maret university Press.
- Van Ek, J.A. and Trim, J. L.M., [1998], *Threshold 1990; Council of Europe*, Cambridge University Press.
- Wardough, Ronald, [1986], *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Wijana, I Dewa Putu. [1995], “*Wacana Kartun dalam Bahasa Indonesia: Disertasi*”, Yogyakarta: Program Pascasarjana Universitas Gadjah Mada
- Wijana, I Dewa Putu, [1996], *Dasar-Dasar Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Andi
- Wijana, I Dewa Putu, [2004], *Kartun: Studi tentang Permainan Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Ombak
- Yule, George, [2006], *Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. Diterjemahkan Indah Fajar Wahyuni.