

Presupposition contributions in stand-up comedy (Discourse analysis of Raditya Dika's stand-up comedy on youtube)

Faisal Fahdian Puksi

Sekolah Tinggi Pariwisata Bandung, Indonesia
email: faisalpuksi@gmail.com

Abstract – This study aims to find out how a comic establishes strategy through presupposition in contributing to building a humour effect in stand-up comedy. A qualitative descriptive method was employed in this research to get full and depth conception. Fifteen (15) stand-up comedy videos hosted by Raditya Dika on YouTube are used in this research. All data obtained then transcribed which then selected 60 statements that considered representing the entire transcript data. From 60 statements, it can be found 651 presuppositions that contribute to building the effects of humour. Presupposition contribution in constructing the effects of humour lies at the level of cognitive process, semantic mechanism, and contextual speech. At the cognitive process level, the researcher finds that presupposition will contribute in creating humour if in a statement there is a presupposition with different and conflicting perspectives. At the semantic mechanism level, the presuppositions of the latter sentence can produce humour by relying on the reference to the previous sentence. For the contextual speech, presupposition will contribute to the creation of humour if it violates the conversational maxim.

Keywords: presupposition, comic Raditya Dika, stand-up comedy

1. Introduction

Presupposition studies of humour cannot be separated from other linguistic perspectives that discuss how a speech can be considered to be funny. It is usually created by comics in order to create a funny effect from the speeches that he or she delivered through presuppositions. The funny effects conveyed through

presuppositions can be seen from several aspects of linguistics such as humour as a cognitive process, humour as a wordplay or semantic mechanism, and humour as contextual speech (Krikmann, 2006).

Researches on presupposition have been done by many researchers (eDomaneschi, eCarrea, ePenco, eGreco, 2016; Fadly & Kurnia, 2015; Tuna, 2017; Camps, 2012; Oktoma & Mardiyanto, 2013). Presupposition has been researched in the German-language song (Rivai, 2000). In the discourse of newspapers has also been widely researched, for example, presupposition in the discourse of cartoons in newspapers (Rahmalia, 2008). Presupposition has also been studied in movies, such as love-themed movies (Paramyta, 2009) and horror-themed movies (Yosi, 2008). Meanwhile, the presuppositions that examine humour discourse have also been studied previously using semantic approaches (Waton, 1997), and humour in multi-cultural situations (Suprijono, 2010) and many more on presupposition research in various contexts, but studies on humour mostly only looks at or analyzes the presupposition of humorous conversations. However, presupposition research on monologues humour has not been widely found by researchers.

Presupposition can be considered as the conclusions or the initial assumptions of speakers prior to the speech that what will be conveyed is also understood by interlocutor (Leech, 1983; Levinson, 1983; Grundy, 2008). Krikmann (2006) also explained that ideally, a linguistic theory of humour should be able to determine and formulate the appropriate linguistic conditions for a humorous discourse to be considered as funny. The appearance of presupposition from comedian or comic speech or statement does not appear out of anywhere, there must be motivation and background.

Attardo & Raskin (1991) analyzed the discourse of humour with the theory of The General Theory of Verbal Humour (GTVH) which is a representation of hierarchical models of verbal humour. The sources of representations of verbal humour on the GTVH model are.

1. Language, including phonetics, phonology, morphophonemic, morphological, lexical, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic.
2. Narrative Strategy, a micro-genre of humour. The humour discourse is organized as an expository, puzzle, question and answer sequence, and dialogue.
3. Target, an "object" (individual/ group member) of humour. Choices such as ethnic, social, or political figures that have been properly considered to fulfil the role in a mild humour.
4. A situation, a proposition that is the target of humour. For example activities, objects, instruments, and others.
5. Logical Mechanism, "logical" does not stand for deductive logic or formal logic, but must be understood in "rational thinking in action".
6. Script Opposition, the creation of humour involves fundamental universality and placing the status in every human communication, a frame of mind, and cognitive theory.

Wordplay is one of the most common attempts by comics. Wordplay usually based on homonyms, homophones, and homographs. One example of the wordplay in the humorous discourse is "Joke Punning". Furthermore, Raskin (1985, in Krikmann 2006) describes joke-telling as a type of humour he calls "non-bona fide" communication that violates the cooperative principle or the maxim of Grice's

conversation. On the other hand, "Bona fide" is a communication that does not violate the maxim of Grice's conversation in pragmatic.

In the case of joke-telling, there are several different situations that may occur, depending on the comic, whether he/ she makes a joke intentionally or unintentionally and depends on the receiver of humour, whether expecting or not expecting a joke (Raskin, 1985, in Krikmann 2006). If the receiver of humour does not consider a joke, then he will try to understand in a standard "bona fide" way. However, if the comic fails to produce a joke, then the comic will look for "non-bona fide" (jokes, lies, rubbish talk, etc.). If the receiver of humour has prepared himself from scratch with a "joke wave", the principle of cooperation begins to operate again. However, the "joke-oriented" way is modified by providing other information that creates a joke.

Every maxim certainly has associativity, so it can cause a joke or humour. Thus, it can be concluded that the formulation of the principle of cooperation in humour will certainly contribute to every necessary conversation, at what stage and where it occurs, and with the purpose of accepting or where the direction of humour talk is conducted (Attardo & Raskin, 1991).

When it is viewed from its purpose, humour discourse focuses on the relationship between meaning and form that refers to whether correct or not is based on the language speakers. Attardo and Raskin (1991) introduced the Isotopy Disjunction Model of Jokes (IDM) which states that what should be underlined in interpreting humour discourse is from the last sentence that depends on the reference of the previous sentence without considering its meaning correct or false, called "semantically empty".

2. Method

This research is a qualitative descriptive study. Data Sources in this research are secondary data sources, which are stand-up comedy videos from Raditya Dika that was uploaded on YouTube. The data in this research is a comic statement in stand-up comedy. Researchers limit the data to only taking 60 comic statements that can build humour and create funny effects to represent all data. The type of data required in this study is a speech or comic statement in stand-up comedy. Documentation technique is done by download, observe, and record. In the process of collecting the data, the researchers collected 15 stand-up comedy videos from Raditya Dika that downloaded from YouTube as the data source. The data obtained through observation method then stored by recording it on the analysis sheet.

Because purpose of this research is to describe presupposition contribution to comic statements in stand-up comedy in establishing humour and creating funny effects, the researcher's data analysis technique focuses only on a presupposition in comic speech or statements that can build humour and create funny effects.

3. Results and Discussion

Here are three examples of speeches in stand-up comedy with presupposition analysis (# 1) to (# 3): Cognitively, something is considered funny, if it involves two different perspectives that contradict each other. This is supported by the presuppositions that appear in the comic speech in the stand-up comedy that he/ she performs.

(#1) “Oia, gue juga seneng karena banyak cewek-cewek disini, gue bersama pacar gue, hari ini gue ditemenin, gue sangat mencintai dia, namanya Bambang.”

(#1) “Oia, I am also happy because a lot of girls are here, I am with my sweetheart, today I am accompanied, I really love my sweetheart, his name is Bambang.”

In the statement (# 1) above, two utterances are found that bring existential presupposition because they state the existence of contested entities that contribute to the cognitive process. The emergence of existential awareness is formulated as below:

- a. I'm also happy because a lot of pretty girls are here. (= p)
- b. There are me and there are pretty girls. (= q)
- c. $p \gg q$

The existential presupposition that appears in the statement (# 1) can contribute to the creation of funny effects because they have different perspectives. When the comic tells the above statement, the receiver of humour begins to process the information in the first speech that can be assumed that he is happy with the existence of pretty girls who exist in that place. But then the receiver of humour compares it to the existential presupposition that appears in the second speech "There is my (comic) sweetheart named Bambang". Bambang is an Indonesian common name of the male.

Then the cognitive principle works to overcome the contradiction (paradox) and the interpretation of the different meanings in the statement (# 1), so in the receiver of humour understanding, it causes a laugh reaction.

The statement (# 1) can also bring up lexical presupposition. This is an element of affirmation of comic statements that imply something that does not exist in the speech. The lexical presupposition can be denoted as below:

- a. I'm also happy because a lot of pretty girls are here. (= p)
- b. I (comic) am a man who loves pretty girls. (= q)
- c. $p \gg q$

The lexical presupposition denoted above is formulated through the use of the word "happy", so the lexical presupposition that appears is "I (comic) am a man who likes pretty girls". Then the receiver of humour compares it back with a different perspective on the next lexical pronunciation gained from the saying "I am with my sweetheart, today I am accompanied, I really love my sweetheart, his name is Bambang", denoted as below:

- a. Today I am accompanied, I really love my sweetheart, his name is Bambang. (= p)
- b. I (comic) am attracted to men. (= q)
- c. $p \gg q$

The existence of Bambang as a common name for Indonesian male referred to as comic's sweetheart who accompanied him at the time. Here, the lexical presupposition implies that it belongs to the same-sex male class. The humour receiver firstly begins processing information in the first speech that assumes "I (comic) am a man who likes pretty girls" and compares it with the second assumption that "I (comic) am attracted to men" that creates different meanings that rise contrary meaning. Then the cognitive principle works to overcome the contradiction (paradox) and the interpretation of the different meanings in the statement (# 1), so in his understanding, it causes a funny reaction.

The presuppositions formulated in the statement (# 1) are existential presupposition and lexical presupposition. Both presuppositions work together

cognitively and contribute to the creation of humour and generate a funny reaction. The appearance of both types of presuppositions above reflects the comic creativity that cannot be separated from bi-association or two planned. The statement involves two different and conflicting perspectives so that humour can be accepted when these two perspectives are differentiated and perceived.

In the next comic statement, the presupposition contributes to a semantic mechanism. The following is an analysis using IDM theory:

(#2) "Gue seneng banget dateng ke Bandung, kenapa? Karena ceweknya cantik-cantik di Bandung, dan seperti yang gue liat sekarang, ceweknya cantik-cantik banget, cowoknya juga gak kalah cantik. Cowok-cowok homo belakang, makasih, makasih, makasih Radit".

(#2) "I am really happy to come to Bandung, why? Because the girls are beautiful in Bandung, and as I see it now, the girls are really beautiful. Guys are also beautiful. Guys in the back said thanks, thanks, thanks Radit".

From the above comic statement, there are three existential presuppositions. Denoted as below:

(I) a. The girls are really beautiful. (= p)

b. There are beautiful girls. (= q)

c.p >> q

(II) a. Guys are also beautiful. (= p)

b. There are beautiful guys. (= q)

c.p >> q

(III) a. Guys in the back said thanks, thanks, thanks Radit. (= p)

b. There are guys who happy to be praised as beautiful. (= q)

c.p >> q

Using the IDM theory, the interpretation of humour in the above statement is derived from presuppositions that rise from the last utterance in the comic statement "There are guys who happy to be praised as beautiful". It depends on the existential reference that appears in the previous utterance "there are beautiful guys in Bandung" and "there are beautiful girls in Bandung" regardless of its true or false meaning called "semantically empty". Can be seen the process of playing a word (joke punning) performed by the comic that led to the existence of linguistic persecution. Linguistic coercion can be seen from the lexical meaning contained in the prefixes of the last speech. The lexical meaning of beauty is a beautiful look on a woman's face. There is an overlap of meaning (antonyms) to the presuppositions that appear "there is a group of men who love to be called beautiful" so that in their understanding it causes a coercion that can create a funny or humorous effect.

It can be seen the process of playing words (joke punning) performed by the comic that led to the existence of linguistic ambiguity. Linguistic ambiguity can be seen from the lexical meaning contained in the presupposition of the last utterance. The lexical meaning of 'beautiful' is a good look on a woman's face. There is an overlap of meaning (antonyms) to the presuppositions that appear "there is a group of men who love to be called beautiful" so in their understanding it causes an ambiguity that can create a funny or humorous effect.

In the next comic statement, joke telling involves the principle of cooperation that violates maxim, giving rise to implicature in the comic's utterance. Maxim is presented as a paradox involving a maximal violation. Here is comic's statement:

(#3) "Gue seneng karena banyak yang datang hari ini, mudah-mudahan sebagian dari kalian, juga ada follower gue. Walaupun tiap hari yang gue dapet cuma "folbek eaaaaa", "cemungut ea kaaaa", "eaaa"... sorry banget gue sering ngatain alay, jadi kalo di antara kalian ada yang alay gue minta maaf, bukan urusan gue untuk mengomentari spesies kalian karena tau ga apa yang terjadi, gue sadar ternyata gue pernah alay."

(#3) "I'm happy because many have come today, hopefully, some of you are also my followers. Although every day I get only "folbek eaaaaa" "cemungut ea kaaaa" "eaaa", I am really sorry to often offended 'alay', so if they're among you is 'alay', I apologize. It is not my concern to comment on your species, because you know what? I realized I've been *alay* before."

In the case of joke telling, there are several different situations that may occur in the statement that is spoken, it depends on the comic whether to make a joke intentionally or unintentionally. Other situations also depend on humour receiver, whether to expect a joke or not. If the receiver of humour does not expect a joke, then he/ she understands in a bona fide way. As in the statement (# 3) the first presupposition is the existential presupposition "comic", "there are you guys referring to the audience" and "there are comic's followers", denoted as below:

- a. I'm happy because many (people) have come today, hopefully, some of you are also my followers (= p)
- b. There I am (comic). There you are that refers to the audience, and there my followers are (comic's followers on Twitter). (= q)
- c. $p \gg q$

In the context above, the existential presupposition is understood by humour receiver in a standard (bona fide) way. In that sense, a comic has failed to produce jokes. This is because comic does not do a maxim violation in his statement.

In the next utterance, the comic said: "Although every day I get only *folbek eaaaaa cemungut ea kaaaa eaaa*". Presupposition that appears in the above utterance are lexical presupposition "comic's followers on Twitter are alay or tacky." It can be denoted as below:

- a. Although every day I get only "folbek eaaaaa" "cemungut ea kaaaa" "eaaa". (= p)
- b. Comic's followers on Twitter are *alay* or tacky. (= q)
- c. $p \gg q$

The existence of the word "Although" is a denial that can cause lexical presupposition that comic actually does not like his alay or tacky followers. That way, comic utterance belongs to non-bona fine for violating the maxim of manner which creates a paradox in his understanding to stimulate laughter and create funny effects on the humour receiver.

In a statement (# 3) the comic continues his statement by saying "I am really sorry too often offended alay", so if there among you is 'alay', I apologize. It is not my concern to comment on your species, because you know what? I realized I've been *alay* before." In that utterance, factual presupposition emerged with "comic often say salary"

that is triggered by "I am really sorry". Existential presupposition also appears to express the existence of *alay* community. Denoted as follows:

- (I) a. I am really sorry to often offended 'alay'. (= p)
b. Comic often says alay. (= q)
c. $p \gg q$
- (II) a. so if there among you is 'alay', I apologize. (= p)
b. There is *alay* community. (= q)
c. $p \gg q$

In the context of the above statement, comic still present his speech by default (bona fide). However, comic performs 'joke oriented' again by violating maxim of relevance. Denoted as below:

- (I) a. It is not my concern to comment on your species, because you know what? I realized I've been *alay* before. (= p)
b. There are you who refer to the audience. (= q)
c. $p \gg q$
- (II) a. It is not my concern to comment on your species, because you know what? I realized I've been *alay* before. (= p)
b. There is *alay* species. (= q)
c. $p \gg q$
- (III) a. It is not my concern to comment on your species, because you know what? I realized I've been *alay* before. (= p)
b. I (comic) was *alay*. (= q)
c. $p \gg q$
- (IV) a. It is not my concern to comment on your species, because you know what? I realized I've been *alay* before. (= p)
b. I've (comic) been *alay* before. (= q)
c. $p \gg q$

The presuppositions depicted in the first notation are an existential presupposition that mentions 'your' existence which refers to the receiver of humour and the existence of *alay* species. The above utterances become non-bona fide when comic tells 'your species' as '*alay* species'. Generally, the name of the species is used for the classification of animals and plants, but here comic mention there is *alay* species. This violates the relevance of maxim. This violation of relevance maxim creates paradoxes so that in its understanding creates a laughable reaction and a humorous effect on the receiver of humour. The humour continues with the occurrence factual presupposition "I (comic) was *alay*" that understood by the receiver of humour. It means comic insulted himself through the implied lexical presupposition " I've (comic) been *alay* before ".

From the above explanation, through the theory of joke telling initiated by Raskin (1985, in Krikman 2006), the researchers conclude that every comic statement can create humour, but not all of the presuppositions can create humour if the presupposition does not violate Grice's cooperation principle. The presupposition that comes from the comic statement will also create humour if it contains lies, nonsense, or anomalies that will cause paradoxes so that in its comprehension generate laughable reactions and funny effects on the receiver of humour.

4. Conclusion

Presupposition has a definite contribution in the process of creating humour in stand-up comedy. The contribution of lexical presupposition to cognitive processes in the creation of humour can be seen from implicitly contradicted perspective. This is cannot be separated from bi-association or two planned which causes contradiction of meaning received by the receiver of humour. The contradiction of meaning from these lexical presuppositions can lead to generating laughable reactions and funny effects on the receiver of humour.

Formulation of lexical presupposition also contributes to the process of creating humour through semantic mechanisms. Playing of word selection (joke punning) can also be one form of linguistic applications that are often used by the comic in creating humour.

Another thing that can also cause a funny effect is the linguistic ambiguity created by the comic. Linguistic ambiguity can be seen from the overlapping of presupposition meaning (antonyms) in the last speech depends on reference presupposition of the previous utterances, without considering have true or false meaning (semantically empty). Ambiguity often arises because many comic statements are conveyed implicitly to create a funny effect. In terms of contextual, comic often makes lexical presupposition by involving the principle of cooperation that violates the maxim of conversation. Presupposition raises an implicature presented as a paradox so can create a humorous effect on the receiver of humour.

References

- Attardo, S. & Raskin, V. (1991). Script theory revis(it)ed: joke similarity and joke representation model. *HUMOUR: International Journal of Humour Research*, 4 (3/4), pp. 293–347.
- Camps, A. C. S. (2012). Communication with Mothers of Newborns Under Phototherapy: Humanistic Presupposition. *Revista da Rede de Enfermagem do Nordeste*. 2012;8(3).
- eDomaneschi, F., eCarrea, E., ePenco, C., eGreco, A. (2016). Selecting Presupposition in Conditional Clauses. Results from a Psycholinguistic Experiment. *Frontier in Psychology*. 2016;6 DOI 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.02026
- Fadly, F. Z. & Kurnia, A. P. (2015). Presupposition in The Jakarta Posts Political Articles: A Pragmatics Approach. *Indonesian EFL Journal*. 2015;1(1):117-124. DOI 10.25134/ieflj.v1i1.620
- Grundy, P. (2008). *Doing Pragmatic*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Krikmann, A. (2006). Contemporary linguistic theories of humour. *Folklore* (33), 27-57: 29.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principle of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Limited.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University: England.
- McCarron, K. & Baden, M. (2008). Compering and comparing: stand-up comedy and pedagogy. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*. Vol. 45, No. 4, 355–363. English Literature Programme, Roehampton University: London, UK.
- Morris, A. (2011). *Rhetoric Review*. Vol. 30 Issue 1, p37-53. 17p.
- O'Reilly, S. (2006). Dead Funny: on the art of comedy. 2006. *Art monthly -London*, (302), 079.
- Oktoma, E. & Mardiyanto, S. (2013). The Analysis of Presupposition in the Short Stories of Silvester. Goridus Sukur. *English Review: Journal of English Education*. 2013;2(1):73-83.
- Pandiangan, S. A. (2012). Praanggapan Dalam Kartun Sukribo Pada Surat Kabar Harian Kompas. Unimed: Medan.
- Paramytha, N. G. (2009). *Praanggapan dalam Film Janji Joni*. Depok: Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Indonesia.
- Puksi, F. F. (2016). Speech Act of Complaints from Online Hotel Review. *Proceeding: Asia Tourism Forum 2016 – The 12th Biennial Conference of Hospitality and Tourism Industry in Asia (ATF-16)*, Atlantis Press, p. 0857-0591.

- Raskin, V. (1985). *Semantic Mechanisms of Humour*. Dordrecht & Boston & Lancaster: Reidel Publishing Company.
- Raskin, V. & Attardo, S. (1994). Non-literality and non-bona-fide in language. *Pragmatics and Cognition*, 2 (1), pp. 31–69.
- Rivai, D. (2000). *Peranan Alat-alat Kohesi dalam Mengikat Tema Lagu Bahasa Jerman*. Fakultas Sastra Universitas Indonesia: Depok.
- Tuna, D. (2017). Revealing to Translate: The Intertextuality and Strategic Nature of Voices, Presuppositions and Metadiscourse in a Non-Literary Text. 2017;5(3):133-144
DOI 10.18298/ijlet.2064
- Wagg, S. (1998). “*They Already got a Comedian for Governor*”: *Comedians and Politics in the United States and Great Britain*”. In Wagg, S. (ed), *Because I Tell a Joke or Two*, London: Routledge, 244–272.
- Walton, Ch. (1997). *Aspek Pragmatik Humour Lisan : Suatu Studi Tentang Bentuk Keterlibatan Praanggapan, Implikatur, Petuturan, dan Dunia Kemungkinan dalam Humour Lisan Bagito*. Depok: Fakultas Sastra Universitas Indonesia.
- Winarni, L. W. (2015). *Tesis: Analisis Praanggapan Pernyataan Humour Dalam Stand-Up Comedy Indonesia*. Bandung: Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Yosi. (2008). *Presupposition in Tagline of Hollywood Horror Movies*. Depok: Fakultas Sastra Universitas Indonesia.
- Yule, G. (2006). *Pragmatics*. NY: Oxford University Press.