

Jangkrik: Taboo Language Use at Comical Interlude in Javanese Shadow Puppet Performance

Latif Amrullah

School of Music Humanities and Media
University of Huddersfield
Huddersfield, England
latif.amrullah@hud.ac.uk

Abstract—This paper aims to explore the reason why taboo language use is frequent during the comical interlude in Javanese shadow puppet performances. The data were taken from a recorded shadow puppet performance in East Java. During the recording, there is much taboo language use by the comedians and the puppeteer. This usage is analysed from the viewpoint of comedy show and linguistic performance. The results show that the use of taboo language use is not regarded as something sacred or offensive in the context of conversation during the comical interlude. The appearance of taboo language use which is perceived as dark humour evokes the feeling of being entertained by violating the social norms.

Keywords—comedy; puppet; taboo language use; sociolinguistics

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper explores the emergence of taboo language use in one of the two clown scenes in Javanese shadow puppet performance: *wayang purwo*. The *Limlukan*, as a comical interlude, appears in early shadow puppet performance which involves on stage participants: puppeteer, comedians, and singers; and off stage: *gamelan* players and audience. The analysis grows out of a broader scope of sociolinguistic taboo word use into comedy as well as a traditional art performance. The data are retrieved from a recorded *wayang purwo* performance video in online sharing website YouTube.

Some of the most exciting scenes in shadow puppet performance or *wayang* in Javanese culture are the appearances of *limlukan* and *goro-goro* in the middle of this sacred object (Cohen, 2007; Foley, 1984) performance. These clown scenes can easily attract spectators' attention (Mrázek, 2000) to enjoy the show as a contingent art form. There will be comedians who talk funnily yet contains pieces of advice and exhortation to of what feast is being celebrated: marriage, tribute commemoration, or gratitude to god. The clown scenes involve the roles of comedians, *dhalang* puppeteer, and *sinden* (female singer) on the stage. All the scenes are supported by the *gamelan* (Withey, 1974) melodies – musical instrument accompanying the performance – so that there is a soul of comedy performance (Raffles, 1830). Although both scenes can provoke fun and laugh, they vary basically to some extent (Mrázek, 2000): characters of *Limbuk* and *Cangik* enact *limlukan*; while *Semar*, *Gareng*, *Petruk* and *Bagong* star the *goro-goro*. Each comical interlude joins together creating and delivering the message of ceremony purpose bound to the socio-religious background (Kroef, 1954).

The *dhalang* (puppeteers) and the comedians must have been consciously aware of how to encourage amusement among the different audience with their different background: gender, age, social status, education, or occupation. The audience is mixed gender because this is a public entertainment, and it has no gender restriction to watch. This public entertainment is attended by wide-range of ages: children, youngers, adults, and elders. However, the first three audiences usually enjoy the performance from the opening until before midnight. The reasons are they feel bored with the performance due to their lack of understanding in the plot of the story, and they fell asleep due to its night performance. For the older audience, however, they have watched *wayang* performance many times during their life. For this rationale, they can comprehend the background story being performed, and they know exactly how to enjoy the show by integrating the atmosphere changes of performance and night's temperature, including the musical instrument and dramatical development story (Mrázek, 2000). For high social status, some socially respected persons and invited spectators have the privilege to enjoy the show behind the rectangular white screen (*kelir*) (Schechner, 1990) because this is the best place to sit in: watching how *dhalang* manipulates the flat, cuts intricately, recites the story and directs the music (Schechner, 1990).

Basically, the show is a shadow puppet, not just an ordinary puppet show. For people who have a lower social status, they watch the show surrounding of the stage. The variety of education and occupation determines the social status in society hold by Javanese people. The higher education and occupation status they have, the higher social status will be addressed. Above those social variations, encouraging hilarious reaction requires fresh and unusual comedy. The practical contents of joke and humour are mostly on the topics of violation of social norms through language use, which results in laughter and relaxes. As the time changes until recently, there is a term of “deconstructed *wayang*” showing that the locus of performance is not merely on the basis

of story and its moral value, nevertheless it has shifted to clown scenes (Cohen, 2007) which is full humour and musical comedy as what the audience' wish to see (Mrázek, 2000).

In daily life, humour and comedy entail the use of informal language. It also applies in the situated comedy performed and broadcasted publicly. The comedians employ daily language variation which is very close to the audience's experiences. It means that the language on the stage should be as natural as possible, simple, and convey the audience that they are involved in the comedy atmosphere. One characteristic of daily language is of being low prestige. The freedom owned by low prestige language will result in the big chances of regulating many language variations freely to express their feeling and emotion in the performance. The best way in regulating language variations is by using language which infringes the social norm, i.e. taboo language and taboo topic (Schnurr & Plester, 2017): to mention two are *Sex and the City* and *Six Feet Under* premiered in US tv cable (Bucaria & Barra, 2016). It is a fact of what experts call as dark humour (Gibson, 2019; Nesi, 2012), which can provoke laughter (Attardo, 1994). Comedians who can take advantages of being superiority for imperfections of others (Hickson-Hahn, 1998) and governing taboo language use during the comedy show will undoubtedly receive great excitement from the floor (Wajnryb, 2005). This phenomenon also happens at comical interlude of *limbukan* in shadow puppet performance. The comedians express some taboo language use during the around two-hour clown scene. For some respects, the use of taboo language is acceptable since it can arise the relaxing feeling and can rejoice the audience. However, despite a public performance, some rules and norms must be obeyed by comedians. It is imperative that shadow puppet performance be considered as sacred and ritual activity back to its original purpose for cultural, religious ritual in Java. In this case, the sacredness of ritual activity should be maintained through the use of proper and appropriate language during the show.

It is true that to some religious practices, sacredness is required thoroughly for the sake of perfection in praying. Some other activities, however, have been incorporated with local or traditional culture; therefore, it is partly or entirely different from its previous beliefs. There was a transformation of motivational performance from the early emergence of old *wayang* into the early entrance of Islam. At that moment, *wayang* was intended for introducing Islam as a new religion for Javanese people yet maintaining the story of Ramayana and *Mahabharata* with some modifications. The properties, viz. puppets, lights, sound, music instruments, were simple (Kroef, 1954), not as complex as it is today. As the advancement of technology, shadow puppet performance gets some improvements in many aspects until what people can enjoy now. At this point, the puppeteer ought to deliver the performance in such a way henceforth the audience are still keen on watching for a whole night story. For this reason, a funny and ludicrous act had better be inserted during this long show (Raj & Dempsey, 2010).

In the light of recent development of traditional performance, it becomes more difficult to ignore the existence of taboo language. In one hand, the puppeteers and other traditional artists feel that they need to preserve this cultural heritage whatever it takes, therefore the *wayang* performance will not become extinct soon. They keep maintaining this cultural performance because there are lots of moral teachings and local wisdom as well as a cultural identity. On the other hand, the rapid changes in technology gradually shift the traditional public amusement into modern private entertainment. As a result, people tend to accept the new entertainment and leave behind the conventional ones. One possible solution for this situation is by modifying the traditional performance to be fit into modern entertainment demand: fundamentally evoking more laugh. Those facts drive the researcher to dig deeper into a small aspect of performing arts, i.e. language use. In this investigation, the aims are to assess the significant usage of taboo language during the comical interlude in shadow puppet performance and how taboo language is perceived during the show.

Because taboo relates to moral behaviour, then there is a dichotomy of language in general: good language and bad language. What constitutes of these two terms has been a long debate. The contentious is what Andersson and Trudgill (1990) want to eliminate. There is no language in such a thing as good and bad; this is only the perception of values or *cover prestige* precisely because every language and its kinds have the prestige of usage. It is under Davis' (1989) elucidation that what is deemed as bad language is frankly limited to scientific proof. From a single fact of linguistic, there will be far more complex viewpoints than just merely the linguistic account itself. Linguistic researches on bad language, for a temporary term, unfortunately, tend to go around history and evolution, grammaticality and meaning, frequency and offensiveness (Fägersten, 2007) which put aside the frame of conversational analysis. Bad language – as linguistic badlands – consists of several overlapping metalanguage terms which, in the English language, is thoroughly found in Wajnryb (2005).

Taboo denotes an alienated attitude which contains effects on daily life (Allan & Burridge, 2006). The community approval of taboo concept in one culture can be completely different from others due to their various perceptions of things in their life. Their experiences of specific events also take place to create a sacred belief perpetuated by general common sense. Accordingly, being sacred in cultural development, conducting taboo actions can lead to undesirable consequence in the future life, bad luck for most cases. However, there is nothing to be worried for linguists to talk about taboo words, although some linguists assume that conducting a study on taboo words is such an inappropriate topic to be discussed in the academic environment (Jay, 2000). This oversight, perhaps, results in the omitting of emotion in language study. If it happens, then linguists will need to reformulate the definition of language as a system of communication.

Taboo word is tightly connected with swearword, although they are partly different. Swearword has been used to discuss the exemplification of foul language (Wajnryb, 2005). Thus, swearword can be said as the vocabulary of swearing which covers range-set of a linguistic form: a simple word, compound words, and formulas as a syntactic structure (Andersson & Trudgill, 1990). Nevertheless, this is not just a simple linguistic piece of a field which is in line with its meaning. Mohr (2013) points out that swearword is claimed to have a strong connection to what it represents rather than other lexical choices. This metalanguage has two meanings that are entirely different to some respect: formal swearing (to tell the truth and only the truth) and informal

swearing (words violating norms in society) (Hughes, 2006; Wajnryb, 2005). The latter will be the focus of discussion due to its controversy and debated issues (Hughes, 2006).

It is essential to determine what the characteristic of swearing is which differs from any act in common saying. Wajnryb (2005) explains that in swearing, there must be a particular intention that the speaker must have in mind. This intention should fit the criteria that constitute of swearing in Ljung (2011, p. 4):

1. Swearing is the utterances containing taboo words,
2. The taboo words are used with non-literal meaning,
3. Many utterances that constitute swearing are subject to severe lexical, phrasal and syntactic constraints which suggest that most swearing qualifies as a formulaic language,
4. Swearing is emotive language: its primary function is to reflect, or seem to reflect the speaker's feeling and attitudes.

In the dyadic model of communication (Dyner, 2011), both speaker and hearer should be treated fairly as participants in order to construct an interaction based on social constraints (D'hondt, 2009). It explicates a comprehensive overview that, in swearing, aspects of speaker and hearer should be deemed equally. If a speaker has an intention in swearing, then the hearer had better have an ability of interpretation of the given product. If the communication fails to convey the intention-production of the speaker and interpretation-reception of the hearer, then the above four criteria of swearing will presumably be irrelevant. There are some shortcomings of the above proposition that probably will hinder the intended meaning of swearing. First, not all of the swearing should contain taboo words to cause offence. Remember that neutral words can generate offensive meaning depends on the frame. Second, the conception of taboo or not taboo words dramatically depends on the area of expertise and in what situation does the words appear. Third, swearing-categorised words may not contain certain feeling or attitudes; there are plenty of other functions of swearing. For these considerations, in this paper, having had an intense discussion between my supervisor Jim O'Driscoll and me, we would propose taboo language use as a mechanical term denoting any use of swearword and its metalanguage terms, to mention just a few of them: profanity, blasphemy, curse, oath, obscenity, foul language. This term will support how taboo *language use* words should be carefully examined in public performance, which it bounds firmly to social and *religious* norms.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Researchers attempted to evaluate frequency and offensiveness of Javanese taboo language use. Sumekto and Kustinah (2019) conducted a research on motives of expressing expletive, ability to differentiate the expletive, the appearance and dominantly media influences. There are some shortcomings, however, that this study only utilizes quantification data (Fägersten, 2007) which sacrifices the possible elaborated answer from respondents. Besides, university student respondents can blur their answer due to the threatened self-conception of being earnest: maintaining their self-image as a good student. Sumekto and Kustinah are influenced by the work of Nicolau and Sukanto (2013), which focuses on gender-group swearword use and their attitudes. Unfortunately, the writers of this paper missed the importance of live data owing to the utilization of multiple choice and open-ended questionnaire. Eliminating the questionnaire as a data collection method can be found in the study conducted by Cahyani and Setiawan (2019). This study examines oral taboo language use as what it is quotidianly. It must be underlined, though, that moving picture broadcasted on tv cannot be equally compared with our daily language: movie production must have been suited into specific purpose so that it is not spontaneous language use.

There are some studies concern with taboo in a broadcasted tv programme, including comedy. Seizer (2011) researched swear words in stand-up comedy involving two comedians in the United States. Data analysis employed the register of dirty words. The results show that obscenity may shift the expectation of the audience from sex to craziness orientation, which can provoke a laugh. Furthermore, the use of particular obscenity helps to heighten the experience, perspective, and effect of the speaker. There is a quite interesting study in terms of the humour production conducted by Hull, Tosun, & Vaid (2017). This study came up with the statement that surprisingness is the crucial notion in producing humour. In the meanwhile, we can look further of the funny basis in the perspective of the audience in the work of Lynch (2010) which studied fifty-nine university students in terms on their reaction having watched a stand-up comedy. The result proposes that participants produce more laugh as the response of their implicit preference. These studies imply several diverse perspectives of taboo language research by considering the role of tv program to educate and inform the public regarding their needs of information and entertainment.

To sum up, this paper differs to some extents regarding some aspects of dataset. The use of oral data is more suitable to explore the language of emotion since taboo language is part of ways to express emotional feeling. Furthermore, unlike stand-up comedy which is deemed as modern comedy, *limbukan* expresses traditional comedy which is full of local wisdom.

III. METHOD

This paper concerns the nature of taboo language use in the public sphere. The author took a recorded shadow puppet performance on online video sharing YouTube in which Percil and friends star it. He is famous in East Java with his identical recognition for Javanese comedian, singer, traditional artist and has been collaborating with various artists and *dhalang* in diverse traditional Javanese performances. Especially in this video, comparing to other artists, he delivers taboo language use during comical interlude yet retaining the funny essentials of his jokes along with moral values. Moreover, the humour materials from East Java are different from some respects: open, spontaneous, and direct. This freedom of language use, in this video, might be the results of the East Javanese language which is located remotely from the epicentre of Javanese language, considering it as

periphery Javanese language, or it tends to be called as Majapahitan Javanese language. The video was accessed from Wayang Jawa YouTube account channel where the video link can be found in <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ywsiVo0ruzs>. The recorded show entitled “CAK PERCIL CS-16 FEBRUARI 2019 BERSAMA KI RUDI GARENG DI PLOSOKLATEN – KEDIRI” is an only comical interlude (Cohen, 2019) of *limbukan*, which last around 2.15 hours. During this show, there are plenty of occasions where taboo language use appears, spoken by either two comedians or *dhalang*. The method is under Ljung (2011) that there are two ways to analyze the use of spoken data: observation and recording. In this circumstance, the latter was governed carefully.

Once the recorded comical interlude was downloaded, the next step was transcribing the data into a true verbatim transcript and selecting the appearances of taboo language use including its conversational environment, laughter as the definite response of comedy. In making the transcription, not only the emergence of taboo language use but also the context of utterances is written orderly. In this matter, conversations among the comedians are essential that there be topical reciprocation which influences the metaphorical meaning of taboo language use. The author’s mental knowledge helps a lot in determining whether a word is categorized as taboo language use words. Then the collected datasets are analysed based on the forms, categorization and situational emergence of taboo language use words.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Situational Contexts

The reciprocal communication emerging humour in this video cannot be separated from the situational context of the conversation. To strengthen this ground, the description of *limbukan* comical interlude will help us to understand the atmosphere of taboo language use words emergence. During the video, we can easily recognize that the *wayang* performance is held at night signified by open-air stage form and the dark of the surroundings. The time of performance strictly follows the traditional rules of *wayang* in Java since it will be uncommon for people watching *wayang* in daylight and at the indoor stage, except on particular occasion which is rare. The invitee of this performance is the parents of the bride as a wedding feast celebration. It is another consideration for the *dhalang* and comedians in creating and delivering their jokes to be suited to the current situation. It is proven by the fact that both comedians read a wedding invitation and say the name of parents as well as the brides. The setup of two puppets, mbok *limbuk* and *mak cangik*, in white screen implies the *limbukan* comical interlude as one of the two clown scenes appearing in wayang performance.

People on the stage play significant roles in creating the situation and building up the atmosphere of comedy. There is a *dhalang* or puppeteer as the storyteller, animator, and ruler of the whole show. In another word, he holds the most significant power of control above other participants: inviting *sinden* to sing, musicians to play the orchestra, and comedians to perform joke. His limited sitting position in a raised stage floor is unable him to freely move since he has to face the white screen all the time while animating the puppet. In the right hand of *dhalang*, there sit on the floor the *sinden* or beautiful women singers in the specific arrangement: eight singers in this video. The youngest and the most beautiful singer should sit closest to *dhalang*, and the oldest is in the farthest from him. Such a kind of position reflects a synergy and mutual relationship of senior and junior women singers as complementing the various type of voices.

On the contrary with the *dhalang*, these singers always sit in such a way that looks higher than usual position due to the use of cushion pad. They have to persist themselves sitting for the whole night performance and be ready to sing whenever the story requires. They should have themselves look beautiful since their position facing the audience is the centre of attention after the *dhalang*. Above two participants, perhaps comedians are the most unimpeded actors. In this video, there are Percil and Kunthet who personage themselves as different self-identity due to the changes of footing. They act as a singer at the beginning, become wise man when giving advice, and comedian once they make the audience laugh. They can easily cope with the stage and changing the direction among *dhalang*, *sinden*, and audience owing to their standing position. Furthermore, there is one more participant who helps creating the atmosphere of performance: gamelan orchestra players. They do exist in the wayang performance but, in this video, they are partly blocked from the camera. Their job as a musician is so essential that there be a strong connection, especially among *dhalang*, *sinden*, and comedians.

The bonding amongst those participants can be seen from the emergence of taboo language use words in 25 different footings as metalanguage terms proposed in this paper.

TABLE I. TABOO LANGUAGE USE WORDS

No	Reference	Taboo language use words
1	Animal	Jangkrik (10), kethek (1), munyuk (1), separo uwong separo kewan (1)
2	Parts of body	Endhasmu (3), cengelm (2), matane pece (1),
3	Personal trait	Goblok (3), koclok (7), bosok (2), gendheng (3), edan (2), mekrok irunge (1), cengoh (2)
4	Threat	Tak kethak (1), tak bacok (2)
5	Thing	Rupane koyo asbak (1)
6	Exclamation	Kurang ajar (2)

Interestingly, the most spelling taboo language use word in this video is *jangkrik* (cricket) as the way to animate personality to animal or to resemble certain features. The emergence of this word is unsurprising, albeit the categorisation as rude because this is the identical word of East Java language. The second highest rank is *koclok* (lunatic) with seven times of use, which functions to

refer the personality to someone due to their silly or crazy actions which trigger this utterance. For the following taboo language use, there are three words that appear three times for each: *endhasmu* (your head), *goblok* (stupid), and *gendheng* (crazy). The rest of the words have a small portion of usage during the performance. It should be admitted that the frequency of usage does not significantly imply the erotic appeal of laughing in the audience. Being funny depends not only on the building the setup and exploding the punch line but also on the choice of words and bodily movement.

B. Taboo Language Use

As the reflection of intention-production of the speaker and interpretation-reception of the hearer, some instances of taboo language use words will be analysed considering the reaction of the audience. The comical interlude encounter involves *dhalang* (D) as the conversation authority holder acting as animator and principal. The two comedians, namely Percil (P) and Kunthet (K), perform as ratified focussed hearer in the conversation in which they have authority and initiative to take turn on the whole conversation. On the other hand, the audience receives a different conversational treatment. They are not supposed to take part in turn-taking of the comical interlude conversation but may react spontaneously regarding the in-jokes conversation. Their status as ratified unfocussed hearer brings the consequence of being paid attention by the *dhalang* and comedians and receiving a great deal of pleasure.

The taboo language use *jangkrik* becomes the most pronounced word among others. On the case of saying this word accompanied by set up of joke, people easily express their laugh spontaneously as a scene at minute 10.40.

TABLE II. THE TABOO LANGUAGE USE *JANGKRIK* AT MINUTE 10.40

K	Jenthik kudu iso ngothak-athik barang e wong lanang <i>Little finger should be able to tweak her husband's belongings</i>	
P	Byuh, keri no <i>(exclam), so twitching</i> Jangkrik kowe <i>You cricket</i>	Laugh in audience for 8 seconds Result of being hit by K
K	Pikiranmu negatif i <i>Your mind is dirty</i>	
P	Lha piye? Jangkrik tenan kowe ki <i>How? You really cricket</i>	
K	Yo ngono <i>That's so</i>	

Only in one footing, P produce two times of *jangkrik* words. In terms of speaker production-hearer reception, it is true that they take turn taking quickly in order to maintain the atmosphere of comedy, eliminating pause fillers which may blockage laugh. Comedians believe that it is unnecessary to provide pauses stop for the audience to think about and internalize the joke delivered. Rather quick chit-chat helps to maintain the peak of a funny moment. In this chunk, the emergence of laugh is perhaps the result of setting up dark humour: making fun on ambiguous sexual joke material. P's exclamation and its following reactions create an unexpected response which engenders audience's mind for the reception of the production without having a chance to have further clarification. It is the starting point of a laugh. When K tries to beat P with wedding invitation paper, spontaneous reaction swearing is expressed by saying *jangkrik* followed by a laugh in the audience. In certain occasions, speaking taboo words combined with torturing action among comedians will, surprisingly, ignite even bigger laugh on the audience.

Perhaps, it is a fallacy of P's reception to conceptualize and reconstruct K's intention of speaking. This is none of their mistakes, in any case. P has choices to reconstruct the message conveyed in the utterance: regarding the statement in the literal meaning, philosophical stance, or sexual activity. Both P and audience choose the latest one which then is deemed as funny, presenting taboo reference publicly. For the sake of entertainment, there is a shift of moral value from the private business of sexual activity into the public consumption of the jokes object. Fortunately, K tries to stay on track the frame topic of conversation by labelling P personality trait for having a dirty mind. There is still fading out the voice of laugh from the audience. It seems evident for comedians that they have difficulty in keeping the funny moment for any longer. The repetition of *jangkrik*, being unwilling to receive such a kind of addressed personification, cannot help both comedians to prolong the laugh. Nevertheless, more on this surface analysis, taboo language use manifested in swearword convince us that referencing other's trait with an animal is such a kind of funny moment in that the speaker and hearer should have the same shared understanding on its meaning.

The relation between *dhalang* and comedians depicts power asymmetry vividly in the frame interaction. Comedians have to obey what *dhalang* (D) is said to them as deference to authority during the shadow puppet performance. Aside from that, comedians may infringe the social norms of interaction in language use: be impolite in talking to a respected person. This issue can be found at minute 1.03.22.

TABLE III.

D	Eh, reneo, reneo tak omongi. Meneng o sek <i>Eh, come, come here I will tell you. Be quiet</i>	P comes closer to D. D intentionally farts close to P
P	(cekikikan) eh, jangkrik <i>(giggling), eh, cricket</i>	
K	Nyapo? <i>What happened?</i>	
P	Engko tak omongi (kepingkel-pingkel) <i>I will tell you later (guffaw)</i>	
D	(kepingkel-pingkel) <i>(guffaw)</i>	
P	(nuding dhalang) kurang ajar <i>(pointing to D) god damn it</i>	Pointing out to <i>dhalang</i> , both D and P are laughing out.
K	Opo? Nyapo? <i>What? What happened?</i>	
P	Aku dientuti e thet teko kono. <i>I was farted thet in there.</i> Jangkrik tenan og. <i>You are really cricket</i> Diomongi trus didhekeke ne mak krek (suoro entut) <i>Being told then be put and attached then cracking (of farting)</i> Koclok, rumangsaku. Iso ditempelne. <i>Lunatic, I think that. How it is attached.</i> Yo lak gak muni rapopo, kedher e ki lho thet. <i>If soundless is all right, but the trembling thet</i> Kaget kancane og, rumangsaku. Koclok kowe ki <i>Shocking your friend, I think that. You are lunatic.</i>	Audience start laughing. <i>Dhalang</i> guffaws with delight Complain Elaborative description Remarks Conditional Remarks

This scene is dubious about the phase of joke set up: purposely created or spontaneously acted among the actors of performance. Based on the changes in the frame in this scene, it is suspicious that D intentionally calls P to come closer to him as if he wanted to tell something. However, connected to the previous frame, there is no significance of this joke action with the topic of conversation, which means he instinctively engages in interrupting the running conversation. D calls P softly for two times when P is talking to a *sindhen* in running action, but he ignores the call. When P approaches and halfway bends his body to get his head closer, there is a three second silent moment before the laugh explodes only followed by strong swearing *jangkrik* (cricket) from P. This taboo language use emerges as a response of an unpleasant and humiliate incident, not directly addressed to D. Perhaps this is the time when D intentionally farts and wants P to hear it for the sake of torturing and humiliating him with taboo action farting. These two motives behind jokes are already widely understood and applied by comedians in most of the comical forms which effectively evoke humour and fun experience for most of the audience. Right after this incident, when both D and P are laughing abruptly, K feels alienated from the current footing which signified by asking "What happened?" to them. Instead of receiving an answer, K is abandoned in this situation by getting postponed response "I will tell you later". It is supposed that the joke is only limited merely for the business of D and P: changing the ratified hearer (K) status from focussed into unfocused. Again, P swears to D by saying a milder swearword *kurang ajar* (god damn it) which refers to unacceptable yet funny action and culturally infringe the politeness of interaction. Instead both D and P keep laughing for a bit longer time. Being unknown to what happened exactly on the two actors, K and audience are keep silent for a while, and there is no laugh at all. It is K who tries to plunge into the pit of a conversation, representing the audience's curiosity, by emphasizing the question of the current situation.

In this short monologue, P expresses his respond of a situation in distinctive sequences. The blasting of the audience's laugh appears in the P's avowal of being farted publicly in the mid of current conversation. The statement of declarative *aku dientuti e thet teko kono* (I was farted {by D} *thet* in there) receives a surprise of a sudden laugh from the audience, *sindhen*, and other participants on the frame. As the victim of taboo activity, audience deems the action as funny scene instead of embarrassment prohibited moment. The P's intention of utterance product is reciprocated by K as well as the audience on the other way around. They perceive the taboo action as a silly thing based on the perception of social norm's infringement. Another reason is that this infringement happens in a jocular situation where strictly the rule of social norm is not applicable; otherwise a shroud of impoliteness to rejoice will become inevitable. After his first astounding declaration, no interlocutor interrupts his speaking. P expresses his feeling by saying *jangkrik tenan og* (you are really cricket). Frankly speaking, it is unclear of the *jangkrik* (cricket) reference whether it is pointed out to D for insulting or intended to the unpleasant situation. His complaint continues with an elaborative description of the event in details by the state of being called, put his hand, and heard the cracking sound. The remark after that refers to D owing to the use of taboo language use word *koclok* (lunatic) which predicates personality trait. He still complains of what D has done by saying conditional sentence along with factual detail of event *kedher e ki lho thet* (but the trembling thet). The final remark on this footing functions as a means for P to express his current feeling of unacceptable incident and along with insulting yet bonding expression *koclok kowe ki* (you are lunatic) addressed to D. Being addressed with such a kind of insult calling name, however, D remains laughing as a response to his superiority action humiliation-like joke.

V. CONCLUSION

The most prominent finding to emerge from this study is that taboo language use words—mostly related to dark humour—do not be regarded by participants as a prohibited word in the sense of meaning and usage vulgarity. Rather ratified participants build a quite different interpretation of speech production of the speaker and gradually reconstruct the hidden intention by making use of their experiential framework. Apart from that, the jocular occasion of entertainment performed publicly does not demand utilization of normative conversational language. In this comical interlude, the comedians apply conventional jokes structure as a means of evoking laugh: imperfections, physical torture, mental humiliation. Finally, the more in-depth understanding of intention-production of speaker and interpretation-reception of hearer shed light on the taboo language use in humour.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my gratitude to Jim O'Driscoll for his insight and intense discussion in denoting the taboo language use words. I am indebted to School of Music Humanities and Media, University of Huddersfield for the financial support in this conference. My thanks also go to the Ministry of Religious Affairs of Republic of Indonesia for having granted me as one of the MORA scholarship awardees. I am also thankful to the board of editors for giving me feedback on this paper.

References

- Allan, K., & Burridge, K. (2006). *Forbidden words: Taboo and the censoring language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Andersson, L., & Trudgill, P. (1990). *Bad language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Attardo, S. (1994). *Linguistic theories of humor*. (V. Raskin, & M. Apte, Eds.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bucaria, C., & Barra, L. (2016). Taboo comedy on television: Issues and themes. In C. Bucaria, L. Barra, R. Sabin, & S. Lockyer (Eds.), *Taboo Comedy: Television and Controversial Humour* (pp. 1-18). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cahyani, P. D., & Setiawan, T. (2019). Swearing words on yowis ben movie by fajar nugros and bayu skak. *International Conference on Interdisciplinary Language, Literature and Education (ICILLE 2018)* (pp. 282-287). Paris: Atlantis Press.
- Cohen, M. I. (2007). Contemporary "Wayang" in global contexts. *Asian Theatre Journal*, 24(2), 338-369. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27568418>
- Cohen, M. I. (2019). Wayang in jaman now: Reflexive traditionalization and local, national and global networks of javanese shadow puppet theatre. *Theatre Research International*, 44(1), 40-57. doi:10.1017/S0307883318000834
- Davis, H. (1989). What makes bad language bad?, *Language and Communication*, 9(1), 1-9.
- D'hondt, S. (2009). The pragmatics of interaction: A survey. In S. D'hondt, J.-O. Ostman, & J. Verschueren, *The Pragmatics of Interaction* (pp. 1-19). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Dynel, M. (2011). Revisiting goffman's postulates on participant statuses in verbal interaction. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 5(7), 454-465. doi:10.1111/j.1749-818x.2011.00286.x
- Fägersten, K. B. (2007). A sociolinguistic analysis of swear word offensiveness. *Saarland Working Papers in Linguistics (SWLP)*, 1, 14-37.
- Foley, K. (1984). Of dalang and dukun-spirits and men: Curing and performance in the wayang of west java. *Asian Theatre Journal*, 1(1), 52-75. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1124366>
- Gibson, J. M. (2019). *An introduction to the psychology of humor*. Oxon: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Hickson-Hahn, F. (1998). What's so funny?: Laughter and incest in invective humor. *Syllecta Classica*, 9, 1-36. doi:10.1353/syl.1998.0005
- Hughes, G. (2006). *An encyclopedia of swearing: The social history of oaths, profanity, foul language, and ethnic slurs in the english-speaking world*. New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Hull, R., Tosun, S., & Vaid, J. (2017). What's so funny? Modelling incongruity in Humour Production. *Cognition and Emotion*, 31(3), 484-499. doi:10.1080/02699931.2015.1129314
- Jay, T. (2000). *Why we curse: A neorpsycho-social theory of speech*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kroef, J. M. (1954). The roots of the javanese drama. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 12(3), 318-327. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/426975>
- Ljung, M. (2011). *Swearing: A cross-cultural linguistic study*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lynch, R. (2010). It's funny because we think it's true: Laughter is augmented by implicit preferences. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 31, 141-148. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2009.07.003
- Mohr, M. (2013). *Holy sh*t: A brief history of swearing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mrázek, J. (2000). Javanese "wayang kulit" in the times of comedy: Clown scenes, innovation, and the performance's being in the present world. part two. *Indonesia* (69), 107-172. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3351279>
- Nesi, H. (2012). Laughter in university lectures. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11, 79-89. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2011.12.003
- Nicolau, M. F., & Sukanto, K. E. (2013). Male and female attitudes towards swear words: A case study at binus international school. *Kata*, 16(2), 71-76. doi:10.9744/kata.16.271-76
- Raffles, S. T. (1830). *The history of java*. london: John murray. Retrieved from <https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/49843>
- Raj, S. J., & Dempsey, C. (2010). Introduction: Ritual levity in south asian traditions. In S. J. Raj, & C. Dempsey, *Sacred Play: Ritual Levity and Humor in South Asian Religions* (pp. 1-20). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Schechner, R. (1990). Wayang kulit in the colonial margin. *The drama review*, 34 (2h), 25-61. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1146026>

- Schnurr, S., & Plester, B. (2017). Functionalist discourse analysis of humor. In S. Attardo, *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Humor* (pp. 309-321). New York: Routledge.
- Seizer, S. (2011). On the uses of obscenity in live stand-up comedy. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 84(1), 209-234. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41237487>
- Sumekto, D. R., & Kustinah. (2019). Undergraduate students' experiential motives when expressing bajingan as their expletive. *Humaniora*, 31(1), 41-50. doi:10.22146/jh.v31i1.26218
- Wajnryb, R. (2005). *Expletive deleted: A good look at bad language*. New York: Free Press.
- Withey, J. A. (1974). An annotated bibliography of the theatre of southeast asia to 1971. *Educational Theatre Journal*, 26(2), 209-220. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3206636>