PRAGMATIC MARKERS AS CONTEXT BOUNDARIES IN INDONESIAN HUMOROUS TALK SHOWS DISCOURSE

Hyunisa Rahmanadia[1]

1. INTRODUCTION

Pragmatic markers are known to be a tool to help maintain the flow of the conversation and to indicate the speaker's thought process (Blakemore, 1987: 144). Over the past few decades, there has been a lot of research on pragmatic markers and how they are used in different languages and types of communication. While there are many investigations and approaches to studying them, most of the theoretical foundation has been based on English. To truly understand pragmatic markers, it is important to study them in other languages, especially those from different language families like Austronesian languages. This step will help to improve our understanding of the definition, characterization, and categorization of this term.

In Indonesia, many researchers have investigated this topic with limited types of data and approaches. Some work related to pragmatic markers in the Indonesian language explores their position (Mutiara, 2019), function (Mutiara, 2017), prosody (Sari, 2009), written and spoken comparative study (Karaj, 2021), and socio-cognitive view (Wouk, 1998, 1999, 2001). This present study aims to understand the roles of pragmatic markers in leading the hearer to the intended context and common ground to figure out humor. Thus, the investigation will focus on answering a question: How do pragmatic markers lead the hearers to find the intended common ground as a context in humorous conversations? Moreover, as it is evident that pragmatic markers investigation can be so broad due to its general variations, I focus my study on the use of pragmatic marker *lho* 'really, beware' in the Indonesian humorous discourse.

This paper is organized into several sections. First, I will demonstrate how humorous sequences are indicated using laughter as a powerful clue. Second, I will briefly review the specific condition of pragmatic markers in the Indonesian language. Third, I will provide the theoretical framework used as a basis for this investigation. Fourth, I will describe the methodology used in conducting this research. Following that, I will discuss the examples and results of the pragmatic markers *lho* investigation. Finally, the paper will conclude with a summary.

2. HUMOR AND LAUGHTER

In this paper, laughter is chosen to be the best indication of humor in the talk show. It has been believed that what makes humor distinctive and enigmatic is its strong association with laughter (Goldstein, 1972: 50). Then, the question that followed this statement is 'Is laughter a sign of humor?'. Flamson & Bryan (2013: 49) address this problem by stating that "laughter and humor often co-occur in social interaction, but their

[1] Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest.

functional relationship is widely debated, and not well understood". We also realize that people laugh not only as a reaction to perceiving humor or something funny. People laughing may occur as a reflection of their happiness, being satisfied, being tickled, or many other emotional stimuli. Moreover, Provine (in Glenn, 2003: 28) has conducted research investigating 1200 conversations containing laughter and concludes that most laughter is not directly related to humor. They may accompany humorous utterances, yet most of them are related to politeness or social interaction factors.

However, Keith-Spiegel (1972: 16) put forward a statement that "laughter is most often described as the overt expression of humor – an indicator that the person is in an 'amused frame of mind' or experiencing something as funny". This statement aligns with Roberts' theory of humor (2017: 19) that humor is an object intently produced to elicit amusement. It explains that most people will laugh in the reaction of being amused and the funniness of humorous utterances are a stimulus to amused people. In a psychological study, John Morreall (in Glenn, 2003: 23) gives a simple claim regarding laughter:

> "Laughter results from a pleasant psychological shift." It is viewed as the outward manifestation of a change in sensory, affective, perceptual, or cognitive state. The change must be sudden, too sudden for the mind to adjust otherwise, to generate the tension released through laughter. The shift must be "pleasant".

Morreall (in Glenn, 2003:23) mentions "a sudden pleasant" as a requirement to elicit laughter. It is clear here that laughter is a sign of feeling pleasant or amused spontaneously. As a result, intense emotional and intellectual involvement must be missing for the stimulus (e.g., humor) to be appreciated (Keith-Spiegel, 1972: 32).

In the discussion above, we can conclude that laughter is not always a sign of humor because humor is not the only factor that stimulates amusement or pleasure. As Glenn (2003: 28) points out, laughter is more than just a response to humor; it also serves to identify the referent as amusing or playful. In other words, laughter may indicate that the person perceives an act as humor, considering that humor is intended to elicit amusement from the hearer.

However, we also have to consider that intended humor may not stimulate laughter in some conditions. For example, humor cited by Raskin (1944:25):

> Back in 1942, I said, "Mama, I'm going into the Army."
> And she told me, "All right, but don't come home late."

People will find it easy to grab the sense of humor in this line in an appropriate condition. Those who cannot infer the utterances or fail to understand the incongruity between 'going to the army' and 'coming home late' will not find it funny. In such cases, should the sentence still be categorized as humor even if it doesn't provoke laughter?. Carrel (1997: 177) explains that the hearer's ability to perceive a particular text as humor is called humor competence. Every person has a different degree of competence depending on many factors, for example, linguistic ability and common ground. When someone does not feel amused or laugh hearing humor but identifies the text or acts as humor, then it can be said that the particular text intended to be humorous hold the potential for humor without necessarily causing laughter. On the contrary, if the listener cannot recognize an intended humorous action as humor, then the action fails as humor for that listener.

3. BRIEF HISTORY OF INDONESIAN LANGUAGE AND ITS PRAGMATIC MARKERS

Indonesian language has a unique history and close connections with other languages in Southeast Asia. Sneddon (2003) identified Sanskrit, Betawi, Javanese, Chinese, and Arabic as influences on the development of Indonesian language. Dutch, Sanskrit, and Chinese contributed many lexical items, while Javanese introduced the schwa vowel and enriched Indonesian affixation. The Indonesian language originated from Malay, but the standard form in Indonesia and Malaysia developed differently due to historical events and policies. It gained official status during the Japanese occupation in 1942 when the use of Dutch was banned. In the modern era, the development of the Indonesian language is affected by the language spoken in Jakarta. As the country's capital city, Jakarta has attracted many immigrants to live and seek jobs they think will increase their social status. The prosperous Jakartan Indonesian has been a role model worthy of imitation by many people in Indonesia. We have to note that Jakartan Indonesian is different from Betawi Malay, spoken by the local community living in Jakarta. Jakartan Indonesian is the language spoken by the residents of Jakarta (not only the local Betawi community) as a lingua franca. However, it is obvious that Betawi Malay also greatly influences the Jakartan Indonesian. Jakartan Indonesian is actively used as the informal language in Indonesia, and the formal or written language must follow the standardization set by the *Balai Bahasa* (the language council of the country).

In its development process, the Indonesian language also borrowed particles from some traditional languages spoken in Indonesia. For example, the particles *kok* 'why' and *lho* 'really (Sneddon, 2003: 159) and *mbok* 'it is you', *to* 'please', *lha* 'well' (Poedjosoedarmoe, 1982: 118) were borrowed from the Javanese language, kek 'anyway' from Betawi, and *mah* 'anyway' from the Sundanese language (Sneddon, 2006: 125) have been actively used in colloquial Indonesian. Thus, in the Indonesian pragmatic markers' investigation, the researchers have to pay much attention to the language used in their data. The distinction between borrowed pragmatic markers in colloquial Indonesian and in the original language depends on the whole discourse in the conversation. For instance, Ikranagara's (1975) investigation of some pragmatic markers, which she called lexical particles, *dong, deh, sih, kan, ye, kok, ah, kek* cannot be counted as an investigation of pragmatic markers in the colloquial Indonesian language because the data she used is a folk play in the original Betawi language spoken in the local community in Jakarta. Even though there is still no comparative study proving any significant differences between the function of pragmatic markers used in some close contact languages, it is obvious that the function of pragmatic markers can differ depending on the context in which they occur.

4. COMMON GROUND AS CONTEXT

Norrick (1989: 118) explained that "humor depends not only on some funny stimulus, but also on the audience, the situation, and the cultural context". This statement leads us to investigate humor production from the interlocutors' common ground. To understand common ground, Kecskes and Zang (2009: 347) introduced the socio-cognitive approach results from the pragmatic approach and cognitive approach integration. They categorize common ground into core common ground and emergent common ground. Core common ground is formed from prior experience or interaction. In contrast, emergent common ground is created from private and personal information and triggered by actual situational context.

In understanding how the interlocutors' common ground plays an important role in promoting laughter to the hearer, I follow specific typological events based on the

interlocutors who manage the knowledge about the conversation constructed by Nordenstam (1992). Nordenstam categorized scenarios involving privileged knowledge into four types: A, B, AB, D, and O events. In an A event, the speaker possesses the knowledge, while in a B event, the listener holds the knowledge. In an AB event, both the speaker and listener have common knowledge. In an O event, the knowledge is commonly shared within the culture. In a D event, the speaker and addressee have differing views or beliefs.

The categorization is aligned with the access to common ground proposed by Kecskes and Zang (2009: 349) who define three classifications into interlocutors' common ground. The three classifications are mental representation activation, facilitated communication by additional information, and communicated private assumption to become common ground. In mental representation activation, the speaker speaks as she/he knows that they have the same common ground and are aware of it. This access represents the AB event in Nordenstam's events. Furthermore, the second type of access is where the speaker is facilitating communication using additional information so that the hearer can activate the shared knowledge that they have. It can be the cultural knowledge or O and D events where the hearer sometimes needs a clue to activate it based on any context of the conversation. The access to interlocutors' common ground using communicated private assumption to become common ground represents the A event where it's only the speaker who holds the knowledge of the utterance.

5. METHODOLOGY

In data collection, the corpus is derived from manual transcription (with annotation) of 10 chosen videos of the shows (the collection size is approximately 50,000 words). Manual data transcription may be time-consuming, yet with detailed accuracy, the writer will be able to control the quality of the corpus to meet the aim of the research. The maximum variation of the talk show videos will be prioritized in the past five years (2015-2020). Humorous talk show videos are provided on YouTube by the program's official YouTube channel. In this case, no ethical issues are needed to be considered. The data can be accessed using links in Table 1.

Table 1. *List of the investigated talk shows*

Title of the talk shows	Duration (in minutes)	URL (last access 10 July 2023)
Password Lucu untuk Buka Plastik Topeng Mas Yeye	00:11:09	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pUHnOTOlTSc
Boy Williams Ngefans Banget sama Yoona Girls Generation - Ini Talk Show 4 Mei 2016	00:15:17	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YSKjuaYS0TU&list=PLxBmM85HF5eUgB5Dh9SnOUhVMUhbpCI5W&index=3
Nunung Nahan Pipis Gara-gara Pelatih Renang ini	00:13:20	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-hzwseg7Hzw
Kocaknya Hitung-hitungan Kodrat si Anak Kecil ini!!	00:13:04	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IVQCmRMTuQM
Ikutan Ini Dangdut, Suara Anak SD Ini Mencengangkan - Ini Sahur 30 Mei 2019 (1/7)	00:35:43	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ubHnDko6QF4

Sule Malu Dicengin Nunung Depan Anaknya - Ini Sahur 26 Mei 2018 (4/7)	00:33:10	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wUJcmWatFVw
Kerennya Montir Ini Bisa Berbagai Macam Atraksi (5/7) - Ini Sahur 13 Juni 2018	00:32:10	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2PKKIEvGniw
Ritual Pengobatan yang Kocak Andika Ketakutan - Ini Sahur 24 Mei 2019 (4/7)	00:28:07	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f_y0FzgvdRg
Kelakuan Kocak Sarimin Saat Mengajarkan Dance (5/7)	00:32:42	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wX7LIBUJmbI
Sule Kesakitan Mecahin Batu Bata - Ini Sahur 29 Mei 2018 (5/7)	00:29:35	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KSKF3lSkkDI

This research collects data from authentic discourse data from one of Indonesia's most famous comedy talk shows, "Ini Talkshow". The "Ini Talkshow" program was first aired in 2014 and proved its existence until 2020. The concept of this program is to entertain people with humor created by its host and co-host. They also invited various guests to be interviewed. Humor in this show was built by the characters involved in it, showing their creativity in face-to-face spoken conversation spontaneously within a theme provided differently in every section. The motives of choosing this program to be the corpus data of this research are appropriate because it represents humorous discourse in everyday conversation. Pragmatic markers analysis needs to have authentic and spontaneous conversation data because it shows the function of language in use. Furthermore, "Ini Talkshow" program is chosen to consider that the talk show's characters come from various ethnicities in Indonesia. The host of this program represents Sundanese people, the co-host represents Betawi people or Jakartan Indonesia, and the other important role in this program represents Javanese people. Besides those key roles in this program, "Ini Talkshow" invites many famous people in Indonesia from various ethnicities. This diversity of the characters played in the program will help the study analyze Indonesia's pragmatic markers holistically.

In the annotation process, laughter is indicated using (AL). However, I am also aware that not every laughter is triggered by verbal conversation. Humorous sequences may be created using funny gestures or many other multimodalities. In excluding this type of humor, extra annotation is added using the (gest-exp) indicator which means that the humor is triggered by gesture and a brief explanation about the event. In other cases, some humor is produced using the combination of verbal and gesture which we count into our main data to be analyzed.

6. PRAGMATIC MARKER *LHO*

Syntactically, *lho* is a particle that may appear in the initial or final position of the utterance. Sneddon (2003) mentioned that this particle is borrowed from the Javanese language and is now getting its place in the colloquial Indonesian language. As a pragmatic marker, previous researchers suggest that *lho* has three main functions in signaling pragmatic properties in a discourse: to emphasize (Sneddon *et al.*, 2010), to introduce new information (Karaj, 2021), and to signal a warning (Miyake, 2015). The example of the

first function mentioned by Sneddon in a non-humorous context can be seen in the excerpt 1.

1. D: *Boleh   dicoba,   ini makanan chef ternama. enggak bisa, harus langsung digigit.*
     can PASS.try this food chef famous NEG can must directly PASS-bite
   A: *Mbak, aku ada asam   lambung **lho**!*
     Sister 1SG exist sour   stomach PM

   D: Please try, this food is cooked by a famous chef. You cannot miss this, you must bite this food directly.
   A: Sis, (please), I have a stomach problem, **really**!.

Example 1. indicated that particle *lho* has a function to emphasize the statement that A has a (serious) stomach problem, so it is not good for him to eat the food. A feels the need to emphasize his statement using this particle because D insists him to try some food that he is not allowed to eat.

Here, I present some examples showing how pragmatic markers lead the hearer to access common ground based on the humorous context.

2. A: *he e,   pengen operasi plastik kayak di korea   korea   itu   **lho**.*
     PM   want   surgery plastic like   in   Korea REDUP   that PM
   B: *beli kantong kresek   aja.*
     buy   bag   plastic PM

   A: yea, (I), want to get plastic surgery like those Korean people, **you know!.**
   B: (you can just) buy a plastic bag. (AL)

Excerpt 2. is multiple-role humor spoken by two active interlocutors talking about plastic surgery. In the conversation, A insists that she wants to have plastic surgery like Korean people. Thus, this utterance also implies that A wants to become more beautiful through cosmetic surgery. As a result, the audience will relate the meaning of plastic to aesthetic surgery, where it is common knowledge (O event) that plastic surgery does not relate to plastics in daily need.

As has been explained before one function of PM *lho*, in utterances, is to emphasize the statement before the PM. When a statement is emphasized, it means that the information must be treated seriously. In paraphrasing way, adding *lho* in the utterance means the speaker stresses that "you (the hearer) have to know how beautiful Korean people are after cosmetic surgery. You know what plastic surgery is. And you must pay attention to my demand that I also want treatment". A further inference that can be understood from her demand is that B (played as A's son) must provide financial support to go to Korea and get cosmetic surgery.

However, in the second utterance, B surprised the audience's attention with a sudden reply to A's request with a suggestion to buy a plastic bag (A event). The humor of this conversation relies not only on the incongruity of multiple-graded interpretations of the word plastic. The mismatch between the retrieval of the audience's common knowledge (as a result of the implication helped by the pragmatic marker *lho* as an emphasizer) and the inference of B's last utterance helps audiences to grab the humor. The incongruity also appears between the emphasized statement using particle *lho* which is supposed to need a serious answer, only gets a silly response by the interlocutor.

3.   A: *Jadi   gini*
        so   this
     S: *mas   tadi   aku   kejepit   pintu   **lho**   mas.* (AL)
        brother just.before 1SG   PASS.stuck   door   PM   brother
     CL: *apa-nya   kejepit?.*
         what-GEN   PASS-stuck
     S: *kaki, makanya aku pake sepatu ini, malu bengkak*
        foot   so   1SG use shoes this ashamed swollen
        jempol-nya   belah   dua.
        toe-POSS   split   two
     A: *diobati   dong, dijahit!*
        PASS-treat   dong PASS-stitch

     A: So, this is]
     S: Brother, do you know that I was just stuck at the door, **you know**? (AL)
     CL: Which part (of your body) was stuck?
     S: foot, because of that, I put these shoes on. I feel embarrassed because the big
        toe is swollen and it was split into two.
     A: ask for treatment please, (and get them) stitched

In example 3, S interrupts the conversation by telling the manipulated incident that happened to his toe (A event but both interlocutors are aware that the incident is manipulated), which the hearer considers unimportant and silly. However, S intentionally ended the utterance with *lho* to draw the hearer's attention to something that needs serious attention (also considering that when S cuts A's word, it should mean that S wants to tell something important). The pragmatic marker *lho* in this utterance helps to build the incongruity in the audience's assumption from the statement before the marker (that the info is fake and silly) and the audience's attention drawn by the speaker using *lho* (the speaker's demand to serious attention). The incongruity activates the surprise signal in the cognition, which then perceived as amusing.

4.   S: *Sayang sekali. kamu kalau urusan Korea   ngomong   sama   saya dong!*
        unfortunately   2SG   if   case   Korea   speak   with 1SG PM
     N: *Kenal   banget emangnya?*
        know   very   PM
     S: ***Lho***, *ya. enggak   lah!.* (AL)
        PM   yes NEG   PM

     S: Unfortunately. You must contact me if you have a problem with Korea(n people)
     N: Do you know them well?
     S: **Of course**, not. (AL)

In example 4, the interlocutors are discussing a situation when N could not meet his favorite Korean artist due to some packed schedule of their performance. Suddenly, S offered his help to schedule a meeting with any famous Korean people (A events triggered further inference). This statement implies that S has special access to or the capability to negotiate with Korean people well so that N could meet his favorite Korean artist. However, N still doubts S's ability by asking him a question for verification. The question is natural since N knows or has shared assumptions that S cannot speak Korean or have any relation with Korean people. Suddenly S answered his question with a pragmatic marker *lho* at the beginning of the answer showing his surprise at the new information that N does not know this (manipulated) fact (D event). However, the marker directly follows with the real surprising truth (for the hearer) that S does not know anything about

Korean people who can help S arrange the meeting with his favorite artists (surprised AB event). The humor is revealed by the incongruity between the emphasized misleading assumptions trigger and the fact that the speaker told at the punch line.

5. S: *Ya   tapi   kan   dia   udah   insaf.*
       PM but   PM   3SG   PRF   express.repentence
       masa'   kamu   gak   mau   memaafkan.
       PM   2SG   NEG   want   ACT.forgive
       *Kasihan lho, bapak   ini pakai kupluk **lho***! (AL)
       pity   PM   man   this wear   kupluk PM
    Si: *ya- ya   aku   sih,   ya   maafin bapak   lah pastinya. Udah aku lupain.*
        Yes   Yes 1SG   PM   yes forgive man   PM of.course PRF 1SG forget

    S: Yes, but he took repentance, are you sure that you do not want to forgive him?.
        Poor him, he put on a *kupluk* (a praying beanie) **look (believe him)**!.
    Si: Yes… For me of course I forgive him, I have already forgotten (the event).

The cultural sense activation used to build humor can be seen in excerpt 5. Yus (2016:318) explained that one source of humor is the portrayal of social or cultural stereotypes in an exaggerated way. In the conversation, S emphasizes the word *kupluk* followed by particle *lho* to guide the hearer to trigger a further inference. By emphasizing this word, S does not only want to show the hearers that the man is a Muslim. Furthermore, S wants the audience to retrieve the same perception of their cultural sense and make them believe that a person who puts on a praying cap is pious following their religion, regrets their past mistakes, and shows his innocence (O event). In the context where Si is showing her negligence in forgiving the man mentioned in the conversation because of a mistake made by the man, S puts pressure on Si to forgive the man because he already regrets his mistake and becomes a good Muslim (only with the evident of the beanie).

At the same time, pragmatic marker *lho* functions to emphasize the current sense of the praying cap that the man is wearing and its inference that is related to the hearer's cultural sense, the audience also realizes that, on the contrary, any person may wear the praying cap regardless of their degree of faith. Thus, S emphasizes that the man wearing a praying cap does not actually have a relation with the innocence of the person. The incongruity appears between the hearer's most relevant common sense and the second common sense retrieved by the support of the marker.

6. CL: *Ini gara-gara   kamu kaget. Dia kan   latah.*
        this because   2SG   shock   4SG PM easily.shock
    A: *Lho kan   saya cuma   mas   cepetan mas,   gitu.*
        PM PM   1SG only   brother quicker brother like.that
    S: *Aku malu **lho**!. (AL) Aku mau bedakin ibu   biar   rapi. Dikagetin   dia dong.*
        1SG shy   PM   1SG want make.up madam for tidy PASS-shock 3SG PM
    A: *Maaf deh mas,   maaf maaf.*
         Sorry PM brother sorry sorry

    CL: This is all because of you. You know that he gets shocked easily.
    A: Come on! , I am only (said) Please be quick brother, just like that.
    S: I am shy ***indeed***! (AL) I just want to put a tidy make up on the lady. But he shocked me.
    A: I am sorry then, Sorry sorry.

In excerpt 6, I focus on the analysis of the marker *lho* in the second last statement, which contributes to humor. The function of particle *lho* in this humor is to emphasize the same perception of both interlocutors that S feels shy when his face is covered by face powder, which makes him look silly. The audience finds it funny because it is obvious that normal people will feel shy finding themselves in that condition. However, on the stage, S plays as a comedian who should act silly to amuse the audience and should not express his true feelings. The incongruity appears when the actor shows (even emphasizes) his real feelings and the audience's expectation.

7. A: *e~ mohon maaf, adek adek e~ ng-ucap aja ya kalau ngeliatin ini* (AL).
        PM ask.sorry little.brother PM ACT-say PM yes if   ACT-see this
    N: *mas,   saya bukan penyebar aliran sesat   lho* (AL). *kok suruh ngucap mereka!*
        big.brother 1SG NEG   spreader sect bad PM   PM order ACT-say 3PL

    A: Mohon maaf, dear brothers, please pray (for your safety) if you see her.
    N: Mas, I am not spreading a misleading idea**, really**. Why did you ask them to pray

In example 7, N enters the studio with a silly costume that makes the audience laugh. Suddenly, A says sorry to the audience and warns them to keep protecting themself by praying. The warning has sparked laughter because it is obvious that N will not harm them. The warning directs the audience to believe the assumption that N will do harm spiritually if they do not protect themselves (O event). Furthermore, N, who understands the implication of A's utterance, replied that he is not a misleading idea spreader who will harm the audience's spiritual life. The statement is emphasized using the marker *lho*. This marker shows the speaker's confidence (that he is correct) and his disappointment with A's utterance.

However, emphasizing the statement makes A's intention clearer to name the bad figure itself which directs the audience's attention. Thus, the negation in the statement, on the contrary, activates the cultural sense and helps the audience to name the dangerous figure as one of the most relevant harmful figures for himself.

8. S: *Ini mau belajar enggak nih! Saya tuh orangnya enggak sibuk **lho**!* (AL)
        this want study NEG PM 1SG PM person-GEN NEG busy PM
    A: *Ya, kalau enggak sibuk lengang dong.*
        Yes if   NEG busy free   PM

    S: Don't you want to study? I am not a busy person ***lho***!
    A: Well, if you are not busy, then you are free, right!.

Lho in 8, is in the final position of the utterance and the function of the marker in the utterance is as an emphasizer. In this context, S is trying to teach A dancing, but A keeps asking questions without giving S a chance to explain. At this point, S seemed to be angry and was supposed to make a statement about this situation. First, S reiterated A's commitment to learning to dance in a high tone, expressing anger. The question and the anger infer that S is somehow busy and does not have much time to waste. However, it follows with the emphasized contra-statement revealing that S is not a busy person.

The humor is triggered by the incongruity between the presupposed utterance that naturally appears in the audience's cognition due to the common sense (O event) they share before the statement and the emphasized comment. In this humor, *lho* functions to highlight the strange or contra-statement so that people realize that there is something wrong with the comment and figure out the humor.

9.   A: *Ini ada cabe-nya   kan, di dalam-nya kan?*
       This exists pepper-GEN PM in inside-GEN PM
    D: *Enggak ada*
       NEG   exist
    A: *Jangan bohong!*
       PROH   lie
    N: *Tak-pegangin   mulutnya.   lho!* (AL)
       ACT.1SG-hold mouth-GEN   PM

    A: It has a pepper inside (the food), hasn't it?
    D: no
    A: Don't lie!
    N: I hold your mouth, **I warn you**!

Lho, which functions as a warning, also triggers humor in the data. For example, in 9, D forced A to eat food that D does not like. A keep arguing because he hesitates and struggles not to eat the food. While D does not give up on assuring A that the food is fine and tastes delicious, N loses her patience and warns A that if A does not eat the food, N will hold his mouth open and put the food into his mouth. The humor is created when N warns A with some unrealistic movement to force him to eat the food (A event). It may trigger the hearers' laughter since the audience knows (common sense) that N will never do that. However, imagining N doing her warning success to amuse the audience.

10.   S: *Dia   tuh   jago*]
       2SG PM expert
    A: *Sudah   cukup.   Tolong..*
       PRF   enough   please
    S: *Dia tuh jago   catwalk lho.* (AL)
       2SG PM expert catwalk PM

    S: He is an expert…
    A: Please, It's enough
    S: He is an expert on catwalk**, believe me**!(AL

The pragmatic marker *lho* in 10 emphasizes the utterance before it. 'He is an expert on the catwalk' is a natural compliment instead of a funny sentence. However, this utterance is said when A is imitating to be a talented artist who can do various things. A must perform something that S informs the audience to prove that he is the real person they called to be onstage. Furthermore, we must bear in mind that in the talk show, the audience shared the knowledge about the fact that A is not the actual artist (AB event). Thus, the sentence not only informs the hearer that A will not be able to do the professional catwalk. The emphasized utterance encourages the hearers to draw the conclusion that S is having fun with A to force him to do whatever he says.

11. N: *ini   dari 16   tuh,   paling manja dia sampe manggil saya aja mama,*
       this from sixteen PM most spoiled   3SG until call 1SG PM mama
       dia tau-nya aku tuh mama-nya.
       3SG know-GEN 1SG PM mama-GEN
   S: *iya,   aku di-urus   sama ini.*
       yes   1SG PASS-care by this
    N: *tak-urus   masa, tak-minum-in susu   kucing   lho   mas* (AL)
       ACT-care   PM   ACT-drink milk   cat   PM brother

    N: From 16 (of my children), only he is spoiled and called me mama, He only knows that
       I am his mother
    S: Yes, she takes care of me
    N: I cared for him and gave him cat's milk *lho* brother. (AL)

Example 11 is humor where pragmatic marker *lho* is used for emphasizing unrealistic solutions. It is this case, the humor is still amusing even without the marker. The pragmatic marker, in this humor, functions to emphasize the funny solution 'I gave him cat's milk' that N made when she was taking care of S (A event). The marker helps the audience to be focused on the funny proposition in the conversation. If the marker is put after the proposition 'I care for him' the utterance will lose a little bit of its funniness because this proposition is a normal condition for a mother to take care of her child. While giving the child some cat's milk to feed him is a strange solution which is unacceptable by the audience's common sense. Thus, it sparked laughter in the hearer due to its incongruity with the people's common sense.

12.   N: *Yoga itu saya makan tiap   hari **lho** mas!*
        Yoga that 1SG eat   every day PM brother
      D: *apa itu?*
         what that
      N: *yogurt* (AL)
         yogurt
      D: *yogurt, yogurt!, atau lari lari   jigong   itu   **lho** mbak.* (AL)
         yogurt yogurt   or   run run dirty.teeth that PM sister
      G: *joging!*
         jogging

      N: Yoga is something that I eat everyday, **you know**, brother!
      D: what is that?
      N: Yogurt.
      D: yogurt, yogurt! or slowly run *jigong*, **you know,** sister.
      G: Jogging!

Example 12. is a multi-party conversation where two interlocutors played with the words *yoga* to create humor. N started the play with a riddle about *yoga* that the answer confused D. Then D continued the riddle by saying that yoga is an activity of running at a slow tempo. D emphasized the wordplay of *jigong* 'dirty teeth' (from *jogging*) to direct the hearer of the funny wordplay(A event).

It can be seen that there are two *lho* used in the conversation. The first *lho* did not stimulate laughter, while the last one contributed to the humor. Both of them are used to emphasize the words and propositions before them. However, the first *lho* emphasized the statement that still did not reach the conclusion of the humor and did not spark laughter because the audience was unable to recall their prior knowledge. The second *lho* helps to create humor by emphasizing the keyword *'jigong'* as the wordplay of 'jogging' and directing them to retrieve their prior knowledge about *'jigong'* as disgusting teeth. Schema 1 shows how the function of *lho* divers in supporting humor production.

Schema 1. *Common ground from the hearer's perspectives*

emphasized - new information - no prior knowledge → no possible inferences → not funny
  emphasized - new information - with prior knowledge → possible inferences → funny

In this analysis, new information isn't just defined as something the listener has never heard before or as anything that is actually novel to the audience. New information is a proposition that the speaker introduces into the context of the dialogue. As a result, the hearer may have heard it or experienced it in some other way. Furthermore, the hearer may have some previous knowledge of the new information introduced in the context. In 12, *jigong* as a wordplay of *jogging* is a new word with no relation to the context. The speaker purposefully emphasizes the incorrect new information in order to lead the audience to draw conclusions that the new information is incorrect. The audience is fully aware of the speaker's goal to create a humorous wordplay with the word "jogging," which is subsequently revealed by G.

From the examples I have discussed above, I briefly show two basic categorizations of how pragmatic markers may be used by the speakers to produce humor and help the hearer to indicate the proper inferences based on common ground and context.

1. Pragmatic markers directly function to trigger humor
    a) create a discrepancy between the general proposition (O event) and the intended context (A event) (examples 2, 3, and 8)
    b) encourage the hearer to seek further inferences in finding the humorous context (AB event) (examples 5, 10)
    c) create a manipulated context in the speaker's cognition (delivering A event) (example 4)
2. pragmatic markers function to support the content of the humor indicating the funny part of the humor (leading the hearer to intended humorous common ground (facilitating AB event to be identified) (examples 6, 7, 9, 11, and 12).

7. CONCLUSION

Humor is creatively produced based on interlocutors' common ground. This investigation shows that pragmatic marker *lho* holds an important role in leading the hearers to the speaker's intended context in humorous discourse where both interlocutors agree that the conversation must be humorous. It is evident that pragmatic markers may trigger further inference when the hearer cannot find the proper meaning in the context related to the humor. Pragmatic markers *lho* are also used to pinpoint the punchline to lead the hearer to the humorous content of the utterances. It is also proved that without the pragmatic markers, the funny aspect of the utterances may be lost.

The pragmatic marker considered here is investigated in talk shows humorous discourse. The aim of this preliminary research is to gain a deeper understanding of how pragmatic markers function within specific discourse. By examining their use, it is possible to uncover the underlying motives and intentions of the speaker, providing insights into the complexities of communication. In further investigation, it is highly recommended to explore other types of pragmatic markers to figure out their roles in humorous discourse or many other different discourses. It is also interesting that the collocation of two pragmatic markers to elicit humor is also found in the data. However, since it is fall outside the focus area of the study, they are not explored in this paper. Moreover, investigating this marker in different contexts will explain the function of this marker in general. Deep exploration of pragmatic markers will give a new perspective on how to understand this phenomenon is used to organize our cognition.

REFERENCES

Blakemore D. (1987), *Semantic Constraints on Relevance*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Carrel A. (1997), "Joke competence and humor competence", in *Humor*, 10, 2, pp. 173-185.

Flamson T. J., Bryant G. A. (2013), "Signals of humor: encryption and laughter in social interaction", in Dynel M. (ed.), *Development in linguistic humor theory*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, pp. 49-73.

Glenn P. (2003), *Laughter in interaction*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Goldstein J., McGhee P. (eds.) (1972), *The psychology of humor: Theoretical perspectives and empirical* issues, Academic Press, New York.

Ikranagara K. (1974), *Lexical particle in Betawi*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Hawaii.

Karaj D. M. (2021), "Indonesian discourse particles", in Wacana, 22, 2, pp. 319-337.

Kecskes I., Zhang F. (2009), "Activating, seeking, and creating common ground A socio-cognitive approach", in *Pragmatics* & *Cognition*, 17, 2, pp. 331-355.

Keith-Spiegel P. (1972), "Early conceptions of humour: Varieties and issues", in Goldstein J., McGhee P. (eds.), *The psychology of humour: Theoretical perspectives and empirical issues*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 3-39.

Mutiara R. (2017), "Particle kok in child language: Stance and positions", in Yanti (ed.), *Celebrating corpus tools. Proceedings of the the 4th Atma Jaya Conference on Corpus Studies*, Jakarta, pp. 11-15

Mutiara R. (2019), "Co-occurences of kok and other markers in colloquial Jakartan Indonesian", in *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 1, 1, pp. 43-61.

Nordenstam K. (1992), "Tag questions and gender in Swedish conversations", in *Working papers on language, gender and sexism*, 2, 1, pp. 75-86.

Norrick Neal R. (2003), "Issues in conversational joking", in *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 9, pp. 1333-1359: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00180-7.

Poedjosoedarmo S. (1987), *Javanese influence on Indonesian*, Pacific Linguistics, Department of Linguistics Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian National University, Canberra.

Raskin V. (1985), *Semantic mechanisms of humor*, D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrech.

Roberts A. (2019), *A philosophy of humor*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Sari F. (2009), "A prosodic aspect of the Indonesian pragmatic particle sih", Paper presented at International Symposium on Malay/Indonesian Linguistics, Sengiggi, Lombok, Indonesia, 6-7 June: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004.

Sneddon J. (2003), *The Indonesian language: its history and role in modern society*, University of New South Wales Press Ltd, Randwick (Sydney).

Sneddon J. N. (2006), *Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian.*, The Australian National University, Canberra:
https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/146284/1/581_Sneddon.pdf.

Sneddon J. N., Adelaar K. A., Djenar D. N., Ewing M. C. (2010), *Indonesian Reference Grammar*, Allen & Unwin, Sidney.

Wouk F. (1998), "Solidarity in Indonesian conversation: The discourse marker kan", in *Multilingua*, 17, pp. 379-406.

Wouk F. (1999), "Gender and the use of pragmatic particles in Indonesian, in *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 3/2, pp. 194-219.

Wouk F. (2001), "Solidarity in Indonesian conversation: The discourse marker ya", in *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, pp. 171-191.