

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents the review of the related literature that includes the concept of discourse. There are definition of discourse analysis, definition of discourse markers, the types of discourse markers, Definition of Stand-Up Comedy, and previous study.

A. Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis focuses on knowledge about language beyond the word, clause, phrase and sentence that is needed for successful communication. It looks at the relationship between language and the social cultural contexts in which it is used.¹ Discourse analysis also considers the ways that the use of language presents in different understandings. It examines how language is influenced by relationships participants as well as the effect in using the language has upon social identities and relations.² It considers how views of the world, and identities, are constructed through the use of discourse.

Discourse analysis also provides communication with a compelling way to study how people present themselves, manage their relationship, give responsibility and blame, create organization, enact

¹ Brian Patridge. *Discourse Analysis*. (London: Great Britain. 2008) 2

² Ibid, P.3

culture, persuade others, and so on.³ Stated a bit differently, taking talk seriously has enabled communication researchers to reframe and address long-standing disciplinary concerns in powerful, persuasive new ways. By now, it should be obvious how ideas from intellectual traditions outside communication have shaped discourse work within communication.

Discourse analysis is always changing from context to language and from language to context.⁴ As we know, word can change language of a context or condition when we talk about many topics and the word sometimes different meaning although written in the same. Besides discourse analysis refers to knowledge about language among the world, clause, phrase and sentence that is needed for successful communication.⁵ In other word, while we can not know when the context of conversation has meaning different with what their mind. Which it can causes misunderstanding in conversation. We should can utterance a word, phrase, and sentence when the situation is right and be right communication and also we must know about discourse markers in conversation. Coherence relations, discourse relations, or rhetorical relations are different means to achieve coherences in discourse. Within the field of discourse analysis, there have been many studies which have compared different languages but which would not, on this understanding, be considered to be specifically

³ Marianne Jorgensen and Louise Phillips. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. (London: Sage Publication, 2002) 45

⁴ James Paul Gee. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. (New York: Taylor & Francis, 2010), 20.

⁵ Brian Paltridge. *Discourse Analysis*. (New York: Continuum, 2006), 2.

typological, because they are not focused upon developing a system for direct, systematic, and universal comparison of a wide variety of languages.⁶

B. Discourse Markers

Discourse markers is a part of pragmatic markers. Pragmatic marker is a class of lexical expression in every language. These expressions occur as part of discourse segment but are not part of the propositional content of the message conveyed and they do not contribute to the meaning of proposition. Member of this class typically have the following properties they are free morphemes, discourse segment initial, signal a specific message and are not classified syntactically but in term of their semantic or pragmatic functions.⁷

Fraser also goes on defining discourse markers as “a class of lexical expression drawn primarily from the syntactic classes of conjunction, adverbs, and prepositional phrase with certain exception. They signal a relationship between the interpretation of the segment they introduce, S2 and prior segment, S1.”⁸

There are four types of pragmatic markers. They are basic pragmatic markers, commentary pragmatic markers, parallel markers, and discourse markers. A basic marker signals the force of the basic message. A

⁶ Davood Mashhadi Heidar, and Reza Biria. *Sociopragmatic Function of Discourse Markers in International Law Texts*. (Finland: Academy Publisher Manufactured, 2011) Vol.1: 1479-1487

⁷ Bruce Fraser. *Pragmatic Markers*. (Boston: Boston University, 1990) 3

⁸ Begona Belles Fortuno. *Discourse Markers within the university Lecture Genre: A Contrastive study between Spanish and North American lectures*” (Dissertation, Humanities and Social Science Faculty of Universitat Jaume, Spanish, 2006), 102.

commentary marker signals a message that comments on the basic message, a parallel marker signals a message in addition to the basic message and a discourse marker signals the relationship of the basic message to the following discourse. Various phonological phenomena such as intonation and stress can, at times, take place of these lexical pragmatic markers, particularly commentary markers.⁹

In this case, the researcher wants to know the final types of pragmatic markers. The fourth and the final type of pragmatic marker is the discourse markers, an expression that signals the relationship of basic message to the foregoing discourse. In contrast to the other pragmatic markers do not contribute to the representative sentence meaning, but only the procedural meaning in which they provide instructions to the addressee on how the utterance to which the discourse marker is attached and interpreted.

There are many classifications of discourse markers according to some author. In this explanation, the researcher explains the classification of discourse markers according to Schiffrin, Halliday and Hasan, and also Fraser.

1. Schiffrin's Theory

Schiffrin said that, the important thing of the analysis on discourse marker is to know how the speakers and hearers jointly integrate forms, meaning and action to make overall sense out of what

⁹ Bruce Fraser. *Pragmatic Markers*. (Boston: Boston University, 1996) 3

is said.¹⁰ The types of discourse markers according to Schiffrin are Discourse connective, marker of information management, marker of response, marker cause and result, marker of temporal adverb, information and participation.¹¹

2. Halliday and Hasan's Theory

Halliday and Hasan's classified conjunction (connective element) as discourse marker are summarized: additive, adversative, causal and continuative.¹²

3. Fraser's Theory

According to Fraser, these are important in understanding function and use of discourse markers. Discourse markers relate some aspects of the message in S1 and S2. Fraser's categories of discourse marker are contrastive discourse marker, elaborative discourse marker, inferential discourse marker and temporal discourse marker.¹³

C. The Type of Discourse Markers

In this thesis, the researcher classifies the types of discourse marker.

In this point, explain the types of discourse marker based on Fraser theory.

¹⁰ Deborah Schiffrin. *Approach to Discourse*. (Cambridge: Blackwell Publisher. 1994) 46

¹¹ Sari, Norma Fitri Ratna, *Discourse markers used by English department students of STAIN Kediri in their oral presentation*. STAIN Kediri. 2016

¹² Sari, Norma Fitri Ratna, *Discourse markers used by English department students of STAIN Kediri in their oral presentation*. STAIN Kediri. 2016

¹³ Sari, Norma Fitri Ratna, *Discourse markers used by English department students of STAIN Kediri in their oral presentation*. STAIN Kediri. 2016

To know the classification of the categories of discourse marker, it has four main categories.¹⁴

1. Contrastive Discourse Markers

Signaling that the utterance is either a denial or a contrast of some proposition associated with the preceding discourse. They do not contribute to the semantic meaning of the discourse segment (S2) which host them, but signals the speaker's intended relationship between the segment and the preceding one (S1).¹⁵ The meaning of contrastive discourse markers words according to Fraser theory are contrast. It is because it indicate as contrastive words.

Example:

- a. Three is a prime number, but four is not.
- b. The water wouldn't boil so we couldn't make any tea.

In sentence (a), "but" signals that the relationship between S1 and S2 is one of contrast, while the sentence (b), "so" signal that the relationship is one of implication or consequence. In general, the aspects of the discourse segment S1 and S2 being contrasted must be members of a contrastable set, that is a collection of expressions which may be contrasted along one (or more) dimensions. A discourse marker does not "create" a relationship between two successive segments, since the

¹⁴ Bruce Fraser. *An Account of Discourse Marker*. (USA: Boston University, 2009) 8

¹⁵ Bruce Fraser. *An Account of Discourse Marker*. (USA: Boston University, 2009) 9

relationship must already exist for the S1-DM+S2 sequence to be acceptable. For example, the “but” in (a) below, repeated here,

- a. Water freezes at 32 degrees but boils at 212degrees.
- b. The movie is over, so we might as well go directly to the party.
- c. A: Fred is a real gentleman, B: on the contrary, he’s boor

Signals that a contrast exists between S2 and S1 and the hearer is to interpret the sequence while being aware of this, while the “so” in (b) signals that conclusion conveyed in S2 is justified by the message conveyed in S1, and the “on the contrary” in (c) signals disagreement of the second speaker with the message of the first. These relationships, and perhaps others, exist between the sequence of S2 and S1 above, whether or not there is a discourse marker present.

The class of contrastive marker includes: all the same, anyway, but, contrariwise, conversely, despite (this/that), even so, however, in any case/rate/event, in spite of (this/that), instead (of doing this/that), nevertheless, nonetheless (this/that point) notwithstanding, on the other hand, on the contrary, rather (than do this/that), regardless (of this/that), still, that said, though, yet.

The other kind of discourse marker shows that interpretation of S2 contrast with the interpretation of S1. Consider below that contain Discourse Markers.¹⁶

- John weighs 150 pounds. In comparison, Jim weighs 155

In this sentence, in comparison indicates that S2 is in contrast with S1. According to its meaning, this subclass can be divided as: but, alternatively, although, contrariwise, contrary to expectations, conversely, despite (this/that), even so, however, in spite of (this/that), in comparison (with, this/that).

2. Elaborative Discourse Markers

Elaborative markers constitute that the third class of discourse markers and signal that the utterance following constitute a refinement of some sorts on the preceding discourse.¹⁷ Elaborative discourse marker signals an elaboration in S2 to the information contained in S1. The meaning of elaborative discourse markers words according to Fraser theory are connect. It's because it has connecting words and also adverb.

Example:

- a. He didn't pick up the letter on the table. Rather, he left it laying there.

¹⁶ Seyed Ali rezvani Kalajahi, dkk. *Discourse Connector: An Overview of the History, Definition and Classification of the Term*. In World Applied Science Journal 19 (London: Oxford University Press, 2012). (11): 1659-1673

¹⁷ Bruce Fraser. *An Account of Discourse Markers*. (USA: Boston University, 2009) 14

- b. I think you should cool of little. In the other word, sit down and wait a little bit.

Whatever the relationship, it is present due to the linguistic interpretation of the segments, taken together with the discourse context, and the discourse marker merely makes clear what relationship the speaker intends. Whereas the sequence in sentence (a), discourse markers in relationship.

Elaborative markers includes: and, above all, also, alternatively, analogously, beside, by the same token, correspondingly, equally, for example, for instance, further (more), in addition, in other words, in particular, likewise, more accurately, more importantly, more precisely, more to the point, moreover, in that basis, on top of it all, or, otherwise, rather, similarly, and that is.

3. Inferential Discourse Marker

There is a class of inferential discourse markers known as inferential markers, expression which signals that the force of the utterance is a conclusion which follows from the preceding discourse. Inferential discourse marker signals that S1 provides a basis for inferring S2.¹⁸ The meaning of inferential discourse markers words according to Fraser theory are conclusion. Its because it has conclusion sentence like so, for example, therefor and etc.

¹⁸ Bruce Fraser. *An Account of Discourse Marker*. (USA: Boston University, 2009) 17

Example:

- a. Marry went home. After all, she was sick.
- b. A: Marsha is away for the weekend. B: So, she won't be available
Saturday

The “so” in dialog (b) has signals that the conclusion conveyed in S2 is justified by message conveyed in S1.

Inferential markers include in this topic are: accordingly, after all, all thing consider, as a consequence, as a logical conclusion, as a result, because of this/that, consequently, for this/that reason, hence, in this/that case, it can be concluded that, it stands to reason that, of course, on this/that condition, so, then, therefore, thus, for example, as consequence, accordance with.

4. Temporal Markers

Temporal markers are time deictic to convey a relationship between the time at which a proposition is assumed to be true, and the time at which it is presented in an utterance.¹⁹ The meaning of temporal adverb according to Fraser theory are adverb of time and also conjunction.

Example:

- a. You should read while doing that.
- b. A: I can't see the boy. B: Then, don't leave.

¹⁹ Bruce Fraser. *An Account of Discourse Marker*. (USA: Boston University, 2009) P.19

According to its meaning, this subclass can be divided as: then, after, as soon as, before, eventually, finally, first, immediately, afterwards, meantime, meanwhile, originally, second, subsequently, when.

D. Definition of Stand-Up Comedy

Stand-up comedy is a [comic](#) style in which a [comedian](#) performs in front of a live audience, usually speaking directly to them. The performer is commonly known as a comic, stand-up comic, stand-up comedian, or simply a stand-up. In stand-up comedy, the comedian usually recites a grouping of humorous stories, [jokes](#) and [one-liners](#) typically called a [monologue](#), routine, or act. Outside live performance, stand-up is often distributed commercially via [television](#), [DVD](#), [CD](#) and the internet. As the name implies, "stand-up" comedians usually perform their material while standing, though this is not mandatory.²⁰

Three theorems survey stand-up comedy as an absolute or ideal genre. In each one, "you" is second-person plural: you, the audience.²¹ If you think something is funny, it is. You may be (collectively) puzzled by your amusement or disapprove of it, but you cannot be wrong about it. This means three things. First, individual reservations are irrelevant: any member of the audience who is unamused by a generally well-received joke should

²⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stand-up_comedy, accessed on November 09th, 2017

²¹ John Limon, *Stand-up Comedy in Theory, or, Abjection in America* (London: Duke University Press, 2000) 11

be regarded as merely deflecting the group response, which is still single-minded and unimpeachable. Second, individual recantations are invalid. An individual may suspect that what he or she called love was lust or loneliness, or that suffering was self-pity. But the collective experience of humor, like the personal experience of pain, fills its moment and perishes; reflection misprizes it of necessity. (Laughter may be the social equivalent of pain, the group incorrigible.) Third, you cannot be retroactively disabused by a critic. To criticize a joke is to miss it, because the joke, as Freud demonstrates, is, in the first instance, an escape from criticism to a prior happiness.²²

The incorrigibility of your response is peculiar to comedy among all forms of art. You may wrongly think a symphony, for example, is beautiful when you have been seduced by the loveliness of the evening or the lyric athleticism of the conductor. Stand-up is uniquely audience-dependent for its value because joking is essentially, first a social phenomenon (no audience, no joke, Freud noted, observing that an untransmitted joke is not, structurally, a joke, and second a fully embedded phenomenon. The particularities of the relationship of joke teller and audience do not make the joke seem more or less funny; they make the joke more or less funny.²³

²² Sigmund Freud, “Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious”, in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, trans. James Strachey (London: Hogarth Press, 1960), 8:125–27

²³ John Limon, *Stand-up Comedy in Theory, or, Abjection in America* (London: Duke University Press, 2000) 13

A joke is funny if and only if you laugh at it. This theorem quarantines comedy not from the serious, but from the humorous in all nonspecific settings. If you laugh at a rude gesture in a tennis match or at a caesura of prosaic commentary during a poetry reading, you are laughing from relief; you may laugh at a presidential witticism out of respect. But laughter at a stand-up routine signifies that the joke is funny, and the joke cannot be funny without it. A joke at which the audience smiles or nods its approbation is a failed joke; a joke at which the audience laughs is a good joke in proportion to its laughter. Perhaps, say, a comedian has been so successful (in his routine, in his career) that your laughter is indiscriminate. This behavior only indicates that you are the sort of audience inclined to find humor (not every audience is this unresentful) where it knows it to have passed before.²⁴

Your laughter is the single end of stand-up. This theorem distinguishes stand-up from all other particular and formal settings of humor. Stand-up comedy does not require plot, closure, or point. Jokes may be as short as ingenuity allows, and there need not be anything but jokes. Constant, unanimous laughter is the limit case. Any comedian is free, of course, to thematize or editorialize or beautify, but in these respects, he or she has in mind extrinsic models. I am demarcating absolute stand-up.²⁵

²⁴ John Limon, *Stand-up Comedy in Theory, or, Abjection in America* (London: Duke University Press, 2000) 15

²⁵ John Limon, *Stand-up Comedy in Theory, or, Abjection in America* (London: Duke University Press, 2000) 16

It is simple to intuit in this ideal structure (the audience cannot err, it cannot feign, it cannot be misled) why comedians might, above all other artists and entertainers, hate their audiences; but the most comprehensive way to put the matter is that they hate their audiences because they are not, as performers, entirely distinct from them. Audiences turn their jokes into jokes, as if the comedian had not quite thought or expressed a joke until the audience thinks or expresses it. Stand-up is all supplement. Freud describes in the teller-told exchange a system of transitive inhibitions, but I am noting a formal as much as a psychological relation. Laughter is more than the value of a routine; more than a determinant of the routine (its rhythm influencing the comedian's timing or its volume his direction); it is the arteries and veins of the routine's circulation.²⁶

In this light, it is hard to fathom how a stand-up performance can be outrageous, that is to say (etymologically) *outré*, outside the circle. In standup as opposed to all other modes of art and entertainment, there is only the circle. The audience cannot be wrong or lie because it cannot reflect or judge: you can fail to see the joke, but so long as you see it, it is yours. That syndrome is itself sufficiently outrageous; but then it is the syndrome and not the joke that creates the emotion, and we can infer that every joke emits its own outraged aura. Even in the case of Lenny Bruce, the outrageous

²⁶ John Limon, *Stand-up Comedy in Theory, or, Abjection in America* (London: Duke University Press, 2000) 17

comedian par excellence, the most that can be granted is that outrage is the aura of the circulating comedy, which is why it has never been decided whether the condition of “outrage,” an inevitable term in all discussions of Bruce, is better attributed to Bruce or his audience.²⁷

Absolute stand-up, so defined, is akin to Clausewitz’s “absolute war”: the shared object is perfect devastation. Absolute war is unlike all actual wars; real wars continue policy by other means, so that perfect devastation is never necessary or desirable. To conceive of absolute war is to measure ordinary armed belligerence by its lapse from an atemporal, geometric ideal. Absolute stand-up is a cognate notion insofar as the mathematical aspect of comedy, noted by many commentators but rarely elaborated, is the result of its pursuit of an apocalyptic technique. In the distance that an actual stand-up situation strays from the absolute, we may register the irruptions of alien impulses we can quantify, for one thing, the interference of audience outrage.²⁸

E. Previous Study

There are many studies about discourse markers. Some of researchers’ interest to take discourse markers because is a lifelong process that involves experiences and analysis. Meanwhile, others researchers believe that discourse markers can occur even when the participants do not

²⁷ John Limon, *Stand-up Comedy in Theory, or, Abjection in America* (London: Duke University Press, 2000) 19

²⁸ John Limon, *Stand-up Comedy in Theory, or, Abjection in America* (London: Duke University Press, 2000) 21

intentionally provoke it. For example studies from Adi Riyanto and Norma Fitri Ratna Sari.

First, *An Analysis of Discourse Markers Used in Statuses of Twitter Owned by an Indonesian Public Figure* by Adi Riyanto. In his thesis Adi explain about discourse markers used in Twitter by Indonesian Public Figure. It found 23 status updated by Indonesian public figure. Adi use Fraser theory to analyze the data and using descriptive qualitative approach.

Second, *Discourse Markers Used by English Department Students of STAIN Kediri in Their Oral Presentation* by Norma Fitri Ratna Sari. In her thesis Norma explain about discourse markers used by students of STAIN Kediri in their oral presentation. It founds 117 discourse markers based on Fraser theory. Fraser divided discourse markers into four types. They are contrastive discourse markers, elaborative discourse markers, inferential discourse markers and temporal markers.

The researcher takes this theory because it has been explain about definition and types of discourse markers. Therefore, the researcher takes the thesis because Norma use descriptive qualitative approach and she analyzed discourse markers have been mentioned before.