

MOCK IMPOLITENESS AND SYMBOLIC INTERACTIONISM IN KI SENO NUGROHO'S JAVANESE SHADOW PUPPET SHOW

Imam Prakoso

Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

imamprakoso@mail.ugm.ac.id

correspondence: imamprakoso@mail.ugm.ac.id

<https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v27i2.8190>

received 15 February 2024; accepted 8 July 2024

Abstract

This research aims to investigate the use of mock impoliteness in Ki Seno Nugroho's shadow puppet performances and the formation of symbolic interactionism between the puppeteer and the audience. This is due to the evolving forms of politeness within Javanese society, particularly in the realm of shadow puppet performances in the modern era. Additionally, there is a public perception of Ki Seno Nugroho as a humorous puppeteer using Bagong as a means of communication during his performances. The analysis of conversations between Bagong and other characters is used to explore the context of mock impoliteness and symbolic interactionism in Ki Seno Nugroho's shadow puppet shows titled "*Bagong Duta*," "*Bagong Maneges*," and "*Semar Mbangun Kayangan*." The results of this study indicate that the use of mock impoliteness serves to create a humorous atmosphere, thus enhancing the entertainment aspect of Ki Seno Nugroho's shadow puppet performances. Moreover, it seems that Ki Seno Nugroho successfully portrays *Bagong* in three forms of symbolic interactionism: as a physical entity (the youngest son of *Semar*, the father of all *panakawan* characters in the Javanese puppet shadow story), a social entity (a representation of resistance by the common people towards authority), and an abstract entity (an entertainment element in shadow puppet performances).

Keywords: Bagong, Javanese shadow puppet, mock impoliteness, symbolic interactionism

Introduction

The traditional Javanese shadow puppet (*wayang kulit*) spectacle has become a part of Javanese society. Both artists and spectators perceive the show as an art form that always represents life values. The symbolism presented in the spectacle indicates that the formulation once created by the ancestors has succeeded in creating a common understanding regarding life in the world and the hereafter. The messages conveyed by traditional Javanese shadow puppets hold aesthetic and cultural significance, making the existence of traditional Javanese shadow puppets timeless, regardless of the globalization wave in Indonesia, especially in Java. One of the interesting phenomena regarding the art of traditional Javanese shadow puppet spectacle can be seen through the presence of Ki Seno Nugroho, a shadow



puppet master, in Yogyakarta. He received great attention in 2015, and his shows attracted huge enthusiasm from the spectators. He was considered successful in self-actualisation whilst considering society's taste regarding the development of traditional arts (Allasso, 2018). Likewise, in the geopolitical context of Indonesia, Ki Seno Nugroho's shadow puppet spectacle is a production of the era since the complexion of traditional arts underwent some significant changes from the New Order era to the Reformation era. Nowadays, traditional arts are not only seen as sacred and philosophical work but also inclusiveness values through representations of society's factual and realistic daily lives (Cohen, 2014).

The strategy used by Ki Seno Nugroho to attract the spectators' attention is by utilizing the deconstruction of Bagong's character as *panakawan* (the sacred servant of a king or deity in Javanese *wayang* stories) in every play. His language style brings up an inclusive discourse of shadow puppet story that tended to be rigid, using Javanese language speech levels of *krama* (high level), *madya* (medium level), and *ngoko* (low level) that changes according to the shadow puppet character's background. In this case, Bagong character becomes the key entertainment factor in telling a shadow puppet story for wider society, using more egalitarian language aspects and even breaking out of the politeness rules of the Javanese language. The language modification used in Ki Seno Nugroho's shadow puppet spectacles illustrates an inclusive discourse between characters: *panakawan*, nobles or king, and the gods. These three types of characters are social status classifications for shadow puppet characters, which are based on the same social status of Javanese society. Social status or caste is the position that one gets automatically at birth (inherited), and the classification is rigid and permanent (ascribed status). On the other hand, the bigger society only knows a social status based on its economic aspect (seen from property ownership) and cultural level (seen from education level) (Holmes, 2013).

The character of Bagong in shadow puppet performances is in the lowest class of society. Nevertheless, Ki Seno Nugroho often portrayed Bagong using egalitarian language and showing resistance against the nobles and even the Gods (Prakoso, 2023). The play exhibits a deconstructive pattern, using language to indicate power relations, politeness, and solidarity. Based on the research background explained, this study aims to explain the strategic forms of Bagong's mock impoliteness, which has become central to one of the representations of language use in the puppet spectacles of Ki Seno Nugroho. The use of mock impoliteness in his performances also seems to have led to a societal interpretation of Ki Seno Nugroho. Over time, people have come to consider Ki Seno Nugroho as the puppeteer who specializes in portraying Bagong. This creates a new phenomenon where Bagong takes on a fresh and important role in Javanese shadow puppetry. In other words, there is a process of symbolic interactionism between Ki Seno Nugroho, who continually revives the character of Bagong and his audience. Ultimately, this strategy has helped elevate Ki Seno Nugroho's prominence, particularly with the emergence of live streaming culture in traditional *wayang kulit* performances in the digital era (Mrazek, 2019).

Several studies related to the use of politeness and impoliteness in cultural contexts and their functions have been conducted previously. As Locher and Larina (2019) have described, research on politeness and impoliteness globally, spanning from Western to Asian cultures, has added a unique dimension to the development

of linguistic studies. Culpeper et al. (2017) describe that sometimes impoliteness does not always have a genuinely negative meaning and can be a way for people to engage in informal communication, such as jokes, banter, or teasing. This distinction is also defined by Culpeper (2021), who differentiates hate speech from impoliteness by the presence of communication involving hatred, extreme behavior, and prejudicial associations. This is evident in Western cultures, such as among Australians, who often use teasing in everyday interactions to make conversations more playful and filled with solidarity (Haugh, 2014). Similarly, Dynel (2021) describes how humor in online communication can take the form of roasting or teasing that does not hurt others' feelings and thus does not lead to cyberbullying. Conversely, Parvaresh and Tayebi (2018) explain that impolite speech can also generate hatred due to violations of the moral order in certain cultures. They studied an Iranian actress who posted a nude photo of herself and subsequently received impolite comments from netizens. Similarly, Tahir and Ramadhan (2024) describe how impoliteness can lead to hate speech in the online realm. They found that expressions such as early warnings, violence and incitement, and offensive language were used by the public to express their disapproval of a presidential talk show in Indonesia.

On the other hand, in a show that emphasizes entertainment, impolite speech is sometimes necessary. Like Ibrahim (2021), who studied the presence of impoliteness in a popular TV show in Egypt. Jokes, sarcasm, teasing, and even sexist humor are commonly used in the show to boost its ratings, and they involve national celebrities. He, Chen, and Dong (2023) examined how insults can actually be necessary to support certain atmospheres or events, such as stand-up comedy shows in China. Of course, these insults are nothing more than jokes and remain within the bounds of necessary politeness. Furthermore, Ahmed and Hussein (2024) describe that sometimes the use of mock impoliteness is needed in communication involving speakers and listeners who share similar cultural backgrounds or social statuses.

In the context of Javanese culture, research on linguistic politeness distinguishes clearly between polite and impolite usage, both in everyday conversation and in artistic performances. Prasetyoningsih (2018) mentioned that the politeness system can be identified through the address system, which is culturally bonded within the Javanese social hierarchy. She found that the forms of address in Javanese shadow play reflect politeness in the Javanese language based on the relationship between the addresser and the addressee, gender, setting (place, time, and atmosphere), respect, and the role/occupation of the participants. This statement is supported by the concept of *mbasakake* (showing respect by using proper speech levels towards older people) in Javanese culture, especially within family settings (Efendi & Sukanto, 2020). This concept involves the use of specific speech levels towards interlocutors with higher social status as a form of respect. It is closely related to the politeness system in the Javanese language, which is not only based on speech levels but also a high degree of respect towards the interlocutor, considering the context of the speech situation (Nurjaleka, Nurhayati, & Supriatnatingsih, 2022; Nuryantingsih & Pandanwangi, 2018; Poedjosoedarmo, 2017).

On the other hand, the presence of taboo language is not uncommon in Javanese society. It is described by Amrullah (2019), who found that language

considered impolite is still used to create humor and entertainment in Javanese puppet shadow performances. However, such use is usually limited to *limbukan* or *gara-gara* scenes (interludes in the dramatic structure of Javanese shadow puppetry that are filled with comedic action and occur outside the main storyline of the play). This research seeks to explore further how mock impoliteness is present and develops within the main story, especially through the character of *panakawan* Bagong, which seems to be a unique phenomenon in the development of traditional Javanese *wayang kulit* performance art.

The use of mock impoliteness in the character of *panakawan* Bagong results in the form of symbolic interactionism occurring between the *dalang* (puppeteer) and the audience. In this context, Ki Seno Nugroho has gained a reputation as a humorous *dalang* by revitalizing the characterization of Bagong. Symbolic interactionism is formed based on the correlation of language elements, symbols, and self-representation within the social environment (Adade, 2019; Carter & Fuller, 2016). Furthermore, Whitmer (2019) describes that one impact of symbolic interactionism is the marketization of the self for socio-economic benefits in the professional world. An example that can be studied from the perspective of symbolic interactionism is the presence of Ki Seno Nugroho, who intentionally associates himself with the character of Bagong, thereby enhancing his fame and increasing demand for his performances among the public who enjoy his shows.

Otherwise, the mock impoliteness discussed in this research also reflects the current existence of Javanese shadow puppetry in society. Since the transition of its performance style from traditional to post-traditional, this has legitimately affected the forms of language used by most puppeteers, including Ki Seno Nugroho. They realize that in modern society, most people demand that Javanese shadow puppetry be an entertaining art form rather than strictly adhering to its pure and conservative roots. If we examine Ki Seno Nugroho's performance style, which often incorporates humor, it likely leads to a contextual shift in language use that tends to deviate from the highly valued Javanese politeness. From the characterization of Bagong, we can see that he prefers to use a variation of the Javanese language that is easier to understand, includes banter, and even uses offensive or condescending words. Nevertheless, Ki Seno Nugroho employs these language styles to enhance the sense of solidarity in the interpersonal relationships between characters, making all the dialogues more comprehensible to the audience (Prakoso, 2021). This approach does not aim to diminish the nobility of Javanese shadow puppetry but rather represents an effort by puppeteers to be more creative in presenting an entertaining and humorous show to modern enthusiasts of Javanese shadow puppetry. Subsequently, this research has two major questions:

1. How is mock impoliteness implemented in Ki Seno Nugroho's Javanese shadow puppet performances?
2. How does mock impoliteness affect the formation of symbolic interactionism in Ki Seno Nugroho's Javanese shadow puppet performances?

Method

This research focuses on the use of qualitative methods to analyze conversations between the character *panakawan* Bagong and other puppet characters. The conversation data in this study is considered pragmatic because it

involves the context of the conversation between the speaker, the interlocutor, and other participants in various situations (Jucker, Schneider, & Bublitz, 2018). Since the interlocutor determines the data, the method used in this research can also be referred to as a pragmatic method (Sudaryanto, 2015). This approach will help analyze how mock impoliteness is used in the context of Ki Seno Nugroho's shadow puppet performances.

The data for this study is taken from video uploads of puppet performances on Ki Seno Nugroho's official channel, PWKS Live. Specifically, several videos were selected that feature *panakawan* Bagong as the main character, such as "*Bagong Duta*", "*Bagong Maneges*", and "*Semar Mbangun Kayangan*". Data collection was carried out by observing and transcribing each dialogue containing elements of mock impoliteness. Subsequently, the conversation excerpts were accompanied by translations to help understand the contextual meanings that emerge.

In the next stage, the data was analysed by describing each linguistic unit along with an explanation of the context of the speech situation so that the forms of mock impoliteness occurring could be identified. The mock impoliteness model used in this study is based on Culpeper's model and incorporates the context of linguistic politeness in Javanese culture. This approach is employed to explore how the use of mock impoliteness not only violates etiquette in Javanese culture but can also create other situations, such as humor or entertainment in shadow puppet performances.

Additionally, the conversation data is examined for patterns that symbolize the interaction between Ki Seno Nugroho and the audience through the medium of the Bagong puppet character. This is done through content analysis of the puppet performances. As Carter and Alvarado (2018) describe, this method is one way to analyze symbolic interactionism through conversation analysis. At this stage, symbolic interactionism is also reviewed from a linguistic aspect, as language is an essential element in understanding the formation of Ki Seno Nugroho's public image within the community.

Findings and Discussion

Mock impoliteness used by the character of Bagong

In Ki Seno Nugroho's performance, several instances of the character Bagong using mock impoliteness were found. These conversations were directed towards characters with higher social status and occurred in the early part of the wayang kulit performance (*jejer*). The following is an excerpt from a dialogue with an explanation of its context.

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| [1] Baladewa | : " <i>Panakawan Bagong padha raharja sapraptamu?</i> "
' <i>Panakawan Bagong, how are you?</i> ' |
| Bagong | : " <i>Menika kados Panakawan Baladewa.</i> "
' <i>You are just like Panakawan Baladewa.</i> ' |
| Baladewa | : " <i>Panakawan dhengkulmu!</i> "
' <i>Panakawan your ass!</i> ' |
| Bagong | : " <i>Anu, adhuh, nuwun sewu kliru! Sinuwun Baladewa, maksud kula ngoten. Karang ketonto e. Wilujeng, Den. Bkti kula konjuk. Nyuwun ngapunten nggih.</i> " |

‘Ah, my apologies! What I mean is Your Majesty Baladewa. I have my slip of the tongue. I am fine, Your Majesty. I give you my highest honour. Please, accept my apologies.’

(*Semar Mbangun Kayangan*, 3 August 2018, 60:11)

The conversation [1] occurred between Bagong and Baladewa. It took place when Bagong attempted to greet Baladewa. We can see that there is a mistake in using the address system, as Bagong referred to King Baladewa as “*panakawan*.” In this context, the term *panakawan* should not be used because the interlocutor has a higher social caste than Bagong. According to the origin story of Baladewa in Javanese shadow puppetry, he is the older brother of Krisna and a king who rules over the Mandura Kingdom (Sudibyoprono, Suwandono, Dhanisworo, & Mujiyono, 1991). After Bagong admitted his mistake, he apologized to Baladewa and changed his address to “*Sinuwun*.” In Javanese culture, the word “*Sinuwun*” is a title for a king. In English, “*Sinuwun*” is comparable to “*His Highness*,” which represents an honorable gesture from people to their king in a monarchical society (Robson & Wibisono, 2002). Indeed, what Bagong says in the dialogue is merely intended as a joke through the use of mock impoliteness towards the interlocutor. This is evident from Bagong’s response, as he quickly corrects his address to Baladewa.

- [2] Bagong : “*Terus Sampeyan teka mriki ajeng napa?*”
‘So, what are you going to do in here?’
- Setyaki : “*Ngemban dhawuh timbalaning Kaka Prabu Dwarawati.*”
‘To carry out an order from Kaka Prabu Dwarawati.’
- Bagong : “*He’em, Kaka Prabu dhawuh piye?*”
‘Alright, what did **Kaka Prabu (my brother)** say to you?’
- Setyaki : “*Kaka Prabu dhengkulmu mlocot! Anggepmu kae kakangmu pa piye?*”
‘**Kaka Prabu (my brother)**, your ass! Who do you think he is? Your older brother?’
- Bagong : “*Oh, ho’o ding! Sinuwun dhawuh pripun?*”
‘Ah, right! What is the order from His Majesty?’
- (*Bagong Dhuta*, 30 April 2018, 180: 46)

Similarly, in conversation [2], Bagong makes a mistake by inappropriately addressing another character with a higher social status. This occurs when Bagong speaks to Setyaki about his arrival. Setyaki explains that his arrival was an order from *Kaka Prabu Dwarawati* (another name for Krisna, a king of the Dwarawati Kingdom and an advisor of the Pandawa’s clan). Setyaki feels offended when Bagong uses the term “*Kaka Prabu*” to refer to *Prabu Dwarawati*, also known as King Krisna, who is Setyaki’s cousin. In Javanese, the term *Kaka Prabu* can only be used by someone who is younger than the king and must have a specific relationship, such as a sibling, spouse, or other relation within the same social caste. It is also important to understand that the word of *Kaka* in Javanese is similar to addressing an older brother in real life, while *Prabu* signifies the king’s social status.

According to the principles of politeness in wayang performances, Bagong should address the character Krisna with a royal title followed by his name, such as “*Prabu Krisna*” or other titles like “*Sinuwun*” (Your Majesty) or “*Bendara*” (Master). However, Bagong instead makes a joke by treating him as an older brother, resulting in mock impoliteness that angers Setyaki. After realizing his mistake, Bagong corrects it by using a more appropriate address for a king.

- [3] Bagong : “*Kula ngaturaken sembah pangabekti kula konjuk, Pukulun.*”
 ‘I give you my highest honour, Your Majesty.’
 Bathara Guru : “*Iya iya, Bagong, ulun tampa. Akarya bombong tyas ulun, ora liwat pangestu ulun tampanana.*”
 ‘Alright, *Bagong*, I accept your expression of honour. I also want to express my honour to you, so please accept it.’
 Bagong : “*Inggih, ulun tampa.*”
 ‘Yes, I accept it.’
 (*Bagong Maneges*, 27 September 2018, 39:15)

Meanwhile, in conversation [3], Bagong used the wrong first-person pronoun. The word *ulun*, which means ‘me’ or ‘I’ in English, is identified as one of the singular first-person pronoun forms used exclusively by gods or deities (Poedjosoedarmo, Soepomo, Luginem, & Suharno, 1986; Utomo, 2007). It is not appropriately used by other groups (kings, princes, and servants) because the boundaries between language and social caste for gods or deities are quite strong. Philosophically, they are defined as characters with the highest social caste, possessing absolute authority and residing in the sacred temple above the sky. They play a significant role in maintaining the stability of the universe. This distinction affects the Javanese language variety, especially in speech levels for dramatic discourse, such as traditional shadow puppets. There is a language of the gods, which includes specific phrases, words, or pronouns that can only be used by gods or deities. It is important to note that the language of the gods is predominantly found and used in traditional Javanese plays derived from classic literature rather than in daily life conversation.

- [4] Nakula : “*Panakawan Bagong, padha raharja?*”
 ‘Panakawan Bagong, how are you?’
 Sadewa : “*Panakawan Bagong, padha raharja?*”
 ‘Panakawan Bagong, how are you?’
 Bagong : “*Pangestunipun, Ndara **Raharja**, anu Nakula Sadewa. Wilujeng, bekti kula konjuk.*”
 ‘Thanks to **Master Raharja**, I mean Nakula Sadewa. I am fine; I give you my highest honour.’
 Petruk : “*Ra sembrono ta, Gong.*”
 ‘Behave yourself, *Gong*.’
 (*Semar Mbangun Kayangan*, 16 September 2018, 59:50)

Besides the use of address titles or pronouns, we can see from the conversation [4] that Bagong also engages in mock impoliteness towards his interlocutor through wordplay in the form of polysemy. In this instance, Bagong

deliberately calls *Nakula* “*Ndara Raharja*.” The word “*raharja*” in this context has more than one meaning when spoken in conversation. In Javanese, “*raharja*” means “*healthy*” or “*prosperous*.” Additionally, in Javanese culture, people sometimes use it as a name, as there is a tradition of choosing names based on words with positive meanings. Therefore, by naming someone “*Raharja*,” there is an implied hope that they will bring health or prosperity throughout their life.

Still, within the use of mock impoliteness through wordplay in the form of polysemy, the characterisation of Bagong in Ki Seno Nugroho’s shadow puppet performances seems to be intended to create a humorous atmosphere. In this context, it can be observed that Bagong also plays the role of a character who speaks frankly, often carelessly disregarding his interlocutors, as seen in his conversation with the deity character below.

- [5] Bathara Guru :”*Bagong.*”
 ’*Bagong.*’
 Bagong: :”*Dalem.*”
 ’*Yes, Your Majesty.*’
 Bathara Guru :”*Ana wigati apa, dene kita sowan ana ing ngarsaning Pukulun Bathara Guru, Bagong?*”
 ’*What makes you come in front of Lord Bathara Guru, Bagong?*’
 Bagong :”*Nuwun inggih, Pukulun Bathara Guru. Kok mboten beta stopmap? Guru kok ora nggawa apa-apa.*”
 ’*Yes, My Lord Bathara Guru. But why don’t you bring a folder? You are Guru, but you bring nothing.*’
 Bathara Guru :”*Aja sembrana, ulun Bathara Guru ya Manikmaya ya Jagad Giri Pratingkah ya Jatimurti.*”
 ’*Behave yourself; I am Lord Bathara Guru also known as Manikmaya and as Jagad Giri Pratingkah.*’
 (*Bagong Maneges*, 27 September 2018, 42: 23)

It can be seen from the conversation [5] above that Bagong creates a mock impoliteness utterance by introducing lexical ambiguity. This occurs when Bagong visits the place of the gods and meets Bathara Guru, the puppet character who serves as the leader of the gods. In this conversation, Bagong appears with a careless speaking style, playing with the name of his interlocutor, Bathara Guru. Bagong uses a lexical ambiguity strategy by asking, “*Nuwun inggih, Pukulun Bathara Guru. Kok mboten beta stopmap? Guru kok ora nggawa apa-apa.*” In this sentence, Bagong implicitly shifts the meaning of the word “*Guru*” from the name of the puppet character to “*Guru*” as a school teacher. This is highlighted by the word “*stopmap*,” which refers to the idea of a teacher who typically carries teaching materials in a folder. This polysemous shift in meaning results in a violation of conversational maxims. Therefore, Bagong’s statement is essentially a form of mock impoliteness directed at Bathara Guru to create a humorous atmosphere in the conversation. A similar strategy is also employed by introducing wordplay in the form of metonymy. In this case, metonymy appears in Bagong’s speech to create a mock impoliteness, as seen in the following dialogue excerpt.

- [6] Bathara Narada :”*Bagong, padha raharja saprapta kita?*”
 ‘How are you, Bagong?’
 Bagong :”*We lha sapa iki?*”
 ‘Who is this?’
 Bathara Narada :”*We lha trondholo iki, ulun iki dewa, Sang Hyang Narada.*”
 ‘Behold, I am a god, Sang Hyang Narada.’
 Bagong :”***Wah, Bathara Teko!***”
 ‘**Wow, Bathara Teko (The God of Teapot)!**’
 Bathara Narada :”*Teko dhengkul kita kuwi! Ulun ki dewa e dionekake Bathara Teko!*”
 ‘Teapot your ass! I am a god, not a teapot!’
 (*Bagong Maneges*, 27 September 2018, 40:22)

The dialogue [6] started with Bathara Narada asking how Bagong was doing. Bagong did not answer the question but asked about someone in front of him. Here, Bagong started showing his mock impoliteness through the underlined word “*Bathara Teko*.” Spontaneously, this made the interlocutor, who was a god, offended and reaffirmed his social caste to Bagong. Regarding this, the interlocutor was offended because of the term “*Bathara Teko*” which in Javanese refers to a small and round teapot used to store tea or coffee. This term is also considered a mockery of Bathara Narada, who is associated with a teapot as his physique is short and fat. It can also be seen that Bagong’s speech crossed the impoliteness principle, which is normally done by a servant to a god. Apart from using the lowest speech level in the Javanese language (*ngoko*), Bagong also addressed the interlocutor with a different name (not an alias) which at a glance was similar to a realization of the positive impoliteness principle. However, if closely observed, the way Bagong communicated, as seen above, was simply a joke intended to tease the interlocutor and create a humorous scene to make the audience laugh. Another form of mock impoliteness that involves physical insults toward the interlocutor can also be found, as illustrated in the following excerpt of the dialogue.

- [7] Bagong :”*Pukulun Yamadipati, niki mpun kula betakake silet, Pukulun.*”
 ‘Lord *Yamadipati*, here I bring you a razor blade.’
 Bathara Yamadipati :”*Dienggo ngapa?*”
 ‘For what?’
 Bagong :”***Nyukur jenggote, Pukulun.***”
 ‘**To shave your beard, Your Majesty.**’
 Bathara Yamadipati :”*Aja sembrana, kowe wani karo dewa, kuwalat kowe.*”
 ‘Behave yourself; if you dare to a god, you will be cursed.’
 Bagong :”*Nuwun inggih, Pukulun.*”
 ‘Alright, Your Majesty.’
 (*Bagong Maneges*, 27 September 2018, 42:01)

Then, for the excerpt [7] above, Bagong demonstrated how to utilize humor through speech that includes mock impoliteness. This began when Bagong spoke to Bathara Yamadipati, a god in a wayang story. Instead of showing a polite manner,

Bagong offended Bathara Yamadipati's appearance, specifically his thick beard. Unexpectedly, Bagong teased the interlocutor by offering a beard shaver. At first glance, Bagong's speech seemed to violate the principle of politeness in wayang stories, which tend to follow conventional norms. However, Bagong's speech created a humorous atmosphere in the dialogue between a servant and a god. Furthermore, Bagong's speech was not intended to start a conflict or lead to a dispute. In fact, Bagong was only trying to tease the interlocutor with his jokes, and his speech remained within the awareness of social caste and position in the wayang context. Another form of mock impoliteness by the character Bagong also appears by referencing characters outside of wayang. This can be seen in the following excerpt of the dialogue.

- [8] Bathara Indra :”*Bagong, padha raharja saprapta kita?*”
 ‘How are you, Bagong?’
 Bagong :”*Sinten menika, Pukulun?*”
 ‘What is your name, My Lord?’
 Bathara Indra :”*Ulun Bathara Indra.*”
 ‘I am Bathara Indra.’
 Bagong :”*Wah, lha warkop DKI!*”
 “**Wow, warkop DKI!**”
 Bathara Indra :”*Aja ngawur, ulun iki dewa.*”
 “Watch your mouth. I am a god.”
 Bagong :”*Wo tak kira nek Dono, Kasino, Indra.*”
 “I thought you were Dono, Kasino, Indra.”
 (*Bagong Maneges*, 27 September 2018, 41: 11)

In excerpt [8] above, we see that Bagong employs mock impoliteness by calling the interlocutor by a different name. This occurs when Bathara Indra opens the dialogue by asking how Bagong is doing. Instead of answering the question, Bagong asks about the identity of the interlocutor. After Bathara Indra tells him his name, Bagong immediately makes fun of it, likening it to a character outside the wayang kulit show. Specifically, Bagong calls Bathara Indra by the name of a character from “Warkop DKI”. The resemblance arises from the name “Indra,” which is the name of the interlocutor and a famous comedian from Warkop DKI in Indonesia. In this sense, Bagong creates a context of confusion using the homophone. The confusion stems from the word *Indra* referring to one of the god characters in the Javanese wayang story or *Indro*, a member of a well-known Indonesian comedy group from the '80s and '90s. Those two words have the same pronunciation, which can confuse the listener. Therefore, Bagong's statement aims to tease the interlocutor by using mock impoliteness to transform a formal conversation between a servant and a god into a more relaxed and humorous interaction.

Bagong as a medium for symbolic interactionism between the puppeteer and the audience

The language style and mock impoliteness of the character Bagong are not merely used to create humor. In the context of Ki Seno Nugroho's wayang kulit performance, Bagong is also used as a symbol to represent the puppeteer himself. Through the characterization of Bagong, Ki Seno Nugroho attempts to brand himself as a humorous puppeteer, bringing the role of Bagong into modern wayang

kulit performances. This can be seen in the three meaningful roles used to interact with the audience.

First, Bagong is presented as Semar's son and a *panakawan*, exhibiting his natural traits. In this context, the puppeteer interprets Bagong as a symbol of a servant or king's sympathizer, characterized by his innocence, childlike behavior, wit, bluntness, but always accuracy (Sudibyoprono et al., 1991), as seen in the following excerpt of the conversation.

- [9] Baladewa :*"Saiki coba, Bagong kuwi lho. Mangka wis suwe ndherekake para pepundhene Pandhawa. Wis suwe ndherekake bendarane Pandhawa, sowan ratu kok tanpa tata krama. Laku dhodhok ya ora, mangka nyembah ya ora. Ing atase ratu kok padhakake dulure lanang dijak salaman ki apa nganggo tata krama kaya ngono kuwi? Gek sawangen kuwi lho, tipake sikil blethokan thok. Keraton e, munggah keraton tanpa sandhalan."*
'Now look at *Bagong*. He has been working as a servant to Pandawa for so long but showing up here in front of the king without manners. No proper gesture, no conduct of worship. Despite giving an expression of worship, he just shook hands with a king like when he met his brother. Where is the dignity? Look at his dirty feet. This is a palace, and he came here without wearing sandals.'
- Petruk :*"Gong."*
'*Gong.*'
- Bagong :*"He?"*
'What?'
- Petruk :*"Ra nggo sandhal?"*
'You are not wearing sandals?'
- Bagong :*"Pedhot e."*
'It was broken.'
- Petruk :*"Ha?"*
'What?'
- Bagong :*"Pedhot, karang udan kok ya. Kejeblok neng peceren, pedhot."*
'It was broken because of the rain. Then I fell in the ditch, so the sandals were broken.'
- Petruk :*"Mau rak ya matur aku, tak tumbaske."*
'Why didn't you tell me earlier so I could buy you new sandals.'

(*Semar Mbangun Kayangan*, 10 April 2018, 60: 06)

From the conversation [9] above, the puppeteer depicts Bagong as an innocent and slightly annoying character due to his inappropriate behavior, which is not suitable for a servant in front of a king. This is illustrated by Prabu Baladewa's words towards Bagong when he appeared before the king. Instead of walking in a squatting position and bowing, as servants usually do, Bagong asked for a handshake as brothers might. Furthermore, Bagong did not wear sandals when entering the palace, leaving footprints all over the floor. This interpretation of Bagong shows that the role of *panakawan* in the story is to bring it to life with his innocent and clumsy traits. This portrayal results in audience enthusiasm, evident

from their laughter at the beginning of the play. This is also a form of creativity used by the puppeteer to develop the basic character of Bagong as one of the *panakawan* and *Semar*'s sons.

Additionally, Ki Seno Nugroho presents Bagong as a character who likes to criticize the king. Bagong not only acts as an innocent *panakawan* but also symbolizes the idea that commoners are key to democracy, as seen in the conversation below.

- [10] Petruk :”*Tur kowe sowan ratu kok tanpa nyembah barang, kuwi jenenge ora elok.*”
‘You came here to visit the king without an adoration; that is not right.’
- Bagong :”*Sing kandha sapa*”
‘Says who?’
- Petruk :”*Lho sing kandha Sinuwun Prabu Mandura wae ngrasani nek kowe ki ora ngerti tata krama ngono kok.*”
‘His Royal Highness King Baladewa told you that you do not have any manners.’
- Bagong :”*Tak andhani ya, Ratu Ngamarta kuwi ratu sing merakyat, Truk. Ora disembah wae ora protes. Beda karo ratu-ratu liyane kuwi, ming arep sowan wae ndadak nganggo ngejokake proposal. Ndadak warna-warna lan sapiturute. Mangka ndadak nyembah laku dhodhok.*”
‘Let me tell you, the King of Amarta is a humble person, Truk. He does not protest if someone does not give him an act of worship, not like the other kings. When we want to meet them, let’s say we must submit a proposal. It is very distressing. Yet we must show them an act of worship and walk in a polite way.’

(*Semar Mbangun Kayangan*, 10 April 2018, 60: 07)

Conversation [10] above took place when Prabu Baladewa criticized Bagong for lacking etiquette when meeting King of Ngamarta, Prabu Puntedewa. Prabu Baladewa stated that Bagong did not kneel and perform *laku dhodhok* (squat-walking), which is customary when a servant meets the king in Javanese culture. Instead, Bagong loudly responded that he didn’t need to do so because it represented the intimacy between the king and his people. In this regard, Bagong countered Prabu Baladewa’s criticism by stating that a king should not be a figure to be excessively worshipped or revered. From this dialogue excerpt, it can be implicitly seen that Ki Seno Nugroho intended to convey the idea that the relationship between the people and their leader should no longer be hindered by high hierarchy. Through the character of Bagong, Ki Seno Nugroho also symbolically conveys a message about someone’s attitude, hoping for a leader who is close to their people.

Bagong’s character is also depicted as a source of entertainment in Javanese shadow puppetry. In this context, Ki Seno Nugroho portrays Bagong not only through body movements and dialogue as part of the wayang characters but also as someone who breaks the ice during the play. Bagong’s speeches and gestures often include jokes that serve as intermezzos within the main story. Implicitly, the puppeteer uses Bagong’s dialogue to highlight the novelty and value of his performances, as seen in the dialogue snippet below.

- [11] Bagong :”Niki kula nek omong niku boten perkara ora isa sastra sing apik, boten, ning tumrap kula wayang niku sakmenika kudu komunikatif. Ora sah perlu nganggo sastra sing dhuwur dhuwur. Watone wong delok niku dhong.”
“It is not that I cannot speak properly, not at all, but I think wayang nowadays is supposed to be communicative performing arts. There is no need to use highly sophisticated ways of speaking.”
“The most important thing is the audience conceives all of the messages.”
(Semar Mbangun Kayangan, 10 April 2018, 60: 28)
- [12]Kresna :”Werkudara.”
“Werkudara.”
Werkudara : Piye?
“What?”
Kresna :”Iki kaya Bagong sowan.”
“Looks like Bagong is coming.”
Werkudara :”Waa Bagong meneh! Waa ora ana liyane po piye”
“It is Bagong again! Like no one else but him or what?”
Bagong :”Karang lakone ki sing dijaluki ki aku e. Nganti susah aku. Wis, arep ngarang kepiye meneh, pripun? Ha ning nyatane sing disenengi kula kok. Sir kula niku nek dha njaluk lakon ki sing angel sisan. Dadi kula niku karuan le mikir. Ra ming Bagong Dhuta Bagong Dhuta. Le ngomongke nganti jeleh. Ha ning piye wong le ngentukake dhuwit nggih niki e.”
“Indeed, the requested story is about me. It makes me sick. What am I supposed to do to create more stories? But the reality is that I am the most popular character. I mean, if people ask for a storyline, make it complex, and I will put more effort into creating a new one, not only the same Bagong Dhuta all over again until all of us are bored with it. However, this is how to get some money anyway.”
Prabu Kresna :”Bagong, kowe ki nggresula karo sapa?”
“Bagong, who are you complaining to?”
Bagong :”Kalih awak kula dhewe.”
“To myself.”
(Bagong Dhuta, 30 April 2018, menit 60: 19)

During the play, apart from acting as a panakawan or Semar’s son and the symbol of social criticism towards the king, Bagong is also presented as a comedic relief. As seen in the conversation [11] above, a puppeteer perceives Bagong’s role as delivering messages to society about his identity in the context of the development of wayang in this modern era. In the example [12], the puppeteer used Bagong to explicitly deliver a message on how wayang was supposed to develop in accordance with the era, and the core aspect that has to be noticed is the audience’s understanding. Therefore, there is no need to use highly sophisticated expressions, as seen in this quote, “*Ning tumrap kula, wayang niku sakmenika kudu komunikatif.*

Ora sah perlu nganggo sastra sing dhuwur dhuwur. Watone wong delok niku dhong.” (There is no need to use highly sophisticated ways of speaking, but the most important thing is that the audience understands.)

Thus, Bagong, as a comedic relief, is also portrayed in example [12], as seen in this quote, “*Karang lakone ki sing dijaluhi ki aku e. Nganti susah aku. Wis, arep ngarang kepiye meneh, pripun. Ha ning nyatane sing disenengi kula kok. Sir kula niku nek dha njaluk lakon ki sing angel sisan. Dadi kula niku karuan le mikir. Ra ming Bagong Dhuta Bagong Dhuta. Le ngomongke nganti jeleh. Ha ning piye wong le ngentukake dhuwit nggih niki e.*” (Nowadays, the stories about me are always in demand. It’s getting tough for me. Well, how am I supposed to come up with more? Honestly, it’s what people seem to enjoy. So, if I’m going to ask for a play, it’d better be a more complex one. Not just the same old *Bagong Dhuta* again and again until everyone’s bored. That’s how you make some money.). Implicitly, it can be seen that the puppeteer is trying to engage with the audience by explaining that the most requested stories involve Bagong. Therefore, when someone requests a play, it’s better if it’s a more intricate story, possibly without involving the *panakawan*. This is conveyed by the puppeteer in a humorous tone while also expressing dissatisfaction with society, as represented through Bagong. In conclusion, the puppeteer has developed Bagong’s character within society, resulting in a high demand for stories involving both Bagong and the *panakawan*. Additionally, from both examples above, it can be observed that Ki Seno Nugroho seeks to affirm his skill in portraying Bagong as a form of traditional shadow puppetry with an entertaining twist.

Conclusion

Based on the outcomes and discussion previously explained, Bagong’s character in Ki Seno Nugroho’s *wayang kulit* performances can be clearly summarized into several points. Firstly, his use of mock impoliteness strategies is evident in how he addresses figures of higher caste such as kings or gods. This can be seen in the mannerisms and language creativity displayed through Bagong’s character, where he employs expressions that subtly challenge the meanings of certain words, thereby introducing humor or entertainment aspects into the shadow puppet performance. Secondly, there is a symbolic interactionism that occurs between the puppeteer and the audience through Bagong’s characterization. Initially, the puppeteer portrays Bagong as a physical entity defined as Semar’s son or a *panakawan*. This is reflected in Bagong’s speech, which alternates between innocence and occasional annoyance, mirroring societal realities. Other than that, the puppeteer also presents Bagong as a social symbol, critiquing authority figures. Through Bagong’s character, portrayed as both innocent and critical, Ki Seno Nugroho explores the *panakawan* archetype as a commoner who often reminds or critiques kings or gods for their perceived benevolent actions. Lastly, Bagong is depicted by Ki Seno Nugroho as an abstract figure designed to entertain audiences during *wayang* performances. Bagong’s dialogue often reflects societal realities and contributes to the narrative substance. Moreover, portraying Bagong as an abstract figure has fueled the demand for stories featuring *panakawan* characters, particularly Bagong, reflecting evolving interpretations of Bagong’s character through traditional *wayang kulit purwa* performances.

However, this study still has limitations. The focus was restricted to wayang kulit performances, particularly those performed by Ki Seno Nugroho. It would be advantageous to expand similar research to encompass a wider range, such as other Javanese performing arts or everyday conversations. Broadening the scope would facilitate an exploration of the context of mock impoliteness in Javanese society. This is pertinent to understanding the concrete development of the Javanese language within society, particularly when considering the dynamics of linguistic politeness.

References

- Adade, C. Q. (2019). *Symbolic interactionism: The basics*. Delaware: Vernon Press.
- Ahmed, A. H., & Hussein, Z. A. (2024). Impoliteness, politeness and mock impoliteness in naturally occurring data. *International Journal of Linguistics Studies*, 4(1), 62–67. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijls.2024.4.1.6>
- Allasso, E. O. (2018). Aktualisasi diri Ki Seno Nugroho: Tinjauan pemenuhan kebutuhan dalam teori motivasi Abraham H. Maslow. *Wayang Nusantara: Journal of Puppetry*, 2(2), 92-102. <https://doi.org/10.24821/wayang.v2i2.3051>
- Amrullah, L. (2019). Jangkrik: Taboo language use at comical interlude in Javanese shadow puppet performance. *Proceedings of the Fifth Prasasti International Seminar on Linguistics (PRASASTI 2019)*. Paris, France: Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/prasasti-19.2019.32>
- Carter, M. J., & Alvarado, A. M. (2018). Symbolic interactionism as a methodological framework. In P. Liamputtong (Ed.), *Handbook of research methods in health social sciences* (pp. 1–19). Singapore: Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-2779-6_62-1
- Carter, M. J., & Fuller, C. (2016). Symbols, meaning, and action: The past, present, and future of symbolic interactionism. *Current Sociology*, 64(6), 931–961. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392116638396>
- Cohen, M. I. (2014). Wayang kulit tradisional dan pasca-tradisional di Jawa masa kini. *Jurnal Kajian Seni*, 1(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.22146/art.5965>
- Culpeper, J. (2021). Impoliteness and hate speech: Compare and contrast. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 179, 4–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.04.019>
- Culpeper, J., Haugh, M., & Sinkeviciute, V. (2017). (Im)politeness and mixed messages. In J.Culpeper, M. Haugh, & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 323–355). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-37508-7_13
- Dynel, M. (2021). Humour and (mock) aggression: Distinguishing cyberbullying from roasting. *Language & Communication*, 81, 17–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2021.08.001>
- Efendi, A., & Sukamto, K. E. (2020). Mbasaaké in family circle: Linguistic socialization of politeness in Javanese. *Linguistik Indonesia*, 38(2), 165–178. <https://doi.org/10.26499/li.v38i2.17>
- Haugh, M. (2014). Jocular mockery as interactional practice in everyday Anglo-Australian conversation. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 34(1), 76–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2014.875456>

- He, L., Chen, R., & Dong, M. (2023). Humorous mockery: How to amuse and be polite at the same time. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 211, 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2023.04.007>
- Holmes, J. (2013). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Ibrahim, W. M. A. (2021). Pushing against the boundaries: Entertaining impoliteness and taboo discourse in the Egyptian TV show Abla Fahita. *Open Linguistics*, 7(1), 372–405. <https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2021-0022>
- Jucker, A. H., Schneider, K. P., & Bublitz, W. (Eds.). (2018). *Methods in pragmatics* (Vol. 10). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Locher, M. A., & Larina, T. V. (2019). Introduction to politeness and impoliteness research in global contexts. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 23(4), 873–903. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-2019-23-4-873-903>
- Mrazek, J. (2019). *Wayang and its doubles*. Singapore: National University of Singapore Press.
- Nurjaleka, L., Nurhayati, S., & Supriatnarningsih, R. (2022). Japanese and Javanese perceptions of the concept of politeness in their languages: Cross-cultural analysis. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 51(5), 478–493. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2021.2006753>
- Nuryantingsih, F., & Pandanwangi, W. D. (2018). Politeness and impoliteness in Javanese speech levels. *Proceedings of the Fourth Prasasti International Seminar on Linguistics (Prasasti 2018)*. Paris: Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/prasasti-18.2018.70>
- Parvaresh, V., & Tayebi, T. (2018). Impoliteness, aggression and the moral order. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 132, 91–107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.05.010>
- Poedjosoedarmo, S. (2017). Language propriety in Javanese. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 17(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.24071/joll.v17i1.579>
- Poedjosoedarmo, S., Soepomo, G., Lagingem, L., & Suharno, S. (1986). *Ragam panggung dalam Bahasa Jawa*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Prakoso, I. (2021). *Ketidaksantunan tuturan tokoh Bagong sebagai pembentuk wacana humor dalam pertunjukan wayang kulit Ki Seno Nugroho*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Prakoso, I. (2023). Tokoh panakawan sebagai sarana pembangun wacana kritik sosial pada pertunjukan wayang kulit di media YouTube. *Widyaparwa*, 51(2), 307–336. <https://doi.org/10.26499/wdprw.v51i2.1179>
- Prasetyoningsih T. H. K. A. (2018). Sapaan dalam pertunjukan wayang kulit studi kasus: Pertunjukan wayang kulit Cantrik Durna oleh Timbul Hadiprayitna. *Totobuang: Jurnal Ilmiah Kebahasaan dan Kesastraan*, 5(1), 33-44. <https://doi.org/10.26499/ttbng.v5i1.49>
- Robson, S., & Wibisono, S. (2002). *Javanese English dictionary*. Singapore: Periplus.
- Sudaryanto, S. (2015). *Metode dan aneka teknik analisis bahasa: Pengantar penelitian wahana kebudayaan secara linguistis*. Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Sudibyoprono, R., Suwandono, S., Dhanisworo, D., & Mujiyono, M. (1991). *Ensiklopedi wayang purwa*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.

- Tahir, I., & Ramadhan, M. G. F. (2024). Hate speech on social media: Indonesian netizens' hate comments of presidential talk shows on YouTube. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 27(1), 230–251. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v27i1.8180>
- Utomo, S. S. (2007). *Kamus lengkap Jawa-Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Whitmer, J. M. (2019). You are your brand: Self-branding and the marketization of self. *Sociology Compass*, 13(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12662>