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Abstract
The opposition of meaning is part of the semantic relation which shows the existence of a meaningful relation or semantic relation between a word or another language unit in a text. This paper tries to scrutinize what types of the meaning opposition are used and how they create the image of the president and vice president candidates. The purpose of this paper is to reveal the word or phrase that is in opposition of meaning and its type as well as the images of president and vice president candidates being presented on Facebook. This study uses descriptive methods to describe the types and meanings and images of president and vice president candidates. The data were gained in the form of language elements such as opposing words and groups of words. They were collected from the comments on the first presidential and vice-presidential debate on Facebook from 17-31 January 2019. The result shows that the opposition found on the debate consists of absolute opposition, polar opposition, relational opposition, and hierarchical opposition bound by cohesion tools to connect the semantical relations or coherence. The meanings obtained are those which contain elements of irony, insults, reproach which ultimately denigrates and overthrows the president and vice president candidates.
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Abstrak
Oposisi makna adalah bagian dari relasi makna yang menunjukkan adanya hubungan kemaknaan atau relasi semantik antara sebuah kata atau satuan bahasa yang lain dalam suatu teks. Masalah yang menjadi fokus tulisan ini adalah bagaimana jenis dan makna oposisi yang digunakan dan bagaimana makna oposisi tersebut membangun citraan pasangan calon capres dan cawapres. Tujuan tulisan ini adalah mengungkapkan jenis dan makna oposisi serta citraan capres dan cawapres di media sosial Facebook. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode deskriptif untuk memaparkan jenis dan makna serta citraan capres dan cawapres. Data penelitian berupa unsur lingual berupa kata dan kelompok kata yang beroposisi. Sumber datanya adalah komentar pada Debat I Capres dan Cawapres di media sosial Facebook dari tanggal 17—31 Januari 2019. Temuannya adalah oposisi Debat I Capres dan Cawapres terdiri atas oposisi mutlak, oposisi kutub, oposisi hubungan, dan oposisi hierarki yang diikat oleh alat kohesi untuk menghubungkan jaringan makna atau koherensi. Makna yang diperoleh adalah makna-makna yang mengandung unsur ironi, hinaan, dan celaan yang ujungnya adalah merendahkan serta menjatuhkan pasangan calon presiden dan wakil presiden.

Kata kunci: oposisi, makna, debat
1. INTRODUCTION

Scrutinizing the netizen’s comments on Facebook on Indonesian first presidential and vice-presidential debate is very interesting since there are numerous of them that contains humiliation, bragging, and sometimes humour. These comments were made as a support to the president and vice-president candidate. The humiliating comments are often made by the netizen to the candidate from the opposite party by using the logic and data as the base of revealing the opposite candidate’s weakness and disrepute, as an instance, “Jokowi nyata kerjanya, sedangkan Wowo (Prabowo) hanya mimpi belum dapat diukur kerjanya “ (Jokowi’s work is real, while Wowo’s (Prabowo) is only a daydream, it cannot be measured yet.” Some bragging comments are also used as a tool to attack the opposite candidate, for example “Jokowi is ‘clean’ and down to earth, while the other candidate is a kidnapper and emotional”. Humorous comments are also found, such as “if I (Ma’ruf Amin) lost, West Java people will be sinful and go to hell”. The humour was found at how West Java people would go to hell if Ma’ruf Amin lost. In Islam, people will go to hell if they have a lot of sin. Therefore, Ma’ruf Amin’s statements contain humour or entertainment.

Every supporter and opponent’s comment in Facebook create an opposition that is stated through the use of diction, both directly and indirectly contains opposition meaning that is stated by the language. Language is a tool to interact between one group and the other group or an individual and another. Saussure asserted that language basically is not only used as a communication expression, but also a social fact (Saussure, 1996:5). This social fact is seen on the interaction in Facebook, where there is a response or comments war between the supporters and the opponents of each president and vice president candidate. Language is used to boost each president and vice president candidate’s popularity. Furthermore, language can also be used to build the image of the president and vice president candidates by showing their success and seriousness to educate and increase the people’s welfare.

The image building can be in the form of positive and negative imaging. The positive imaging relates to the support, while the negative imaging relates to the opposition. The supports will give positive imaging towards the president and vice-president candidate by giving good comments, while the oppositions will give the negative imaging towards the president and vice president candidate by giving bad comments. Those comments create the conflict. This conflict is the struggle of individuals, groups, and parties to achieve their goals against the opposing party, followed by threats or violence. The opposition happened because of the contrasting arguments, personal feelings, culture, concerns, and the rapid social change. Those differences peaked and became a conflict due to the personal’s, group’s, or parties’ urge and concern that are not realized. The conflict was dominated by these feelings. Feelings could sharpen these differences that each party try to disparage and humiliate each other. Some instances of these feelings that create the conflict are hatred, dislikes, and envies. Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (Depdiknas, 2008) defines ‘opposition’ as the conflict between two language elements to show the contrasting meaning or can also be defined as the opposing party in the legislative board and so forth that oppose and criticize the ideas or political policy of the ruling group (Depdiknas, 2008: 985).

In social media, everyone can write, express, criticize, even humiliate freely without any boundaries. Such development of media that is getting more transparent is not followed by the adequate tolerance to respect and appreciate each other. In fact, there are a lot of humiliation, reproach, and bullying on the online media. One of the highlights is the blasphemy that corners the candidates’ supporters or opponents’ group. There are a lot of postings that contain humiliation. The humiliation pattern can be found in the form of attacking one another that actually leads to the decrease of each candidate’s popularity to the people’s reluctance to vote, such as the posting saying that the number-one candidate is the descendant of the Indonesian Communist Party (Partai Komunis Indonesia), or the number-two candidate is the human rights violator.

The phenomenon of comment war on Facebook is unique as it uses nicknames to both sides in order to breakdown the opponent. Nicknames given to both sides are cebong
tadpole), kampret (shucks), kaum sumbu pendek (short fuse people), kaum bumi datur (flat earther), jendral kardus (cardboard general), Zainudin Ngaciro (A nickname given to people who kept fleeing at important times. Those nicknames are meant to insult both candidates.

Cebong or tadpole is generally an insult to the candidate number 1’s supporters as the candidate number 1 has a nickname of Raja Kodok ‘king of frog’. On the other hand, kampret (shucks) is an insult or nickname to the candidate number 2’s supporters. However, this paper, is not specifically discussing the comment war of the nicknames. It focuses more on antagonism or aid models which was used by each of the supporters towards each candidate because the comments made by each side are difficult to accept and the accepted ones also use semantic strategies in order to obtain effects that are difficult to refute. And of course, this will create a reaction that is even more exciting. Therefore, the author believes that semantic strategy becomes the main choice for each side of supporters to be able to push through the use of the meaning approval or disagreement.

Based on the aforementioned explanation, the problem in this study is how opposition meaning and the imaging of each president and vice president candidate on Facebook is presented. This study is aimed at revealing types and the meaning of the opposition used as well as the candidate’s imaging on Facebook. The type and meaning of the opposition of the supporters’ comments are varied, yet the conflict element or the opposition form is very clear because they are aimed at imposing the other candidate’s image not to be voted by the people.

This research employs semantic theories, especially about opposition of meaning which is a part of the semantic relation. The relation of meaning is the existence of the meanings relation or semantic relation between a word or another language unit and another word or language unit (Chaer, 1995:82). This semantic relation might deal with the identical meaning (synonymy), the opposite meaning (antonymy), multiple meaning (polysemy), the meaning coverage (hyponymy), meaning deviation (homonymy), and the excessive meaning (redundancy), etc. The term antonymy is the general term that refers to the opposite meaning (O’Grady, Dobrovolsky, & Aronoff, 1989:172; McManis, Stollenwerk, & Zheng-Sheng, 1987:191; Djajasudarma, 1993:49; Kridalaksana, 2008:15).

The term antonymy originated from Greek anoma ‘name’ and anti ‘to oppose’. Thus, antomy literally means the other name for other things or more specifically is the expression in which its meaning is considered is the contrasting meaning of the other (Verhaar, 2000:133). If antonymy is found in the social communication, (Murphy, 2003:10) Murphy noted that it can be the base that a particular pair of words as antonym seems to have a very important cultural component because every language has its own opposite meaning.

There are various terms related to antonymy. They are known as word opponents, meaning opponents, antonymy, and opposition of meanings. If the term word opponents is used, it cannot be explained what word opposing the meaning is about. If the term meaning opponents is used, then the level of opposition is not equal. Similar difficulties are also found while the term antonymy is used. Therefore, in this study, the term opposition of meaning is used since it contains the meaning of word that clearly is the opposition compare to the words that only have contrasting meaning (compared by Chaer, 1995:89 & Riemer, 2010:137). The author used the term indirect opposition to refer this contrast and indirect opposition to refer the clearly opposing meaning.

The netizen’s comments after the first presidential and vice-presidential debate is stated in the form of written text that the relation of the opposition is seen from its form and meaning or the cohesion and coherence. Cohesion includes definition, cohesiveness, and wholeness, while coherence includes relationships and connection.

Cohesion is the relation that is created as a result when a specific textual elements interpretation is related to the other elements (Ilham, Sumarlam, & Kristina, 2016:272). According to Oktafianus (in Agustina, 2016:99), cohesion will appear if the interpretation of one element depends on the other elements in one text or discourse. In consequence, the comments that contains opposition of meaning on the debate is the text that is also related to linguistic, such as vocabulary, semantic, grammar, as well as coherence, and cohesion (Badara, 2012:26). Text
is understood as a whole semantical unit instead of a whole grammatical unit, such as morpheme, words, clause, or sentence (Halliday & Ruqaiya, 1976:2). Departing from the aforementioned explanation, a number of sentences can be a text if they have a correlation and form a meaning. Therefore, texts have networks and they differentiate from those that are not. To build the networks, a text requires a bond between its parts in the text that is known as cohesion and the meaning which is known as coherence.

Previous researches about opposition of meanings have been done, such as a research by Sukriyah, Sumarlam, & Djatmika (2018) entitled “Kohesi Leksikal Sinonimi Antonimi, dan Repetisi pada Rubrik Cerita Anak, Cerita Remaja, dan Cerita Dewasa dalam Surat Kabar Harian Kompas” (the Kohesion of Synonymy, Antonymy, and Repetition Lexical on Child’s Story, Teen’s story, and Adult’s Story rubrics on Kompas Daily News). Their study tried to reveal the lexical cohesion, one of them was analyzing the antonymy that uncovered how opposition in the lexical cohesion relation is. It is found that the most striking aspect of this antonym lies in the semantic lexical cohesion of discourse that describes the language unit and hierarchical opposition of a discourse. Another study is a study by Jayantini & Umbas (2018) entitled “the Diction of the Oxymoron Figure of Speech and Its Translation in the Poetry Anthology of Tidak Ada New York Hari ini.”

The topic being raised in this study is the the diction of oxymoron figure of speech that contains the meaning distribution of two antonymies in one syntactical relation, both in the coordination or in the subordination between the lines of the poetry. It is found that the oxymoron diction can be in the form of: (a) binary opposition, namely absolute opposition of two words; (b) gradable antonym, namely opposition of words with measurable gradation; and (c) relational antonym namely opposition with a hierarchical relation. The distinctive characteristic of this research compared to the previous researches is that the data being analyzed is taken from the comments that contains opposition of meanings on the the first presidential and vice-presidential debate on Facebook. Furthermore, the type of the opposition does not directly deal with the word for word, but rather the corresponding or matching meaning that binds the opposition relation. Thus, this study is different from the previous studies.

2. METHOD
This study employs qualitative descriptive method that describes the language data and analyses it qualitatively without using numbers. This method is used in order to give a systematic and accurate portrayal about the data, characteristics, as well as the analyzed phenomenon relation.

The data is collected through the observation and note-taking technique proposed by Mahsun (Mahsun, 2005:92). This method was employed to gain the data through an observation. The note-taking technique is not only defined as the oral data, but also the written ones, in this case, is by reading the comments on the the first presidential and vice-presidential debate on Facebook. In addition, the data that contains the opposition is collected with the reason or the background of the use.

The research data are lingual elements in the form of opposing word and word groups. The data source is the comments on the first presidential and vice-presidential debate on Facebook from 17—31 January 2019 with the theme of law enforcement and human rights, terrorism and corruption eradication. The responses or comments on Facebook after the debate are varied. These responses were collected and sorted out during that time. The responses that contain opposing comments were categorized based on the opposition of meaning as well as their meaning. After that, the data was analysed and elaborated with the instances of comments that contain opposition. The data analysis was done by analysing the comments that contain the opposing dictions line by line, classifying them according to their opposition form and their meaning found on Facebook comments on the debate. Finally, the analysis of the opposing meaning and the investigation of the semantic relation were administered.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS
Based on the analysis on the comments on the first presidential and vice-presidential debate
on Facebook, there are some existing kinds of opposition. These oppositions are 22 absolute opposition, 16 polar opposition, 6 relational opposition, and 12 hierarchical opposition. These opposition were analysed based on their meaning sometimes are completely opposing (direct), and sometimes only contrasting (indirect). Therefore, direct and indirect opposition sometimes exists in absolute, polar, relational, and hierarchical opposition, so that there is a possibility that the opposition is absolute opposition in terms of the form, but in terms of meaning, it is direct or indirect opposition.

Direct opposition means that the opposition is stated explicitly/completely contrary to words/phrases that contain opposition. Conversely, indirect opposition (the author defines as) is an opposition that is not explicitly stated/contrasts meaning with words or phrases only, but uses words, phrases that implicitly have opposition meanings. The direct oppositions are *impor ekspor* (import-export), *dungu-kerdas* (dumb-wit), *panggung topeng monyet-panggung akal sehat* (the monkey-show attraction stage-healthy mind stage). The indirect oppositions are *damai-ricuh* (peace-chaos), *tenang-lincah* (calm-agile), *dipenjara-aman saja* (jailed-safe), *nyalon gagal-nyalon terus* (failed candidacy-continuous candidacy), *yang sempurna-hancur berantakan* (the perfect one-completely falling apart).

3.1 Absolute Opposition

Absolute opposition is the definite or unconditional opposing meaning. There is an absolute circumstances between one particular form or unit and another particular form or unit. This absolute opposition in the date can be seen from the following instance.

(1) *KPU di Rezim JOKOWI Itu SOK TAHU HAM orang GILA tapi “BUTA HAM” buktinya: “Hanya di NKRI Orang GILA Disuruh MEMILIH PRESIDEN”*

‘KPU (General Election Commision) in Jokowi’s regime acted like a know it all on human rights, but “blind on human rights”, proof: “only in Indonesia, mentally-disturbed person is ordered to vote for

In the example (1), the word “tahu” (know) is in opposition to the word “buta” (blind). The word “tahu” (know) means ‘(1) understand after seeing; (2) know, know; (3) heed, cared about; (4) knowing; (5) clever, capable; (6) converted, aware; (7) ever’ (KBBI, 2008: 1376). The word blind means ‘(1) cannot see because it has broken eyes; (2) do not know, do not understand about something’ (KBBI, 2008: 229). The second definition of “buta” (blind) is “not-knowing” is ‘the opposition of the word “tahu” (know)’. The word “tahu” (know) is in absolute opposition to the word “buta” (blind) in the phrase “tahu HAM” (know human right) and “buta HAM” (not-knowing about human right). Even though it is said to be in absolute opposition, “tahu HAM” versus “buta HAM” is not word for word comparison knowing it has no counterpart, such as “life” versus “death.” So, “tahu” versus “buta” is not equal because the word-for-word opponent of “buta” is “lihat” (see). However, example (1) is using “tahu HAM” and “buta HAM” to show the indirect use of absolute opposition that has meaning bond. Example (1) has negative imaging on Jokowi because it acknowledges Jokowi as “buta HAM” (blind on human right).

(2)
opposition bond, which is found on the phrase “tolak impor” (rejecting the imports) and “mau impor” (willing to import), rejecting the imports or closing imports and willing to import or opening the imports. Closing the imports means ‘not allowing the imports for food products’ while opening the imports means ‘allowing the imports for food products’. From example (2) it is seen that there is a contradiction between Jokowi’s initial policy during his first candidacy to become president few years ago and now when he is president, namely “closing the door to imports of food products produced by farmers in order to glorify farmers and open imports of food products to meet the needs of the community without regarding to farmers’ harvests. Apparently, the substitute opposition forms are closed import words and open import words which are interpreted as rejecting imports and will to import.

The resulting image is that Jokowi does not take side with the little people, especially farmers even though it is not true in reality where the government still pays attention to farmers’ harvests.

(3) “PEMBEBASAN BA’ASYIR BUKTI JOKOWI TIDAK ANTI ISLAM” Jika akhirnya pembebasan itu tak jadi dilakukan, apakah itu juga bisa dijadikan sebagai bukti bahwa Jokowi anti Islam?

“Ba’asyir’s release is a proof that Jokowi is not anti-Islam”, even if the release was not carried out, can it also be a proof that Jokowi is anti-Islam?

There are phrases like “not anti-Islam” and “anti-Islam” in example (3) which are included into indirect opposition because the opposition is not in the form of its opposing pair. The word “anti” means ’does not like’ (KBBI, 2008: 75), so it can be equal to “hate” while the phrase “not anti-Islam” means “does not hate” which equals to “like or love Islam.” Hence, the meaning of ’not anti-Islam’ equals to ’like Islam’, while ’anti-Islam’ equals to ’hate Islam’. The rethorical question in example (3) shows the opposition form that leads the reader to critically think that the opposition is not always in the form of word per word in pairs, but the meaning that is created from the combination of diction used.

The image that was built through example (3) seems to corner Jokowi. In fact, the Government protects all its citizens despite different beliefs.

(4) Testing consistency and common sense…

Visiting tempe stalls importing soybean
Visiting open sea importing sea salt
Visiting rice fields importing rice
Visiting corn fields importing corn
Visiting the union labor importing foreign labor

Example (4) illustrates a country with abundant natural and human resources, yet still buying from overseas. As a country with abundant natural and human resources, it should sell or export instead of buying or importing. Although it does not directly show the opposition of meaning, example (4) implies that despite the fact that the majority of the Indonesian are farmers, agricultural products in Indonesia are still imported, including its labor. Thus, there is an absolute opposition to the word import which is bound indirectly to the meaning of export or buy and sell. Example (4) portrays that Jokowi’s reign was full of imports.

(5) Rakyat Jelata: Ngapain kita mesti ribut siapa yg akan menang di pilpres nanti toh kita ini ttp sj kita yg tak akan dikasih jabatan apapun sma ke 2 calon.
Kalau sy mah simple sj mau Jokowi yg kalah ya Alhamdulillah atau Prabowo yg menang jg Alhamdulillah.

‘Poor people: why should we argue about who is going to win the presidential election? We will not be given any position by the two candidates after all. For me it is just simple, whether it is Jokowi who loses or Prabowo who wins, alhamdulillah (thank God).’

Absolute opposition is found in example (5), namely the words “menang” (win) and “kalah” (lost). “Menang” means ‘superior, achieving results, graduating, getting prizes, can exceed, declared true in the case’ (KBBI, 2008: 898). “Kalah” means ‘not winning, losing, not graduating, not equal’ (KBBI, 2008: 606). Example (5) seems neutral for not supporting one of the candidates because their fate will not change whoever wins, but at the end of the statement it uses the word Alhamdulillah (thank God) if Jokowi loses and still thank God if Prabowo wins. The end of the statement is the one that makes the readers smile since the statement maker does not treat both candidates equally. The image that is built in the statement is that Indonesian people want Jokowi to lose and Prabowo to win.

3.2 Polar Opposition

The meaning of the words which belong to polar opposition is that the contradiction is not absolute but is a gradation. This means that there are levels of meaning in these words, for example, the words “rich” and “poor” are two words with polar oppositions. The contradiction between rich and poor is not absolute. People who are not rich do not necessarily feel poor, and so do people who are not poor do not necessarily feel rich. These polar oppositional words are relative in nature, difficult to determine absolute limits. Or it can also be said that the limit can shift, not fixed at a point. If it is diagrammed the situation becomes as follows: getting richer and getting poorer. Polar opposition was also found in the first Presidential debate which can be seen from the following explanation.

JOKOWI MEMANG BUKAN ORANG

YG SEMPURNA TAPI LEBIH BAIK DARI WOWO ORANG YG HANCUR BERANTAKAN

Jokowi is surely not a perfect man, yet (he is) better than Wowo, a man that is completely falling apart.

The polar opposition in example (6) is found in the words “sempurna” (perfect) and “hancur” (falling apart). “Sempurna” means ‘complete, very well organized, very good’ (KBBI, 2008: 1265). On the contrary, “hancur” means ‘badly damaged, destroyed, broken, perished, heart-broken’ (KBBI, 2008: 479). The concept of “sempurna” is graded from very perfect, perfect, somewhat perfect, less-perfect, imperfect. In addition, Jokowi as a human being surely has weaknesses. Nothing is perfect, yet rather perfect might exist. The word “hancur” is graded from very destroyed, destroyed, and somewhat destroyed. Therefore, if Prabowo is considered destroyed or falling apart, of course he is not completely destroyed or falling apart since until that time he could still run for presidential candidacy. More precisely, perhaps it is Prabowo’s heart that is broken since he and his wife are divorced and he is far away from his son. The image being built is that Jokowi is better than Prabowo based on his track record. Jokowi is simple, independent and popular compared to Prabowo who always failed to become president.
Do people know...
I only asked rhetorically to a tree
Pertamina (national oil & gas mining company) incurred losses
BPJS (department of social & security) incurred losses
PLN (state electrical company) incurred losses
Garuda (national airlines company) incurred losses
BUMN (state-owned enterprises) were sold
Highways were sold
Rupiah stumbled
Debt is piling up
So, what are we good at?

The satire in example (7) contains indirect polar opposition because they compare “rugi” (losses) and “hebat” (great). In some sectors the government suffered losses. “Rugi” means ‘not getting a profit, less than capital, not getting benefits, something that is not good, disadvantage’ (KBBI, 2008: 1186). “Hebat” means ‘tremendous, amazing, strong, exciting, good, scary’ (KBBI, 2008: 488). “Rugi” is equated to bad or if graded to be very bad, bad, rather bad, not bad, while great can be aligned well if graded to be very good, good, rather good, not good. Hence, the polar opposition exists in the words “rugi” and “hebat” that is included into indirect opposition. The image of Jokowi being presented in example (7) is very bad because many sectors in his government period suffered losses.

Bismillah, saya niat mengingkari MEME produk Generasi Muda Nahdatul Ulama yang menyesatkan ini, karena TIDAK ADA KEWAJIBAN FIQIH APAPUN bagi warga NU untuk memilih paslon KO-MA dalam PILPRES 2019.

‘Bismillah (in the name of God), I intend to deny this misleading meme, the product of Nahdatul Ulama Young Generation, because there is no obligation of any fiqh for NU people to choose KO-MA (Jokowi-Ma’ruf) in 2019 presidential election.’
Example (9) shows a comparison of the performance of President SBY and President Jokowi. People who are able to think would be able to distinguish “gagal” (failed) and “prestasi” (achievement). These two words are polar opposition. “Gagal” (failed) means ‘not successful, was not achieved, did not happen, made a service blow’ (KBBI, 2008: 404), while the meaning of “prestasi” (achievement) is ‘the results that have been achieved from what was done’ (KBBI, 2008: 1101). The failure or achievement of a performance cannot be measured only by a few achievements but many elements lie behind it. Fail in this sense has a meaning of achievement but not maximally. Evidence has been sought, for example economic growth, but has not succeeded as expected. So, the range of failure and achievement is graded from failing, half failing, failing a little until succeeding or achieving a maximum achievement. The image contained in example (9) is that Jokowi is considered unsuccessful in running the government to improve the people’s welfare.

(10) Saya doakan semoga Pak Jokowi menang lagi pada pilpres nanti dan saya doakan semoga Prabowo keok lagi pada pilpres nanti….amin.
(Mari kita aminkan bersama agar doa saya dikabulkan oleh Tuhan)

‘I pray for Pak Jokowi hopefully to be elected again in the next election and I pray for Prabowo to be defeated in the next election… amen.(Let’s say amen together so our prayers be heard by God)’

The polar opposition also appears in the phrase “Jokowi menang” (Jokowi wins) and “Prabowo keok” (Prabowo loses) as shown in example (10). “Menang” (to win) means ‘superior, can defeat opponents, achieve results, pass, get prizes, can exceed, declared true in the case’ (KBBI, 2008: 898), while “keok” (defeated) is considered equal with “kalah” (losing). “Kalah” (losing) means ‘not winning, losing, not graduating, not equal’ (KBBI, 2008: 1186). “Meniagn” (to win) means ‘able to defeat the opponent’, while “kalah” (losing) means ‘not able to level’. Lose and win graded from the losing range, half lost, narrowly lost to win. However, netizens’ comments are indeed painful for one of the supporters of the candidates because the language used is very straightforward and sometimes humiliating. So, it takes some wisdom and a cool head of the readers’ to react to those comments. Prabowo is a person who is considered unlucky because several times he has failed to become president so as not to become president according to example (10).

3.3 Relational Opposition

(11) Ya Allah, Pak Kyai... Disindir Ira Koesno. “Ini debat, bukan pidato”. #debatcapres

‘Dear Allah/God, Pak Kyai… Being quipped by Ira Kusno“this is a debate, not an oration.”’

The relational opposition in example (11) is stated indirectly in the words “debat” (debate) and “pidato” (oration). “Debat” (debate) means ‘discussion and exchange of opinions on a matter by giving each other reasons to defend each other’s opinions’ (KBBI, 2008: 301). Thus, in a debate, the element of attacking and maintaining opinion is more dominant. “Pidato” (oration) means ‘a discourse that is prepared to be spoken in front of the public’ (KBBI, 2008: 1071). Debate and oration are both delivered in public. Debates tend to defend opinions that are believed and attack the opinions of opponents or other groups while oration tends to convey information and invite the audience to follow their expectations. The opposition to the relationship that takes place between the debate and the oration is contained in its meaning, namely the attacks in debate, while the oration invites, so that the relation is an indirect relationship. In addition, his image is that Ma’ruf Amin is less appropriate to be vice president because he is more knowledgeable in religion than government science.
The one who increased the fuel price is Jokowi
The one who increased the electricity basic fare is Jokowi
The one who increased the price of liquefied petroleum gas is Jokowi
The one whom removed the subsidy is Jokowi
Rupiah weakened because of Jokowi
The one who made foreign worker access easier is Jokowi
The one who increased debt is Jokowi

But why hating Prabowo?

Example (12) represents the opposition of the indirect relationship between “naik” (to rise) and “benci” (to hate). “Naik” (to rise) is in opposition to “going down”, but because it is indirect opposition, it is related to “benci” (to hate). The relationship that occurs are casual relationships. Because of the increasing prices in many sectors, people should be annoyed by or hate the government (Jokowi). However, in the example (12) Prabowo is the one who is hated and not Jokowi. It shows unequal opposition. In the context of relational opposition, the opposition in example (12) has a cause-and-effect relationships. Example (12) gives a good image to Prabowo.

Example (13) at a glance does not show relational opposition, but when it is observed closely there is an indirect relationship opposition, namely “boneka” (puppet) and “orang dekat” (close people). “Boneka” (puppet) means ‘children’s imitations for children’s games and their figurative meaning is people or country, and so on which are only toys for others’ (KBBI, 2008: 206). “Orang dekat” (close people) means ‘a trusted person or someone who is influential/powerful in providing solutions or policies to be taken or policies to be decided’. So, the power is in the people who are close to the President while the President is a puppet that is controlled by the (other) real power owner in the context of the example (13) above. The relational opposition lies in the relationship between the owner of the authority with his toy puppet. Example (13) gives a negative image to the existing President at the time (Jokowi) because he is considered as a puppet.

Example (14) Golkar proposes ex-corruptor candidates the most, Jokowi acted suicidal. He regretted Jokowi didn’t read all the lists of his party
Jokowi’s supporting parties are PDIP, Golkar, Nasdem, Hanura, Perindo, and so on. If Golkar is mentioned as a party, it means the other parties’ name supporting Jokowi are indirectly mentioned. Golkar candidates are involved in corruption which is indirectly supported by Jokowi and those corruptive parties. If Prabowo was mentioned, then Gerindra also represented him. If Gerindra legislative candidates had many corruptors, it meant Prabowo was considered to be supporting the corruptors. In example (14) there are the words “usung” (propose) and “menyerang” (attack), from the base word “serang” (to attack). “Usung” means ‘carrying or lifting and carrying with something by placing it on the shoulder or it can mean lifting something that is done by many people with tools or not using tools’ (KBBI, 2008: 1540). One of the meanings of “serang” (attack) is ‘to oppose by launching criticism’ (KBBI, 2008: 1283). So, it is included into indirect opposition because the meaning of “usung” is similar to lifting or supporting and “menyerang” has the same meaning as opposing by launching criticism. The relational opposition to it exists in the words “usung” and “menyerang.” The image being presented is that Jokowi attacked his own supporting party because of his ignorance.

The relational opposition in the example (15) lies on the phrase “berdosa” (sinful) and “masuk neraka” (to go to hell) even though there is no logical connection if Ma’ruf Amin lost, West Java people will go to hell. The contradicting relation exists in the phrase “orang berdosa” (sinners) or guilty people will be punished in hell. It is very reasonable based on the law of sowing: whoever plants evil deeds will reap evil and whoever plants goodness deeds will reap goodness. However, the vice-president candidate, Ma’ruf Amin, was not appropriate since if he lost, West Java people would be sinful and go to hell. In the context of oppositional relationships, sin and going to hell are cause and effect relationships as well as virtue and heaven. In addition, the image that was built was inappropriate for a religious figure to say such a thing. For details, it can be seen from the example (15) below.

Ma’ruf amin: If I lost, people of West Java would be sinners and go to hell.

3.4 Hierarchical Opposition

The meaning of words in the hierarchical position expresses a series of level or levels. Therefore, words in the hierarchical position are words in the form of names of measurement units (weight, length, and contents), names of calculation units and dates, ranks, and so on.

(16) Merakyat Bukan Berarti Harus Berpenampilan Seperti Rakyat kebanyakan, Tapi Tampil Apa Adanya dan berjuang Semata2 Untuk kepentingan Rakyat memakmurkan Bangsa dan Negara. Lebih baik kita Punya Presiden Konglomerat yg Berjiwa dan Pro kepada Rakyat dari Pada Presiden Yg Pura2 Merakyat Tapi Pro kepada Konglomerat dan Menyengsaraan Rakyat.

‘Being a populist doesn’t mean you have to appear like others but appear the way you are and fight for the sake of the people, the prosperity of the nation and the country. We rather have a conglomerate as a president with a spirit for the sake of the people than a president that pretends to be with the people but stand with the conglomerate and torment the people’
Example (16) states a hierarchical opposition or level from the words “presiden” (president) to the word “rakyat” (people), namely a conglomerate president who has a spirit of defending his people and a president who only pretends to have one. In this example the conglomerate president is identical with presidential candidate number 2, Prabowo Subianto, and the president who pretends to be populist is identical with presidential candidate number 1, Joko Widodo. The word “presiden” (president) means ‘the head of an institution or head of state’ (KBBI, 2008: 1101) while “rakyat” (the people) are ‘residents of an area, ordinary people, subordinates or subordinates’ (KBBI, 2008: 1135). Thus, the hierarchical opposition lies with the president and the people aimed at the description of presidential candidates Prabowo and presidential candidate Jokowi. The hierarchical opposition to Prabowo’s presidential candidates is anticlimax from high to low while Jokowi’s presidential climax is from low to high. In addition, the image that was built was to choose a president like Prabowo who was rich and populist.

(17) Siapa sebenarnya pemimpin NKRI ini skrn? presiden atau mentri, seorng presiden di bilang grasa grusu oleh mentri, padahal sdh lama d pertimbingkn

‘Who is the actual NKRI leader? The president or the minister? A president was critised by a minister said to be in a hurry, however this had been planned for a long time.’

President is the highest position in an institution or country. The president in the context of the country is a high leader who has several ministers as his assistants. The relationship between the president and the minister is the line of instruction, namely superiors and subordinates. So, example (17) has a hierarchical opposition, namely superiors and subordinates. However, the hierarchical opposition shown in example (17) cornered the president because the president’s decision was annulled by his own minister. The president’s decision was overturned by the minister and such minister criticized that the president was grudging. This related to the release of Ustadz Ba’asyir from prison which had been approved by the president but was canceled by his ministers, namely the Ministry of Politics, Law and Security.

It appears that the image being portrayed in the meme is the president has less power than his ministers in terms of making a decision.

Back then they made the lower-class people became the grassroot. They screamed on behalf of the lower-class people’s misery. After being on top, the lower-class people became the victim of the tyranny of power with no mercy. The people are made to turn against each other. Religion is defamed. Communism becomes the golden child of the party. Lower-class people who were then the fuel turned to smoke coming from rubbish that are useless.

Is there anyone still want to vote for this…?

Example (18) explains that “wong cilik” (lower-class people) or “akar rumput” (grassroots) are used as fuel for power. After that, they are only useless garbage smoke. “Wong cilik” (lower-class people) or “akar rumput” (grassroots) are ‘financially struggling people’ (KBBI, 2008: 1563), while the “penguasa” (ruler) is ‘the person who controls to carry out something, governs something’ (KBBI, 2008: 746). In the context (18) the ruler is the Partai Demokasi Indonesia Perjuangan (PDIP) which
makes “wong cilik” (lower-class people) as fuel for power but after gaining the power the lower-class people are ignored like a trash. The hierarchical opposition in example (18) is comparing the ruler with the lower-class people. The hierarchy in question is from the common people and the authorities. The authorities use ordinary people as energy or fuel for success. Example (18) perceives PDIP as a party that makes the ordinary people as a means to achieve their goals as rulers.

(19) Di era pak harto dollar naik, demo turunkan presiden
Diera SBY BBM naik, demo turunkan presiden.
Di era JOKOWI dollar naik, BBM naik,
SEMBako naik, LISTRIK naik, UTANG
naik, PAJAK naik berlipat-lipat, Disuruh 2
periode

HASBUNALloh WANIKMALWAKIL

‘In Suharto regime, dollar increased, people rallied to demote the president in SBY regime, fuel price increased, people rallied to demote the president.

In Jokowi era, dollar increased, fuel price increased, basic food price increased, electricity price increased, debt increased, taxes increased and multiplied, but the president is to be reelected for the second period.

Hasbunallah (only Allah is our help and he is also the one to protect us)’

During the leadership of Pak Harto, SBY, and Jokowi, there were differences in community reactions related to the rise of several sectors. From the example (19), in Jokowi’s era prices in many sectors rose, namely dollars, fuel, food, electricity, debt, and taxes so that Jokowi should step down. Hierarchy is a sequence of levels or levels of office, authority, or sequence of biological levels, such as family, genus, species. In example (19) there is a sequence pattern of rising prices, namely dollars, fuel prices, groceries price, electricity price, taxes price, and debts. The logical consequence is that the president should step down. Apparently, there is an increase in the relationship between the ups and downs of these events. This sequence pattern shows the hierarchical opposition because the increase starts from the low to the high or from the small to the big, from the simple to the complex. Example (19) shows the order from small to large. The image is a lot of negative things done by Jokowi’s government, but he still wants to be elected again.

(20)

National debt increases
Foreign workers enters freely
Law and regulation crashes
Officials only scratches or does nothing
The ruler pretends to be busy
The citizens are being arrested
Let’s change the president..!!

Rhyme appears to be an important element in example (20). The first line ends with the sound /uk/ in the word “menumpuk” (piling up), then the second line sounds /uk/ in the word “masuk” (enter), the third line sounds /uk/ in “ditubruk” (crashed), the fourth line ends with the sounds /uk/ as well in the word “garuk-garuk” (to scratch), the fifth line ends with the same sounds in the word “sibuk” (busy), the sixth line ends with the sounds /uk/ in the word “diciduk” (arrested), and the last line sounds /uk/ in the word “yuk” (let us). The hierarchical opposition in the example appears in the choice of the diction which shows authority, like “aparat” (officials), “penguasa” (ruler), and “rakyat” (people). This opposition shows direct opposition because aparatus, penguasa, and
rakyat have a ranging level of authority from the low to the high authority and the people’s authority is the highest superordinate. In the context of opposition, example (20) illustrates the condition of a country that has a lot of debt, foreign workers who are free to enter the country, the law is violated, the apparatus is confused, the authorities are relaxed, the protesting people are arrested. These conditions make people frustrated and want a change of leadership. The performance image of Jokowi government in example (20) is considered unsatisfactory due to many negative things happened.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the discussion being presented, the opposition found in the first presidential and vice-presidential debate is indirect opposition. The use of indirect opposition on the debate dominates the discourse compared to that of direct opposition. The oppositions on the debate consist of absolute opposition, polar opposition, relational opposition, and hierarchical opposition bounded by the cohesion tools to connect the meaning networks or coherence. The meanings obtained from the data are the meanings that contain element of irony, insults, reproach which ultimately denigrate and bring down the candidates. In addition, some of the meanings found are actually real while some are being exaggerated and not in accordance with the reality such as the phrases “tolak impor” (reject the imports) and “masa gak boleh impor” (cannot import? How come?), Pertamina, BPJS, and PLN suffered from financial loss, and so on. In addition, the images in each of the examples illustrate the performance of Jokowi’s government which still has many weaknesses and still has desire to rule again. Meanwhile, the images in the opposition party are Prabowo who has already been destroyed and it is hard to win so it is losing.

The first presidential and vice-presidential debate showed that the supporter groups have less ethics in commenting so that they use the opposition to demean and humiliate each candidate. Therefore, language especially meaning is used as tools to cover the truth and diminish the ethics of politeness.
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