Self-Reference in Honorific of Sasak Speech Community: Sociolinguistics-Pragmatics

Lalu Santana¹, Abdul Hakim Yassi², Hamzah A.Machmoed³, Mustafa Makkah⁴

¹, ², ³ Hasanuddin University, Faculty of Cultural and Sciences. St. Perintis Kemerdekaan . Makassar. Indonesia

Abstract: The study aims: To describe the achieved social statuses’ self-reference using Base Alus / honorific principle in their everyday exchanges. To determine part of speech of Base Alus / honorific principle that is used among the Sasak Community (achieved social statuses). To show the different of honorific exchange occur among addressee and addresser (regardless their social status). This research applied the method of qualitative in Language and Ideology, Language and culture approaches. The data analyzed by Language Politeness supported by indexicality
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1. Introduction

Honorific is a part of speech level. Speech level is a branch of sociolinguistic study which happen based on the classification of human, animal, thing and through the use of word in semantic referent. Subject and object in semantic can be human and animal. Human and animal can be classified such as; sex, age and position. As mentioned by Lakoff (1986), where one of the some categories includes ‘women, water, fire, fighting, dogs, and scorpions. This statement indicates the classification systems, though, share a common set of semantic principles of categorization, the main of which are animal and physical properties. Linguistic classification features established the word choice or speech level. Craig (1986: 5), stated that “linguistic classifications mark humanness and animacy first, then shape, then use and consistency”. Those criteria of the speech levels seem to be encoded by classifiers most often is social status distance. Speech level close related to speech communities which choose some codes to honor or respect one and other in honorific term.

Honorific is used by one or some groups or speech community to appreciate the high prestige of social status distance in everyday exchanges. In dialogue of everyday exchanges, one or groups of speech community certainly construct some codes or word level to honor / respect one another. Fishman (1971: .28), “A Speech Community is a subtype of community, all of whose members share at least a single speech variety and the norms for its appropriate use”. In the reality, one cannot live alone and cannot live among themselves without language as a medium for interrelation in everyday exchanges. One cannot also use variety or code by him / herself. He must be loyal to social conventional agreement.

Many researchers investigated the honorific principle (HP) in daily communication as medium to prevent discursive dispute in social relationship ideally. Some of them have developed their researches such as: Dunn (2005), the use of humble for self-referent which restricted on situational factors and social status of referent. Potts and Kawahara (20014), concerned on emotive definite descriptions and the salient features of Japanese Honorific. After tracing the H researches above, researcher has decided to analyze actor’s self-referent to follow up Dunn study (2005), he investigated the use of humble for self-reference, but the speaker was the educated person and in monolog. Researchers will focus on Actor’s self-reference of SPI achieved social status whose HE refers to the addressee and addresser in dialogue of everyday exchanges. There were some discursive disputes among them. Commoners said that ‘Basen dengan menak, H is a noble language. But when they got new status, they turn to speak in BA / H even though they were an addressee or an addressee; they were active as Actor in dialogue / conversation.

SPI high or achieved social statuses are as objects in former researches, but in this research, they were as actors or as subject and object that are active in using H in everyday exchanges (dialogue). Researcher supposed that they were as the addressee and addresser still being unconscious to the HP, while they were responding the other’s addressing form or utterance of the HE. They showed unconsciousness to Budaya-tata-krama culture- rules and norms or titi-tate-care (discipline and carefully to use the rules of speaking) or the HP; self-humbling and exalting the others in social politeness context).

The phenomena above cannot be separated from language politeness. Language politeness cannot be separated from social distance which is inherent in local wisdom. HE is uttered through language politeness which classified into politic verbal to prevent discursive dispute in everyday exchanges or interrelation among them. Researcher has concerned on the ego’s standing which is divided into the politic verbal. Politic verbal is whether it keeps the HP, while they was responding the other’s addressing form or utterance of the HE. They showed unconsciousness to Budaya-tata-krama culture- rules and norms or titi-tate-care (discipline and the way of speaking) in everyday exchanges.

Watts ( 2005: 51), states “Two forms of marked behavior may now be posited, one leading to communicative breakdowns and the other to enhancement of ego’s standing with respect to alter, i. e., to making other people have a better Opinion” of one self. The first type of behavior is “non-politic”, the second, I contend “polite”.

Volume 6 Issue 11, November 2017

www.ijsr.net

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

Paper ID: ART20177774
DOI: 10.21275/ART20177774
Watts’ theory of language politeness and politic verbal behavior has been applied to investigate whether high or achieved social statuses of SPI were being politic or polite. It is possible forSPI to be politic in order his interlocutor would be happy. For example “enggih-enggih nenten kepanggih” agree with some statements but never done anything (it can be marked lie).

In Sasak local wisdom, the polite expressions (BA / HE) of SPI are marked as dengan naon adat (one who always speaks in HP) and impolite taui kurang ajar (one who speak roughly, arrogant or impolite). Naon adat is equal to knowing the HP and the way to use it. For instance, addresser chooses low level (H-) refers to him when he says to addressee maraq aturkh saq baruq (as my recent utterance) and choose the high level (H+) refers to addressee, maraq pengandike saq baruq (as your recent utterance).

2. Review of Literature

2.1 Sasak Language Deixis

Deixis is a technical terms (from Greek) whose meaning is ‘pointing’ via language and constitute the most basic thing human do with language. In addition, any linguistics form used to accomplish this ‘pointing’ is called a deictic expression or indexical, Yule, (2002: 9). Proximal terms indicate ‘near speaker’. For example, ‘now’ referring to some point or period in time by the speaker’s utterance occurs at its center. Distal terms can purely indicate ‘away from speaker’. In Sasak language, the case is quietly similar what like is occurred in Japanese, the pronunciation of ‘that’ will make out between that near speaker ‘iyak’ /iyak/, near addressee ‘iku’ /IkU/ and distant from both speaker and addressee ‘tau’ /taU/.;

2.2 Honorific

Conferring or showing honor or respect; Honorific is part of sociolinguistics-Pragmatics. Honorific studies how to honor and respect the other in different social status, commonly attaches to membership in a recognized profession. Fillmore described the aspect of sentences in his theory social deixis “the aspect of sentences which reflect or establish or are determined by certain realities of the social situation in which the speech acts occurs,” (1972: 76). Meanwhile, Brown and Levinson explained “those aspect of language structure that en encode respect to the addressee without referring to him, in which case we have an addresser honorific. The third kinds of relational information between speaker and bystander are more rarely encoded in bystander honorifics. The term bystander here does duty as a cover term for participants in audience role and for non-participating overhears.

Levinson (1983: 92), he notes “nominal predicates tend to agree with actual number and person, finite verbs with morphological person and number encoded in polite form of the pronoun, with language-specific decisions on predicates of intermediates kind”. He also described “the other way in which addressee are referred to, namely by title of address, also causes agreement problem – a decision has to between second or third agreement, and, where relevant, between titles of address can co-occur with degree of respect encoded in verbal agreements,” (1979b). Another theory of honorific also promoted by Levinson (1983: 92) is “In Languages with honorific, honorific concord can thus become an intricate aspect of morphology, which cannot always be treated formally without reference to the socially deictic values of particular morphemes”.

Levinson (1979b), furthermore gave the example, honorific to children, argues for the existence of prior and well-established meanings independent of rules of usage. He also explained the Social deixes which is concerned with the meaning and grammar (e.g. the problems of honorific concord) of certain linguistic expressions, while sociolinguistics is also concerned, inter alia, with how these items are actually used in concrete social contexts classified with reference to the parameters of relevant social system. He emphasized that “social deixis” can be systematically restricted to the study of facts that lie firmly within the scope of structural studies of linguistic systems, leaving the study of usage to another domain.

Dunn describes the honorific expression “The use of distal forms indexes a more “public” and socially governed self-presentation, while direct forms index a more intimate and spontaneous side of the self,” (Cook, 1996; Dunn, 1999). In this research, actors (addresser and addressee) are expected to use these forms when responding addressing form that refers to them. And then they are suspected being conscious
or unconscious while they are speaking on non-humble in everyday exchanges among social politeness contexts.

All languages have addressing form referents including Sasak Language. Sasak Language addressing form referents are; referents Base Jamaq are personal pronoun: 1st person; aku (singular) aku+mesak, aku+bedu…. Aku selapuq / selapuq epen I am alone, we are both, we are all, all use own (plural), 2nd person; kamu, side you (singular) kamu pade, side pade you / you are all (plural), 3rd person; nie or proper name (singular) nie pade they are all (plural). Referent in Base Alus (high level/honorific) are; 1st person dieweq tiang I (singular), diewek tiang selapuq I and all (plural), 2nd person pelangguhm / pelinggihm you (singular), pelangguhm / pelinggihm same you are all (plural), 3rd person den + proper name, attitude and physical condition den boling Imran, dan ayah Katok (singular) and + sareng + proper name den ayah katok sareng den boling Imran Den Ayah Katok with den boling Imran (plural). Referents for 3rd person / natural are Panjaq and Kaule slave and se vant.

3. Method

Data have been analyzed by descriptive qualitative method and use political verbal behavior as main theory and indexicality as supported theory political verbal behavior is used to judge the indexical of honorific expression. Indexical in honorific expressions are determined by actor’s self-referrer in everyday exchanges.

Data are gained from the respondent or Sasak community who speak in Sasak language dialogue in everyday exchanges. Sasak community here is the commoners who are achieved status of religious title, government or state employer, and wealth or rich man and Ascribed status or nobleman who keeps strong enough the ethnocentrism. Data that have been analyzed are the sample of data which are taken from the population of data.

The populations of data are all the oral expressions in everyday exchanges / dialogues of Sasak community. The sample of data that taken from the population / dialogue which relevant with the objective of study.

4. Result and Discussions

Data analyses were taken from the everyday exchanges of samples which took place in public service, commoner house and noble house. Dialogue in everyday exchanges was experienced by achieved, ascribed and assigned statuses. The dialogue in everyday exchanges as the reality event or real data becomes the core of data. The dialogues are as follow:

**D1:** Lalu Wiradmaja: “Arak Mardi?”
Lalu Suharto: “Enggih arak, Di! Tebo yakm isiq Gede Ajok”.
Yes. He is Di you are being looked
for by Gede Ajok

Mardi: “Enggih, mangkin juluk”. Ooo, De...

Lalu Wiradmaja: “Beliyet Setoh, embe?”
Beliyet there where
Where is my land certificate?

Mardi: “Ampure De. Endeq tiang jauk mangkin. Ngandike bae”
Pardon De not I take now.
Say just

De, Sampunan lumbar kon kantor.
Piran-piran saq tiang
De do not come to office any time will I

Pardon me, I do not bring it with me now.
You just say. You do not need to come here. I will bring it to your house anytime.

Lalu Wiradmaja: “Auk aneh mento, yaqk antihm”.
Oke if like that will I wait you

Oke.. If that is the case, I will be waiting for you.

Mardi: “Enggih ngiring daweq!”
Oke. Follow please
Oke…. I agree.

The first actor, as a staff of agrarian affairs expressed the utterances BJ AdF Mardi without title, which referred to the long distance / indirect referent. BJ question Beliyet Setoh, embe, refers to the long distance (indirect form) by ‘setoh’ (that). In fact, the Beliety (land certificate) belonged to him. He should say ‘Tunas embe Beliety tiang. Auk aneh mento, yaqk antihm’, the entire utterances are BJ agreements. He should express ‘enggih, yaqk antos (yes, I will wait you). The whole utterances indexed that he has a higher social status than his interlocutor, and he is unwilling to address in HE. He kept his dignity by expressing BJ for his lower status interlocutor. He was unwilling and very egoistic. Although he was addressed by full of H, he never responded by HE.

The second actor, a sectary of village office, expressed utterance H+ respond ‘Enggih’ referred to the addressee which portrays that he is the same level with addressee and he is very respect to addressee by addressing him in H+ AdF
‘De’ referred to Lalu Atmaja. It is contradicted when he expressed BJ AdF Di and BJ Verb Teboyakm without H+, which indexed that he is higher social stratum and a close relation or intimacy with the addressee.

The third actor was a commoner as a staff of village office whose expressions were full of (H+) and (H-). H+ utterances include “Enggih, mangkin juluk”. Ooo..., De., Napi arak, egenrauh?” Ngandike bae De, Sampunan lumbar kun kantor. H- Utterances are Ampure, De. Endeq jauk mangkin Piran-piran saq tiang paraq leq gedem, tiang ngaturngm, Enggih ngiring daweq.

The entire utterance indexed that he used to respond to the noble man, he seems know ‘titi tate care’ of speaking. Eventhough he is a commoner or in low status according to ascribed status, he got achieved status as staff of village office. He knew how to honor and respect others. He is very humble and has a good manner. In fact the first actor and second actor addressed him in (BJ), he consistently responded in (H+) and (H-).

D2: Napisah : “Napi yaqm anuk?”
What will you do?
What do you want to do?

Atini : “Endeq man.”
Not yet. I have not finished it yet.

Napisah : “Embe taoq pegedengann?”
Where place house your
Where do you live?

Atini : “Batu Nyale.”
Batu Nyale. I live in Batu Nyale

Napisah Tengah. : “Tiang Tegel Praya
I handle Praya Central.
I am in charged in Central Praya

Atini ngantor?:
How way your go to office.
How do you go to your office?

Napisah : “Kelemak aru tiang solog. Ye ampunq endek
orning early I go out.
That why not
Mauk ngeme”,
can cook.
I went out early morning. Consequently, I could not cook rice.

Atini : “Silak, meno.”
Please like that. Excuse me. I want to go home.

The first actor as a government employee expressed utterances H+ question ‘Napi yaqm anuk’, which referred to addressee mixed with modal ‘yaq’ that derived from suffix ‘m’ and neutral word ‘anuk’. These utterances indexed that she wants to give a good service by altering the addressee with questions (H+) ‘Napi’ and H+ Rp ‘Sampun’. He expressed the utterance H+ question ‘Embe taoq pegedengann’, which indexed that she ‘naon adat’ (knew the rule), and she is a good staff. She seems to establish a close relation by referring herself with PsP (H-) ‘Tiang Tegel Praya Tengah, Kelemak aru tiang solog. Ye ampunq endek mauk ngene’. The entire last utterances indexed that she wanted to give a good service. She was successful to build a good dialogue. She always kept (H+) expression although her interlocutor responded her by code-mixing.

The second actor as acommoner expressed utterances BJRp ‘Yaq tiang piyak KTP’, which refers to herself which indexed that she was uncertain to express H+, it is strengthened by the expression, ‘Endeq man’. He should express ‘enggih endeq man’. Batu Nydale should be preceded by ‘Tiang, tiang leman batu nyale’, and sub-utterance ‘Berembe entann ngantor’ should be preceded by ‘nunasang’, and inserted ‘lumbar’ between ‘entann’ and ‘ngantor’. ‘Nunasang brembe entann lumbar ngantor’. Her discourses indexed that he did not know much HP although she closed conversation by HE ‘Silak, meno’, indexed that she is a polite interlocutor.

D3: Sarjan : “Mamiq! Sampun...?”
Mamiq finish. Have you finished, Mamiq?

Haji: “Endeq man bedait.”
Not yet meet.

Not Yet. I have never met my son.

Sarjan : “Napi aran adiktiang nike?”
What name young brother my
that.

What is your son’s name?

Haji: “Lemak wah tiang lumbar Malik.”
Tomorrow oke I come again

It is better, I come here tomorrow.

Sarjan : “Enggih, silak!”
Yes, please.

Martodi : “Tiang beketuan Pak?”
I ask Pak.

May I ask you a question sir?.

Sarjan : “Ape araq?”
What there. What is that?
Martodi : “Embe taqth bedafter?”
Where place we register?

Where can we register?

Sarjan : “Tewah. Embe berkhasm?”
Here oke. Where bundle your. Here. Where is your document?

Martodi : “Nike Pak. Silak!”
Here Pak. please. Here, you are sir.

Sarjan : “Maih!”
Give. Give me!

The first actor as government employee expressed the utterances in shifting code. He expressed H+ Adf ‘Mamig’ referring to ‘Haji’ although the Haji is commoner. The utterance indicated that he was very respectful towards Haji, and he wanted to be admitted to know the ‘adat’ (knowing communication rule). It was never mind for him although Haji responded him in BJ. The first actor expressed H+ question by consistently using ‘sampun’ and ‘Napi’, but unfortunately he expressed H+ question ‘Napi’ with BJ phrase pronominal ‘Napi aran adik tiang’. These utterances indexed that he did not know much HP- he should have expressed ‘Napi pasengan Sanaq tiang?’ And he ended the conversation with the H+ Ag, ‘Enggih, silak’, which shows that he wanted to keep his face from the Haji and it seemed clear when he addressed other different social status by uttering all BJ Phrase. ‘Ape araq? Te wah, Embe berkhasm, Maih?’ indicated that he was superior to his addressor although the addresser addressed him by expressing both the BJ and BA. He was plimming with his status by distinguishing the status of his addressree.

The second actor as a state employee expressed utterances H+ Rp and question ‘Enggih, Napi’ and H+ DmP ‘Nike’. At the end of the dialogue, he expressed BJ Verb ‘laim’ referring to the addressee without HE. He should have expressed ‘Lumbarm’. These imply that he only knew H+ Rp and question, and he used the expressions to get respects.

D5. Mahrum: “Tiang tunas tulung sekali, baun endek terubah KTP
I ask help once, can or not change ID

Tiang niki. Endek arak tanggal lahirlt eq niki?”
I here. Nothing date

ngantos derik!”
Sit just a moment, wait here

Mahrum : “Pak! Tunas tulung sekali, yaqk rubah KTP.”
Pak, ask help once, will I change ID

Petugas, Aris.. Niki lumbar

juluk. Baun pelungguh

Staff. Aris here come a moment. Can you

Karva niki?”
Do it

Yaya : “Embe taqkh bedatbear?”

The first actor was a commoner expressed subutterance H+ Adf ‘Tiang’ referred to himself when he addressed the staff and stressed by the second subutterance H+ PsP ‘Taoqk’, but the dialogue closed by Indonesian expression ‘Terima kasih’. The utterance indexed that he was inconsistent in using HP, or he was careless about HP. He should express H+ closing expression ‘Matur tampiasih’ which referred to addressees.

The second actor as a state employee expressed utterances H+ Rp and question ‘Enggih, Napi’ and H+ DmP ‘Nike’. At the end of the dialogue, he expressed BJ Verb ‘laim’ referring to the addressee without HE. He should have expressed ‘Lumbarm’. These imply that he only knew H+ Rp and question, and he used the expressions to get respects.

Researcher: “Tiang nenten jari petugas, makin pebojakm
I not become staff, now

I look for you

Petugas, Aris.. Niki lumbar

juluk. Baun pelungguh

Staff. Aris here come a moment. Can you

Karva niki?”
Do it

Yaya : “Terima kasih, Bu!”
Thank you, Mom!
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Based on the description above, it can be concluded that:

5. The utterance indexed that he was hesitating to honor, and 
H+ by the expression "... katur". The third actor was the researcher that disturb him, and he did not want to help the addressee. In the politic verbal. He did not want the addressee "Melinggih bae juluk, ngantos deriki" referred to the addressee. The entire utterances indexed that he acted the politic verbal. He did not want the addressee disturb him, and he did not want to help the addressee. In the reality, he sat nicely and talked while laughing with others. The third actor was the researcher that may not be described. The forth actor is Aris, the broker. He expressed utterance H+ "Melinggih bae juluk, ngantos deriki" referred to the addressee. The man who knows the rule "Silak antos tegamel pasengamn". He should have expressed 'Silak antos tegamel pasengamn'. The utterance indexed that he was hesitating to honor, and he did not consider the social status.

5. Conclusion

Based on the description above, it can be concluded that:

5.1 The way of achieved statuses in using self-referent in BA / honorific is divided in 5 ways. The first is the way of the experienced commoners whose religious title was always keeps the honorific principle. Some of them were careless but still in principle of honorific Principle. In everyday interaction, religious titles such as Haji and Ustad; / Kiyai always take a part in many social activities of all Sasak Communities. In expressing the utterances which referred to them, they consistence to use honorific (H-) which referred to them for example H- Verbs; atur tiang, tiang nulas, tiang bolok, tiang pareq. Honorific (H+) which referred to the addressee for example H+ Verbs; pengandika, basem, seremin, and rauh / lumbar. The careless of them are H+ Verb; tiang ngican in which referred to them and H- Verbs ngantos in which referred to addressee. The second is the way of government / state employers. They tend to express BA / honorific in different purposes. Some of them want to give good service, to show up or fluming themselves without pay attention to Honorific Principle. The third are government / private teachers who express BA / honorific in Honorific Principle. Although it still exists the inconsistence among of them but it is in tolerant. The fourth are the wealth/rich man. They are tending to express BA / honorific but they do not care the Honorific Principle and some of them are arrogant. The fifth is the businessmen who express BA / Honorific are not for respect the other but for politic verbal behavior or the express BA / Honorific in order the buyer want to buy their merchandise.

5.2 The parts of speech of BA / Honorific that used among achieved and ascribed social status of Sasak community. These are related to the five senses; H-Verbs; bolag / jeler. Manah, atur, kemelik, merase and H+ Verbs; seremin/cingakin, pekayunan, atur, pengandike. Reply of the commands; tiang and enggih for achieved status or commoner and dewek titian and inggih for ascribed status or noble. Inviting; silak for achieved status or commoner and dawek for noble. Possessive pronoun, the addressee addresses the addressee who own the referent that belong to the addressee for achieved status or commoner and for ascribed status or noble, instate of addressing the addressee who own the referent that belong to addressee, noble man also refer to third person or long distance or indirect form that owned by addressee but the reality the referent belong to addressee. Nobleman chose the lowest level word to refer him by uttering the third person kaulem saq too ... your salve at... The referent of this word is him. Honorific (H-) for addresser and Honorific (H+) for addressee.

5.3 The honorific exchange occur among addresser and addressee regardless social status are expressed in mixing code between BJ Verbs and tiang-enggih, silak, niki and nike. Indonesian Verbs and tiang-enggih, silak, niki and nike. In this case is available the differences of politeness and naon adat know the rule or the way of speak titi-tata-cara. The man who knows titi-tate-cara is possibly a polite one. The man who speaks in polite way is guaranty to be naon adat or tittate-care.

5.4 The politest of BA / Honorific is the most difficult to be detected whether the Actors of expression are lie or true. The falsehood is covered by the strategy of politeness expression to gain the hidden propose / mission.

5.5 Sasak people in addressing the addressee are depended on the behavior and conduct. Although the addressee are human but they have bad conduct, a like animal, they must be addressed a like animal predicate.

5.6 The inconsistence, careless, unconsciousness and mistake of BA / honorific principle that committed by commoner and also committed by noble. Stop saying BA Basen dengan Menaq is the noble’s language. Lets learn BA since the beginning or childhood in family in order Sasak people have enough knowledge of BA.
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