

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

Lalu Santana<sup>1</sup>, Abdul Hakim Yassi<sup>2</sup>, Hamzah A.Machmoed<sup>3</sup>, Mustafa Makkah<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup> 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 addresser and addressee (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*

**Keywords:** achieved social status, self-reference, honorific principle

## 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. Researcher will focus on Actor's self-reference of SPI achieved social status whose HE refers to the addresser and addressee in dialogue of everyday exchanges. There were some discursive disputes among them. Commoners said that BA *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 addresser 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 addresser and addressee 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, neither fluming, arrogant and plain nor lie. Politic and polite have been justified by Local wisdom *titi-tate-care* (discipline of the rules 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".

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 for SPI 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 *tau 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 like what 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 '**tauh**' /**taUh**/.

### 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 encoded the social identities of participants (properly, incumbents of participants-roles), or the social relationship between them, or between one of them and persons and entities referred to," (1978: 183). Honorific is relevant to the topic of social deixis in so far their grammatical. The examples of such grammatical are "polite" pronouns and titles of address form.

Steven C. Levinson (1983: 90), he classified honorific in two kinds of socially deictic information that seem to encode in language around the world: rational and absolute". Relational variety is the most important which typically get expressed are those between: 1. Speaker and referent (e.g. referent honorifics). 2. Speaker and addressee (e.g. addressee honorifics). 3. Speaker and bystander (e.g.

bystander or audience honorifics. 4. Speaker and setting (e.g. formality levels).

Levinson (1983: 90), he states that we can talk of honorific just where the relation in (1) and (2) concerns relative rank or respect; but there many other qualities of relationship that may be grammaticalized, e.g. kinship relations, totemic relations, clan membership, etc., as made available by the relevant social system. His book distinguishes the first three kinds of honorific traditional descriptions have often confused (1) and (2): the distinction is that respect, whereas in (2) it can be conveyed without necessarily referring to the target. Thus the familiar *tu/vous* type of distinction in singular pronoun of address (which following Brown and Gilman (1960), we shall call T / V pronouns) is really a **referent honorific** system, where the referent happens to be the addressee. In Korean, Japanese and Javanese, it is possible to say some sentences glossing as 'The soup is hot' and by the choice of a linguistic alternate (e.g. for 'soup') encode respect to the addressee without referring to him, in which case we have an **addressee 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 deixis 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: 1<sup>st</sup> person; *aku* I (singular) *aku+ mesak, aku + bedua.... Aku selapug / selapug epenn* I am alone, we are both, we are all, all use own (plural), 2<sup>sd</sup> person; *kamu, side* you (singular) *kamu pade, side pade* you / you are all (plural), 3<sup>th</sup> person; *nie* or proper name (singular) *nie pade* they are all (plural). Referent in Base Alus (high level/honorific) are; 1<sup>st</sup> person *deweq tiang* I (singular), *dewek tiang selapug* I and all (plural), 2<sup>sd</sup> person *pelungguhm / pelinggihm* you (singular), *pelungguhm / pelinggihm same* you are all (plural), 3<sup>th</sup> person *den + proper name, attitude and physical condition den boling Imran, den ayah Katok* (singular) and + sareng + proper name *den ayah katok sareng den boling Imran Den Ayah Katok* with *den boling Imran* (plural). Referents for 3<sup>th</sup> person / natural are *Panjaq* and *Kaule* slave and servant.

### 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-referent 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 expressed 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?"

Is Mardi? Is Mardi here?

Lalu Suharto : "Enggih arak. Di! Teboyakm isiq Gede Ajok".

Yes. He is Di you are being looked for by Gede Ajok

Yes, He is. Di ...! You are being looked for by Ged Ajok

Mardi: "Enggih, mangkin juluk". Ooo,,  
De,, Napi arak, egem  
Yes, wait a moment. Ooo De  
What is make you  
rauh?"  
come  
Yes, wait a moment. Ooo, De. Why do you come here?

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  
paraq leq gedem, tiang ngaturngm".  
come at your house, I give you  
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 **Beliet** (land certificate) belonged to him. He should say '*Tunas embe Beliyet 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, egemrauh?" Ngandike bae De, Sampunan lumbar kun kantor. H- Utterances are Ampure, De. Endeq tiang 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 villiage 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 : "Yaq tiang piyak KTP."  
 Will I make ID card  
 I want to make an ID card

Napisah : "Sampun?"  
 Finished? Have you made it?

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

Napisah : "Embe taq pegedenganm?"  
 Where place house your  
 Where do you live?

Atini : "Batu Nyale."  
 Batu Nyale. I live in Batu Nyale

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

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

Napisah : "Kelemak aru tiang sogol. 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 taq pegedenganm**', 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 sogol. Ye ampunq endek mauk ngeme**'. 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 a commoner 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 entanm ngantor**' should be preceded by '**nunasang**', and inserted '**lumbar**' between '**entanm**' and '**ngantor**'. *Nunasang brembe entanm 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: "Endeqk man bedait."  
 Not yet meet.  
 Not Yet. I have never met my son.

Sarjan : "Napi aran adikiang 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 taoqt bedafter?”  
 Where place we register. Where  
 must I 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 ‘*Mamiq*’ 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 addresser although the addresser addressed him by expressing both the BJ and BA. He was plimning with his status by distinguishing the status of his addressee.

The second actor was a commoner whose religious title ‘**Haji**’ (Haji) expressed the utterances the derivation negation with possessive BJ ‘*Endeqk*’ referred to himself in neutral perception. When he expressed H+ clause ‘*tiang lumbar*’, ‘*Tiang*’ is H-referred to him and should be followed by H- ‘*pareq*’. In that clause, he expressed H+ ‘*lumbar*’ which refers to addressee. The entire utterances indexed that the **Haji** was forced to express BA although the compounded and misused the diction or without HP.

The third actor was a commoner expressing the utterances H+ PsP ‘*Tiang*’ and H+ DmP ‘*Nike*’ only. He never expressed other BA parts of speech than both of them. The entire utterances indexed that he knew the common expressions HE such as ‘*Inggih –Tiang*’ and ‘*Niki – Nike*’. The use of the expressions was just to show politeness.

**D4:** Yaya : “Bu, Tiang beketuan Juluk?”  
 Bu, I ask a moment. May  
 I ask you, Mom?

Sinayu : “Enggih, Napi?”  
 Yes, what. Yes. What can I  
 do?

Yaya : “Embe taoqk bedadtear?”

Where place we register. Where  
 must I register?  
 Sinayu : “Rungan leq nike laim.”  
 Rooms at that go you. You go  
 to that room!  
 Yaya : “Terima kasih, Bu!”  
 Thank you, Mom!

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 addressee.

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  
 lahir leq niki?  
 I here. Nothing date  
 born at here  
 Help me, please! Can my ID card be  
 replaced or not, as it  
 does not entail my birth of date..

Fadlan : “Melinggih bae juluk,  
 ngantos deriki!”  
 Sit just a  
 moment, wait here  
 Sit and wait here for a moment!

Mahrum : “Pak! Tunas tulung sekali,  
 yaqk rubah KTP.”  
 Pak, ask help once, will I  
 change ID  
 Help me Sir. I want to change my ID  
 card!

Researcher: “Tiang nenten jari petugas, makin  
 tiang pebojakk”  
 I not become staff, now  
 I look for you  
Petugas. Aris..., Niki lumbar  
 juluk! Baun pelungguh  
 Staff. Aris here come a  
 moment. Can you  
Karya niki?  
 Do it  
 I am not a staff here. Let me find  
 him. Aris come here!

Could you help him?

Aris: "Enggih, baun."

Yes, can. Yes I can.

Mahrum : "Pire biaya?"

How much cost. How much is the cost?

Aris: "Edak, embe berkhasm?"

Nothing, where bundle your.

It is free! Where is your document?

Mahrum : "Nike."

Here. Here you are.

Aris: "Antih tegang gilaranm, enggih!"

Wait be called name your, oke

Please wait for your name to be called!

The first actor as a commoner expressed the utterances HE '**Tiang tunas Pak! Tunas tulung**', referring to him indicates that he is humble. However, he is careless in HP as in the phrase '**Pirebiaya**'. He should express '**Nunasang pire yaq katur**'. He looked politely by expressing H+ Dm '**Nike**'. The second actor was a government employee expressed utterance H+ '**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 fourth actor is Aris, the broker. He expressed utterance H+ Rp '**Enggih**' referred to addressee. He did not give other H+ by the expression '**Antih tepanggih aranm**'. He should have expressed '**Silak antos tegamel pasenganm**'. 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 five 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 *Ustadz / 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 nunas, 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 inconsistency 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; *boloq / 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 addresser addresses the addressee who own the referent that belong to the addresser 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 addresser. 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 titi-tate-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 inconsistency, 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.

## References

- [1] Brown, Penelope, and Steven C. Levinson . 1978. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press
- [2] Cook, H. M. 1996. Japanese language socialization: Indexing the modes of self. *Discourse Processes*, 22,171-97.
- [3] Craig, C.G. 1986a. Introduction, in C.G. Craig (ed.), pp.3-12. 1986. *Noun Classes and Categorization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [4] \_\_\_\_\_ 1986b. Jalcatec noun classifiers: a study in language and culture, in C.G. Graig(ed.), pp. 263-293.
- [5] \_\_\_\_\_1990a. *Chibchan nominal classification*. Paper read at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association.57
- [6] \_\_\_\_\_ 1990b. *Rama Kuup: gramáticarama*. Managua: Centro de investigaciones y documentación de la Costa Atlántica.
- [7] \_\_\_\_\_ 2000. Classifiers, in G. Booij, C. Lehmann & J. Mugdan (eds.) *Morphology: An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- [8] Dunn, C. D. (1999) Public and private voices: Japanese style shifting and the display of affective intensity. In G. Palmer & D. Occhi (Eds.), *The languages of sentiment* (pp. 107-30). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [9] \_\_\_\_\_..2005 *Japanese Honorific Use as Indexical of the Speaker's Situational Stance: Towards a New Model* Texas Linguistic Forum 48: 83-92 Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual symposium about Language and Society –
- [10] Fillmore, C. J. 1972. *A Grammarian Looks at Sociolinguistics*. Georgetown University Monograph Series in Languages and Linguistics 25: 273-287..
- [11] Fishman, J.A. 1971. *Sociolinguistics*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- [12] Lakoff, G. 1986. *Classifiers as a reflection of mind*, in Craig (ed.), pp. 13-51.
- [13] Steven C. Levinson. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press
- [14] Potts, C. and Kawahara, S. 20014. *Japanese honorifics as emotive de\_nite descriptions* University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- [15] Watts J. Richard, etc. (2005). *Politeness in Language : studies in its history, theory, and practice/ with a new introduction by Richard J. Watts; edited by Richard J. Watts, Sachiko Ide, Konrad Ehlich.* \_ 2nd rev. and expanded ed. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, 10785 Berlin
- [16] Yule, George. 2002. *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press: New York
- DR., Hamzah A. Machmoed, M A (co-promotor). and DR. H. Mustafa Makkah, M.S (co-prpmotor).

## Author Profile



**Lalu Santana** is an English teacher at Islamic University of Mataran (UIN Mataram). Est Nusa Tenggara Province in 1974. He got his bachelor (S.S) in 1997 at Faculty of Letter, Hasanuddin University and his magester degree (M.Hum) in 2012 at Postgraduate Program in English studies of Hasanuddin university. He joined S3 (Doctorate Program) on Linguistic Study in 2013 at Cultural and Science Faculty of Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia. This paper is a part his dissertation which is supervised by Prof. DR. Abdul Hakim Yassi Dipl. TESL., M.A (promotor). PROF.