SAYING *"SAMPUN"* IN THE JAVANESE SPEECH COMMUNITY: BETWEEN POLITENESS STRATEGY AND SINCERITY

Sri Waluyo[1]
[1]Program Studi Sistem Informasi
STMIK Bina Patria
Email: sriwaluyo@stmikbinapatria.ac.id

Abstract

This paper attempts to reveal the illocutionary act and politeness strategy among the Javanese speech community behind the word *"sampun"* or *"already"*. Four different conversations in two different situations were noted based on the writer's observations. Two conversations between a Basa Jawa teacher and his students were noted in two different classrooms in a junior high school. While, the other two conversations were observed in a house with a Javanese host who was visited by two different Javanese guests in two different occasions. The findings revealed that the word *"sampun"* in the school which was uttered by the students to respond the teacher's question was insincere and contained positive politeness and indirect illocutionary act. However, the finding was different in the host and guest conversation where the first guest was sincere when uttering *"sampun"* while the other was not so sincere due to the local wisdom of the politeness strategy admitted by the Javanese speech community.

Keywords: *"Sampun", Illocutionary Act, Politeness Strategy, Speech Community*

Abstrak

Penelitian ini mencoba mengungkap tindakan ilokusi dan strategi kesopanan di kalangan komunitas wicara masyarakat Jawa dibalik makna kata "sampun" atau "sudah". Data dalam penelitian ini adalah empat percakapan dalam dua situasi berbeda dalam keseharian masyarakat Jawa. Dua percakapan antara seorang guru Basa Jawa dan para siswanya dicatat dari dua kelas berbeda di SMP. Sedangkan, dua percakapan lainnya diamati dari sebuah rumah dengan seorang tuan rumah dan dua tamunya yang sama-sama orang Jawa. Pengamatan menunjukkan hasil bahwa kata "sampun" di sekolah yang diucapkan oleh para siswa dalam merespon pertanyaan guru tergolong tidak tulus dan mengandung unsur kesopanan positif dan tindakan ilokusi tak langsung. Hasil berbeda didapat dari situasi tuan rumah dan tamunya dimana tamu pertama tulus ketika mengucapkan "sampun" sedangkan tamu kedua tidak terlalu tulus disebabkan oleh kearifan lokal tentang strategi kesopanan yang diakui oleh komunitas wicara Jawa.

Kata Kunci: *"Sampun", Tindakan Ilokusi, Strategi Kesopanan, Komunitas Wicara*

1. INTRODUCTION

The Java Island is among the big five islands in Indonesia. The most dominant tribe and language used here is Javanese. It is the mother tongue of about 70,000,000 people mostly living in Central Java, the Special Territory of Yogyakarta, and East Java. There are also Javanese communities in other parts of the country as in West Java, North Sumatra, and Lampung, and even abroad as in New Caledonia, South Pacific, and Suriname (Gunarwan, 2001).

Javanese belongs to the Western Austronesian language family along with Malay, Batak, Minangkabau, Sundanese, Madurese, Tagalog, and many others. The Javanese language is considered as highly standardized language as stated by Geertz (in Gunarwan, 2001) that Java "has been civilized longer than England". He further elaborated that "it is nearly impossible to say anything without

indicating the social relationships between the speaker and the listener in terms of status and familiarity" (Wardhaugh, 2006: 277).

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND
a. Javanese Speech Community

In dealing with pragmatics studies, we cannot easily separated from the sociolinguistics filed due to the involvement of speech community as the social variable. Wardhaugh (2006: 119) stated that sociolinguistics is the study of language use within or among groups of speakers. The question arises is what groups really are. For sociolinguistic purposes, a group must have at least two members but there is really no upper limit to group membership. People can group together for one or more reasons: social, religious, political, cultural, familial, vocational, avocational, etc. We should also give further awareness that the groups we refer to in various research studies are groups we have created for the purposes of our research using this or that set of factors. They are useful and necessary constructs but we would be unwise to forget that each such group comprises a set of unique individuals each with a complex identity (or, better still, identities).

According to Geertz (1961) as quoted by Magnis-Suseno (1984: 38), there are two basic rules that are most dominant in shaping the patterns of social intercourse in the Javanese community. The two basic rules, which Magnis-Suseno calls principles, are the principle of *kerukunan* (harmony) and that of *hormat* (respect). The former refers to the duty of each and every member of the community to endeavor to maintain social harmony, and the latter refers to the responsibility of all community members to show respect to others on every occasion in accordance with their status and standing in the community (Gunarwan, 2001).

The Javanese levels of language are dictated by an aggregate of factors such as the status of the hearer or addressee (including that of the person(s) talked about), the social distance between the speaker and the hearer, and to a certain extent, the degree of formality of the speech event. Some grammarians distinguish up to twelve speech levels. Poedjasoedarma et al (1979: 13), on the other hand, distinguish only nine levels, and elaboration of the commonly used three levels, namely, *ngoko* (low), *madya* (mid), and *krama* (high) (Gunarwan, 2001).

b. Speech Acts

Leech (1983:17) stated that in general, speech act was defined as act of communication. Communicating means expressing a certain attitude, and the speech acts type being performed corresponds to attitude type being expressed. As an act of communication, speech acts will succeed if the hearer able to identify in accordance with the speaker's intention and the attitude is being expressed.

Speech acts are three types of act performed or expressed by a speaker in uttering a sentence. It means that sppech acts also need to be interpreted in terms of their meaning of sentence, i.e. what the speaker of those sentences intends to convey. Austin in Levinson (1983: 236) identifies three different levels of action beyond the act of utterance itself. He distinguishes levels into act of saying something, what one does in saying it, and what one does by saying it, and named these as the 'locutionary', the 'illocutionary' and the 'perlocutionary' act, respectively. For instance, a bartender said, *"The bar will be closed in five minutes"*, It was done by means of direct quotation. He was, at that time, thereby performing the locutionary act of saying that the bar will be closed in five minutes (from the time of

utterance), the content of his loucutionary, was not fully determined by the words he was using, for they do not specify the bar in question or the time of the utterance). In saying this, the bartender was performing the illocutionary act of informing the time of the bar's imminent closing and perhaps also the act of urging the customers to order a last drink. Whereas the upshot of these illocutionary acts understands on the part of the hearers, perlocutionary acts were performed with the intentions to be performing the perlocutionary acts of causing the time to believe that the bar is about to close and of getting the customers to order one last drink. He was, at that certain time, performing all these speech acts, at all three levels, by just uttering certain words.

c. Illocutionary Acts

Based on Austin's opinion (in Levinson 1983:236) illocutionary act is the act which is committed by producing utterances; by uttering a promise, a promise is made, by uttering a request, a request is made. The concept of an illocutionary act is central to Searle (1983) in his understanding of speech acts. An illocutionary act is the expression of a proposition with the purpose of doing something else. This more complex than a simple locutionary act because an illocutionary force is attached to the utterance that indicates how the expression should be taken. Examples of illocutionary acts are: "I will return this book to you next week" and "please hand me that pencil." In the first example the illocutionary act has the force of a promise to return a book. The second example is an illocutionary act with a force of them request that in which the speaker is soliciting a reaction.

Furthermore, Brown and Yule (in Agbedq, 2008)) states in uttering a sentence, a speaker could be seen to have performed some acts or illocutionary act. It is conventionally associated with each illocutionary act is the force of utterance which can be expressed as a performative such as 'promise' or 'warn'. In addition, Coulthard (in Himood, 2007) argues that an illocutionary act is an act performed in saying something, the act identified by the explicit performative. Furthermore, the interpretation of illocutionary act is concerned with meaning, the interpretation of illocutionary act with force. Another theorist, Hurford, et al (2007: 201) classified illocutionary acts into two; the direct illocution of an utterance is the illocution most directly indicated by a literal reading of the grammatical form and vocabulary of the sentence uttered and the indirect illocution of an utterance is any further illocution the utterance may have.

From the above explanation, illocutionary definition can be concluded as important act in producing an utterance because the illocutionary itself gives main purpose of an utterance. By the illocutionary acts, communication can go on.

d. Brown and Levinson's Politeness Strategies

Illocutionary acts is very important than the other art of speech acts because the illocutionary itself is the central to linguistic communication and defined by social convention, such as accosting, accusing, admitting, apologizing, challenging, complaining, condoling, congratulating, declining, greeting, promising, offering, thanking, recommending, naming, etc. It can be concluded that illocutionary acts are communicative if the speaker's illocutionary intention is recognized by the hearer and the attitude being expressed.

On the other hand, Brown-Levinson divided politeness into four strategies (Najeeb, et al, 2012), they are:

a) Bald On-record: Does not usually seek to minimize threat to the hearer's face, this strategy shocks or embarrasses the addressee, and it is mostly used when the speaker has a close relationship with the hearer such as a family member or close friends. Such examples can be seen in instances of urgency: *"Watch out!"* or *"Be careful!"* In instances of efficiency: *"Hear me out"*.

b) Positive Politeness: Attempts to reduce threat to the hearer's positive face and to ensure that the hearer is comfortable, such as: prevent disagreement and jokes, be optimistic, use of solidarity, make a promise, listen and attend to the hearers" needs and wants.

c) Negative Politeness: This is usually oriented from the hearer's negative face. Negative face is the desire to remain autonomous so the speaker is more apt to include an out for the listener, through distancing styles like apologies. For example: be pessimistic, be indirect, decrease the imposition, use hedges or questions, apologize and use the plural forms of pronouns.

d) Indirect Strategy: This strategy uses connotations instead of direct requests. For example, a speaker might say "wow, it's cold here", which would imply to the listener to take an action, such as increasing the temperature of the heater in the room, without directly asking him/her to do so.

3. METHODOLOGY

Descriptive qualitative approach was employed here in analyzing the data gathered. According to Nunan (1992: 3), qualitative research assumes that all

knowledge is relative, that there is a subjective element to all knowledge and research, and that holistic, ungeneralisable studies are justifiable which means that the outcomes generated from one qualitative approach study cannot be applied to contexts or situations beyond those in which the data were collected. In line with Nunan, previous theorists such as Chaudron (1988), Merriem (1988), and Allwright (1991) also come with the similar theory and explanation. Based on the theories above, the writer used note and interview in gathering the data to get real and natural experience. The data were then analyzed based on the illocutionary act mentioned by Hurford and politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson. Then, the data were classified based on the categorizations and finally interpreted by the writer.

4. DATA COLLECTION

The data were collected based on the writer's experiences in two different occasions. The first occasion was taken in two classroom situations with 30 students each where a Basa Jawa teacher was asking some questions to his second grade of junior high school students. The questions delivered were attempted to receive the answer *"sampun"*. The second occasion was noted in a house of Javanese villager in Klampok village Godong district Grobogan Regency. The house was selected due to the number of guests who often visited. The main conversation taken here was when the host offered to give or do something to the guests in order to receive the answer *"sampun"*. Here, the writer attempts to observe different guests with different power and solidarity toward the host.

Besides noting the conversation, the writer also attempted to interview the speakers that saying *"sampun"*. This interview was obviously required in order to get the real meaning of the word

"*sampun*" they had uttered earlier before.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

After being collected, the data were then analyzed and classified in tables. Among the many conversations occur, four reliable conversations were noted which that then interpreted based on the illocutionary acts concept. Here are the complete tables of conversation and the analysis.

Table 1. Classroom Conversation (First room)

Speaker	Utterance	English Translation
Teacher	*Sugeng enjang, murid-murid.*	*Good morning, students.*
All students	*Sugeng enjang Pak Guru*	*Morning, Sir.*
Teacher	*Pripun, PR e wingi pun digarap dhereng?*	*How was your homework? Have you done it?*
Some students	*Sampun Pak Guru.*	*Yes, already, Sir.*
Teacher	*Lo kok sing jawab meng sithik. Sing liyane pripun? Coba Bagus, pundhi PR e?*	*What? I heard only some of you said "yes". What about others? Bagus, where's your homework?*
Bagus	*Kesupen Pak.*	*Sorry, Sir, but I forget it.*

The table above showed a short conversation between Basa Jawa teacher with his students in the beginning of the classroom. By the time the teacher asked about homework, only some of the students said "already" or "*sampun*". Here we can see the different status between teacher and students through the use of different level of Javanese language.

Table 2. Classroom Conversation (Second room)

Speaker	Utterance	English Translation
Teacher	*Sugeng enjang.*	*Morning.*
All students	*Sugeng enjang Pak Guru*	*Morning, Sir.*
Teacher	*Pripun, PR e wingi pun digarap dhereng?*	*Have you done your homework?*
All students	*Sampun Pak Guru.*	*Yes, already Sir.*
Teacher	*Apik tenan! Ayo jajal saiki Dewi maju garap nomer siji.*	*Excellent! Dewi, now you come forward and do number one.*
Dewi	*e..e..dhereng rampung Pak.*	*Em..em..not yet Sir.*
Teacher	*Lho.. jare mau uwis?*	*What? You said you've finished it.*

The table above showed a short conversation between a Basa Jawa teacher with his students in the beginning of the classroom. By the time the teacher asked about homework, only some of the students said "already" or "*sampun*". Here we can see the different status between teacher and students through the use of different level of Javanese language.

Table 3. Conversation between Host and the Guest 1

Speaker	Utterance	English Translation
Host	*Wah, Lek Jaelani, piye kabare suwe ra dolan.*	*Hi, brother Jaelani. Long time no see. How are you?*
Guest	*Sae Kang, nggeh niki radi lumayan kathah damele.*	*I'm good, but I have some jobs to do.*
Host	*Kene-kene lungguh sek ya. Aku lagi sarapan. La iki mau wis mangan durung? Kene sekalian iki lo segone seh akeh.*	*Come on in and take a seat. Have you had breakfast yet? I'm eating now. Come on join with me. We have some plenty of food.*
Guest	*Sampun kok Kang. Wau sak dherenge mriki pun di masakne mak ne.*	*Already. My wife had cooked for me before I was here.*
Host	*Tenan lho iki. Iki lho ayo bareng-bareng sekalian.*	*I mean it. Come on have breakfast with me.*
Guest	*Saestu sampun kok Kang.*	*Thank you but seriously I am still full.*
Host	*Yowis tunggu sek sedhelok ya.*	*Alright then, just wait a second!*

The table above showed a short conversation when a guest was visiting a relative house. They have a quite close relationship yet still in distance due to the age gap.

Table 4. Conversation between Host and the Guest 2

Speaker	Utterance	English Translation
Guest	*Kulo nuwun.*	*Excuse me.*
Host	*Nggeh monggo. Sinten nggeh kok kadose dhereng nate pirso?*	*Who is it? I think we've never met before?*
Guest	*Kulo Gilang Mbah, Adike Pak Suyudi.*	*I'm Gilang, Sir. Mr. Suyudi's little brother.*
Host	*Pak Suyudi Ngroto niku?*	*Mr. Suyudi? From Ngroto?*
Guest	*Nggeh leres Mbah.*	*Yes, I am his little brother.*
Host	*O..lah. Monggo-monggo pinarak. Mak, gaweke wedhang ki ono tamu.*	*I see. Come in please and take a seat. Honey, we have a guest here. Bring some tea, will you?*
Guest	*Alah pun (sampun) mboten usah repot-repot.*	*No.. no.. don't bother yourself, Sir.*
Host	*Alah.. ming wedhang mawon kok.*	*It's okay. It's just tea.*

The table above showed a short conversation when a guest was visiting the host house. Though they actually had quite far gap of age, yet they still used the same level of Javanese language *(krama)* which proved that there was a distance between them since it was their first time meeting.

Table 5. The Interview with the Speakers of *"Sampun"*

Speaker (Based on the Previous Tables)	Reasons for Saying *"Sampun"* (Interpreted in English by the Writer)
1	I said *"sampun"* because I am afraid that the teacher will be angry with me if I said the truth that I haven't finished my

	homework yet.
2	I said *"sampun"* because I am afraid that the teacher will be angry with me if I said the truth that I haven't finished my homework yet.
3	I said *"sampun"* because I am completely full and I think my stomach cannot handle more food.
4	I said *"sampun"* because it is a *"sopan-santun"* (politeness) that I learn from the Javanese society.

6. DISCUSSION

Based on the data analysis above, some findings are revealed. In the first and second tables, the power and solidarity among the participants are obviously dominant here in influencing their utterances and level of Javanese language. The students testimonies that they said *"sampun"* because they were afraid with the teacher's negative reaction if they told him the truth have also led the writer to conclude that this strategy is classified into Brown and Levinson's positive politeness. Though, it can also be classified as "lying" as stated in the indirect illocutionary act according to Hurford.

In Table 3, the speaker's response of saying "sampun" is definitely sincere as it is followed by the further utterance of *"saestu"* or *"I mean it"*. Here, the writer classified it as a Brown and Levinson's negative politeness since the speaker declined the invitation of the host to eat breakfast together. The word *"saestu"* in Javanese language is classified as polite refusal which contains apology without any threatening act in it. On the illocutionary act point of view, when the guest spoke that he was already full and refuse to join the host activity of eating breakfast is classified as sincerity that then the direct and indirect illocutionary acts can be called as just the same without any distinction.

Meanwhile in the last table, when the guest said *"sampun"* is a matter of *sopan-santun* or indirect part of the politeness strategy due to the local wisdom of the Javanese culture.

Moreover, these two people were considered as the same level in terms of power and solidarity as it was the first time they met. The evidence showed that the host still insisted to serve tea to the guest and the guest's testimony has revealed the politeness strategy behind the *"sampun"*. Thus, the direct illocutionary act is refusing the offer of the host, while actually the indirect illocutionary act is "I don't actually mind if you don't serve me tea but if you insist I will absolutely drink it."

7. CONCLUSION

The Javanese culture, especially in terms of the language use, is still quite complicated to analyze. The meaning behind each utterance can be quite or even totally different with what the speaker has actually said. Here, the literal meaning of the word *"sampun"* is different in some occasions observed. When a Javanese speaker said *"sampun",* it might be sincere and at the same time also contain apology for not following or accomplishing one's request or offer. However, the word *"sampun"* might also mean very different. *"Sampun"* or *"already"* means *"dhereng"* or *"not yet"* due to the local wisdom of politeness strategy or *sopan-santun* which is commonly admitted among the Javanese speech community. We may call it as unwritten rule of the society to maintain good relationship and local culture. This mini research is just a simple case of the illocutionary acts example which occurs in a certain place and time. Therefore, further research and study need to

conduct to get more examples and knowledge dealing illocutionary acts especially those in the Javanese speech community.

REFERENCES

Agbedq, C. (2008). Declaratory Illocutionary Acts as Language of Democracy in Nigeria: A Pragmatic Exploration. *Nsukka Journal of Humanities No. 17 pp. 114-123*

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gunarwan, A. (2001). The Speech Act of Criticizing among Speakers of Javanese. in *Papers from the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society*, ed. K.L. Adams and T.J. Hudak, Tempe, Arizona, pp. 171-191. Arizona State University, Program for Southeast Asian Studies

Himood, Z. (2007). Perlocution and Text Typology with Reference to Translation. *Tikrit University Journal for Humanities Volume 14 No. 1 January 2007*

Huda, S. (2007). *An Analysis on the Traits of Figurative Language Used by Pranatacaran in the Javanese Wedding Ceremony*. An Unpublished Thesis of Islamic University of Malang

Hudson, R.A. (1980). *Sociolinguistics*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Hurford, J., Heasley, B., Smith, M. 2006. *Semantics: A Course Book*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Jauhari, E. (2008). Pasif Aksidental dalam Bahasa Jawa: Kajian dari Perspektif Tata Bahasa Leksikal-Fungsional. *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Pengajarannya Year 36 No. 2 August 2008 ISSN 0854-8277*

Leech, G. (1993). *Pragmatics Principles*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia Press

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Mesthrie, R., Swann, J., Deumert, A., & Leap, W. (2004). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh

Najeeb, Z., Maros, M., Nor, N. (2012). Politeness in E-Mails of Arab Students in Malaysia. *GEMA Online^{TM} Journal of Language Studies Volume 12(1), Special Section pp. 125 - 145*

Nunan, D. (ed). (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching*. Boston: The McGraw-Hill Companies.

Sahayu, W. (2003). Variasi Fonologis Pemakaian Bahasa Jawa di Pusat Kota dan Daerah Pinggiran Bagian Utara Kabupaten Grobogan. *Humaniora Journal XV No.3 October 2003 pp 336-344*

Searle, J. (1983). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics Fifth Edition*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing