

# A Contrastive Study of Politeness Strategies Between Arumpone and Batara Wajo Based on Dialogue Discourse in the Lontara Latoa and Sukku'na Wajo Manuscripts

Kamsinah

Department of English Literature, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia

Muhammad Darwis

Department of Indonesian Literature, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia

Ainun Fatimah

Department of English Literature, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia

Muhammad Nurahmad

Indonesian Language and Literature Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Muhammadiyah University of Makassar, Indonesia

Muhammad Ali Imran

Indonesian Language and Literature Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Muhammadiyah University of Makassar, Indonesia

**Abstract**—This paper aims to demonstrate the differences in the values of linguistic politeness strategies in the Bugis language inherited by King Bone, *Arumpone* (abbreviated as AP), and King Wajo, *Batara Wajo* (abbreviated as BW), respectively through the *Latoa Lontara* manuscript (Bone) and the *Sukku'na Wajo Lontara* manuscript. This is very interesting because theoretically (Brown & Levinson, 1978), the dialogue in the two *Lontara* manuscripts was asymmetrical or hierarchical (the dialogue between the king and the subordinates), so superiors may use the *cukuk* speech to subordinates. However, this study found that BW used the *cukuk* speech, while AP did not. The difference in the choice of politeness strategy was that AP chose the type of distance politeness or self-politeness, while BW chose camaraderie politeness. As for subordinates, they should use *congaa* speech to their superiors in asymmetrical speech situations. However, the facts show that the subordinates of both kings never use the *congaa* speech to their respective superiors. In this case, *Kajaolallido* (abbreviated as KL), the AP's subordinate used the *sanraa* speech as used by AP to him, and even used the *cukuk* speech to AP when was asked to give moral advice. Meanwhile, BW's subordinates always used the *cukuk* language to BW. The most important finding here is that the power of the moral advice variable became the determining variable in choosing the politeness strategy and shifts the power of the social status variable.

**Index Terms**—politeness strategy, speech norm, manuscript, Arumpone, and Batara Wajo

## I. INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, Bone Regency and Wajo Regency were two kingdoms that lived as neighbors and had a Bugis language (Buginese) background. Bone was led by a king called *Arumpone* or *Mangkau*. This pure feudal royal system survived into modern government. The last *Arumpone* (hereafter abbreviated as AP) was La Pabbenteng, Matinroe Ri Matuju, (period 1946-1951). Meanwhile, Wajo was initially led by a king with an absolute monarchy system, called *Batara Wajo* (hereafter abbreviated as BW). However, the third BW was forced to abdicate and was killed for committing a moral offense. Since then, the appointment of the king of Wajo is no longer hereditary, but is always democratized through elections by the Representative Council, so the name BW changed to *Arung Matoa* 'an elder king'. Thus, Wajo has transformed from an absolute monarchy to an elected monarchy or limited democracy. In this case, *Arung Matoa* in the Kingdom of Wajo is the main king or the elder king (Farid, 1985, p. 574).

Based on the facts of the *Lontara* manuscript, the two kingdoms used the Buginese as the language of government. In this case, based on the *Latoa* manuscript, *Arumpone* (hereafter abbreviated as AP) used the Buginese in interacting with his subordinates, *Kajaolallido* or *Kajao Lallidong* (hereafter abbreviated as KL). Actually, KL's real name is *La*

*Mellong*. The title *Kajao* was given by the Kingdom of Bone to KL as a form of appreciation because he had the intelligence and special ability to become an adviser to the king. Meanwhile, *Lallido* or *Lallidong* is the name of KL's hometown. Likewise, based on the *Lontara Sukku'na Wajo* manuscript, BW used the Buginese in interacting with his subordinate, whose name is Petta Arung Saotanre (PAS).

Although both of them were kings and were in an asymmetrical or hierarchical form of communication, AP used a negative politeness strategy (*sanraa* speech), while BW uses a positive politeness strategy (*cukuk* speech). This is very interesting to analyze for two main reasons. First, the data source is the *Lontara* manuscript and second is the dialogue discourse which is a fact that proves the non-universality of Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory.

The use of politeness strategies in the *Lontara* manuscript is very interesting and important to study because it cannot be denied that the *Lontara* manuscript is a linguistic reality of the Buginese. More than that, language builds and transmits Buginese civilization. One of the language civilizations inherited by the *Lontara* manuscript is politeness in speech. In this case, there are two phenomena that are in contrast to one another, namely the phenomenon of politeness in the speech of AP and BW to their respective speech partners, namely KL and PAS. The interlocutors of this king each had the status of subordinates. Research on the differences in politeness strategies between AP and BW has never been done and this is very interesting because, in politeness theory which is claimed to be universally applicable (Brown & Levinson, 1987), it is refuted by the reality of AP and BW's speech with their respective subordinates in the *Latoa* and *Sukku'na Wajo* manuscript.

The indicator used to show AP and BW politeness strategies is the use of second-person singular pronouns. According to Helmbrecht (2013, p. 186; 1914), from a linguistic point of view, one of the most important strategies for being polite is to avoid addressing people directly (see also Pizziconi, 2006). In this case, addressing others in the second person is classified as a negative politeness strategy. In unfamiliar situations or when there is no power, this negative politeness strategy is considered to threaten the other person's face and opens up opportunities for the other person to use the same strategy to threaten the speaker's face. Therefore, it is very important for speakers to take into account various social differences linguistically in connection with efforts to maintain a positive face, both the speaker himself and the hearer (see Njuki, 2021; Palmer, 1981; Matsumoto, 1988).

## II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

### Politeness Theory

Lakoff (1990, p. 34) defines politeness as "a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all forms of human social interaction". Yule (1996, p. 60) states that politeness in interactions is defined as a means used to show awareness of the importance of keeping other people's faces. Gleason and Ratner (1998, p. 286) put forward the same opinion, that politeness means acting to protect other people's feelings and involves both actions related to positive face (desire to be approved) and negative face (desire to avoid being intervened by others) (see Hudson, 1996).

According to Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 63), the face, in turn, is shaped by two particular 'wants', namely the desire to avoid obstacles and the desire to be approved. The choice of means to achieve these two desires is called 'strategy' by Brown and Levinson and this is determined by (1) Distance (D): interaction of social distance between Speaker (S) Hearer (H), (2) power (P) possessed H over S (P; this may, of course, be a negative value), and (3) cost, for H, of the result (R) (Rx, defined as how far a 'face-threatening act' face threatening' [FTA] x was assessed as coercion in the culture under investigation). Each of the three context-dependent dimensions contributes to the seriousness of the FTA, 'and thereby determines the level of politeness with which, other things being equal, the FTA will be communicated' (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 81).

The distinction between positive face and negative face in politeness theory is related to face-saving strategies so that faces are also categorized into positive and negative (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 13). Positive or negative face-threatened situations are referred to as face-threatening actions. For example, when someone is criticized, their positive face, namely the need to be appreciated and liked, is threatened. Likewise, when someone is ordered to take an action, their negative face, namely the need to be free to choose an action, is also threatened. To reduce threats to positive and negative faces, positive and negative politeness strategies can be used. In this connection, Brown & Levinson identify fifteen major strategies for positive politeness (i.e. the things we do to make H feel good), another ten for negative politeness (i.e. minimizing certain impositions), and another fifteen for 'off-record' (i.e. a cue or code that allows H to assign a non-threatening facial intent to communication).

Positive politeness is manifested by fostering close relationships with speech partners, friendliness, familiarity, warm relationships, acceptance, solidarity, and praise (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In the case of greetings between speakers and hearers, you can use familiar single personal pronouns. Positive politeness strategies can indeed function as a means to develop or maintain warm, friendly, and intimate relationships (Brown & Levinson, 1987, pp. 103, 129-130). Instead, negative politeness strategies are adopted to preserve the freedom of action, inviolability, and independence of the recipient, which are necessities of the negative face (Brown & Levinson, 1987, pp. 13, 61-63). Negative politeness is expressed by keeping distance from the speech partner, formality, official attitude, and respect (see also Fraser, 1981, 1990; Ide, 1982, 1984, 2001).

In this regard, Lakoff (1990) divides politeness into three types: distance politeness, deference politeness, and

camaraderie politeness. What is meant by distance politeness is politeness which refers to one of the strategies of civilized humans which is similar to the habit of animals that respect their territory so that other animals do not interfere. The politeness of distance shows the existence of equality between the speech participants. In this case, humans usually use symbolization to create a fence for the area of authority. Meanwhile, deference politeness assumes that there are parties who demean one of the participants in the conversation or both. Then camaraderie and politeness show that interaction and relationship are socially positive ideas and openness is the most significant sign of politeness. In friendship ethics, being open to others and kind is the most desirable and adorable thing. Regarding the three types of politeness, Lakoff (1975, p. 298) summarizes them with three rules of politeness, namely (1) Don't impose, (2) Give options, and (3) Make a feel-good be friendly.

#### Speech Level in Buginese

In Buginese, positive and negative politeness strategies can be realized through the use of speech levels. According to Darwis (1995, p. 4), in Bugis culture there are three kinds of speech norms (speech ethics), namely:

- (1) bicara *congaa* (*congaa* speech),
- (2) bicara *cukuk* (*cukuk* speech), and
- (3) bicara *sanraa* (*sanraa* speech).

The term *bicara congaa* consists of two words, namely *bicara* 'speech' and *congaa* 'looked up'. So, the *bicara congaa* is 'look-up speech', which means a form of upward vertical communication. The concept of *congaa* speech is equivalent to the term deference politeness (Lakoff, 1990). With this, the speaker humbles himself by showing respect to the hearers. The linguistic feature is the use of the first person plural inclusive pronoun: *idik* 'we', the first plural pronoun ending for verbs: *-kik*, the first plural pronoun prefix for verbs: *ta-*, and the first plural pronoun ending for nouns: *-ta*. This strategy is very well and effectively used to avoid conflict or the risk of threatening the face of others. With this, the hearer feels very valued and exalted. For example, *Aga taanre* 'What do we eat' and *Yatega bolata* 'Which is our home'.

Following Brown and Levinson (1987), *congaa* speech is used to maintain the hearer's positive face. According to Rashid (2016, p. 268) and Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory is oriented toward the hearer and not the speaker. This is in line with the opinion of Chen (2001, p. 90) that Brown and Levinson (1987) argued that the purpose of politeness is to save face. However, because their concern is saving the hearer's face, they do not give systematic attention to the speaker's efforts to save their face. To realize this goal, in the concept of *congaa* speech, the first person plural (inclusive) pronoun *idik*, the first person plural pronoun prefix *ta-*, and the first person plural pronoun suffix: *-ta* are used. This is in line with the results of Helmbrecht's observation (2015, p. 176) that "a first-person plural pronoun can be used to refer to a second-person singular in a doctor--patient dialogues".

The term *bicara cukuk* 'cukuk speech' comes from the combination of the words *bicara* 'speech' and *cukuk* 'look down'. So, *cukuk* speech is 'look-down speech', a form of downward vertical communication. This means that *cukuk* speech is the opposite of *congaa* speech. This is in line with the concept of camaraderie politeness (Lakoff, 1990). In this case, camaraderie politeness considers that interaction and connection are positive ideas. In this type, being open is desirable. *Cukuk* speech is usually used in intimate or informal communication (informal situations). *Cukuk* speech is used as a politeness strategy to show seniority, either because the speaker is older or has a higher social status, in addition to showing familiarity with the other person. In line with Brown and Levinson's (1978) theory, this form of communication is also used to show a positive face which is commonly called a positive politeness strategy.

The *cukuk* speech can be used as a choice of positive politeness strategy as well as negative politeness. This depends on the circumstances. If the speaker has power or has a social distance that is close to the other person, then the *cukuk* speech is very effective for eliminating stiffness and formality, even very good for building intimacy. On the other hand, if the other person has power or is not yet a close friend, using *cukuk* speech to him is a form of negative politeness and threatens the person's face. The use of the *cukuk* speech is marked by the use of the second person singular pronominal prefix *mu-* or suffix *-mu*. For example, *Aga muanre* 'What are you eating' and *Yatega bolamu* 'Which is your home'.

Furthermore, the term *sanraa* speech is taken from the two words: *bicara* 'speech' and *sanraa* 'equally'. So, *sanraa* speech is speech equally, a form of communication between equals. In this situation the speaker and the hearer place themselves in a parallel (symmetrical) position, that is, they do not consider themselves higher or lower. *Sanraa* speech is in line with distance politeness (Lakoff, 1990) which shows equality between the participants. The linguistic feature of the *sanraa* speech is avoiding the use of second-person pronouns that are familiar or honorific (Ogino, 1986). Instead, the particle *-e* or the third person singular pronoun: *ia*, *na-*, *-na*, or *i-*. For examples *Aga iaranre* 'What to eat' and *Yatega bolae* 'Which house do you mean'.

*Sanraa* speech is the most often used to show a negative face, to protect self-image (authority) so that it is not "invaded" by other people. This politeness strategy is chosen to try to create social distance between speech participants to prevent the possibility of interfering with each other's personal internal affairs (Leech, 1983). Lakoff (1973) refers to the use of conventional speech norms as a social distancing strategy aimed at demonstrating the characteristics of impersonal relationships.

In this connection, the form of personal pronouns in Buginese is in the form of free morphemes and some are in the form of bound morphemes (Darwis, 2014, p. 367). The following table describes the pronouns which are in the form of

bound morphemes that consist of prefixes on verbs, suffixes on verbs, and suffixes on nouns. The latter expresses a possessive meaning.

TABLE 1  
THE FORM OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS IN BUGINESE

	Personal pronouns	Prefixes on verbs	Suffixes on verbs	Suffixes on nouns
First person singular	iyak	ku-	-kak	-ku
First person plural	idik	ta-	-kik	-ta
Second person singular	iko	mu-	-ko	-mu
Second person plural honorific	idik	ta-	-kik	-ta
Third person singular	ia	na- i-	-i	-na

### III. METHODOLOGY

The Buginese dialogue discourse data used in the study of this paper was secondary data obtained from the following sources:

- (1) The *Lontara Latoa* manuscript: the data source for Mattulada's (1985) dissertation; and,
- (2) The *Lontara Sukku'na Wajo* manuscript: the data source for Farid's (1979) dissertation.

This paper used a purposive sampling technique, in which only dialogues with positive and negative strategic politeness were selected to be included. Descriptive research techniques were used in data analysis and guide cards were used to identify positive and negative politeness strategies.

The data were analyzed using the content analysis method by applying the speech level theory of the Bugis language (Darwis, 1995, 2008) within the framework of Brown and Levinson's (1978, 1987) and Lakoff's (1990) politeness theory. Brown and Levinson's politeness theory was applied to analyze, interpret and discuss the data collected. Critical attention was directed to the universality claim of Brown & Levinson's politeness theory in connection with the existence of cultural constraints, namely language norms in the speech levels of Buginese (see Harris, 2021).

### IV. RESULT AND ANALYSIS

#### A. Politeness Strategies in the *Lontara Latoa* Manuscript

Politeness Strategies in the *Lontara Latoa* Manuscript In the Latoa manuscript, there were texts that took the form of dialogue, between AP and KL. This dialogue was a dialogue between the superior (the king) and the subordinate (the expert advisor of AP). This is a very interesting issue because theoretically (Brown & Levinson, 1987), the dialogue should be asymmetric or hierarchical. It means, in such situations in which there is power and a distance and there is no kinship, the superior usually uses the *cukuk* speech (positive politeness strategy) and the subordinate uses the *congaa* speech (negative politeness strategy). However, in dialogue discourse data, AP (the king), consistently used *sanraa* speech (positive politeness strategies) and KL (the subordinate), did not use the *congaa* speech (negative politeness strategies), but he alternately used *cukuk* speech (positive politeness strategies) and *sanraa* speech (negative politeness strategies). Example:

- (1) Makkedai Kajaolallido, "Aga sio, Arumpone, *mu*aseng tettaroi nrebba alebbirem*mu*, patokkong pulanai alebbireng *mubakurie*, aja' natattere-terre tau tebbe'*mu*, aja' napa wenna pangampo' warangparang *mubakurie*?" (Kajaolalido said, "What is it, O Arumpone, what you called not letting your glory fall, always upheld the glory that you had, not divided your people, not was like the sower of your property.")

In the dialogue sentence (1) KL uses the *cukuk* speech (positive politeness strategy) to his superior, AP. Text (1) threatens AP's face because it uses direct speech through the use of the familiar second-person pronoun prefix *mu-* and the familiar second-person pronoun suffix *-mu-*: *tau tebbe'mu*. Actually, there are two other KL options, namely (1) *congaa* speech with plural pronoun prefix *ta-* and suffix *-ta-*: *tabakurie*, *tau tebbe'ta*, *alebbiretta* (see 1a) and (2) *sanraa* speech using the passive verb *ri-*: *riaseng*, *ribakurie*, and the definite article *-e-*: *alebbirengnge* and *tau tebbe'e* (see 1b). These are in line with the opinion of Palmer (1981, p. 62) that the polite form, in many European languages, can be in the form of the second person or third person plural. For example, in French, Greek, and Russian, the first person plural is used; whereas in Italian and Spanish, the third person is used.

- (1a) Makkedai Kajaolallido, "Aga sio, Arumpone, *taseng* tettaroi nrebba alebbiretta, patokkong pulanai alebbireng *tabakurie*, aja' natattere-terre tau tebbe'*ta*, aja' napa wenna pangampo' warangparang *tabakurie*". (Kajaolalido said, "What was it, O Arumpone, what we called not letting your glory fall, always upheld the glory that we had, not divided our people, not was like the sower of our property.")

(1b) Makkedai Kajaolallido, “Aga sio, Arumpone, *riaseng* tettaro i nrebba alebbirengge, patokkong pulanai alebbireng ribakurie, aja’ natattere-terre tau tebbe’e, aja’ napa wenna pangampo’ warangparang ribakurie”.

(Kajaolalido said, “What was it, Arumpone, what is called not letting glory fall, always upheld the glory that is owned, not divided the people, not was like a sower of property.”)

It is important to note that, even though AP has a higher social status as a king, he answered KL (1) above with a *cukuk* speech, but a *sanraa* speech.

(2) Makkedai Arumpone, “Lempu’e, Kajao, enrengge accae”.

(Arumpone said, “Honesty is, Kajao, with intelligence”)

AP and KL frequently utilized *sanraa* speech with each other to maintain the formality of the speech, which at the same time prevented each of them from entering into a situation of personal speech. In fact, perhaps the most reasonable reason is that it is a reflection of the high socio-cultural dignity of AP, which may not be shared by all kings in this world. Meanwhile, at the same time, KL chose to use *cukuk* speech (positive politeness strategy) to show intimacy with AP, while aiming to make morality (advice value) a basis for consideration in selecting politeness strategies. Then, at other times KL also used *sanraa* speech to AP, so that their interaction with AP remains formal, distant, and impersonal. In addition, every time he spoke, KL greeted his interlocutor with the name AP’s social status, to which AP responded with the greeting of Kajao, so that the interaction between the two parties truly became formal, distant, and impersonal. Example:

(3) Makkedai Kajaolallido, “*Ianaritu, Arumpone, tenniato*na ritu”.

(Kajaolalido said, “That’s what it was, and that was not what it is.”)

In example (3) KL used *sanraa* speech with prefixes *ri-* as markers. The prefix *ri-* is third-person oriented. If the marker *ri* was omitted, the text becomes *cukuk* speech (3a) because it directly addresses the second person singular.

(3a) Makkedai Kajaolallido, “*Ianatu, Arumpone, tenniato*(na)yatu”.

(Kajaolalido said, “That was you; nor that to you.”)

(4) Makkedai Arumpone, “Kegae pale’, *Kajao?*”

(Arumpone said, “Then which one was it, O, Kajao”.)

(5) Makkedai Kajaolallido, “*Ia inanna waramparangge, Arumpone, tettaroengngi tattere-terre tau tebbe’na, temmatinro topi matanna arungge ri esso ri wenni, nawa-nawai adecengenna tanana, natangngai olona munrinna gau’e, napogau; Maduanna, maccapi ppinru ada Arung Mangkau’e; Matellunna, maccapi dduppai ada, Arung Mangkaue; Maeppana, tennalupai surona ppoada ada tongeng*”.

(Kajaolalido said, “As for the core of the property, O Arumpone, do not let your people divided, the King does not sleep day or night, contemplate the welfare of his country; he saw the beginning and the end of the action, he just did it; Second, Arung Mangkaue must be skilled at constructing sentences (answers); Third, Arung Mangkaue must be good at pronouncing sentences; Fourth, his messenger does not neglect to say what is right).”

In text (5) KL used *sanraa* speech, namely by replacing the second-person approach with a third-person approach. In this case, he used the markers *-na, na-*, and *-i, -e*, and a personal name: *tau tebbe’na, matanna, tanana, nawa-nawai, natangngai, maccapi, dduppai, arung-e, gau’-e*, and *Arung Mangkaue*.

In examples (6) to (9) below, AP and KL each used a negative politeness strategy through the use of *sanraa* speech with the *-e* article marker.

(6) Makkedai Arumpone: “Aga appongenna *accae, Kajao?*”

(Arumpone said, what is the source of that intelligence, Hi Kajao?)

(7) Makkedai Kajaolallido, “*Lempu-e, Arumpone*”.

(Kajaolalido said, “Honesty, Arumpone.”)

(8) Makkedai Arumpone, “Aga sabbinna *lempu-e, Kajao?*”

(Arumpone said, “What’s the reward for honesty, Kajao?”)

(9) Makkedai Kajaolallido: *obbi’e, Arumpone*.

(Kajaolalido said, a call for truth, Arumpone).

In examples (10) and (11) below, when KL gave more detailed moral advice, he returned to using *cukuk* speech (positive politeness strategy). This sentence clearly threatened AP’s positive face. However, the AP may have regarded this as something reasonable due to the factor of the power of moral advice.

(10) Makkedai Arumpone, aga riobbireng, *Kajao?*

(Arumpone said, “Which is a call to truth, Kajao?”)

(11) Makkedai Kajaolallido: *iana riobbireng, Arumpone, makkedae, aja muala tane’-titaneng, tania tane-titanengmu, aja’ muala waramparang tania waramparammu, nataniato manamu, aja’ to mappassu tedong, na tania tedommu, enrengge annyarang, tania annyarammu, aja’to muala aju ripasanre’ natania iko pasanre’i, aja’to muala aju riwetta wali natania iko mpettawaliwi.*

(Kajaolalido said: “As for what is a call to truth, Arumpone, do not take plants that are not yours; do not take property that is not your property, nor is it your inheritance; nor take a buffalo from its stable if it is not your buffalo; and a horse that is not your horse, unless you are leaning against it, do not take a piece of wood that you have not leaned on; nor take a piece of wood that has been cut at both ends that you did not cut.”)

In the example text (11) AP used *sanraa* speech with the prefix *ri-* as a marker. However, KL responded to this

*sanraa* speech with a *cukuk* speech. Here the markers of the *cukuk* speech were the second person singular prefix *mu-*: *muala* 'you take', the suffix *-mu*: *tane-ttanengmu* 'your plants', *waramparammu* 'your property', *manamu* 'your inheritance', *tedommu* 'your buffalo', *annyarammu* 'your horse', and the second person singular pronoun: *iko*. Actually, according to politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1990), KL should use *congaa* speech because it was dealing with an interlocutor who had a higher social power status. However, KL used *cukuk* speech because he was asked to give moral advice. This means that moral advice was the determining variable in the use of *cukuk* speech and shifts social status and other variables.

*Congaa* speech variation of (11) is (11a) as follows.

(11a) Makkedai Kajaolallido: *iana riobbireng, Arumpone, makkedae, aja taala tane'-ttaneng, tania tane-ttanengta, aja' taala waramparang tania waramparatta, nataniato manata, aja' to mappassu tedong, na tania tedotta, enrengnge annyarang, tania annyaratta, aja'to taala aju ripasanre' natania idik pasanre'i, aja'to taala aju riwetta wali natania idik mpettawaliwi.*

(Kajaolallido said, "As for what is a call to truth, Arumpone, not to take a plant that is not ours; not to take a property that is not ours, nor is it our inheritance; nor to take a buffalo from its stable if it is not ours, and a horse that is not ours. we, unless we learn to fight against it, do not take a log that we have not leaned against, nor take a log that has been hewn at both ends that have not been cut by us.")

The conversation between AP and KL became specific from a cultural perspective because they greeted each other by mentioning each other's social status. In this case, AP's address term was *Arumpone*, and KL's address term was *Kajao*. With this, social interaction between the two parties was always formal and distanced (see Grimshaw, 1978)

#### B. Politeness Strategies in the Lontara Sukku'na Wajo Manuscript

The following text is a dialogue between BW and Petta Arung Saotanre (PAS). These two people are related. In terms of kinship, PAS is more senior because he has the status of an uncle, but in the government structure (kingdom), the nephew, namely BW, is more senior. Now that each has power (+power), there is intimacy (-distance), and there is kinship (+kinship); theoretically their relationship is asymmetrical. In situations like this, the seniors should use the *cukuk* speech, while the juniors should use the *congaa* speech. However, in practice, in the *Lontara Sukku'na Wajo* text, both parties use the *cukuk* speech (positive politeness strategy), which is indicated by the marker *mu-*, not *ta-*; *-tu*, not *-ritu*, *-ko*, not *-kik*; *iko*, not *idik*. Example:

(11) Naripangajarina ri Petta Arung Saotanre, makkedae: "Aja' *mupogau'i gau' makkuaetu nacaccae' to Wajo'e, nacacato Dewata Seuae'. Narekko maelo'ko mala makkunrai iamatoha welampelangnge muala mupobainei, maupe'muatu to Wajo'e narekko iko napoambo'.*"

(Then, (BW) was advised by Petta Arung Saotanre saying, "Don't do things that are roughly hated by the Wajo people, also those that are hated by God Almighty. If you want to take a woman, then you take the one who is still a virgin and you marry him, Wajo will still feel lucky if you are made a father by them).

(12) Makkedai Batara Wajo: "Madecenni amaure, *musuro* mappalo, to kelakkaie nappapotto". Mappaloni makkunraie to Wajoe mattapottoni, *naia engkae lakkainna, tennapinra mupisa gau'na Batara Wajo (AZA, 59)*".

(Batara Wajo said, "Okay, Uncle, *you* order men with hats to protect married men, so Wajo women have to wear hats too, as a sign that they already have husbands, but Batara Wajo's behavior has not changed; he took women who hat too.")

Petta La Tenribali and his cousin, Petta La Tenritau, dialogue in examples (13) and (14) below. Their relationship was asymmetrical, so theoretically, this kind of communication is identical to example (12) above. In a speech situation like this, Petta La Tenritau as a junior should have used *congaa* speech (negative politeness strategy) to his senior, Petta La Tenribali, but instead chose *cukuk* speech (positive politeness strategy). This case means that both parties ignored Brown & Levinson's theory by using camaraderie politeness that is informal and not distant.

(13) Makkedai Petta La Tenribali ri sappo sisenna, "Aga aréga *muollirengnga'*, apa' ia' mu'dani mémettona maélo' *sitakko*".

(Petta La Tenribali said to his first cousin: "What do you mean by calling me, because I too have longed to meet you).

(14) Makkedai Petta La Tenritau, La Tenripekka, La Matareng, "Assiturusenna ikkeng to Lipu'-Tellu-Kajuru'e' ri Boli: *Iko maelo' riala Arung Mataesso, kiranrengngi alebbiremmu... (AZA, 111)*".

(Petta La Tenritau'. La Tenripekka and La Matareng said, "The result of our deliberations, the people of Lipu', Tellu-Kajuru'e in Boli. "You are the one who wants to be appointed as Arung Mataesso and we defend your glory."

The *cukuk* speech markers in example (13) above are the familiar second person singular pronoun *iko* and the familiar second person singular suffix *-mu*: *alebbiremmu* 'your glory'.

The following examples of utterances (15) and (16) show the use of *cukuk* speech (positive politeness strategy) Puang ri Maggalatung to young people.

(15) Makkedatōi (Puang ri Maggalatung), "Malempu'ko sio, kalaki, mumapato mappallaong nasaba' réso temmangngngi' malomo nal é á pammase Dewata (AZA, 365).

(Puang ri Maggalatung also said, "Be honest, you children, and work hard, because only persistent effort is easy to follow with the pleasure of God."

(16) "E kalaki', aja' muakkeda majariwi waramparammu, nyamengiwi innawammu mulao ri pallaommu, nasaba' ia ada maja'é ripoada tenripaitai taué parempajang, napuppuritoi pallaong mapeddi'" (AZA, 361).

(O children, do not abuse your possessions, calm your mind and go to your place of work, for bad words are spoken so that one cannot see the light of happiness and one persists in poor work).

The use of the familiar second person singular affix *mu-* and *-ko*, as well as *kalaki* 'the children' greeting in examples (15) and (16) marks the use of the *cukuk* speech (positive politeness strategy) which of course threatens the positive face of the speaker, but this is considered normal because the nature of their social relations is asymmetrical. In a situation where the speaker has the power of aristocratic status and is also older, he can actually use *cukuk* speech to ordinary citizens, especially to children who are still young.

The examples of dialogues (17) and (18) below show different situations. Here BW talks to an ordinary citizen named Lato'é. The politeness strategy chosen is positive politeness or it is called the *cukuk* speech. The marker is the familiar second-person singular suffix: *-mu* (*bainemu* 'your wife') and the other person replies with the familiar second-person singular prefix: *-u* (*de' uissengngi* 'I don't know'). This dialogue shows the neglect of hierarchy or the nature of asymmetric relationships in the selection of politeness strategies.

(17) Makkedai Petta Batara Wajo: Niga malai bain énu?

(Petta Batara Wajo said: Who took your wife away?)

(18) Makkedai Lato'é: Dé' uissengngi.

(Lato'é responded: I don't know.)

## V. DISCUSSION

Theoretically, the form of communication that was established between AP and KL is usually categorized as a form of asymmetrical or hierarchical communication. In this case, the rule is that there is power, there is familiarity (distance), but there is no kinship, so the higher-ranking person usually uses a positive politeness strategy or the *cukuk* speech (a form of downward vertical communication). The fact is that AP never used the *cukuk* speech to his subordinate, KL. This means that AP maintained a positive face (self-respect) as a king by choosing to use *sanraa* speech (negative politeness strategies). With this, the atmosphere of a distance, formal and rigid relationship with the other person was always maintained (see Kramer, 2013).

Meanwhile, the hearer KL, the subordinate, should have used *congaa* speech (a form of upward vertical communication) or a positive politeness strategy to the AP because the AP was the leader. However, in practice, KL generally used *sanraa* speech and occasionally *cukuk* speech (positive politeness strategy). The dominance of the use of *sanraa* speech proves that the social relations that existed between AP and KL were formal and distant. The use of *sanraa* speech was very effective in maintaining a positive face for both parties. As for the use of KL's *cukuk* speech to superiors, AP, can be accepted as something that did not threaten AP's positive face because KL provided moral advice (warnings) to AP. What applies here is not individual power, but the power of moral values.

AP's speech was more polite than the speech of his interlocutor, namely KL. AP never used second personal singular pronouns for KL. In other words, AP never used direct speech to the interlocutor. In this case, AP used distance politeness, realized by using *sanraa* speech (negative politeness strategy). Actually, in general, KL used the same politeness strategy, but he also used the second person singular pronoun (direct speech) to AP when asked to give moral advice. This reason for giving moral advice was used by KL to commit violations of distance politeness and deference politeness as well (Lakoff, 1990).

The choice of using *sanraa* speech (negative politeness strategy) for AP was a very appropriate and effective self-defense mechanism to achieve two goals at once, namely saving self-face and other-face. According to Ceng (2001, p. 89), both parties have a vulnerability. There are two reasons, namely, first, just as there are speech acts that threaten other-face, of course, there are speech acts that threaten self-face (see also Brown & Levinson, 1987, pp. 67-68). Second, the speaker's face can be attacked by hearers, just as hearers' faces can be attacked by speakers. Furthermore, the choice of using *sanraa* speech for AP was a very special form of self-politeness and perhaps rarely practiced by others. The choice of this politeness strategy also reflects the high self-respect of the Bugis Bone people. Then, it is from this cultural perspective that the motto which is very popular among the people, which reads, *Matanre sirina to Bone-e* 'The self-respect of the people of Bone is very high.

On the other hand, the characteristic of politeness for BW is *cukuk* speech. With this politeness strategy, BW performs speech acts to achieve friendly politeness. In an intimate and friendly atmosphere, BW was not worried by the possibility of a threat to his positive face (self-face) and also did not intend to threaten the positive face of others. It is true, both parties (speakers and listeners) felt comfortable greeting each other with *cukuk* speech. However, if the speaker is not familiar with the hearer, the use of *cukuk* speech is very vulnerable to threats, especially if it is carried out by a speaker who does not have the power to force his will on the hearer.

## VI. CONCLUSION

The characteristic of AP linguistic politeness is the *sanraa* speech (distance politeness). With this *sanraa* speech, neither the other-face nor the self-face is threatened. This type of politeness is termed distance politeness by Lakoff or

self-politeness by Ceng. With this *sanraa* speech too, AP avoids two extreme possibilities, namely the extreme of *congaa* speech and the extreme of *cukuk* speech. With the first extreme, the speaker sacrifices his face too far to save the other face, whereas, with the second extreme, the speaker lowers the positive face (other face) of the listener too far to elevate his positive face. Meanwhile, the characteristic of politeness for BW is *cukuk* speech (camaraderie politeness). With this politeness strategy, BW tries to create an atmosphere of familiarity between himself and his subordinates. In an intimate and friendly atmosphere, BW does not need to consider the possibility of a threat to the positive face self-face and also does not intend to threaten the positive face of the other face. Thus, both parties (speaker and hearer) feel comfortable greeting each other with *cukuk* speech.

The distinction in the selection of politeness strategies between AP and BW was by the characteristics of each royal tradition. The Kingdom of Bone from generation to generation had adhered to an absolute monarchy system. This is also by the motto that lives on and is popular among the people: *Matanre sirina to Bone-e* 'The self-respect of the people of Bone is very high'. This cultural characteristic was already relevant to the characteristics of the use of *sanraa* speech. On the other hand, The Kingdom of Wajo is characterized by limited democracy. With this spirit of democratic life, a motto emerged which is very popular among the people of Wajo, namely, *Maradeka to Wajoe, Ade' nami Napopuang* 'People of Wajo are already independent, the law is served'. This cultural characteristic was already relevant to the characteristics of the use of *cukuk* speech.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Brown, P. (1978). "Face saving following experimentally induced embarrassment". *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 6, pp. 255-271.
- [2] Brown, P. & S. C. Levinson. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [3] Chen, R. (2001). "Self-politeness: A proposal". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, pp. 87-106.
- [4] Darwis, M. (1995). Tingkat tutur dalam bahasa Bugis: Suatu studi sosiolinguistik ["Buginese speech level: a sociolinguistic study]. *Journal Linguistik Indonesia*. Year 13, No. 1 and 2, June and December 1995. pp. 33-43.
- [5] Darwis, M. (2008). "Reorientation of social strata in Buginese community: A sociolinguistic analysis. *Buletin Penelitian, Accredited Journal*, ISSN: 0215-174X, Akreditasi SK No. 55/DIKTI/Kep/2005, Volume 7, Special edition, Juni 2008.
- [6] Darwis, M. (2014). Perilaku morfosintaksis bahasa Bugis [Buginese morphosyntactic behavior]. Article from *Proceeding KIMLI 2014: Kongres Internasional Masyarakat Linguistik Indonesia*, Bandar Lampung, 19-22 Februari 2014, pp. 367-370.
- [7] Farid, A. Z. A. (1979). *Wajo pada abad XV- XVI: Suatu penggalan sejarah terpendam Sulawesi Selatan dari Lontara* [Wajo in the XV- XVI centuries: A piece of hidden history of South Sulawesi from Lontara]. Ph.D. Dissertation. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia.
- [8] Fraser, B & W. Nolen. (1981). "The association of deference with linguistic form". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 27, pp. 93-109.
- [9] Fraser, B. (1990). "Perspectives on politeness". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 2, pp. 219-236.
- [10] Grimshaw, A. D. (1978). "Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction". In Esther N. Goody (ed.). *Cambridge Papers in Social Anthropology. Language in Society, Volume 8, Issues 1*. pp. v + 324.
- [11] Helmbrecht, J. (2013). "Politeness distinctions in pronouns". In Martin Haspelmath; et al. (eds.). *The World Atlas of Language Structures*, pp. 186-189. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [12] Helmbrecht, J. (2014). "Politeness distinctions in personal pronouns: A case study on competing motivations". In MacWhinney, Brian (ed.) et al. *Competing Motivations in Grammar and Usage*, pp. 315-332. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [13] Helmbrecht, J. (2015). A typology of non-prototypical uses of personal pronouns: synchrony and diachrony. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 88, pp. 176-189.
- [14] Harris, S. (2001). "Being politically impolite: extending politeness theory to adversarial political discourse". *Discourse and Society*, 12, Issue 4, pp. 450-470.
- [15] Hudson, R.A., (1996). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [16] Ide, S. (1982). "Japanese sociolinguistics: politeness and women's language". *Lingua*, 57, pp. 357-385.
- [17] Ide, S. (2001). *A Critique of politeness theories*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- [18] Ide, S, et al. (1984). "Sociolinguistic analysis of women's use of honorifics - an analysis of a housewife's natural conversation". In Daily Context. In: *Report of National Special Project: Standardization of Language*, Tokyo.
- [19] Kramer, M. Bi. (2013). "GTFO!! Politeness and stylistic features as means of positioning in MMORPGs" (Massive Multiplayer Online Role-Playing Games).
- [20] Lakoff, R. T. (1973). "The logic of politeness; or minding your p's and q's". *Chicago Linguistic Society*, 9, pp. 292-305.
- [21] Lakoff, R. T. (1990). *Talking power: The politics in language in our lives*. Glasgow: Harper Collins.
- [22] Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- [23] Mattulada. (1985). *Latoa: satu lukisan analitis terhadap antropologi politik orang Bugis* [Latoa: An analytical description of the political anthropology of the Bugis]. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- [24] Matsumoto, Y. (1988). "Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese". *Journal of Pragmatics* 12(4), pp. 403-426.
- [25] Njuki, E. and H. K. Ireri. (2021). "Positive and negative politeness strategies used by Kenya's members of national assembly". *Open Access Library Journal*, Volume 8: e7690. Chuka, Kenya: Chuka University.
- [26] Ogino, T. (1986). "Quantification of politeness based on the usage patterns of honorific Expressions". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 58, pp. 37-58.
- [27] Palmer, F. R. (1981). *Semantics*. (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [28] Pizziconi, B. (2006). "Politeness". In: Mey, J.L., ed., *Concise encyclopedia of pragmatics*, Elsevier, London.

- [29] Rashid, S. Md. and A. N. Abdullah. (2016). "A critical review of prominent theories of politeness". In *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 6, December 2016, pp. 262-270. Australian International Academic Centre, Australia.
- [30] Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language*. Fourth editions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



**Kamsinah** is an associate professor in linguistics in the Department of English Literature, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia. She holds a bachelor's degree (1984) and a master's degree (2003) as well as a doctoral degree in theoretical linguistics (2011) from Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia.



**Muhammad Darwis** is a professor of linguistics in the Department of Indonesian Literature, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia. He holds a Bachelor's degree (Indonesian Linguistics) from the Faculty of Letters, Hasanuddin University (1982), a Master's degree (1990), and a doctoral degree (1998) in the same field at the Postgraduate Program at Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia.



**Ainun Fatimah** is a lecturer in English in the Department of English Literature at the Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia. She holds a bachelor's degree (2009) and a master's degree (2011) in applied linguistics from Hasanuddin University.



**Muhammad Nurahmad** is a lecturer in the Indonesian Language and Literature Education Department at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Muhammadiyah University of Makassar, Indonesia. He holds a Bachelor's degree in Japanese syntax from the Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Hasanuddin University (2010), a master's degree (2015), and a doctoral degree (2021) in theoretical linguistics from the Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia.



**Muhammad Ali Imran** is a lecturer in the Indonesian Language and Literature Education Department at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Muhammadiyah University of Makassar, Indonesia. He holds a Bachelor's degree in psycholinguistics from the Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Hasanuddin University (2012), a master's degree from Gadjra Mada University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia (2014), and a doctoral degree in linguistics from the Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia (2023).