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Abstract
Politeness has been considered as a core dimension of social interaction regardless of culture and ethnicity and is a predictor of good etiquette to prevent offensive reactions from the other interlocutor. The main purpose of this study is to address the politeness strategy use in Buginese Language with special reference to Anregurutta Pappandangan Maros of South Sulawesi. The present research has been set up to account for an ethnographic research and as such research instruments were strictly employed to comply with the nature of research design. These include field notes, direct observation, in-depth interviews, and recordings. Data were mostly gathered from Anregurutta and the rest from the local people mostly by means of recording and interviews. Greater proportion of the recorded data were from Anregurutta whose daily language of interactional conversation is in Buginese. The recorded conversations were analyzed by means of descriptive analysis and interpretative paradigm. The analysis came up with a series of findings that partly confirm the validity of previous politeness framework, such as Brown and Levinson (1978), and Yassi (1996) with reference to Kinship (K), Distance (D) and Power (P). The finding deviates from the universality of politeness pattern that confirm use of bald-on strategy in non-kinship relation. It appears from the study, bald-on strategy was consistently used in kinship pattern, such as Anregurutta and his wife and daughter. (4.1.5 and 4.1.8). This research gap is most probably due to changes in interactional paradigm as a result of religious values that has affected the way kindship family interacts. The second finding that has been neglected in the study of poliness of which contributes as the research gap is in reference to metalinguistic of politeness that count spiritualism and Islamic sufism as generating motives of having to be polite to other people. The finding may contribute the development of pragmatics with special reference to politeness strategy in non-european context since these aspects have been neglected in previous studies.

Keywords: Politeness, Aphorisms, Prominent, Anregurutta, Contribute.

How to cite: Rani, A., H., et al. (2020). Typical Features of Politeness Strategy Performed by Anregurutta (Religious Leader in Pappandangan Maros District of South Sulawesi). ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities, 3(4), 590-606. DOI: https://doi.org/10.34050/elsjish.v3i4.12339
1. Introduction

Politeness is culture specific as, like all communicative acts, it carries different meanings in different cultures and it will also vary depending on certain circumstances. What is regarded as linguistically polite behavior in one culture might be considered impolite behavior in another culture. Zhan (1992:3) notes that ‘politeness strategies vary from language to language, from culture to culture.’ Hongladaron et al. (2005) also note that ‘politeness is a culturally embedded notion both relates to human culture and to the various local cultures’. Politeness is a system of interpersonal relation designed to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange (Lakoff, 1990:34). Fraser (1990:233) views politeness as the implementation of conversational rights and obligations as speaker and hearer operate under the “terms and conditions of the conversational contract”.

In most of the studies, the politeness has been conceptualized especially as strategic conflict avoidance or as strategic construction of cooperative social interaction (Watts, 2003:47). In daily communication, to have a polite conversation the speaker will choose appropriate strategies. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that to recognizes what people are doing in verbal exchange (e.g. requesting, offering, criticizing, complaining, etc.) not so much by what they overtly claim to be doing as in the fine linguistic of utterances.

The positive politeness strategy shows that the hearer has a desire to be respected. It also confirms that the relationship is friendly and expresses group reciprocity. Positive politeness strategy (“showing solidarity”): FTA is avoided by appealing to the listener's positive face. Politeness involves showing concern for two different kinds of face needs: first, negative face needs or the need not to be imposed upon; and secondly, positive face needs or the need to be liked and admired. Behavior which avoids imposing on others (or avoids 'threatening their face') is described as evidence of negative politeness, sociable behavior expressing warmth towards am addresses is positive politeness behavior (Brown and Levinson 1987:102). According to this approach, any utterance which could be interpreted as making a demand or intruding on another person's autonomy can be regarded as a potential face-threatening act. Even suggestions, advice and requests can be regarded as face-threatening acts, since they potentially impede the other person's freedom of action. Polite people avoid obvious face-threatening acts, such as insults and orders; they generally attempt to reduce the threat of unavoidable face-threatening acts such as requests or warnings by softening them or expressing them indirectly; and they uses positively polite utterance such as greetings and compliments where possible. To choose what politeness strategies that should be used on conversation, the politeness must be considered on the situation whether it is formal or informal.

Therefore, it is interesting to explore politeness practices in different communities such as in Bugis society. Bugis people who are mostly found in South Sulawesi Indonesia have been long known for their unique traditional and religious norms. Their concept of pangngaderreng ‘a system of conduct’, siri’ na pesse ‘shame and compassion’, and the symbolism of sarong sutra ‘silk sarong’ characterized their cultural life. In addition, their religious norms and other social
systems such as gender and social status contribute to these characteristics (Abdullah 1986, Pelras 1996, Mahmud 2008a).

According to Pelras (1996: 25), "Bugis society is one of the most complex and seemingly hierarchical among all people in the islands, with different strata consisting of some degree of mobility". This hierarchical system can be traced by looking at social status, referred to as onrong, onro, and 'batireng, all of which mean 'place' or degrees and status both of which mean 'social status'.

Historical development marks three important statuses in Bugis society. The first important status is the nobles known as aristocrats or to-Arungr, who had the ancestors of the 'king' white water in the past and could begin their chosen name with honor, Andi (Pelras, 1996). The second important status is the status of religion, strongly influenced by the Bugis' adherence to the teachings of Islam and was obtained by making a pilgrimage to Mecca, in Saudi Arabia called ‘Hajj/Hajjah. But in Maros, there are also a group of society descendants of the prophet Mohammad. They are labelled Syarif for the men and Sarilah for the women. Assegaf can also act as anreguru or spiritual teacher. They hold a higher status than the karaeng or puang in Maros context. Karaeng or puang are social status based on their fortune or wealth and not by royal blood (found in this recent data sources, 2019). In Pappandangan Karaeng or puang is addressed to spiritual person.

Overall, Bugis status is related to many facets of life and is interrelated to form a Bugis hierarchy. Ossowski’s (1963: 49) confirms that 'social status is determined by several factors which are influential in many contexts of interaction. This creates a 'synthetic gradation' of status, in which, an individual's social status depends not only on 'each separate factor involved in evaluation' but also on 'the level of consistency among the factors conferring prestige' (Ossowski, 1976: 53).

Language is also a reflection of culture (Rahman and Letlora, 2018). On the contrary, culture is a value, a principle that can be trusted in a language-speaking community, and can be a guide in interacting and communicating, including the culture of the Bugis Maros community of South Sulawesi Province. This proposal will examine the politeness strategy use in Bugis Pappandangan Maros. Pappandangan is in Turikale as a village located in Turikale District, Maros Regency. The distance from Turikale Village from Solojirang, the Subdistrict capital, is 0.5 km. This village is the centre of the crowd in Maros Regency. Maros Central Market is in this village. Every day, various communities from the village gather in this kelurahan to sell their produce.

Pappandangan was blessed with a vast expanse of rice fields and traversed by the Maros River flow. These two gifts are a source of livelihood for the residents of Pappandangan, a vast rice field that most of the residents depend on agriculture for their livelihoods, while those who live around the river flow some choose to be miners of sand dug. The natural conditions that are still green and cool spoil anyone who comes to Pappandangan, especially with the attitude of citizens who are welcoming and friendly.

In Bugis Maros language, it has been considered that the greater the social distance between the interlocutors, the more politeness is expected.
Now, Maros Buginese will address more polite to the stranger than to their friends. They will also be more polite to their idol than to the people in the relative power. The indicators of their politeness show when they use clitics.

In the Bugis Maros Papandangan’s ethnic culture it seems that the phenomenon of politeness in language which has been reviewed from some researchers can be comprehensively examined through the social status which the higher status recently based on the religious or spiritual one called andregurutta. It means that the hierarchical structure has been changed since the higher status from royals blood called ‘puang or karaeng’ now owned by spiritual or Anregurutta.

2. Method

The data for this paper were partly taken from my Ph. D thesis, which was based on the fieldwork that I conducted for one year in 2019 until 2020 in Bugis communities, Pappandangan Maros. To collect data, I employed ethnography of communication using some strategies such as participant observation, informal interview, and recording conversations. The respondents were involved in this research. The respondents was interviewed about the concept of politeness. They included adat ‘cultural’ leaders, religious leaders, and professional workers aged from 23 to 83 years old, both men and women. There were 50 respondents in Maros district.

3. Discussion and Findings

The analysis of the present study not only focuses on linguistic elements regarding politeness strategy but also social dimensions with reference to Buginese Maros Pappandangan. Overall, this part addresses the findings that will address the Research Question (RQ) that asks What are the politeness patterns of the Bugis Pappandangan Maros?.

Modes of Interactional Politeness Utterances

3.1. Communication between Anregurutta (Puang Abdullah Asaf) and a Guest (Dg.Cinnong)

(1) a. Dg.Cinnong : Assalamualaikum
/Bless and piece upon you

B. P.Abdullah : Waalaikumussalam, tamaki’
/Bless and piece upon us, come in

A. Dg.Cinnong : iye, Puang
/Yes, Sir.

B. P.Abdullah : Agatuparellu’?
/Whats up?
The conversation was performed by Anregurutta and a local people who is submitting her zakat fitrah in Anregurutta’ house. From this conversation, it appears that Anregurutta has preferred to choose bald-on politeness strategies with the people with different rank. From the beginning of the conversation, Anregurutta make little use of any available address terms in Buginese language. Therefore, it is not clear as to whether Anregurutta has attempted to indicate respect to his guest or not. However, what is more prevalent about politeness strategies by Anregurutta words are instruments for indicating politeness in local languages, such as Makassarese and Buginese and even to other local languages as well. From this conversation, it can be inferred that to
Buginese Pappandangan, hierarchical relation does not really determine the choice of politeness strategy use.

The conversation between two non-kinsip interlocutors which according to BL theory employs both negative and off record as well as dont do FTA. What is the difference emerging from the present conversation is the mixture between negative politeness strategies for example

Waalaikumussalam, tamaki’; Agatuparelluta’?; tudangni; ada juga pola Bald on Record misalnya Tab, komae; Oh, iyye Aseng-asengna e

3.2. Conversation between Sakti with Anregurutta (Puang Abdullah Asaf).

(3b) Sakti : Egana tudu uita buahna lemo
e(gana=so many) (tudu=that uita=I see)
(buahna=fruit) (lemo=orange) (ta= you)

I see so many oranges.

Puang Abdullah Asaf : Iyye Alhamdulillah maega
(iyye=yes) Alhamdulillah (maega=so many)

Yes, Thank to the God, so many oranges

Sakti : Engka kira-kira siaga pong lemo’?.
(engka=How many) (kira-kira=amount)
(siaga=how much) (pong=tree)
(lemo=orange) (ta=you)

Ada berapa kisaran jumlah pohon jeruknya

How many orange trees do you have?

Puang Abdullah Asaf : Alhamdulillah engka tellu pong mabbua maneng ni de’tomma na maega

Alhamdulillah, (engka=there are)
tellu=three) (pong=tree) (mabbua=has fruits) (manengni=all of them) (de’=not)
tomma=too) (na=this) (maega=many).

Thanks to The God, there are three has fruits, not too many

Sakti : Macinna tokka sedding mappiara lemo’
(macinna=interested) (tokka=too)
(seding=eager) (mappiara=plant)
(lemo’=orange)

I am also interested in plant the orange

Puang Abdullah Asaf : Ba’ medding mucangkoi nakko elokki.

(ba=yes) (medding=better)
mucangkoi(grafted) (nakko=if) (elok=want)
(ki’=you).

yes it's better you grafted it
Sakti: Erettoa pale cedde.
(ERettoa=give me) (pale=too) (cedde=a bit)
give it to me too, a bit

In this interaction between Anregurutta and Sakti, Anregurutta employs enclitic -ta to denote negative politeness strategy although Anregurutta is much older than his interlocutor. Here, Anregurutta employs -ta at the end of the word Lemo (oranges) to signify politeness to his friend. Here, enclitic -ta and -nu can be attached to the base word Lemo to indicate different form of politeness. It may be inferred that to a greater extent Pappandangan politeness strategy with reference to this context is in line with Brown and Levinson theory of politeness.

3.3. Conversation between Anregurutta (Puang Abdullah Asaf) and Regional Chief of Religion Office

A. RCRO: Ta’dempengnganga Anregurutta agama tu mai papakkasiata
(Excuse me Anregurutta, how’s life?)

B. Puang Abdullah Asaf: Ya allhamdulilah de’napada waktutta pamalolo sibawa macoaani. Idi magitu sehaseha mukki?
(Yes, thanks God. But it is not the same as during my young Age and moreover, I am getting old now. What about you, is Everything Ok?)

A. RCRO: Ba’Alhamdulilah, tabe ta’dampengngeng nga’ e gurutta nasaba engkae, eloeka mewaki sita sibawa mappakutana ri idi, Puang, tuli engkaka kowwe de’tomma kusibukkanki gurutta?.
(Yes, thanks God. Excuse me Anregurutta, I have something to ask. I am often coming here. Am I bothering you Sir?)

B. Puang Abdullah Asaf: Alhamdulilah, marennuka kasi nakkri jokka jokkaika nasaba de’na pada kondisi fisikku biasa. Iyya biasa lokkai towwe lokkai koe.marennuka kasi narekko ri jokka jokkaika ripolei riaga ka Alhamdulilah, iyamaneng naro pada upaminasa.
(Thanks God, I am impressed if someone visits me because my physical condition is not the same as usual. I am the one who visits people when I feel longing. I am expecting now that people visits me)

A. RCRO: Biasatommaku se’ding makkutana gurutta, nakkotuli engkaka lokka komai makkeda
ammakki engka ammang makkeda magi tuli
engka munnaro pak kandep loka mai.

(You might have questioned my visit to this
area so often but rarely pop in Anregurutta
place)

B. Puang Abdullah Asaf : Alhamdulillah se’di asukkureng
maraja.narekko engkamukka kasi poleika.
Alhamdulillah.

(Thanks God, if someone is willing to visit
me)

A. RCRO : Ta’dampengngeng tokka Gurutta
nasaba,sarena wenni ramalang, uparellu
ladde gurutta lokka se’ding masiiji ma’baca
mamiraje natappa pole elokka lokka menre ri
mekka. Millauka harapan ri idi gurutta sapa
tau engka jokkaku engka kedoku Engka
jokkaku engka kedoku engka kebijakakku
temma deceng ta podang laloka. Nasaba
iyyaro ida riasengnge tomappanrede
pamirinta parnerta iyyatu to panritae ulamae,
malangkaki seddi sukkuru narekko
naingatkangngi ulamatta to panritata nasaba
to panritae de’gara laen nassuroang
selainna anu decengmitu, nasaba iyyanaro
riasengnge tau mapparenta ajaklalo taso’bu
so’buiang nga gurutta.tapodang laloka
madeceng narekko engka masala-masala ri
lalenna iyae tugasku selaku kakandep
kementrian agama kabupaten maros.

(Excuse me Gurutta, in one night of
Ramadhan I am expecting you to perform
isra’ mi’raj and at once pray for the God for
my intention to perform pilgrimage to
Mekkah. Who knows if during my term of
office as regional chief of religion office here
there is a misconduct, action, performance
which are inappropriate. Anregurutta as the
wise man will be able to forecast if things are
right and wrong. I believe that Anregurutta is
always insisting good things and therefore
please tell frankly if I have something wrong)

B. Puang Abdullah Asaf : Masya Allah iyye we sipakainge siparing
ngerrangi ri agamana puang alla ta ala
fazakkir fainna zika tampaurunnukminin
appakainge ko siparing ngerrangiko narekko
madecengngi Alhamdulillah pugaul narekko
maja salai, bara weddingi kesi pemerinta
pemerinta laingedede nasaba de’gara tau
sempurna ‘maccaki mappakainge tapi
parellu tokki ri pakainge’, mappakainge ri
(Oh my God, we need to remind each other to the best of god religion based on Alquran. Please remind each other to do good things and not to do wrong things. We pray for the God hopefully the government is always on the right tract. There is no such a perfect man and sometimes we can remind people but we also need to get reminded. You have position, status, property, strengths. Oh my Lord, please guide us to the right way)

A. RCRO: ta’dampengnge nga gurutta, nasaba elona millau simang nasaba engka empa jama jamang elo ri selesaikan ri kantoro ede.iyamuni pertemuanta iyya cinampemi na pabarakkai puang alla tala gurutta, makessing kapang gurutta milau doa dolo. (Excuse me Anregurutta, I need to leave because there are works to get done at the office. Our visit is very short but may it be blessed. It is good if Anregurutta pray for the God)

B. Puang Abdullah Asaf: Bismillahirrahim Alhamdulillalah, alfatih alhamdulillahi rabbil alamin allahumma salli ala saidina Muhammading wa ala saidina Muhammad, allahumma bariklana fibarakatil jazima haidihil yaumil rahmatika ya arhamarrahimin ya azis ya gaffar ya tawabiyal alahimalmafissudur rabbilahazihal mudahazal suduki wa akhrijana maja alna min ladunka sidik waja alna minladunka sultana rabbana wagfiriana warhamhuma kamarabbana sigara wasalallahu walhamdulillahi rabbil alamin summa salamu alikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh.

This conversation was performed between Anregurutta and RCRO (Regional Chief of Religion Office) in Maros. It is implied from this conversation that power (position) is not a predictor of politeness determinant factor in Maros Pappandangan context. From this conversation, the RCRO has a powerful position but he addressed the Anregurutta not by means of Bold-on record strategies. He insists on using entitlement Gurutta to denote superiority in that conversation. On the other hand, Anregurutta maintains the politeness strategies to show reciprocal relation or equal relation with the RCRO. It can be
inferred that there are inconsistency in the politeness strategies in Buginese Pappandangan in comparison with consistency relation as revealed by Brown and Levinson.

3.4. **Conversation between Anregurutta (Puang Abdullah Asaf) and Pappandangan Rich Businessman**

**A. Puang Abdullah Asaf**
- *Hallo assalamualaikum Wr.Wb.*
  (Hello, assalamualaikum)
- *idi Muhammad Tang?*
  (Are you Muhammad Tang?)

**B. RB**
- *walaikumusalam wr wb.Tabe Puang.*
  (Waalaikumussalam, Excume me Puang)
- *iyye*
  (yes)
- *ittanna nappa ungkalinga saddatta.*
  (It’s been very long not to hear from you)

**A. Puang Abdullah Asaf**
- *Aga Karebatu Seha’ seja mukki? .*
  (How’s life, is everything Ok?)
- *ittanna nappa ungkalinga saddatta.*
  (It’s been very long not to hear from you)

**B. RB**
- *Tabe Puang, de’to ku menganggu iyye Puang.*
  (Excuse me Puang, am I bothering you Puang)

**A. Puang Abdullah Asaf**
- *de ma, justru mu bangtuka kasi,Alhamdulilah.*
  (Not at all, I even feel to get help, thanks God)

**B. RB**
- *magi karebana anuta’ santrita?*
  (How’s your Islamic school?)

**A. Puang Abdullah Asaf**
- *Alhamdulilah ndi,sukkuruki cuma pada liburui Makkokkowe nasaba koronae*
  (Thanks God brother, but the tudents are on holidays Due to corona)

**B. RB**
- *iya bawa puang,karyawakku rodo kurang lebih seratus*
  (I have about 200 hundred employees Puang)

**A. Puang Abdullah Asaf**
- *Masya Allah.*
  (Mow)

**B. RB**
- *makkeda'ka pajikkani jolo engka ri panggajian nakko ce'dena ce'dena pa’*
(I said, the company will keep on operating so that we have something to pay as little salary just to fulfill basic needs. Therefore, there should not be any massive dismissal. So, although only a little we will thanks God for it.)

A. Puang Abdullah Asaf : sukkuruka tudu maega karyawanta tapi yakinki tania dalleta na anre tapi dallena muto kasi na anre' pile maega karyawan pile maega laleng dalle na ereki puang alla ta ala. makki tauwwi ha tania ri aseng dale makkoro iyya ro dalle pole puang alla ta ala tania dalle rekeng rekeng akka leng.

(Thanks God, you have got lots of employees, but believe it that it is not your fortune that they take instead they take their own fortune. The more employees you have the more fortune from the God. So, the fortune is basically from the God, not from humans).

A. Anregurutta : jadi willau doangengki ce’de bara engka na pabbarakka puang alla taala usahata iyya makko tono napabbarakka puang alla tala umurukku .....doa sampai alhamdulillahi rabbil alamin

(So, I pray for you hopefully the god will bless your Company and also the God bless my age. Thanks God.)

A. RB : Waalaikumsalam Wr Wb.

The conversation was performed between Anregurutta and a rich man in Maros. From this conversation, it is evident that the charisma of Anregurutta is maintained by the other interlocutor by the insistence of the use of Puang. Puang is the highest form of politeness strategy in Buginese context. In this conversation (Tabe Puang, de’to ku mengganggu iyye Puang), the status of being a rich man does not influence the way the interlocutor make use of politeness expression, such as Tabe Puang. Therefore, it can be inferred that power relation is not dominant in this conversation rather it is more on cultural context. The context of Anregurutta as a prominent people has important role in social interaction in Buginese Pappandangan context. Brown and Levinson theory of power relation in the determination of politeness strategy use applies.

3.5. Conversation between Anregurutta (Puang Abdullah Asaf) and Regional Vice-Chief of Parliament Member
B. RVCP : Assalamu alaikum wr wb. Puang Aji.
(Assalamualaikum)

A. Puang Abdullah Asaf : Wassalamu alaikum wr wb.
(Waalaikumussalam)

B. RVCP : Tabe, Puang Aji, pak Chaidir, Wakil Ketua DPR
(Excuse me, Puang Aji. I am Chaidir, vice-chief of Regional parliament)

A. Puang Abdullah Asaf : Magi tudu seha-seha mukki, Alhamdulillah
(How’s life, is everything Ok?)

B. RVCP : Aga karebata, Puang Aji, melesi lessi mukki
(How are you Puang Aji, are you Ok?)

A. Puang Abdullah Asaf : Alhamdulillah.
(Thanks God)

B. RVCP : kondisie, ri issengmaneng ni kapang koronae, maitta paja, mudahan ri marusu yahe.
(As we all know that today the problem of corona has not lasted yet, especially here in Maros)

A. Puang Abdullah Asaf : Ri padamillauk ki ri puang allata ala namagatti mua iyyahe koronae
(We pray for the God, hopefully, the corona problem will last quickly)

B. RVCP : Iyye Puang aji, iyye koronae maega to jamajamang aga de’na pura nasaba iyye lasae yahe matau manengngi tauwwe mappigau,
(Yes, Puang Aji. This corona has caused many things undone because many people stop doing things)

A. Puang Abdullah Asaf : Ba’, ripakkoannamani bawang ri pasi sennangng atie, nacobami puang alla ta ala.
(I think so, we can not do anything and we need to be patient because this is probably a warning from the God)

B. RVCP : Iyye tongeng puang aji, amin millautokka yahepuang aji na ri doakang maneng ngi, ri doakak ka, ri doakangngi manengngi masyarakae, mallesi lessi mui iyye koronae, na engka hikmah na ri runtu yahe tercata’ ri sejarahye iyyahe engka masa koronae na engka hikma ri runtu.
(Yes, I couldn’t agree more Puang Aji. I request Puang Ajie that you pray for the God for the sake of the people that the corona will last and we will learn useful thing from it one of which is the new history of corona which we may have learnt something from it)

A. Puang Abdullah Asaf: nasaba iyyaro asenna cobaan, iyyanaro iyya selaku Pembina agama berkewajiban manengki selesaikangi ta’cedde –ta’cedde masala dengan niat kesabaran dan ikhlas.nasaba iyyamiro nasuro tokki puang alla ta ala bekali aleta yanaritub sabbara nan nia shala tasipakainga makti ndi, siparingerrangi. nasaba sipakaringerrangi patauwwe ,nakko de’na gaga pari ngerangiki ndi’, de’gaga ri onrongi tassipakainga, Insya Allah de’gaga pakainge’ki.

(What we understand about disaster, I as religion supervisor have the obligation to resolve the problem by means of patience. The God requires us as human to have a patience and if there is something wrong we need to remind each other as the basis of our livings. If no one remind us we have no reliance on living)

B. RVCP: tongeng siseng Puang Aji, iyyena elo ka millau saba pole ri idi Puang Aji, ta saba sabari tokka na engka to’ pole ri Puangnge lao ri aleku mancaji tau nomoro seddinna marusu, uakkai jariiku iyye duae, nappa ri doakan, ri pammulani Puang Aji.

(I couldn’t agree more Puang Ajie. I wish to have a permission from you Puang Ajie and your support to become the first person here in Maros. I raise my two fingers and please pray for me Puang Ajie)

A. Puang Abdullah Asaf: iyye, Assalatu assalamu ala sayyidina Muhammad wa ala sayyidina Muhammad, allahumma barik lana fi ma razaktana birahmatika yaumil arhmar rahimin ya azis ya gaffaru wa biallimafis sahidikahuma rjanamu wa ja allina minladunka sultana allahumagriflana wali wali dayya warhamhuma kama rabbaya sighara wasallallahu alihi wal hamduillahirrabbil alamin,summa salamu alai kum wr wb

B. RVCP: Amin Puang Ajie makasih Puang Aji.

(Amien, Puang Ajie)
The conversation was performed by two people between Anregurutta and the Regional Vice-Chief of Parliament (RVCP). From this conversation, it is clear that power is evident in Anregurutta as compared to the RVCP. From the structure of hierarchical relation, the RVCP is more powerful because he is the one that has the authority on every regulation issued in the region. However, the RVCP insists on using politeness address terms by using, Puang Ajie. What can be inferred about power relation here is that the notion of Anregurutta has special value to the eye of RVCP most probably due to religion effect. This means that to politeness value to Buginese Pappandangan rely much stronger on the religious entitlement rather than cultural values. There is a social cohesiveness that determines the politeness strategy use in Buginese Pappandangan which is not justified in Brown and Levinson theory.

4. Conclusion

Politeness strategy that concerns the present study involving an area of a district called “Pappandangan” is not merely about linguistics elements. More importantly, it is impacted by the long historical evolution characterized by power and relation of the rulers and kingdoms which are characteristically politeness domain. With reference to Buginese politeness strategy, there are nonlinguistic elements that predominantly affect the politeness strategy in many patterns of social interactions. In principle, Buginese politeness strategy with reference to Pappandangan Buginese system. There existing strategies, such as avoidance of topics, selection of ending particle which are characteristics of Buginese language and choice of words. There are also cultural addresses that influence the way people construct their politeness utterances. However, Buginese could do much more than what has been addressed and advocated by Brown & Levinson (1978) whose notion to have lacked of features of religious and spiritual dimensions.

Another aspects of shared strategy among language users in reference to politeness strategy is a production of humorous expressions. Humor has played the important role of interpersonal interactions in the workplace, campus, or office and has been perceived as having the opposite effect. It is believed that the concept of structured linguistics elements when involving humor is not present. However, cautious consideration should be taken into account when involving non-linguistic elements that may incur misunderstanding of one of the interlocutor. In Buginese context, involving humor to include politeness can only be performed when the two interlocutor know each other. Research found that humor can help initiate the individual and social-level positive affect. Humor events are defined as “discrete social behaviors that a producer intentionally creates.

Buginese and Makassarese Language have a social function to make connection between particular groups of people who inhabit the area of Maros regency. Without a means of communication in Makassarese and Buginese language, people seem to be impossible to interact with others in their daily communication to deal with their farmland, business vendors, social gatherings, wedding parties and family gatherings. In order to sustain the communication
well, speakers of both languages should be able to choose strategies to have polite conversation. Often politeness strategies are affected by cultural convention, which is based on community's social values. However, Buginese and Makassarese people do not have problems in interacting together since both languages are mutually intelligibility. In every society operates a normative notion of their own politeness, which is not the same for all interlocutors, situations and cultures. In Makassarese and Buginese norm, for instance, the linguistic choice is often influenced by the addressee's age, status, position, relationship, social constraints and gender and as well as rank of the people, such as Karaeng or Puang.

There seems to be a complex analysis of the relations between politeness, impoliteness and culture with special reference to local culture, such as the principle of sipakatau (respect each other) and sipakaiinga (remind each other). In order to argue that Makassarese and Buginese language need to develop new models for analyzing politeness at the level of global culture. However, this may not possible because other aspects are more prevalent, such as spiritualism, religious practices and Islamic sophism dominate the emerging strategies with special reference to Pappandangan Maros. We argue that cultures are not homogeneous and that within each culture there are different views on what constitutes polite and impolite behavior; therefore, if we use models of politeness which ignore the heterogeneous nature of politeness and impoliteness, those generalizations about cultures will not apply in Maros. They can only tell us about the dominant politeness norms and do not reflect the variety of norms and disagreements about politeness and impoliteness which characterize linguistic behavior within wider context of South Sulawesi.

Based on the conversational analysis, it was found that Buginese Maros language is used as a marker of politeness in many context of social interaction. Some of the determinant and influential factor include the social status of the community in Maros Pappandangan. Another strategic politeness being used as a marker of politeness Buginese in Pappandangan is the use of second singular person pronouns, words, greetings, politeness markers vocabulary. The social status is often the reflection of education, age, employment, economy, or rank which is used as marker in speech as a form of respect, solidarity to superiors, subordinate, a fellow employee, the older, and the younger. However, to obtain a strong influential status, a person much has solid attachment to the religion practices.
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