0. Introduction

Sundanese speech levels have been treated by Kern (1906), Kats and Soeradiadja (1927), Eringa (1949), Satjadibrata (1956), Wirakusumah and Djajawiguna (1957), Noorduyn (1963), Wessing (1974), Djajawiguna (1978), Ayatrohaedi (1980), and Soedradjat (1986).

Notwithstanding, these studies have been based on reported usage or intuition, not analysis of actual texts. This has yielded a standard model based on "features of the social environment in which the speech event is taking place", most notably, "a) social status of the addressee or referent, b) social status of the speaker, c) the difference (if any) between a) and b) [and], d) the degree of friendship (intimacy) between the speaker and the addressee" (Wessing 1974: 12).

This paper presents this model in some detail and discusses results of an analysis of 60 texts documenting speech level use by Sundanese interlocuters. This analysis produces seven previously unreported aspects of interlocuters' knowledge of speech level use.

1. The speech situation

The estimated 1992 population of Indonesia was about 190 million, of which over 112 million reside on the island of Java. Of those, an estimated 30-35 million are speakers of the Sundanese language. The Sundanese language situation is succinctly summed on the macro-level by Harsojo:

"Nowadays Sundanese is used widely among the population of West Java. In village settlements, the language of instruction is Sundanese, whereas, in towns, Sundanese is primarily utilized in the family circle, in conversation among friends and intimate acquaintances, and also in public and official places between people who are aware that they both know Sundanese. With regard to the language refinement, it is frequently mentioned, that

---

1 The full version of this paper is forthcoming in Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics, Series A of Pacific Linguistics.

2 Various versions of this paper have been critiqued by Roger Shuy, R. Noorduyn, E. Sadtono, Bjørn Jernudd, Robert Lord, Evangelos Afendras, Gisela Bruche-Schulz and anonymous reviewers, to all of whom I am indebted for helpful comments.

pure and refined Sundanese is to be found in the area of Priangan, that is, in the regencies of
Ciamis, Tasik-malaya, Garut, Bandung, Sumedang, Sukabumi and Cianjur. Even now, the
Cianjur dialect is still considered the most refined Sundanese. From Cianjur also came the
songs for lute and flute referred to as Cianjurani. Considered less refined is the Sundanese near
the north coast of Java, for example, that spoken in Banten, Karawang, Bogor and Cirebon.
[Furthermore,] The language of the Baduy, which is spoken in south Banten, is archaic
Sundanese." (Harsojo 1983: 300-301)

The Baduy have lived in the mountains at the extreme western end of Java, in south
Banten, apart from Islamic and Western influences with which most Sundanese
people have interacted for centuries. They have resisted cultural change. They did
not convert to Islam. One story has it that their ancestors, defeated warriors of the
pre-Islamic Kingdom of Pajajaran, fled there after a defeat in battle by the Islamic
kingdom of Banten in late 15th or early 16th Century, but this has now been shown
to be a romanticized view.4

In modern times, the psychological impact of meeting some Baduy has been
recorded by Sundanese literary scholar, Ajip Rosidi. He noted their social
characteristics, including their language, which may be similar to those of
pre-contact Sundanese people. Rosidi writes:

"I have never done a formal study, but on meeting several Baduy, I noted no unique physical
characteristics. There were, however, striking contrasts to other Sundanese. Immediately
evident were features developed in response to their environment, to nature and as a result
of their education - in short, culture traits: distinctive black or dark blue clothing, the
ancient head scarf, behavior so full of self-confidence [as opposed to malu 'shyness'], and
4) the language, which does not symbolize relative social levels of speaker and addressee."
(Rosidi 1980: 128)

Speculation as to how speech levels came to play a part of Sundanese has yielded
various explanations. The following appears to be the most credible, given
geographical factors:

"Aside from an emotional, literary evaluation, the existence of the distinction between
refined and less refined, and pure and less pure Sundanese may perhaps be explained from
the point of view of Sundanese history: Priangan, for example, was known to have been
culturally influenced by the Islamic [Javanese] Kingdom of Mataram. In the 19th century, there
were familial and cultural relations between Sundanese nobility, specifically in area of
Sumedang, with [Javanese] nobility in Solo and Yogakarta. In addition, it is possible that the
psychological climate and environment exerted an influence upon certain aspects of language."
(Harsojo 1983: 301)

Sumedang's location in easternmost West Java, along with Ciamis, Tasik-malaya,
and Garut, close to what is today Central Java, gives credence to this theory.

On the micro-level, historically, reports Soedradjat:

"The higher speech level was employed among members of the regents' [=chief district
administrators] families. In fact, only upper class people, descendants of the royal families,
knew the speech level system. Speech levels were formally taught in [Dutch] schools only
in the early 20th century. Speech levels thus became a part of the life of educated
Sundanese people (Rosidi 1980)." (Soedradjat 1986: 108)

Indonesian independence in 1949 exerted new influences on language development.
According to Soedradjat:

4 Prof. Noorduyn has called my attention to the challenging of this interpretation by Bakels
(1989).
"The use of speech levels has changed over time in such a way that some levels are now used differently from the way they were used very much earlier. Some of these levels [i.e., Medium and Very high levels] are rarely used nowadays. Only in the wayang [i.e., puppet drama] performance is the high level now used [in the way that it was used socially in the past]. In the past, the high level was used to show respect to the menak 'aristocrats'. Nowadays, however, the distinction in class based on blood is not significant, and therefore the high level [i.e., L] is used to any addressee whom a speaker thinks should be given respect." (Soedradjat 1986: 108)

Variant terminological systems and models of speech level use exist. Of these, Satjadibrata's (1956) seems to be the standard formulation, because Noorduyn, Wessing and Soedradjat rely heavily on it. In it, two levels constitute the frame: Kasar (K) 'low level' or 'general conversational speech' and Lemes (L) 'high level' or 'speech in which polite (i.e., Lemes) vocabulary is used'.

Choice of vocabulary is, however, not the only aspect of the Lemes style.

"In the Lemes level, the manner of speaking plays an important role. Even if the vocabulary is perfect, if the speed and loudness are not proper, the speaker may be regarded as not respecting the addressee." (Soedradjat 1986: 112).

People are said to be 'speaking Lemes' or 'speaking Kasar' according to the overall impression the listener derives from the utterances s/he hears.

Socially, use of speech levels is one aspect of politeness, which ranges from Lemes refined, in accordance with customary law' to Kasar 'lacking refinement'. The Kasar-Lemes scale is a theme underlying many aspects of Sundanese culture: deportment, dress, body movement, etc.

Finer distinctions are possible, though their use is very infrequent: Lemes Pisan (LP) 'very polite', Panengah (P) 'rather polite', and Kasar Pisan (KP) 'crude, earthy'.

2. Social determinants of speech level use

The social relationships of interlocuters influence selection of speech level. Social relationship is a function of the relative statuses of interlocuters in a conversation. Some of these statuses may be seen in an overview of Sundanese society. Harsojo writes:

"Economics, political ideology, modernity, governmental administra-tion, communications, education have created an upper stratum, consisting of village administrators, teachers, information specialists, office workers, students, armed forces personnel, merchants and entrepeneurs, all possessing an outward-looking orientation. On the other hand, there is a lower stratum, consisting of a great number of farmers, most of whom still illiterate, whose life style remains lraditional. People on the upper stratum possess economic skills based on the principle of seeking profit. They have connections with middle-men and large merchants in cities. All economic power of the village may be said to be centered in the upper stratum. Generally, the bond between upper and lower classes takes the form of debt or contracts not beneficial to the lower stratum, whose economy is weak." (Harsojo 1983: 305)

Surjadi has also provided a description of Sundanese social structure in the context of modernization:

"H. Geertz (16-18) connected means of livelihood with social system. In cities she proposed a social composition consisting of "an urban elite, an urban middle class and an urban
proletariat." The urban elite consists of the diplomatic community, businessmen, and communities of foreign Asian businessmen: Chinese, Arabs and Indians. Next, "an Indonesian metropolitan superculture" is forming itself by cultivating symbols such as higher education, ability to speak foreign languages, overseas experience and possession of western produced luxury goods such as automobiles.

The urban middle class consists of mid-level civil servants and other officials such as health officers, teachers and mid-level armed forces personnel. It also includes groups of skilled laborers: tailors, stone masons, blacksmiths, merchants, electricians, drivers, mechanics of motorized vehicles, etc.

Finally, the urban proletariat consists of laborers, messengers or household servants, peddlers, pedicab drivers, etc. They are generally unskilled and illiterate.

As for the village,...[Geertz] only wrote "most villages are fairly homo-geneous both in economic condition and in general outlook."

With regard to the composition or even the social strata in cities, as proposed above, the major part is valid for cities in West Java, especially Bandung. In Bandung the diplomatic community is very small, among which are British citizens at the British Council, and the community of foreign businessmen, indeed exists, e.g., the Japanese.

Nowadays, the service sector, especially the field of entertainment, is developing in large cities such as Bandung, with the birth of night clubs and bars. Another fast growing area is transportation. The number of intercity vehicles in West Java, and also those within the city of Bandung itself, with the existence of new routes for motorcycle taxis, honda taxis, etc., is developing very rapidly. The result of this development for the labor sector is an increase of drivers, conductors, and also passenger agents. (Surjadi 1974:22-24)

Interlocuters' social relationship affects choice of terms to address and refer to each other. The frame of reference within which this choice takes place is 'familiality', or kekeluargaan in Indonesian. Surjadi illustrates this principle.

"In everyday social interaction, Sundanese people, on meeting a person for the first time, after revealing their panca kaki 'genealogy' and finding no family relationship whatsoever, then determine each other's positions according to age. So the younger calls the elder akang 'elder brother' [eucu 'elder sister']. In return the elder addresses the young-er as avladi 'younger brother[sister]'. The term of address mang, 'uncle', besides its family reference, is also frequently used for a non-family relationship, i.e., a person with whom one is not acquainted, but whose status is lower, eg. pedicab or ox cart drivers, and so forth." (Surjadi 1974: 134)

Furthermore, interlocuters' social relationship also affects their choice of lexical terms which in any way refer to themselves, each other, or any other person(s) they happen to refer to (eg. my, your or his/her house).

Figure 1 is a summary of norms for choice of speech level. This arrangement shows that social relationship is the basis of the system. STRANGERS, at one end of the scale (1.), are presumed to speak Lemes with each other, while intimate FRIENDS, at the other end (6.), always speak Kasar.

The people Satjadibrata mentions in 7. do not seem to be active participants in the speech level system, and we are not told anything more about their ability in this area.

All others are governed by interlocuters' social relationship, that is, their relative statuses. Only when interlocuters' statuses are equal does acquaintance (4a.) and relative age (4b1,2) exert an influence on choice of speech level.5

---

5 People referred to in 7 do not seem to be active participants in the speech level system. We are not told anything more about their ability in use of speech levels.
3. Speech level variant types

A speaker must know four patterns of lexical variables to convey a social attitude, which may be reserve (with strangers), respect and/or humility (to one’s betters) or solidarity (with one’s intimates). The four patterns are shown in Figure 2, on the following page.

The Type I variable has a different word or form of the same word for Polite respect, Polite humble and Kasar. A speaker has two means of showing respect toward the addressee or a third person:

1. By using a respectful word (Lr) to refer to the addressee’s or a third person’s activity (‘looking at’).

   Bapa ningali ka abdi. (Lr)  ‘You, sir are looking at me.’

2. Or, by using a humble word (Lh) to refer to his/her own activity. Humbling him/herself, a speaker indicates respect for addressees or third persons.

   Abdi ningal ka Bapa. (Lh)  ‘I am looking at you.’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Type I Address &amp; Reference</th>
<th>Type II Address &amp; Reference</th>
<th>Type III Address &amp; Reference</th>
<th>Type IV Non-Address &amp; Non-Reference &quot;neutral polite&quot;*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respect</strong></td>
<td>Lr ningali 'look at'</td>
<td>Lr rambut 'hair'</td>
<td>LE dugi 'until'</td>
<td>Dugi ka énjing. 'Til tomorrow!'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Respectful words</em>* POLITE</td>
<td>bumi 'house'</td>
<td>éwed 'confused'</td>
<td>énjing 'tomorrow'</td>
<td>as in...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respect</strong></td>
<td>Lh ningal 'look at'</td>
<td>Lh/K biak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Humble words</em>* POLITE</td>
<td>rorompok 'house'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>inmah, 'house'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>indung 'mother'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-MARKED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 2:**
Patterning of Variants
(Ref. Satjadibrata 1956)*
[*Follows Noorduyn’s English terminology (1963)]

---

* Lr = 'Polite respect' Lemes pikeun nu dihormat (Terms referring to objects, places, actions, etc. associated with the addressee or with someone being referred to whom the speaker wishes to respect.

Lh = 'Polite humble' Lemes pikeun nu ngahormat (Terms referring to objects, places, actions, etc. associated with a speaker, who wishes, by humbling himself to show respect to the addressee or person being referred to.)

LE = 'Neutral Polite' Lemes Enteng (Terms not associated with speaker or addressee, but are nevertheless are considered to be Lemes.)

K = 'Everyday speech' Kasar terms.
Both *Lemes* and variants are forms of the same word. The *Kasar* variant is a different word, *nénjo*.

Other verb forms operate similarly:

1a. *Buku éta ditingali ku Bapa.* *(Lr)* 'That book *was seen* by you.'
2a. *Bapa ditingali ku abdi.* *(Lh)* 'You *were seen* by me.'

For the addressee's activity in 1a., the speaker chooses a respectful word *(Lr)*. In 2a., the speaker refers to his/her own action with a humble word *(Lh)*. In so doing, s/he symbolizes respect for the addressee.

Additionally, there are a few Type I nouns, as well:

1b. *...humi Bapa.* *(Lr)* '...house your' (your house), but...
2b. *...rorompok abdi.* *(Lh)* '...house my' (my house).

The variants are different words. Both are *Lemes*. The *Kasar* variant is yet another word, *imah*.

Another Type I noun is 'mother': *(Lr)* = *ibu*, *(Lh)* = *pun biang*, and *(K)* = *indung*. All three variants are different words.

Type II variables have the same word for Polite respect and Polite humble and a different word for the *Kasar*. A speaker may respect the addressee or personal referent by referring to a characteristic of either the addressee, referent or himself/herself with the same *Lemes* term.

*Gamparan éwéd.* *(Lr)* 'You (are) confused.' *Abdi éwéd.* *(Lh)* 'I (am) confused.'

The *Kasar* term is a different word entirely, *bingung*.

Type III variables have one word for Polite respect and another for Polite humble and *Kasar*. A speaker humbles him/herself by referring to him/herself with the same word as is used in *Kasar* speech. That is, the same word would be used in a situation requiring a *Kasar* term symbolizing different social status/rank and also solidarity.

*...rambut Bapa...(Lr)* '...hair your...' *...bukut abdi...*(Lh/((K)))* '...hair my...'

A sub-class of Type III terms, including *adi* 'younger sibling', *anak* 'child', and *bapa* 'father', make the distinction between *Kasar* and *Lemes* by prepositioning the particle *pun*. Prepositioned *pun* makes the expression *Lemes*: *pun anak* 'my child', *pun bapa* 'my father', both of which are Polite humble words *(Lh)*.

Type IV variables, because not used for address, and first, second or third person reference, have only a *Lemes* and a *Kasar* term. Interlocuters can show respect to each other by choosing neutral polite *(LE)* terms, which can be adjectives, adverbs, nouns, verbs, conjunctions and augmentatives *(pisau* 'very').

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Datang <em>(LE)</em></th>
<th><em>ka isuk.</em>(LE)</th>
<th><em>Kasar</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dugi <em>(K)</em></td>
<td><em>ka ènjing.</em>(K)</td>
<td><em>Lemes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrive</td>
<td>at tomorrow!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'M Until tomorrow!'

Mention of speakers' ways of referring to themselves are rather scattered in previous treatments. Item 8 in Figure 1 covers one particular case. Satjadibrata does not mention self-reference for STRANGERS. Presumably they should use *Lemes* to refer to themselves, but I have observed that STRANGERS make very
few references to themselves, each other, or, for that matter, to third persons. Furthermore, other contingencies for self-reference are left unaccounted for by Satjadibrata. How, for example, does a speaker refer to himself/herself when the addressee is neither an intimate friend, nor someone to whom one speaks in the Lemes style? We are not told.

In conclusion, by observing norms for use of speech levels, social meanings are transmitted. Kasar style can not only express awareness of an addressee’s lower status, or lack of respect, but, in the right circumstances, solidarity.

4. Speech level use in discourse: A text-based study

Sixty texts were elicited from a total of eight different people over a period of two months. Five people were language instructors in Indonesian and Sundanese at a language school in Bandung. One was a university graduate in Economics, presently employed in the Department of Taxation in Jakarta. The other four were high school graduates. The remaining three people were village people: two women working as household helpers and a man working as a warehouseman.

The reason for using elicited texts (rather than constructed texts, or inter-views) is that interviewing and constructing texts taps interlocuters’ explicit knowledge (of speech levels, in this case). Eliciting texts taps interlocuters’ tacit knowledge, so that they will be able to judge “what sounds appropriate” in a particular situation, even though they may not be able to tell why it is.

In elicitation sessions, I described situations in which a speech event might take place and participants assumed various participant roles. Speech event enactments were tape-recorded and immediately replayed to the actors and other Sundanese-speaking onlookers, as a check on their authenticity. If a performance as a whole, or any interlocuter’s performance was deemed inauthentic, the performance was repeated (several times, on occasion) until interlocuters and onlookers were satisfied. Recordings were archived and are the basis for this study.

Speech level terms in texts were identified according to Satjadibrata’s (1956) listing and tagged by type: Lemes Pisan, Lemes, Panengah, Kasar (only if other choices were possible, being that Kasar is unmarked) and Kasar Pisan.

For a broad overview, frequencies of occurrence of speech level terms were tabulated. Numeric values were assigned to each level to create an impressionistic politeness scale: Lemes Pisan (+2), Lemes (+1), Panengah (+0.5), Kasar (0) and Kasar Pisan (-1). An average of values for each dyad (i.e. a pair of interlocuters) and for each individual was calculated for all texts using the following formula:

\[
M = \frac{\sum(2a+b+.75c-e)}{N}
\]

Where \(a, b, c, d\) and \(e\) are the total of Lemes Pisan, Lemes, Panengah, Kasar & Kasar Pisan terms, respectively, in each text; \(N = a+b+c+d+e\).

---

7 Very polite, Polite, Rather polite, General conversational and Crude or earthy speech.
This array of Dyad averages represents a global view of speech level use by dyad and by interlocuter across texts.

5. Results

There were five kinds of dyads: STRANGERS, ACQUAINTANCES, CO-WORKERS, FRIENDS and FAMILY members. Averages for each type of dyad were sorted and arrayed in descending order.

The ranges of Dyad averages for the various degrees of acquaintance of interlocuters appear in Table 1. Table 1 shows the upper bounds as similar while the lower bounds are variable. The lower bounds of each range distinguish them from each another. One initially confusing fact is the similarity of upper bounds (i.e., 1.00-1.17). The reason for this similarity appears to be that in every group, there is a wide variability in the use of speech levels and it will be necessary to investigate further to discover that the reasons for this variability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relatedness</th>
<th>Overall ave.</th>
<th>Range of Ave.(Dyad)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRANGERS</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.80 - 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQUAINTANCES</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.21 - 1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-WORKERS</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.40 - 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.18 - 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.09 - 1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1:
Ranges of dyad & Overall Averages
by degrees of relatedness

5.1. Strangers

STRANGERS, predictably, use Lemés style overwhelmingly.

The following excerpt was produced by STRANGERS. The venue indicated was the Bandung train station. A 28-year-old businessman returns from Jakarta on the evening train and is met by his brother. Leaving the station, they encounter a woman in her forties who seems apprehensive. She approaches and asks directions. Lemés words are in bold italic type.

(1) D: Oh, Ibu badé ka mana? Ka-tingal-na linglung pisan.
    Oh, Madam wants to to where? Apparent-ly confused very.
    ‘Oh, where do you want to go? You seem very confused.’

(2) S: Leres, Dén.
    ‘Correct, prince/honored sir.’
Some cases of STRANGERS using Kasar appeared after they had been introduced, and were therefore strictly no longer STRANGERS, but ACQUAINTANCES.

Furthermore, the great majority of these 23 seemingly misplaced Kasar terms in STRANGER dyads were Type IV Kasar variants replacing Neutral Polite terms, which, I believe signal a general relaxation of formality.

In conclusion, texts for STRANGERS, then, are by and large accounted for by Satjadibrata's model.

5.2. Acquaintances and co-workers

ACQUAINTANCES and CO-WORKERS overwhelmingly use Lemes style to interact with each other.

Though the ranges of averages for ACQUAINTANCE and STRANGER dyads overlap, the difference between overall averages for STRANGER and ACQUAINTANCE dyads is statistically significant. It follows that the overall average for CO-WORKER dyads is also statistically different from that for STRANGER dyads.

Since the overall average for ACQUAINTANCE and CO-WORKER dyads are the same, these two types have were treated as a single category, though identities of individual dyads were retained.

ACQUAINTANCES and CO-WORKERS use Lemes style frequently among themselves. But, they use Kasar terms more frequently than STRANGERS. The majority of Kasar terms used (64%) are chosen in preference to Neutral Polite (Type IV) words, indicating a gradual relaxation of formality in those social situations.

The other 36% consist of Kasar chosen instead of Polite respect or Polite humble terms. This means that interlocuters intend to signal their perceptions of their own, addressees', and referents' relative social statuses (Same Status). If we
focus on Kasar terms replacing Polite respect and Polite Humble terms, we have a clear indication of the social meanings being exchanged.

Two patterns emerge. Pattern 1: One of the interlocuters produces no Kasar< Polite respect/humble terms while the other speaker produces 1 to 15, the average being 2.7. Pattern 2, both interlocuters produce 1 or more Kasar<Polite respect/humble terms. To interpret these patterns, texts were examined for the social values showing respect and/or humbling oneself.

In text 48, two women friends, A & B, converse in Kasar style, in accordance with the received model (Ref. Fig.1-4a).

In Scene 2 of the same conversation, C, A’s nephew, enters and politely "speaks p" to A’s friend. A’s friend, as expected, "speaks down" to C (Ref. Fig.1: 2a & 2b or 4b1 & 4b2). Specifically, all 15 Kasar terms chosen instead of Polite respect are produced by A’s friend. A’s nephew uses only Lemes terms.

But, another phenomenon besides status or age differences becomes evident. The following excerpt illustrates this.8

(1) C: Aya naon ieu, Ibi, ribut-ribut kieu?
   'What's up here, Auntie, so noisy like this?'

(2) B. Nyaëta ibi tēh hayang di-gawé yeuh.
   'That is auntie FOCUS wants to work y'know.'

(3) A. Heueuh, cenah hayang di-gawé nu gedé buruh-na, aya,Dir?
   'Unh-hunh, says wants to work which large the pay, exist,D?
   'Ya, says she wants work with a large salary, is there any, Chaidir?'

(4) C: Badé moal, Ibi?
   'You do, don't you, Auntie?'

A’s nephew answers A’s and A’s friend’s questions in Lemes style. Once, B uses a Lemes term, but it is the same term just used by C.

(8) C: leu badé moal?
   'This want to will not?'

(9) B. Nya badé waé ari taeun mah.
    'Y'know want to indeed with regard to that FOCUS.
    'Y'know I do indeed with regard to that.'

(10) A. Enya. Siti ambēh tong nga-lamun waé, kaluman nēmpo-na.
     'Y'know. Siti so that don’t daydream just, uneasy see-it.
     'Y'know. Siti don't just daydream, I'm uncomfortable seeing it.'

(11) B. Kevel nga-lamun waé.
     Disgusted daydream just.

---

8 Lemes words are in bold italics, Kasar words in underlined bold italics.
'I'm disgusted just daydreaming.'

(12) C: *Artth ёнjing we ku abdi.*
Indeed tomorrow just by me.
'Well tomorrow by me [it will be found].'

(13) B. *Ah entong ёнjing mending ge ayeuna waέ.*
Ah don't tomorrow better also now just.
'Ah don't talk of tomorrow, it'd be better also just now.'

(17) A. *Gedé gaji-na?*
'Large the salary?'

(18) C: *Dua rébu sa-dinten mah.*
Two thousand one-day FOCUS.
'2,000 rupiahs per day!'

(19) A. *Ah. Lumayan atuh.*
'Ah! Not bad indeed.'

(20) B. *Dua rébu sa-dinten?! Euleuh untung atuh nya.*
Two thousand one-day?! Oh my profitable indeed y'know.
'2,000 per day?! Oh my! Good fortune indeed, you know.'

*Lemes* terms in lines 9 (*badé*), 13 (*ёнjing*), and 20 (*dinten*), all B's utterances, are exceptions to Satjadibrata's model. Their motivation is as follows:

I. When repeating a co-speaker's utterance in a clarifying or challenging speech act, repeat the exact words. Do not change speaking style, regardless of social relationship.

As the conversation proceeds, yet again, B uses *Lemes* style (line 23), counter to stated norms, this time to express thanks for C's information.

(23) B. *Oh, nya atuh keun hátur nuhan.*
Oh, y'know indeed let be give thanks.
'Oh, all right, that's it, thank you.'

(24) C. *Sa-wangsul-na éta tēh.*
One-return-NOM that FOCUS.
'You're welcome for that.'

Neither A's relationship with B, nor B's with C warrants *Lemes* style. The act of thanking someone seems intrinsically *Lemes*. Speakers know the following:
II. Use Lemes style to express "thanks", regardless of any other style being used.

Soedradjat feels that nuhun and hatur nuhun are not so different in politeness. Perhaps these days this so-called exception is really not such an exception.

In conclusion, ACQUAINTANCES B and C in Text 48, excluding exceptions, conform perfectly to Satjadibrata's norms (0.00 and 1.00, respectively). A similar phenomenon occurs among CO-WORKERS. In Text 44, Scene 1, two male CO-WORKERS (C and D), slightly different in age, converse in an office. The first topic is work, but it soon shifts to a second, D's son's school problems. The style is Kasar, usual for well-acquainted persons of equal status (Ref. Fig.1-4a).

(1) C: Ku naon, Dju, éta mani...mani s-arar-edih kieu?
From what, Djunaedi, that rather very-sad like this?
'Why, Dju, very... so very sad like this?'

(2) D: Enya⁶, Dir, poë⁶ ieu p-ar-ar-using pisan euy.
Y'know, Chadir, day this much confused very indeed.
'True, Dir, today I'm very dizzy indeed.'

(3) C: Éta pa-gawé-an⁰ ditumpuk baé meureun⁵ nya⁶.
That work is piled up just no doubt y'know.
'That work is just piling up apparently y'know.'

(4) D: pa-gawé-an⁰ numpuk! Mana deui?
Work piles up! What next?

(5) Di imah⁵ pusing, si⁴ Ahmad teu lulus sakola...
At home confused, ol' Ahmad not pass school...
'At home headache, young Ahmad failed school...'

(6) C: Si⁴ Ahmad saha?
Young Ahmad whose?
'Who is his father?'

(7) D: Anak⁴.
'Child.'

(8) C: Oh, anak⁴.
'Oh, child.'

(9) Si⁴ Ahmad anak⁴ Djunaédi anu kelas tilu SMP tén?
Young Ahmad child Djunaedi which class 3 jr.hischool that?
'Young Ahmad, Djunaedi's son in class 3 jr.high, that one?'

Suddenly, C and D begin using Lemes terms: Neutral Polite (line 10), Polite respect

---

⁹ 4 = Kasar replaces Polite respect [Lemes pikeun nu dihormat]
⁵ 5 = Kasar replaces Polite humble [Lemes pikeun nu ngahormat]
⁶ 6 = Kasar replaces Neutral Polite [Lemes Eutung]
(line 13), Polite humble and Polite respect (lines 14-15) and Neutral polite (lines 17, 19 and 21).  

(10) D: Muhun\(^1\).
'Yes.'

(11) C: Teu lulus ayeuna \(^{ny_{6}}\)?
'No pass now, true?'

(12) D: Teu lulus.
'Not pass.'

(13) C: Kumaha tah \(^{budak}^{4}\) tèh? Badè\(^{3}\) ngulang maksad-na\(^{4}\)?
How alas kid FOCUS? Going to repeat intention-the?
'Indeed, how about that kid? Is he repeating the grade your intention?'

(14) D: Piwarang\(^{2}\) abdi\(^{2}\) mah ieu ngulang, \(^{ngan}^{6}\) anjeunna\(^{3}\)
Command my FOCUS this repeat, only he educated.
'I told him he should now repeat, just so he gets an education.'

(15) C: Tah, atuh kitu mah.
Alas, indeed like that FOCUS.
'Well shame, like that indeed.'

(16) D: Swastany\(^{6}\)?
Private/non-government, y'mean?'

(19) C: Muhun\(^1\), swasta. Éta tèh nampi\(^{1}\) kénéh, SMA
Yes, private. That FOCUS receive yet, sr.high which afternoon
'Yes, private. It's accepting students, late afternoon high school.'

(20) D: Swasta mana nu saél tèh?
Private which one that good FOCUS?
'Which private school/s is/are good?'

(21) C: Muhun\(^1\), étu mah swasta nu SMA 'Bur' tah
Yes, that FOCUS private which sr.high 'B' alas for instance.
'Yes, that private one 'Bur' High School, well, for example.'

---

\(^{1}\) Neutral Polite [Lemes Entung]
\(^{2}\) Polite humble [Lemes pikeun nu ngahormat]
\(^{3}\) Polite respect [Lemes pikeun nu dihormat]
\(^{4}\) Kasar replaces Polite respect [Lemes pikeun nu dihormat]
\(^{5}\) Kasar replaces Polite humble [Lemes pikeun nu ngahormat]
\(^{6}\) Kasar replaces Neutral Polite [Lemes Entung]
Social relationship remains constant. But change of topic accompanied by change of style points to a rather obvious explanation: *Lemes* 'Polite' style is a consensual way of handling sensitive, potentially embarrassing (to D, here) topics in a face-saving manner. In other words, *lemes* style serves as a "bad news cushion." This is not surprising, given that, in Sundanese culture, other people's *perasaan* 'feelings' are treated very delicately. Being sensitive to others' feelings is a mark of a *lemes* 'refined, cultured' person. The principle C and D are following, then, is:

III. When CO-WORKERS (perhaps also FRIENDS & ACQUAINTANCES) discuss a topic which constitutes a threat to any of their *perasaan* 'feelings', they should select *Lemes* style to "cushion the bad news."

In Text 44, Scene 2, a second CO-WORKER, an attractive woman, W, approximately the same age as C and D enters. Thereafter we note a nearly two-fold increase in production of *Lemes* terms for the same dyad, C and D. It appears that W's presence in Scene 2 affects the male colleagues, who present a good image to their colleague of the opposite sex.

D (male) greets W (female) and they begin chatting about work.11

(23) W: *Padamelan¹* di-tinggal-keun kalah ka ng-ar-obrol,
Work abandoned lose to chatting

(24) *pa-gawé-an⁶* téh!
work FOCUS!
'Work abandoned in favor of chatting, think of the work!'

The says he, W, child-his not go up... not pass.
'He says, Willa, his child didn't pass... not pass.'

Stupid apparently that FOCUS. Or headstrong.
'That one's stupid apparently. Or stubborn/naughty.'

Indeed if male FOCUS, must ahead.

---

11 1 = Neutral Polite [*Lemes Entung*]
2 = Polite humble [*Lemes pikeun nu ngahormat*]
3 = Polite respect [*Lemes pikeun nu dihorntat*]
4 = Kasar replaces Polite respect [*Lemes pikeun nu dihorntat*]
5 = Kasar replaces Polite humble [*Lemes pikeun nu ngahormat*]
6 = Kasar replaces Neutral Polite [*Lemes Entung*]
'Indeed, if a child is a male, he must stay in school.'

(33) C: \textit{Saur-na}³ \textit{ieu}, \textit{budak-na}⁴ \textit{tēh} \textit{alim-eun}³ \textit{neras-keun}³. Says-he this, kid-his FOCUS natural-ly go ahead-

(34) \textit{Saur}² \textit{abdī}² \textit{tēh}, \textit{ieu} \textit{waē} \textit{kedah}² \textit{di-pilari-an}² \textit{sakola} Say I FOCUS, this just must be selected school nu which

(35) \textit{supados}¹ \textit{henteu} \textit{nganggur}. late afternoon so that not idle. 'He says this, as for his child, he must of course stay in school. Say I, just this we must look for a late afternoon school so he's occupied.'

(36) D: \textit{SMA mana nu saē}¹ \textit{nya}⁶, Willa? High school which one which good y'know, W? 'Which high school is good hm, Willa?'

(37) W: \textit{Indra atanapil} Bur. 'Indra or Bur.'

..........

(39) C: \textit{Tah, SMA Indra gé saē}¹ \textit{tah.} Alas, high school I also good alas. 'Alas, Indra High School also is good y'know.'

(40) D: \textit{O, saē}¹. Oh, fine.

......

In summary, references to D’s son remain in Kasar style, as do Kasar< Neutral Polite terms, such as (e)\textit{nya} 'yes, true'. The remainder of terms are Lemes of various types (Ref. Fig.2).

Thus, in addition to the use of Lemes style for "cushioning bad news", where both speakers are males, a further factor is stirred into the mix which further refines the Lemes style in Text 44 Scene 2. This may be stated as follows:

IV. When male CO-WORKERS (perhaps also FRIENDS and ACQUAINTANCES) are speaking and are joined by a woman, they should select Lemes style (or a more elevated degree of Lemes) in the woman's presence.

---

In another example, two co-workers, D, a 28-year-old man, and W, a 27-year-old woman, discuss a matter in an office. W complains of not having received her
monthly paycheck.12

(1) W: *Dju, kumaha yeuh mani l-al-ieur*, teu *boga* duir. D, how hm rather very-confused, not have money. "Dju, how about it, hm. I'm rather confused, don't have much money.'

(2) D: *Muhun*, *Will, tosi kaping* hiji teu acan nampi artos waé. Yes, W, already date one not yet receive money just. 'Yes, Will, it's already the first of the month, but we've not yet received our salary.'

(3) W: *Kumaha atuh majikan téh mani kitu pisan,* How indeed boss FOCUS rather like that very,

(4) *teu di-per-hatos-keun* pisan, ka-ter-lalu-an! not be-paid attention to very, NOM-too-past-IZER 'What a shame the boss is like that, we are totally ignored. it's too much!'

(5) D: *Kumaha nya majikan téh... majikan téh kitu?* How y'know boss FOCUS... boss FOCUS like that? 'What about it that boss, y'know ... what about a boss like that?'

(6) W: *Taros-keun* geura... usul. Ask quickly... suggestion 'Ask about it right away ... I suggest.'

(7) D: *Muhun*, *upami* engké siang ieu (heu)nteu hasil engké abdi. Yes, if... later day this not succeed later I

(8) *ka-ditu lah ka majikan, ka dunung-an.* to-there hm to boss, to employer. 'Yes, if...later today this isn't solved, later I'll go there to the boss, to the employer.'

(9) W: *Kumaha arí abdi mah répot atuh mani kacida pisan?* How if I FOCUS busy indeed rather busy very? 'What about my being busy, so very busy?'

(10) D: *Nya* sami waé, *Will, sareng* abdi. Y'know same just, W, as me. True it's just the same, Willa, as with me.

In Scene 2, the boss joins the conversation. He asks what they are chatting about. W answers.13

---

12 I = Neutral Polite [Lemes Entung]
2 = Polite humble [Lemes pikeun nu ngahormat]
3 = Polite respect [Lemes pikeun nu dihormat]
4 = Kasar replaces Polite respect [Lemes pikeun nu dihormat]
5 = Kasar replaces Polite humble [Lemes pikeun nu ngahormat]
6 = Kasar replaces Neutral Polite [Lemes Entung]

13 I = Neutral Polite [Lemes Entung]
2 = Polite humble [Lemes pikeun nu ngahormat]
3 = Polite respect [Lemes pikeun nu dihormat]
4 = Kasar replaces Polite respect [Lemes pikeun nu dihormat]
5 = Kasar replaces Polite humble [Lemes pikeun nu ngahormat]
6 = Kasar replaces Neutral Polite [Lemes Entung]
(15) W: Éta, Pa,... biasa lah mani tos¹... kosong...
That, Sir,... usual hm rather already... empty...
'That, Sir,... the usual, well, it's already... rather... empty.'

(16) C: Oh, perkawis¹ gaji.
Oh, matter salary.
'Oh, the matter of salary.'

(17) W: Muhun¹, tos¹ kaping¹ hiji, Bapa mah mani
Yes, already date one, you-Sir FOCUS rather

(18) sa-ngunah-na⁴ pisan.
as-comfortable-ADV very.
'Yes, already the first, you, Sir, are rather very lacksadaisical.'

(19) C: Kumaha nya⁶ kersa³ ng-antos-an³ dua dinten¹ deui?
How y'know must be-waiting two days more?
'Hmm about it hm, must it wait two more days?'

(20) W: Badé³ ka mana kitu?
Want to to where like that
'Where to, if it's like that?'

......

(22) C: Nyaëta bapa têh badé² ka-luar kota ayeuna têh
That is Sir FOCUS want to go-out city now FOCUS.
'As for me, I am going out of town now.'

......

(24) W: Bapa mah nya-nyabah-an¹ waé arî⁶ urang... lalieur² yeuh
You-sir FOCUS going far away just as for us... confused yah
'As for you, Sir, going somewhere far away and we... have a headache... hm.'

(25) C: leu aya urusan pening.
This there is matter important.
'This is an important matter.'

(26) D: Ka-luar kota tah dua dinten¹ deui! Leu tos²
To-out city alas two day more! This already
gasping yah!
'Going out of town two more days! We're already gasping for air!'

(27) C: Tuda bapa têh kedah² ayeuna, leu têh,
Because sir FOCUS must now, this FOCUS,
ber-angkat² ka-luar
tavel to-out

(28) kota têh, margi¹ leu urus-an par-usaha-an.
city FOCUS, because this arrange-NOM NOM-business-IZER.
'I must now leave here to go out of town, because this is a company matter.'

(29) W: Asal¹ ulah bohon wé, Pa, da tos¹... ieu pisan atuh...
Basis don't lie just, sir, 'cause already... this very alas...

(30) répat² pisan.
critical very.
'Just don't lie, Sir, already ... we are very alas... in a critical situation.'
For the D and W, the boss’s presence is clearly a factor in the symbolic social meaning system. Closer inspection reveals a shift in style due to W’s indignation (lines 18 & 24). She chooses a Kasar word, where she would normally select a Polite respect term, according to Satjadibrata.

The boss uses Neutral Polite (lines 16, 19 & 28), Polite respect (line 19), and Polite humble (lines 22 & 27). This is unexpected, given that C is W’s and D’s boss! It appears that C is trying to deflect W’s anger, after she hears of C’s impending two-day out-of-town business trip. We are led to infer two more exceptions to stated norms, both relating to anger:

V. Use Kasar style to express anger in extreme circumstances, even to one’s superior.

and,

VI. Use Lemes style to deflect anger, regardless of relative statuses of interlocutors.

C leaves and W’s anger increases. C and D converse in Kasar style following stated norms. But, when W refers to the boss’s going away, she should use Polite respect style (Ref. Fig.1), but uses Kasar (line 35: indit) instead.

Of course, use of levels to vent anger is tacitly known by native-speakers. The point is that this knowledge does not appear in explicit statements of speech level
norms. Readers or learners with no first-hand experience of Sundanese remain ignorant of what Spradley and McCurdy (1975) have referred to as "rules for breaking rules".

5.3. Friends & family

In contrast to STRANGER, ACQUAINTANCE and CO-WORKER dyads, there is a much wider range of variability of speech level use among FRIENDS and FAMILY member dyads, no doubt because a wider range of emotions (intimacy to strict decorum) is possible among these groups.

More interlocutor patterns of speech level use are balanced for FRIEND than for FAMILY member dyads.

An example of FRIENDS' communication is found in Text Scene 1. D is C's older friend. Both are males.

D wants to know about the yield from C's rice fields this year. C reports it has been a rather good year. D congratulates C.

(3) D: Sae1 nya0 ayeuna.
'Fine, y'know, now.'

(4) C: Sumuhun1. Kumaha yeuh sawah Akang anu di Cianjur?
Yes How yah rice field older brother which in Cianjur?
'Yes. How about your rice field, older brother, in Cianjur?'

(5) D: Nu-mawi1 ieu, Yi, kagung-an2 akang mah...
And so this, younger bro., be-owned older brother FOCUS rada rather

(6) kirang1 sae1 taun ieu teh hasil-na.
less good year this FOCUS harvest-the
'And so, younger brother, mine... not so good this year the harvest.'

(7) C: Ku-naon?
From-what?
'How so?'

(8) D: Margi1 ...keuna hama wereng.
Because... struck brown leafhopper pest.
'Because...there was a brown leafhopper pest.'

(9) C: Atuh... kedah3 di... ieu... di-pasih-an3 pupuk sareng1
Goodness... must be... this... be-applied fertilizer and

(10) di-basmi waé hama wereng.
be-sprayed just brown leafhopper pest.
'Goodness...it must ah...be fertilized...and sprayed for the brown leafhopper pest.'

14 1 = Neutral Polite [Lemes Entung]
   2 = Polite humble [Lemes pikeun nu ngahornat]
   3 = Polite respect [Lemes pikeun nu dihornat]
   6 = Kasar replaces Neutral Polite [Lemes Entung]
Speech levels in Sundanese

(11) **D:** Oh, pupuk, pupuk mah parantos\(^2\). Pupuk sareng\(^1\)... éh, Oh, fertilizer, fertilizer FOCUS already. Fertilizer and unh

(12) **parantos\(^2\) di-semprot. Namung\(^1\)... rupi-na\(^1\) teu acan\(^3\)
already be-sprayed. But... appearance-ADV not yet

(13) **di-pasih-an\(^1\) sae\(^1\) ku Gusti pa-ningten\(^1\).**
be-given good by Lord probably.

(14) **C:** Sumuhun\(^1\). Ah, éta mah kedah\(^3\).. ieu wé
Yes. Ah, that FOCUS must.. this just
di-pa-damel\(^3\)-na.
be-done-it.

‘Oh, fertilizer, I've already applied fertilizer. Fertilizer and... ah, already sprayed. But...apparently not yet blessed by God.’

Though a conversation between male friends, the style is relatively formal for this dyad, probably due to the fact that the topic is one which requires *Lemes* style to 'cushion bad news.'

A second example of FRIENDS' communication is Text 48 Scene 1. S is W’s older friend. Both are women. W inquires about S’s daydreaming. S replies.\(^15\)

(2) **S:** Nyaéta ieu téh mikir-an\(^5\) hayang\(^5\) di-gawé\(^5\)
That is this FOCUS think-ing want to be-working
jiga batur\(^4\)
if person

(3) **resep isuk-isuk\(^6\) ng-abring, jadi mun\(^6\) boga\(^5\) gawé\(^5\)**
willing early in the morning walk together, so just have work

(4) **mah pan meureun-an\(^5\) rada senang kana hate\(^5\).**
FOCUS then assuredly rather happy in liver.

‘That is I was thinking I would like to get work if someone is willing to hire me, I’d be happy every morning walking in a group, so just I have work, I’d be rather happy in my innermost being.’

(5) **W:** Eh, ari\(^6\)... sugan\(^6\) téh di-gawé\(^4\) da ka-tingal-i\(^1\)
Hey, as for... thought FOCUS be-working hmm view-ed
bas a éta
language that

(6) **mah sinarieun sok indir\(^4\).**
FOCUS unexpectedly happening wants to go.

‘Ei, with regard to...that thought, work, apparently that expression unexpectedly wants to go.’

---

\(^1\) = Neutral Polite [*Lemes Entung*]
\(^2\) = Polite humble [*Lemes pikeun nu ngahormat*]
\(^3\) = Polite respect [*Lemes pikeun nu dihormat*]
\(^4\) = Kasar replaces Polite respect [*Lemes pikeun nu dihormat*]
\(^5\) = Kasar replaces Polite humble [*Lemes pikeun nu ngahormat*]
\(^6\) = Kasar replaces Neutral Polite [*Lemes Entung*]
(7) S: **Nyaéta ieu téh jadi pa-nganggur.** Hayang

That is this FOCUS become unemployed. Want to

téh kitu

FOCUS like that

(8) **di-mana waé nga-babu-babu kitu.**

at-where just be household helper like that.

That is, I've become someone out of work. I want like that wherever to work as a household helper like that.'

(9) W: **Enya** pan di **imah** gé **loba** **pa-gawé-an** na

Y'know isn't at home also runs work then

pusing-pusing teuing?

'Isn't it true that at home there is also much work, why such a big headache?'

(11) S: **Laah arí** di **imah** mah da **nyaéta pagawéan**-ana

Hm as for at home FOCUS alas that is work-the

teu aya

not exist

(12) **buruh-na geura arí di-gawé** mah kajeun

income-the quick as for be-working FOCUS no matter

teuing **capé**

very tired

(13) aya **buruh,**

there is income.

'Well, as for at home, that's work without any income, if employed, although tired, there is income.'

(14) W: **Nya** **néang-an** waé atuh... ké geura... **pan seueur**

Y'know looking for just indeed... later quickly... not true many

(15) **kenal-an ongkoh,**

acquaint-ance individually.

'Y'know, just look for work...later...I'll have many acquaintances.'

....

The mood here is dictated by S's frustration and anger at being unemployed. This is symbolised by the profusion of Kasar terms.

Turning to FAMILY members, ranges of averages for FRIEND and FAMILY member dyads are identical. The similarity, however, stops there. Patterns of speech level use differ for FAMILY member and FRIEND dyads.

FAMILY member dyads provide a range of social relationships, across which to observe speech level use. One documented relationship emerges, however, which is symbolized by choice of the words budak, anak and murangkalih when referring to an adolescent. Satjadibrata shows budak and anak as either Kasar or Polite humble, depending on their use (Ref. Fig.2, Type III). An adult, however, would choose between budak or anak (=Kasar) and murangkalih (=Lemes) for a third person referent. Polite humble applies only to first-person reference.

In Text 26, Scene 1, a mother and father discuss their son's report card. The wife uses slightly more Lemes terms than the father, a disparity no doubt due to the fact that Indonesian wives tend to be younger than their husbands, hence, the value
of respect is appropriate.

References to their son and his problem reveal an interesting use of speech levels. Father’s first reference is a Kasar term (si Kosim). Using a Kasar term could symbolize the referent’s perceived lower status or intimacy.

F. Mam, kumaha si Kosim teh? Rapot-na awon pisan!
Ma, how ol’ K FOCUS? Report-the bad very!
‘Mom, what about that Kosim? His report card is very bad!’

The mother, in turn, uses the Lemes term murangkalik.

N. Atuh da murangkalih-na(Lr) males pisan.
Goodness hm child-the lazy very.
Sanés kirang warah.
Not less taught.
‘Oh my, the boy’s very lazy. Not untaught.’

What is the meaning of this Polite respect reference? Mother may be showing respect to father (= the father’s child) by using a Polite respect term? But when the father asks,

F. Kinten-kinten naék moal?
Apparently go up will not?
‘Probably he’ll pass, won’t he?’

the mother switches and refers to the boy and to what he must do to be able to pass to the next grade with a Kasar term:

N. Ké upami masih tiasa di-leres-keun sareng budak-na(K<Lr)
Later if still can be-corrected and child-the
kersa(Lr) di-ajar masih tiasa.
wants to be-educated still can.
‘Later if it is still possible to be straightened out and the kid wants to study, he still can.’

Relationship alone cannot account for this switch in the midst of a dialogue where interlocutors are using Lemes style. A reasonable explanation is that mother is shifting to Kasar to show anger at her son’s negligence (an enactment of Rule IV regarding anger).

Text 45 is an interaction between CO-WORKERS involving the same type of reference to one’s own child, that is using a Kasar term to symbolize anxiety or unhappiness.

S is unhappy. Her successful daughter was chosen to go overseas to further her studies. A colleague catches S daydreaming and asks her what’s wrong. S replies respectfully, but in a way reflecting pride in her daughter.

S: leu pun anak(Lh) cenah badd ka luar negeri....
This my child they say going to to out country...
‘This, my child, it is said, will go overseas....’

The colleague congratulates S.

C: Nya saé atuh ng-iring bingah. Gaduh(Lr) putra(Lr)
Y’know good indeed, join happy. Possess child
bade(Lr) balajar ka luar negeri mah!
going to study to out country FOCUS.
'Y'know it's really good, I'm also happy. Having a child who wants to study overseas, indeed!'  
... Jantten ka-tingal-i-na éta téh murangkalih(Lr) aya  
...And so apparent that FOCUS child there is  
ka-majeng-an...  
'...And so apparently that child is getting ahead.'

But, S is torn between pride in her daughter's achievement, anger about the daughter's impending departure, and respect for her colleagues.

S: Nyaéta ari ka-hoyong mah, ulah cios, kitu...  
That is as for NOM-desire FOCUS don't happen like that...  
Gaduh budak téh, teu dua, teu tilu, mung hiji-hiji-na...  
Have child FOCUS not two not three only one-AUGMENT-the  
'That is, my wish is, don't happen, like that... I have this kid, not 2, not 3, only this one...'

Again, S shifts to a Kasar term to refer to her daughter.

5.4. Speaking in public

Finally, speaking in public highlights the relationship of speech levels to speech functions. Situational factors are constant: a restricted number of speakers, one speaker performs at a time, and an audience.

Tasks performed in public are:
1) a village head's announcement of an upcoming public speech to be given in a local mosque after evening prayers,
2) a committee head's greeting and welcome to the audience,
3) a request for someone to read from the Qu'ran,
4) and introduction of the speaker at the afore-mentioned event,
5) the guest speaker's telling about himself,
6) response to the welcome,
7) retelling of humorous experiences in Indonesia,
8) telling of plans for the duration of this stay,
9) delivery of his main address,
10) compliment to those attending, and finally,
11) closing.

The tasks are in rough chronological order, the latter ten constituting a major speech event.

The data recall Satjadibrata's explanation of the use of Kasar for scholarly reading material. In general, Kasar vocabulary is fuller and broader than Lemes vocabulary. In the texts of these 11 tasks, Kasar terms are reserved for the visiting speaker's main address about personal health and hygiene. Kasar terms appear to serve as a topic indicator for speaking in public, as well. This phenomenon is not only limited to reading material. That is, use of Kasar terms means the material is relatively objective and non-personal.

Furthermore, our analysis gives a clear picture of how an effective public speaker uses speech levels to prepare the audience for the main topic.
In tasks 1) and 2), the village and committee head use *Lemes* terms exclusively while making announcements. The committee head uses *Lemes* terms exclusively in tasks 3) and 4), no doubt due to the fact that announcements are mostly concerned with the relationship between announcer and the villagers, and between the announcers, the villagers and the guest speaker, towards whom they show respect. Objective information is subordinate to the social relationships between speech event participants, or as Halliday might say, "interpersonal meaning" dominates "ideational meaning."

Text 36 illustrates this style. The text of the recorded announcement is as follows. RT is the neighborhood association, and Pak RT the association head.\(^\text{16}\) RW is the citizens’ association.\(^\text{17}\)

\textit{RT. Para Sadêrêk sa-daya, utami-na warga RW 05, engkê wengi} \\
PLU brother one-all primari-ly member distr.ass’n 05 later evening \\
\textit{badê di-aya-keun pang-aos-an anu mana pen-ceramah-na,} \\
going to be-exist-CAUS NOM-read-ISER that which AGENT-lecture-the \\
\textit{nyêta Bapa Doktor XYZ ti Amêrika.} \\
that is Mr Doctor XYZ from USA.

'Friends, especially residents of district 5, this evening a lecture will be presented in which the speaker will be Dr. XYZ from the USA.'

\textit{Pang-aos-an di-aya-keun ngowit-an tabuh tujuh} \\
Lecture be-exist-CAUS begin-ning hour seven \\
\textit{tilu puluh di Masjid Salman} \\
three ten (=30) at Mosque S.

'It will take place beginning at 7:30 PM at Salman Mosque.'

\textit{Sim kuring (Lh) sa-laku ka-tua RW 05 nga-hatur-keun} \\
person I as-acting NOM-old district ass’n 05 give-CLAUS \\
\textit{ba-rêbu-rêbu nûhun sa-teuacan-na.} \\
Nom-thousand-PLU thanks as-not-yet-NOM

'I, acting as head of district 5, express thousands of thanks beforehand.'

When the guest performs, he sprinkles a few *Kasar* terms throughout his self-introduction (task 5), response to the welcome (task 6), sharing of experiences (task 7), telling about plans (task 8), telling something good about the area (task 10), and closing (task 11). Mostly, he uses Polite humble terms to refer to himself and his experiences.

This public style is seen in Text 37.1. The guest speaker opens with the Arabic blessing, 'Peace and mercy and the blessing of God be with you' and continues...

---

\(^{16}\) Ke-tua rukun tetangga \\
NOM-old association neighbor. 

\(^{17}\) rukun warga \\
association member
As the speaker approaches his main address (Text 37.2), he uses Lemes style up to the point where he announces the topic of his address, itself a Kasar term. In his address, he uses Kasar terms. As he finishes the main address, he reverts to almost exclusive use of Lemes terms. An excerpt from the address follows.

**TP:** 

Sim kuring(Lh) nga-raos bingah dina wengi ieu,  
person I feel happy in evening this,

ku aya-na pang-aos-an anu di-aya-keun ku RW 05,  
from exist-NOM NOM-read-ISER which be-exist-CLAUS by district ass’n 05

anu mana sim kuring(Lh) atos kënging ka-hormat-an  
that which → person I already receive NOM-respect-ISER

kanggé masih-an wejang-an anu mugi-mugi aya mangpaat-na  
for giving advice which maybe there is valuable-NOM

kanggo urang sadaya-na.  
for us one-all-NOM.

'I feel happy this evening, because this pangaosan is being held by neighborhood 5, in that I have the honor of giving advice which hopefully will be of value to everyone.'

Sim kuring(Lh) dina ka-sempet-an ieu badé nyangga-  
person I in NOM-opportune-ISER this want to propose

keun hiji pokó pedaran ngena-an, atanapi pa-tali jeung(K)  
one title touch-ing or tie-d with

ka-séhat-an(K).  
NOM-healthy-ISER.

'Given this opportunity, I want to propose a title connected to, or tied to the topic of health.'
6. Conclusion

This study has confirmed Satjadibrata’s model of speech level use in Sundanese. It has also broken new ground by documenting seven previously unaccounted for additions.

These additions constitute knowledge Sundanese speakers already have, which learners must acquire. It concerns not only "knowledge of" formal Lemes and Kasar paradigms, but also "knowledge how to" use these forms.

The first addition concerns a situation when one interlocutor repeats something another has just said.

I. When repeating a co-speaker’s utterance in a clarifying or challenging speech act, repeat the exact words. Do not change speaking style, regardless of social relationship.

We showed an older speaker of higher status repeating a term used by a younger speaker of lower status, that is repeating the Lemes term the younger speaker said. According to Satjadibrata, the Kasar equivalent would be required by the older speaker’s status.

The second addition is the speech act of thanking someone.

II. Use Lemes style to express 'thanks' regardless of any other style being used.

An older, higher status speaker may thank a younger, lower status speaker with the Polite Hatur nuhun. Thanking someone is intrinsically Lemes.

The third addition concerns the situation when speaking with someone in Kasar style, i.e. a friend, close associate, etc. Switching into Lemes style helps cushion bad news. It protects that person’s feelings.

III. When CO-WORKERS (perhaps also FRIENDS & ACQUAINTANCES) discuss a topic which constitutes a threat to any of their perasaan 'feelings', they should select Lemes style to "cushion the bad news."
The fourth addition concerns expected **acknowledgement of a female’s presence** in mixed-sex conversational groups.

**IV.** When male CO-WORKERS (perhaps also FRIENDS and ACQUAINTANCES) are speaking and are joined by a woman, they should select *Lemes* style (or a more elevated degree of *Lemes*) in the woman’s presence.

Among CO-WORKERS, when a third person having a relationship of CO-WORKER, FRIENDS or FAMILY member enters, that person has the potential to affect speech level use between the original two speakers, whereas STRANGERS and ACQUAINTANCES do not.

The fifth addition concerns use of speech levels to **express strong, negative emotions**. Such displays among FRIENDS and FAMILY members are usually symbolized by use of *Kasar* references to the person on whom these feelings are focussed.

**V.** Use *Kasar* style to express anger in extreme circumstances, even to one’s superior.

The sixth addition involves use of speech levels as hedges, or qualifiers, or make excuses to **deflect expressions of negative emotion**, as when a boss tries to placate an employee’s anger at being paid late.

**VI.** Use *Lemes* style to deflect anger, regardless of relative statuses of interlocutors.

The final addition related to speaking in public. Speakers will usually begin in *Lemes* style to establish a relationship with the audience (Halliday’s "interpersonal metafunction"), then switch to *Kasar* style for the main address (Halliday’s "ideational metafunction"), thus serving as a **topic indicator**.

Finally, STRANGER, ACQUAINTANCE, CO-WORKER, FRIEND and FAMILY member dyads actually encompass a continuum which has been called a range of degrees of acquaintance. Neutral Polite terms and Kasar replacements for Neutral Polite terms (Fig. 2, Type IV) seem to constitute a psychological sensor to
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a social situation, above and beyond the scale degrees of acquaintance.
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