

Strategies for Establishing Harmony in Javanese Face-to-face Dialog in Purwa Shadow Puppet Performances

DWI RAHMAWANTO

*Linguistics Study Program Department of Linguistics
Faculty of Humanities
Universitas Indonesia*

F.X. RAHYONO (Corresponding Author)

*Linguistics Study Program Department of Linguistics
Faculty of Humanities
Universitas Indonesia
frahyono.hum@ui.ac.id*

ABSTRACT

Harmony is a critical Javanese philosophical concept used to establish social relationships. In face-to-face communication, the principle of harmony is enacted in an attempt to ensure the social relations between the speakers remain harmonious, peaceful, and free from disputes. In face-to-face discourse, the selection of speech acts that establishes these aspects is a strategic communication tool. Every speech act states a different level of politeness when addressed to different speech partner. Wayang kulit, a leading puppet theater performance of the Javanese, contains face-to-face dialogs that enact such efforts to maintain harmony. This study examines these dialogs between wayang kulit characters to better understand the role that language plays in establishing harmony in this art form of puppet theater. The study uses the classification of speech acts by Searle (1975). It is observed that the choice of illocutionary speech acts plays a role in controlling the occurrence of disputes in communication. These speech acts are also studied from the perspective of the theories of politeness from Brown and Levinson (1978) and Leech (1983); (2014). We argue that politeness in speech is used to express the values of Javanese harmony. The results of this study provide practical insight into the principle of Javanese harmony, represented in face-to-face communication in a purwa shadow puppet performance, and also represents a universal value appropriate for the realization of friendly social relationships more broadly.

Keywords: Javanese harmony; politeness strategy; speech acts; wayang purwa

INTRODUCTION

In an article on the Indonesian news website Kompas.com, Movanita (2017) reported that hate speech is the activity most widely reported to the police. In 2015, approximately 671 reports were filed. This is a regrettable development. The prevalence of hate speech reminds society that language can be used to harm as well as establish what is good. Suseno (1991) posited that such expressions of hate are negative because they can seriously disturb people and disrupt the fabric of harmony in society.

One important function of language is maintaining social relationships among the participants of speech acts (Gunarwan 2007). Kridalaksana (2005) asserted that one of language's main functions is to communicate. When someone talks to someone else, they are not just mouthing words, but are trying to achieve something through those spoken words (Austin 1984). Wierzbicka (1992, p. 3) asserted that language, as a tool of communication, demonstrates that language is used to convey messages or expressions to others. Austin (1984) posited that these messages are speech acts and observed that messages are a means for people to accomplish things through language. He distinguishes three types of such actions communicated through language: locutionary acts, the act of uttering the speech; illocutionary acts, the delivery of the speaker's intent; and perlocutionary acts, the result or effect of the action on the other person.

According to Austin (1984), speech acts that establish harmony are most likely to induce participants to respond in a friendly manner. According to Suseno (1991), the value of

harmony comprises three aspects: harmoniousness, serenity, and absence of disputes. In the context of speech, the atmosphere of harmony is manifested in utterances that demonstrate respect for others. Utterances that calm or reassure the speech partner are speech acts that do not burden them. In addition, speech acts that prevent disputes are those that maintain the other party's self-image. According to Leech (1983), politeness is a strategy to maintain social balance and friendly relationships. When speaking with politeness, an individual is attempting to maintain the social balance and friendliness of the relationship between the speaker and speech partner. Maros and Rosli (2017) asserted that to maintain harmony and friendship, the public must focus on politeness.

Discussions regarding harmony cannot be separated from discussions of ethics. The principle of harmony becomes the reference of all actions undertaken by Javanese society to make life harmonious and peaceful. Following Suseno (1991), the researchers concluded that harmony is maintained if one creates harmonious social relations and creates an atmosphere of peace. Speech acts that express modesty are not likely to interfere with the freedom of others or prioritize the speaker's personal interests first, nor do they threaten the face of the conversational partner.

Rahyono (2015) asserted that life in this world is represented by various human individuals with a range of characters from the worst to the best. *Wayang kulit* "shadow puppet" performances portray a dialog between good and evil. These performances teach lessons on ethics of behavior, speech, and attitude in Javanese culture. The ethics of speaking in Javanese, both the language used in wayang performance dialogue and that found more widely in society, are called *udanegara* (Nojowirongko 1954). Darmoko (2004, p. 85) described *udanegara* as an ethical teaching in the dialog between the *wayang* puppets. According to Anderson (1969, p. 5), a *wayang* performance is an exploration of an individual's identity and their relationship to others and the universe, and this perspective implies that *wayang* presents teachings regarding how to maintain good social relationships. This study investigates the interpersonal dialog between *wayang* characters. This type of dialog express aspects of the human condition, such as appreciation of others, the reduction of 'burdens', and protecting the self-image of the other person.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND RESEARCH QUESTION

The dialogue between leader characters in the Javanese shadow puppet shows illustrates how conflicts of interest between puppet characters arise and are addressed. Every utterance in a conversation has the potential to build harmony or disharmony. Thus, participants in the dialogue need to use certain speech action strategies so that harmony in the speech event is maintained. This study aims to analyse the choice of speech acts and politeness strategies adopted to create and maintain harmonious atmosphere in conversations between the participants in the Javanese shadow puppet. Based on the data of conversations between puppet characters, the question raised in this research is how the strategy of speech in the dialog between *wayang kulit* characters is used to maintain harmony in the situation. The study asks the following research questions.

- 1) What type of speech acts are used to create harmony?
- 2) What type of illocutionary speech acts are used to maintain harmony?
- 3) What type of politeness strategies are used to maintain harmony?

FRAMEWORK

In the context of face-to-face communication, harmonious social relations can be realized if the participants respect and avoid being condescending to each other. An atmosphere of such mutual respect and not being condescending toward others in communicative situations can be created if both parties prioritize joint agreement and a sympathetic attitude. Politeness strategies that support mutual respect include 1) acting to avoid disagreements, 2) the use of in-group identity markers, 3) indirectness and the establishment of boundaries, and 4) minimizing impositions on the speech partner (Brown & Levinson 1978, Leech 1983). A tranquil or placid atmosphere can be maintained if the participants in the speech act use positive or negative politeness and follow the maxim of politeness. Expressions of modesty are those that do not intrude on the other's freedom, prioritize the speaker's personal interests, or threaten the face of the partner. Actions that prevent negative emotions and avoid the emergence of disputes can be expressed in speech governed by caution and an attitude of respect for the partner (Brown & Levinson 1978, Leech 1983).

The concept of face formulated by Brown and Levinson indicates that public self-image comprises two related aspects: negative face and positive face (Brown & Levinson 1978, p. 61). In their theory of politeness, Brown and Levinson (1978) asserted that every speech act has the potential to threaten the face of the partner. To protect the face of the partner, the speakers estimate the degree of threat of a speech act they intend to utter. The three considerations used as parameters of the degree of vulnerability are a) the magnitude of differences in power or dominance between the speakers and speech partners, b) the social distance between speech actors, and c) the relativity of the types of face-threatening speech in the particular cultural context (Gunarwan 2007, p. 81). In the context of communication, politeness is a speech strategy to ensure utterances do not threaten the face of the partner; therefore, every speaker should use positive or a negative politeness strategy. When a speaker wants to avoid a threatening speech act, they can, for example, not say anything, take a deep breath, shake their head, or an act that makes others suspect that they need help (Cutting 2015, p. 33).

The theory of politeness presented by Leech (1983) intended to complement Grice's theory of the cooperative principle (Grice 1991). Leech (1983, p. 80) has stated that the cooperative principle cannot in itself explain why speakers often state what is intended in an indirect manner. The principle of politeness presented by Leech explains that the nonadherence of speakers to the cooperative principle is required to fulfill another principle: the principle of politeness (Leech 2014, p. 77). Leech explained that the communication of politeness involves two participants: self and other. Self refers to the speaker, and the other refers to the speech partner. Other is also used to appoint a third person, either present (or not) in the event of a speech act. Leech classified the principle of politeness into six maxims: tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy. Cutting (2015, p. 39) explained that there is an overlap in the categorization of the principle of politeness between Brown and Levinson and Leech's concept of politeness. In the politeness category of Brown and Levinson (1987), a speech act may contain negative politeness and positive politeness. Likewise, in the politeness category used by Leech (2014), a speech act can involve more than one maxim, for example the maxims of both tact and generosity. Associated with the profile of speech data in the wayang dialogue, the utilization of both principles of politeness is required to complement the analysis of the data. Brown and Levinson's politeness strategy is applied to enhance the scrutiny regarding maintaining the self-image of the interlocutors while the Leech maxims (1983) are adopted to observe the utterance strategies showing appreciation to others.

In the discussion about "politeness as a real-world goal", Thomas (1997, p. 159) states that politeness is interpreted as a sincere and genuine desire to be pleasant to others. Therefore, politeness is a real motivation that underlies a speaker's language behavior. Conceptually, Brown and Levinson's and Leech's politeness theories measure politeness in language based on the presence or absence of speaker's attitudes to maintain the hearer's positive self-image as someone who needs to be respected and appreciated. The cultural context underlying the constituents of politeness theory proposed by Brown & Levinson and Leech is not Javanese cultural context. However, language politeness in Javanese culture is also measured by whether speech choices used to maintain or threaten the hearer's self-image. Based on the universal nature of language and politeness expressed in the language, the application of the two politeness theories can be held accountable..

LITERATURE ON JAVANESE HARMONY AND SHADOW PUPPETS

Javanese culture places high regard on the principle of harmony because it creates an atmosphere of comfort and serenity in community social relations. In Javanese culture, harmony is not only a practice, but a central ideological concept understood in life, aspirations, and social relations (Hawkins 1996, p. 225). According to Suseno (1991, p. 39), the state of *rukun* "harmonious" is a normal state that must be maintained to avoid disrupting the harmony. Language has a critical role in the realization of harmony: the affective function of maintaining social relationships between people (Gunarwan 2007).

A study of harmony in Javanese linguistic behavior was done by Gunarwan (2007, pp. 297-329). His research performed a quantitative study of harmony in Javanese linguistic behavior, but did not investigate Javanese speakers speaking Indonesian. He concludes that in conducting the speech act of prohibiting, Javanese people use certain politeness strategies so that balance or harmony is maintained. Based on this information, this study aims to explore the strategy of harmony of the Javanese in face-to-face speech in shadow puppet performances. Referring to the concept of ethics in speaking Javanese called *udanegara* (Najawirongko), the politeness rules used in the dialogues of puppet-shadow performance also is also reflected in everyday conversation among the Javanese speech community. In contrast to Gunarwan's research, this study does not only examine prohibition speech act, but also covers all types of speech acts employed in puppet-shadow performance dialogues. This research adds to and expands on the literature on politeness in the Javanese language.

Suratno (2012), in his study of speech acts in *wayang*, described the types of speech acts in *limbukan* scenes in puppet shows. *Limbukan* is a scene performed by the characters Limbuk and Cangik. Both are female servants in a kingdom. This *limbukan* scene is a scene of Limbuk and Cangik humor that talks about the core story of a puppet show. Based on this information, Suratno found strategies, implicatures, and the implementation of the principle of politeness in those *limbukan* scenes. Suratno focused on *limbukan* scenes and did not investigate other types of scenes; thus, the war scenes were not discussed. His findings provide information on the types of speech acts in puppet shows. The research is a pragmatic study of the *wayang* performance and does not relate to the forms of politeness in speech to the principle of harmony. Harbono's (2014) research describes the types of speech acts found in shadow puppet shows. Harbono tries to explain the connection between pragmatic phenomena in shadow puppet shows include extra-linguistic phenomea found in society, religion, and aspects of education. He shows that the choice of the type of speech acts in a puppet show can be influenced by all or any of these aspects. For Harbono, the quantitative elements in the study tend to be stronger than the qualitative elements, so the meaning of the choice of the types of speech acts is not taken into consideration. In this article, the use of

speech acts to build harmony in puppet shows is explained qualitatively. With this we can obtain an overview of the use of speech acts in Javanese to build harmony between members of the Javanese community.

METHODS

This research was conducted by using a qualitative approach and based on conversation data in purwa shadow puppet performances. The *wayang* performance was chosen as the data source because *wayang*, in addition to being a notable product of Javanese culture, is not just a spectacle or entertainment but intended as a medium for teaching how to establish good social relations. The data in this research consists of audio-visual recordings of a *wayang kulit* performance that narrate stories from the Mahabarata and Ramayana. The puppet masters (dalang) of these performances are Ki Anom Suroto and Ki Bayu Aji. The recordings were made during performances on May 5, 2012, in Sukoharjo, with *Bima Suci* as the main character (lakon). The recording can be found on YouTube and was downloaded on September 25, 2015, at 15:33.

The data source was chosen because of the unique use of language by the main character. The Bima character in the play is an egalitarian figure. In the context of language the character does not consider the level of speech when speaking with others. Therefore, Bima does not use speech level choices to maintain harmony in speech, but illocutionary choice of speech. This, in line with the concept of pragmatic politeness (Brown & Levinson 1978), Leech (1983, 2014) which explains that politeness is determined through the choice of illocutionary power.

The provision of data was conducted using a method of careful, discriminatory listening, and rational judgement (*simak*). The dialogue between primary characters is orthographically transcribed referring to method described by Sudaryanto (2015). The method of analysis of speech acts in this paper is based on Searle (1975), in which the analysis of the pragmatic politeness based on Brown and Levinson (1978), and Leech (1983, 2014). Data analysis goes through the following stages. Firstly, the speech acts were analyzed aiming at identifying the illocutionary force of utterances. In distinguishing one kind of illocutionary force from another, Searle's approach (1975) is applied. Based on this identification, we will know whether the markers, indicators, or even implications performed by speech acts represent certain type of its general function in communication, such as commands, suggestions, promises, praises. Secondly, politeness strategy is used in the analysis. Its purpose is to seek the utterances that express the speaker's intention to establish and maintain social harmony highlighted in theory of politeness strategy proposed by Leech (1983, 2014) and Brown and Levinson (1978). From its indicators, it can be identified whether the utterances adhere to or violate the politeness principle subsumed under positive and negative politeness. By connecting the findings with the Javanese cultural value of harmony proposed by Suseno (1991), the strategy of harmony establishment can be perceived.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In face-to-face communication, participants are not always in agreement, that is, their opinions may diverge. In that context, to avoid a conversation ending in conflict, participants adjust their speech in advance to prevent disputes from occurring. When participants take such steps to create a harmonious atmosphere for communication, it preempts disruptions. In the context of this research, the techniques used to realize such harmony are called the

harmony strategy. The key point that underlies Brown & Levinson's politeness theory posits that each speech has the potential to impose face-threat on the hearer. Consequently, each speaker needs to carefully determine the communicative strategy in order to maintain the hearer's self-image. This point of view shows that politeness aims to maintain the partner's self-image. The politeness principle proposed by Leech places others (hearers) as parties who need to be valued and benefited. Speakers need to express values that benefit hearers and vice versa. Hence, both theories highlight that politeness in speech attempts to establish and maintain harmonious interaction."

HARMONIZING SPEECH

The expression of harmony in face-to-face dialogs in *wayang* performances occurs when the characters in the *wayang* want to express something as a response to something said by their interlocutor. Expressions of consent, sympathy, empathy, and support can be considered for one's response. To make one's response harmonize with the partner, the speaker can choose different types of wording and speech acts. When differences of opinion or conflicting views occur, the participants can manage their speech to minimize the likelihood of disagreement.

The analysis of the face-to-face conversations between *wayang* characters reveals that the management of potential conflict or avoidance of disagreement are performed by reducing the drive toward coercion or imposition of views by one speaker on the other. What we observe in the data in cases where one speaker insists on forcing their opinion on the other is systematic use of a reaction in which the second speaker lowers their own level of insistence to arrive at a position of mutual agreement.

Strategies for preserving harmony in communication is achieved by selecting speech acts that induce harmony. That expression of harmonization is performed with the speech act of agreement. In the following conversation, utterance B is an example:

- (1) A: ⁽¹⁾*Sira kulina mor sejarah.* ⁽²⁾*Mokal yen sira lali marang sejaraha Rama Parasu ya Rama Bargawa.* ⁽³⁾*Kae uga satriya pinandhita....* ⁽⁴⁾*Ana kodrat ana wiradat.* ⁽⁵⁾*Kabeh menungsa diwenangake mbudidaya.*
"You often are deeply involved in history. It is unthinkable that you would forget the history of Rama Parasu and Rama Bargawa. ... They are also knights who become priests. Where there is God's will and good intention. All human beings are permitted to work."
B: *We la jagad dewa bathara. Hmmm... kaya tuguraja tekadmu Werkudara.*
⁽¹⁾*Iya ta dhi. Yen pancen tak elingke ora keduga nampa. Dhasare pun kakang tansah ngurmati marang panemune liyan.*
"My god of the gods! Hmmm ... '... like a great monument to your strength of Werkudara. All right, brother. If I am warned to not accept it. Basically, I always respect the opinions of others."

In dialogue 1, speaker A is a knight who became a priest and established a college. Speaker B comes to ask speaker A to become a warrior again. Speaker A stands firm with his decision to remain a priest and speaker B continues:

"... *kaya tuguraja tekadmu Werkudara*"
"... like a great monument to your strength of purpose Werkudara."

In the phrase *kabeh menungsa* "all humans," speaker A wants to show that he as a human being *diwenangake* "has the right" to *mbudidaya* "try." To maintain harmony, speaker B is attempting to agree with what speaker A considers true. The strategy of positive politeness in the form of consent is expressed through the following speech act:

"*Iya ta dhi ... dhasare pun kakang tansah ngurmati marang panemune liyan*"
"All right, brother, ... basically I (*kakanda*) always respects the opinions of others"

The word *dhasare* “basically” demonstrates sincerity, that is, the speakers *tansah ngurmati marang panemune liyan* “always respect the opinions of others.” Although B does not really approve the utterance A, but through the utterance, B reduces disagreement with the speech partner. The word *liyan* “others” in the context of the speech refers to speaker A. The utterance implies that the speaker genuinely respects their opinion. This form of magnanimity, accommodation, or self-effacement demonstrates that the speaker accepts what the other speaker says. Agreeing with the speech of another person is a form of invoking the maxim of politeness through the maxim of modesty. With such mutual agreement expressed in speech, antagonism is avoided, and the atmosphere of harmony during the conversation remains intact. Aziz (2017), in his research on agreements strategies in academic discussions, found that the approval strategies employed by students received positive feedback. Harmony can be maintained when a speaker expresses agreement speech. In addition, the expression of agreement enhances a sense of solidarity.

Harmony is also manifested through the use of indirect speech acts that express humility and a reduction of imposition on the other speaker: an example is presented in the following conversation.

- (2) A₁: *Sowan kula punika namung badhe ngaturaken gegambaran nagari Ngamarta sasampunipun dipuntilar kakang penemban.*
“The purpose of my visit is to convey the picture of the country *Ngamarta* after you leave.”
B: *Ngamarta ana apa?*
What is going on in *Ngamarta* then?
A₂: *Sareng kakang penemban dangu mboten kondur, wekdal menika para kawula pasemonipun kadi basanta katutup ing hima. Langkung-langkung kakang Prabu Puntadewa rumaos angles penggalhipun. Dhuh kakang penemban, mugi wonten keparenga penggalih suwawi kula dherekaken kondur makempal dhumateng kadang-kadang, kakang penemban.*
“Because you did not come home for such a long time, right now people can be likened to a moon covered by clouds. Moreover, big brother *Puntadewa* is sad at heart. Dear older brother, if you please, allow me to return home to meet with our brothers, brother.”

In utterance A₁, speaker A uses the illocutionary directive indirectly (Searle, 1991), by pleading in utterance B to return to *Ngamarta*. The most notable part of the content in utterance A₂ is as follows:

Dhuh kakang penemban, mugi wonten keparenga penggalih suwawi kula dherekaken kondur ...
“My dear old brother, if you please, allow me to return home”

The illocutionary force of directive request for speaker B to return to *Ngamarta* begins with a reduction of the obligation or pressure on the partner through the use of phrase *mugi wonten keparenga penggalih* “if you please.” The speech act provides freedom to the partner to determine how they want to respond. In the use of an illocutionary directive, the politeness of request speech can be enhanced by providing the partner with the choice of how to accede to the request or refuse to respond. In addition, a direct request may be preceded by a convincing reason for speaker A’s inquiry to be responded to by speaker B. The reason given by speaker A in utterance A₂, which explains the consequences that occurred after B’s departure, satisfies the preparatory condition. The speakers’ requests in utterances A₁ and A₂ have pragmatic felicity and put speaker A into a position of authority to make requests of speaker B (Leech 2014, p. 135). Notably, the manner of the imposition of speaker A’s authority does not place a burden on B.

PACIFYING OR CALMING SPEECH ACTS

Speech acts that express the value of harmony can be realized through a strategy of composure or imperturbability. Through this strategy, participants attempted to maintain the atmosphere of a conversation as calm, relaxed, peaceful or serene. This atmosphere can occur if the participants of the conversation mutually maintain positive and negative politeness and is created to avoid threatening the speakers' self-images. An example of such a strategy is found in dialogue 3:

(3) A: *Anoman, katon sumengka pangawak bajra lakumu....apa arep meguru marang Bima Suci?*
"Anoman, it seems that your arrival is really rushed. ... Do you want to study with the Sacred Bima?"

B: .⁽¹⁾ *Pun kakang ora maido, wektu iki si adhi bisa mbabar kawruh panunggal.* ⁽²⁾*Nanging wruhanana Werkudara, kawruh panunggal kuwi dadi laranganing dewa, Bratasena. Lan kudu eling, menawa sira iku satriyaning praja. Tak jaluk si adhi wedia marang siku dhendhaning bathara ya dhi....Mula becik jugara wae ya dhi, jugara! Tak jaluk si adhi ngugemi marang sapta margamu lan sumpah prejuritmu he Werkudara.*

"I do not dispute that right now that you can teach me the science of unity. But know oh Werkudara, the science of unity may lead to (things) which are forbidden by the gods. And remember, Dik, you are a knight warrior. I entreat you, fear the divine law, Dik. Therefore, it's better to go back, Dik! I ask you to keep your seven oaths, and the oath of your soldiers oh Werkudara."

In dialogue 3, speaker A (Werkudara) asks the purpose of Anoman's (speaker B's) arrival by putting himself as the person who needs praise. In the *meguru marang Bima Suci* phrase "to study with the Holy Bima", speaker A (Bima Suci) positioned himself as a teacher and positioned partner B as a student. That is, speaker A's utterance violates the maxim of approbation (approval, admiration). Responding to the question: "*apa arep meguru marang Bima Suci?*" "Do you want to study with the Holy Bima?," Anoman seeks to maintain Werkudara's face by a speech act that expresses agreement and avoids disagreement. The form of avoidance of disapproval is shown in utterance B ⁽¹⁾ *pun kakang ora maido, wektu iki si adhi bisa mbabar kawruh panunggal*. The phrase *pun kakang ora maido* "I (kakanda) do not dispute" allows the speakers to indirectly acknowledge and approve what the partner stated. This phenomenon works to emphasize mutual agreement between participants and helps communication to occur in a harmonious atmosphere.

In his next speeches, Anoman asked Werkudara not to continue his actions and return to become a knight. The request is shown by utterance B ⁽²⁾. In the utterances, there is a directive illocutionary stated by the use of the word *wedia* "you must be afraid" and also "you must return (as before)". The directive illocutionary in the utterances is marked by the form of affix *-a* in the word *wedia* 'fear' and also 'return'. Affix *-a* in Javanese shows the imperative form. The imperative form expresses command more than requests. Through this form of command, the speakers have suppressed the hearers' freedom to do something. For this reason, the speakers have threatened their hearers' negative faces.

The negative face threatening act towards speaker B caused by directive, is reduced by the use of the word *tak jaluk* "kuminta" "I beg (you)" in the utterance. The word is not a verb marker in the Javanese language, indicating that the speaker was the first to perform the act of *jaluk* "request, entreat." The word *jaluk* indicates that the speaker wants the other person to conduct the request of the speaker *ngugemi marang sapta marga lan sumpah prejurit* "I ask you to keep your seven oaths, and the oath of your soldiers."

With the use of the words *tak jaluk*, Anoman attempts to reduce the burden of imposition in his response to what his partner said. Based on the illocutionary act, the use of the word *tak jaluk* shows that speaker B fulfills a sincerity condition, which requires speech partner A to do something. Therefore, the request *tak jaluk* has a lower imposition than the

command form that is marked by the -a affix. Through the use of request *tak jaluk* speaker B (Anoman) places his position not as the authority in the dialogue. The purpose of the strategy of reducing the burden of imposition through speech acts is to maintain an atmosphere free from disputes or negative emotions that can enflame conflict. The degree of imposition as expressed in speech acts is relative, because an utterance can have harmonious and disharmonious effects, depending on the expression of harmony shown in the utterance. In discussing the characteristics of politeness, Leech (2014, p. 4) asserted that politeness has gradations of polite and impolite behavior.

The degree of harmony depends on the expression of the value of harmony that a person shows in his speech. The value of harmony comprises two aspects: harmony and serenity. Harmony is realized through prioritizing mutual agreement, being empathetic, acting within the group, and using indirect and measured speech. In addition, the expression of serenity is manifested if this phenomenon does not interfere with others, puts aside personal interests, prevents negative emotions, and avoids the occurrence of disputes. Thus, the degree of harmony is determined by both of these things, namely harmony and serenity. In this case, the degree of harmony is directly proportional to the expression of harmony and serenity. The more one expresses harmony and serenity, for example, in an explanation to a conversational partner, then the higher the potential of a person to maintain harmony. Conversely, the more one conceals the expression of harmony and serenity in utterances said to a conversational partner, the lower the potential of a person to maintain harmony.

The application of the concept of harmony appears in the example of the use of the word *tak jaluk* in utterance 3B shows the existence of the maintaining expression of harmony. The use of the word *tak jaluk* is related to the control of the speaker's ego; thus, their actions do not disturb others and are unselfish. The use of the word shows the form of the request to the speech partner. The form of utterance 4 is considered politer than the command in utterance 5.

- (4): *Tak jaluk si adhi ngugemi marang sapta margamu lan sumpah prejuritmu he Werkudara*
“I want my younger brother (you) to keep your seven oaths, and the oath of your soldiers oh Werkudara.”
- (5): *Si adhi ugemana marang sapta margamu lan sumpah prejuritmu he Werkudara.*
“My younger brother, keep your seven oaths and the oaths of your soldiers, oh Werkudara.”

Making a request in the speech is an obedience to the generosity and tact maxims. Here, the request sentence has a lower burden than the command sentence. The sentence of request does not require the hearer to act according to the wishes of the speaker. In other words, the hearer has the choice to obey or reject the speaker's request. The request sentences, therefore, reduces the others' losses and reduces benefits against one's self. Nevertheless, other forms of speech have a higher form of expression of harmony, for example, using a negative politeness strategy of choice (Brown & Levinson 1978) by using the word *yen bisa* “if possible” so the utterance becomes utterance (1) below.

Such utterances are politer than the previous utterances because they impose a lighter burden on the conversational partner with the use of the word *yen bisa* “if possible.” Other utterances are considered more impolite, for example, those with the word *pokoke kudu* “have to whether you like it or not,” as exemplified in phrase 4. Phrase 4 is considered impolite because it places a high burden on the partner.

1. *yen bisa, tak jaluk si adhi ngugemi*
“If I can, I will ask my younger brother (you) to keep ...”
2. *tak jaluk si adhi ngugemi*
“I ask my younger brother (you) to keep...”
3. *si adhi ugemana*
“Younger brother (you) keep ...”
4. *si adhi pokoke kudu ngugemi....*
“Younger brother (you) have to keep...”

Utterance 1 can be considered the most polite. The use of *yen bisa* in Javanese can be interpreted as "if it is possible" in the utterance. This indicates that the speaker gives a choice to the speaking partner. The word *yen* "if" indicates the existence of an optional condition for the speech partner to act according to the wishes of the speaker. Through the use of *yen* can be "if it is possible" actually the speaker has given two choices to his friends, *bisa* "can" and *ora bisa* "can not". By giving these choices the speaker gives the partner the freedom to make choices. The overall force of this is that speakers do not obligate the speech partner to do something.

The word *tak jaluk* "I request" marks a speech request. The request statement does not impose an obligation on the partner to take any action. The repeated use of *yen* can imply "if it is possible" which precedes the word *tak jaluk* "I request" increase the degree of politeness of the request, because acting is optional. If *yen bisa* "if it is possible" is not be used as in utterance 2, then the level of speech politeness will be reduced because speakers do not give a choice to their partner. However, it is still considered polite because it does not impose the burden of obligation for speech partners to take action.

The level of politeness decreases in utterance 3 because it issues a command. This is indicated by the existence of affix *-ana* as in the word *ugemana* "you must keep your promise". Affix *-ana* is a variant of the form of affix *-a* which marks commands in Javanese. The use of this form of command indicates that the partner has an obligation to carry out the command of the speaker. That is, the speech of the speaker has a high imposition on the speech partner, so that the utterance is considered impolite.

Utterance 4 is considered to be the least polite because it constitutes an obligation and does not give a choice to the speech partner. This is indicated by the use of *poko ke kudu*, "whether one likes it or not, it has to be (done)". If in utterance 3 the speech partner is given the obligation to do something, in fact the speaker has the choice to act or not act. The use of *poko ke kudu* be "whether one likes it or not, it has to be (done)" in utterance 4 requires the speech partner to do what the speaker said. In a study of politeness strategies in translating, Ardi (2018) explained that translators need to change the illocutionary speech in order to show polite translation. In this case, the phrase *poko ke kudu* replace *tak jaluk* phrase is used as a politeness strategy. Therefore, it changes the illocutionary act from a directive command into a directive request.

SOCIAL DISTANCE BETWEEN PARTICIPANTS IN A DIALOG

In *wayang purwa* performances, the social statuses of the characters differ. Poedjasoedarmo (1985) asserted that groups such as court retainers "*panakawan*," household staff "*emban*," and warriors "*prajurit*" have lower social statuses, and the class of gods "*dewa*," kings "*raja*," knights "*kesatria*," and military leaders "*punggawa*," have higher social statuses. In Javanese, such social differences are signaled in the different registers of the language used. The concept of *udanegara* "etiquette" (Nojowirongko 1954) means that the manner of speech a character is expected to use in a puppet show is determined by their social status. Such a position is one of the considerations of the characters in how they convey a message. The implication of this consideration is that the effect of a speech act differs depending on the social position of the other character. In the context of this study, harmony is also influenced by the social distance between the performing characters.

The research data demonstrates that the social status level of characters influences their manner of interaction, particularly in speech, where giving orders predominates. Direct commands are used by a character talking to someone with a lower social status without upsetting harmony in the context of their communication. Such directness does not generate

feelings of disharmony. Dialogue 10A is an example that demonstrates a harmonious atmosphere.

- 10 A:*Mula kowe sawadya bala budhala marang Arga Kelasa momor nyawiji myang wadya Astina....*
". Therefore, you and the troops go to Arga Kelasa and unite with the forces of Astina'
B: *Kawula nok non-ngestoaken dhawuh.*
"Right, I will carry out your order."

In utterances 10A and 10B, the speakers' social status differs. The dialog occurs in a formal situation in the Jong Biraji kingdom. Speaker A has a high status, namely, the king of Jong Biraji, and speaker B is a prime minister "*patih*" in the kingdom; thus, speaker A's position is higher than speaker B's. In the exchange, speaker A gives a direct command to speaker B to go to Arga Kelasa. The command is given with the word *budhala* "go." The form of the direct command does not create disharmony with speaker B because, as the command giver, speaker A has a higher status position, whereas the recipient has a lower status position as a prime minister who always follows the orders of the king.

In utterances 11A and 11B, a command is given by a character who has a lower social status than the partner.

- 11 A: *Ya kakang Semar wruhanana, aku jengkar saka kasatriyan, labet mestuti dhawuh saka kanjeng eyang ing Sapta Arga supaya aku sumusul marang kakang mas Werkudara marang Sumur Jalatundha....en ta aku ora enggal sumusul marang kangmas, kaselak aku ora bisa ngisep marang ngelmu kang kawedharake mau kakang.*
"Kakanda Semar, **you have to know**, I left the knights' residence for honoring our grandfather's orders that resided in Sapta Arga so I followed my older brother Werkudara to Jalatundha well. If I do not catch up soon, I will be too late and not get the knowledge he teaches, Kakanda.
B: *E enggih-enggih gus. Langkung prayogi dipunestoaken dhawuhipun eyang Abiyasa wau nggih gus....rayogi enggal dipunangsu kawruhipun kalawau nggih den.*
"Yes, yes, young master. **You should do** the orders of your grandfather Abiyasa, young master....you should right away start deepening your understanding of the science (which he teaches), young master."

If the instruction speech is conveyed by the speakers who have a higher social status, then the speakers are able to use the direct command form, namely in the word *wruhanana* 'as (you) know'. Conversely, if the instruction is delivered by speakers who have a lower social status than the hearers, then the form of the order used is indirect order form. The use of words "better" or "*prayogi*" should be a form of respect intended to build a harmonious atmosphere.

Direct commands, as aforementioned, can create inconsistency when used by speakers with the same level of relationship, such as utterances A and B below, an extract of a dialog between a warrior and forest giant.

- 12 A: *Aja kok bacutake lakumu kudu bali kudu bali.*
"Do not you continue your journey, (you) have to come back, (you) have to come back"
B: *Kena ngapa kudu nuruti aturmu? Apa sing tak wedeni.*
"Why should I do what you say? What do I have to fear (from you)?"

In above utterances A and B, the participants have an equal social standing. Speaker B is walking through the forest when he meets speaker A; thus, an assumption could be that the situation in the dialog is informal. In this case, speaker A has no relationship with speaker B, that is, they just met; thus, an assumption could be that speaker A and speaker B have equal status. In this context, both speakers do not know the social status of each other. Thus, they consider themselves at the same social status, as shown from the use of the same level of speech. In utterance 12A, speaker A instructs speaker B, as his partner, not to continue his journey, and this instruction is indicated by the words *aja* "do not" and *kudu* "must." The word "do not" is an adverb form in the Javanese language and conveys a prohibition. Additionally, the word "must" is also an adverb form and indicates an obligation and

something that must be attended to. Based on this information, the language used in dialogue 12 utterance A is a directive prohibition giving a direct order to the partner.

The response in utterance B is a refusal of the restrictions and commands asserted in dialogue 12 utterance A. Rejection is expressed through the utterance *kenangapa aku kudu nuruti aturmu* “Why should I do what you say” In utterance B, speaker questions the command addressed to him because no reason is provided as to why he should follow the orders. The command in utterance 12A is considered infelicitous condition, that is, speaker B is not obliged to follow the directive because neither of the two participants has a position to dominate the other, unlike in dialouge 11.

Furthermore, *apa sing takwedeni* “What do I have to fear (from you)” is used in utterance 12B. The utterance emphasizes utterance 12A regarding their order being void of validity. Speaker B scorns the idea that he should be *wedi* “afraid” and must obey speaker A. Utterance 12B can also be identified as a challenge (*sesumbar*), a type of bragging. The utterance *apa sing takwedeni* also implies that speaker B is not afraid of speaker A. In this manner, an atmosphere of disharmony is observed between speakers A and B.

Based on this explanation, we observe that the distance of relationship or position between speech participants can affect the atmosphere of harmony during communication. In this case, this phenomenon is apparent in the directive in the form of direct commands. The direct command spoken by a king against his prime minister “*patih*” in dialogue 10 is not considered as likely to result in disharmony, because the participants have an asymmetric relationship. One speaker has a more respectable position than the other. A king has the felicity condition to give an order to his prime minister; thus, he gives the order. Additionally, a direct command can lead to disharmony if the participants have an equal or symmetrical position.

The findings of speech strategies for establishing harmony are shown in table 1.

TABLE 1. Strategy of using speech act that establish harmony

Illocutionary force	Strategy of politeness	Effect
Assertives (stating)	Adherence to negative politeness strategy	Agreement is realized
	Changing the form of a statement into a question	Harmony is realized
	Using measured speech by obeying the maxim of approbation	Harmony is realized
	Obeying the maxim of agreement	Agreement is realized
Assertives (reporting)	Obeying the maxim of approbation and the maxim of modesty	Harmony is realized
	Using measured speech by obeying the maxim of sympathy	Harmony is realized
Directives	Using in groupness strategy	Agreement is realized
	Using negative politeness strategy (reducing the burden of imposition by using a request utterance)	Disputes can be avoided
	Using the indirect speech	Harmony is realized
Exspressives	Using direct speech to lower-level speakers	Disputes can be avoided
	Obeying the maxim of approbation	Disputes can be avoided

CONCLUSIONS

The direction of a communicative situation does not always adhere to the participants' desires. Differences in opinion and thinking are unavoidable necessities when the purpose of a conversation is to solve a problem. A shadow puppet performance is designed to provide a moral or ethical education. The debate in the dialog of *wayang* performances is presented to convey the message that the resolution of interpersonal disputes is possible through a dialog more concerned with the feelings of the other than oneself. Debates in dialogs with the

potential to be disagreeable can be avoided if an agreement occurs in response to the problem.

The results of this study prove that politeness in speaking is the determining factor for the realization of a harmonious atmosphere in conversation. Based on the pragmatic message conveyed in the conversation, politeness in a *wayang* conversation shows a gradation. Therefore, the choice of speech acts that satisfy pragmatic felicity condition is a strategy for achieving harmony.

Directive speech acts have the potential to threaten the negative face and burden the speech partner by lowering the level of impoliteness and using speech acts that put the speech partner in a lower position. In a debate, one of the characters always begins with an utterance that is able to convince the partner to act without feeling humiliated or threatening their freedom. The harmony strategy was chosen by considering the context of the participants, the formality degree, and the type of speech act. The use of various speech act strategies implies the awareness of diversity in society. Therefore, different strategies of establishing harmony is required to communicate with others.

Efforts to maintain harmony are expressed through speech that satisfies pragmatic felicity condition. Speakers sincerely consider their speech partner as someone who must to be respected and agreed with. The effort to maintain harmony represented in the shadow puppet dialogs has a universally applicable and practical value. Everyone has the opportunity to defuze disputes due to prolonged debate by choosing conversational strategies that create an atmosphere of harmony suitable for the context of the subject of discussion, the state of interpersonal relations between the participants, and the media of communication.

In Javanese culture, the situation of relations between social roles among the participants plays a crucial role in determining the choice of speech acts and politeness strategies. If the speaker has a higher social status, but at the same time still wishes to show respect for the hearer of lower social status, the speaker can directly change the choice of speech acts and politeness strategies. In multicultural politeness studies, the different social roles among participants engaged in the conversations needs to be considered so that social harmony can be realized.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Reseach Fund provided by Hibah Publikasi Internasional Terindeks untuk Tugas Akhir Mahasiswa (PITTA) 2017, Universitas Indonesia.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, B. R. (1969). *Mythology and the Tolerance of the Javanese*. New York: Cornel University.
- Austin, J. (1984). *How to do things with Word (reprinted edition)*. UK: Oxford University Press.
- Aziz, A. A. (2017). Agreement strategies among Malaysian Chinese speakers of English. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*. 168 - 189.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1978). *Politeness. Some Universal in Language Usage. Strategies in Social Interaction*. Cambrigde: Cambrigde University Press.
- Cutting, J. (2015). *Pragmatics*. London : Roudledge.
- Darmoko. (2004). Seni gerak dalam pertunjukan wayang tinjauan estetika. *Jurnal Makara sosial Humaniora Vol. 8(2)*, 83-89.
- Grice, H. (1991). Logic and conversation. In S. Davis (Ed.), *Pragmatics a Reader* (pp. 305-315). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gunarwan, A. (2007). *Pragmatik: Teori Dan Kajian Nusantara*. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Atma Jaya.
- Harbono. (2014). *Studi Kasus Pakeliran Wayang Kulit Purwa Sukron Suwondo Beserta Tindak Tuturnya (Kajian Sosiopragmatik)*. Surakarta: Universitas Sebelas Maret.
- Hawkins, M. (1996). Is rukun dead? Ethnographic interpretations of social change and Javanese culture. *The Australian Journal of Anthropology*. 218-234.

- Kridalaksana, H. (2005). Bahasa dan linguistik. In Kushartanti, U. Yuwono, & M. R. Lauder (Eds.), *Pesona Bahasa: Langkah Awal Memahami Linguistik* (pp. 3-14). Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principle of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Leech, G. (2014). *The Pragmatics of politeness*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Maros, M. & Rosli, L. (2017). Politeness strategies in twitter updates of female English language studies Malaysian undergraduates. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*. Vol. 23(1), 132 - 149.
- Movanita, A. N. (2017, Maret 26). *Kompas.com*. Retrieved from <http://nasional.kompas.com/read/2017/03/26/08465611/2016.konten.berisi.ujaran.kebencian.paling.banyak.diadukan.ke.polisi>
- Nojowirongko, M. (1954). *Serat Tuntunan Padalangan*. Yogyakarta: Tjabang Bagian Bahasa Ngayogyakarta.
- Poedjosoedarmo, S. (1985). *Tingkat Tutur Bahasa Jawa*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.
- Rahyono, F. (2015). *Kearifan Budaya dalam Kata, edisi revisi* (rev ed.). Jakarta: Wedatama Widya Sastra.
- Searle, J. R. (1975). A Taxonomy of illocutionary acts. In K. G. (Ed.), *Language, mind, and knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1991). Indirect speech acts. In S. Davis (Ed.), *Pragmatics: A reader* (pp. 265-277). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode Dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan Secara Linguistik*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Suratno. (2012). *Kajian Sosiopragmatik Tindak Tutur Adegan Limbukan Dalam Seni Pertunjukkan Wayang Purwa Di Surakarta*. Surakarta: Universitas Sebelas Maret.
- Suseno, F. M. (1991). *Etika Jawa*. Jakarta : PT. Gramedia.
- Thomas, J. (1996). *Meaning in Interaction: An introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1992). *Semantic, culture, and cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.