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Abstract
This paper is about a character language, i.e. a language with character through pragmatic viewpoints. A character language should be directed, the writer argues, to politeness (distant language) and camaraderie (close language), the two varieties of language use in every diglossic speech situation. The writer’s arguments are, among others, that distant language is formal, indirect, and non-literal, and that close language is informal, direct, and literal. Distant language is spoken to hearers with power factor, while close language is spoken to hearers with solidarity factor. Ignorance or incompetence of this may cause impoliteness, i.e. rude situations or awkward situations in interpersonal interactions. This tendency elaborates pragmatic viewpoints (Goffman’s positive and negative face, 1959; Brown and Levinson’s positive and negative politeness strategies, 1987; Renkema’s solidarity and respect politeness, 1993; and Jumanto’s politeness and friendship, 2008; 2011) and types of hearer elaborated by Brown and Gilman (1968) and advocated by Jumanto (2011). Examples in the Indonesian language are given to support the everyday-use-of-Indonesian-language arguments.
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DIGLOSSIC SITUATION AND CHARACTER LANGUAGE

A diglossic situation exists in every speech society. High and low varieties of language usually exist there in the society, as they meet the demands of verbal interactions of the members. A diglossic situation in a speech society is then a situation where people usually speak the two varieties or variants of their language, i.e. high language and low language, or for more ease to say, formal language and informal language. What is a diglossic situation to do with character language? What is it to do with character Indonesian language? Let us talk about the word ‘character’ first. Quotations on ‘character’ here are taken from Hornby (1987) and CALD (2008).

‘Character’ is all those qualities that make a thing, place etc. what it is and different from others (Hornby, 1987). The word ‘character’ also refers to three contents: (1) ability, (2) qualities, (3) validity (CALD, 2008). From the two quoted highlights, we could probably say that a character language is a language with ‘character’, thus a language which is able to function as a means of communication (ability), has qualities with which the language is different from the others, and is effective in a correct formality (validity).

A character language should function as a means of communication, i.e. human communication, interpersonal and social. In an interpersonal communication, a character language should consider the speakers, the values and idiosyncrasies they believe in and hold, and their background knowledge as well. This is an interpersonal context. A character language should also involve the social values and norms, and other social aspects the speakers may elaborate in their verbal interactions. This is a social context. Thus, to be able to function as a means of communication, a character language should consider the interpersonal context and the social context of the speakers involved in verbal interactions. This is the first content: ability.

The second content of a character language is qualities. Qualities in this case may refer to everything special which distinguishes a particular language from the others. Thus, a language with character is then a language distinguishable from the other languages. In this sense, a character language is unique despite some universal aspects of languages in the world. Here, we can say that a character language has an identity.

The third content of a character language is validity. Validity in this case refers to effectivity in the correct formality (CALD, 2008). Formality refers to high or strict attention to rules, forms, and convention (Hornby, 1987). Informality then does the reverse. In this light, a character language should have formal forms and informal forms. Formal forms are high forms (or of high variety) and informal forms are low forms (or of low variety).

From the accounts above, we can finally sum up here that a character language is a language which can function as a means of communication in a diglossic situation, i.e. either in formal situations or in informal situations.

Is Indonesian a character language? What is a character Indonesian language to do with pragmatics? What is pragmatics to do with a character Indonesian language?
How is a character Indonesian language elaborated through pragmatics? These are questions to deal with in this paper.

ASPECTS OF PRAGMATICS IN CHARACTER LANGUAGE
The aspects of pragmatics in character language talked about here, the writer argues, are meaning interaction, form, distant language, close language, politeness, camaraderie, object language, and metalanguage. The writer has selected the aspects, as those aspects exist and are elaborated in every speech society for daily verbal interactions by the native speakers. Each of the aspects is taken into account below.

Pragmatics as interaction of meanings
Pragmatic linguistics or linguistic pragmatics or, for short, pragmatics is not merely talking about locution, illocution, or perlocution. It inevitably is. A speech is an act with the three meanings, i.e. locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary meanings. In pragmatics, this each meaning can be a force, an illocutionary or a pragmatic force. We are speaking and doing something at the same time, or to be more pragmatically specific: we do the act of saying something, implying something, and affecting someone at the same time. In the context that a speaker is talking to a cold wall or even a beautiful statue, or is speaking alone (soliloquy), we miss the perlocution. This is what Austin has elaborated in his grand theory of speech acts *How to Do Things with Words* (1957). Austin’s elaboration of speech acts theory is, in the writer’s opinion, in line with Malinowski’s argument that language is a mode of action (1923).

Pragmatics is of human interactions every day (pragmeme = a human act; Mey, 2001). Pragmatics is about interaction of meanings (Thomas, 1996; Jumanto, 2011). Though the search of meaning has long been done since de Saussure and Peirce in the early 1900, Bühler (1918), Malinowski (1923), and Morris (1933), it has been interrupted by the search of form since Bloomfield (1930), Fries (1940), and Chomsky (1950). The search of meaning was then revived by Austin (1957) with his speech acts theory and then advocated by Searle (1965).

Pragmatics is the study of language use within context. Language use or spoken/written communication is a discourse (Richards, 1985; Mey, 2001; CoBuild, 2003; Jumanto, 2011). Utterances are the concrete forms of language use which we analyze as text. The analysis of pragmatics is then basically a discourse analysis on text within context (cf. Schiffrin, 1994; Mey, 2001; Jumanto, 2011b). Pragmatics is thus the study of meaning on using language in communication between the speaker and the hearer, within context, i.e. linguistic context and context of situation, in a particular speech society (Jumanto, 2011).

Pragmatics regards communication as interaction of meanings, not interaction of forms. However, form or text is important as the vehicle of meaning. Without the form or text, language use or communication or discourse never happens, as there is nothing to be perceived or there is no text (cf. Jumanto, 2011b).

The meaning (explicature or implicature) interacted in pragmatics is later developing or is open to probable elaboration by the speaker into the so-called ideology and then the myth. Here, the vehicles of meaning are not only an
utterance or a speech act (or an idiotext), but also an ideotext (a text bearing an ideology of a particular societal group or a political party) and a sociotext (a text bearing an ideology of a particular society) (cf. Jumanto, 2010; 2011).

How does pragmatics deal with form to find out meaning, as the form is the vehicle of meaning? To come to this answer, let us observe the account below.

**Form in Pragmatics**

Forms of utterance in pragmatics can be observed in three dichotomy types: (1) formal-informal, (2) direct-indirect, and (3) literal-non literal (Jumanto, 2011). As referred to in the beginning of this paper, formality refers to high or strict attention to rules, forms, and convention (Hornby, 1987); and therefore, informality does the reverse. Formal utterances then have more complete, longer forms, and are in a good order. Informal utterances, in the same light, then have incomplete, shorter forms, and are not in a good order, and sometimes cut-down, reversed-up, and changed in favor of the speaker (Jumanto, 2011).

Direct utterances are the utterances whose meanings can be soon interpreted directly from parts of the utterances, i.e. the meanings based on linguistic context (cohesive meanings). This meaning is called explicature in pragmatics. The opposite of this is called implicature. Implicatures are the meanings of indirect utterances, i.e. the meanings based on context of situation (coherent meanings). To come to an implicature of an indirect utterance, a hearer usually thinks a bit longer than he does to an explicature of a direct utterance.

Similar to direct and indirect utterances are literal and non-literal utterances. Literal utterances are the utterances in their usual and obvious sense. The opposite is non-literal or figurative utterances. Non-literal utterances use allegories and metaphors (CALD, 2008). Allegories are stories, paintings, or descriptions of ideas such as anger, patience, purity, and truth by symbols of persons with those characters. Metaphors are imaginative ways to describe something by referring to something else with the similar characteristics or qualities. A metaphoric language is thus the language with no usual or literal meaning but the language which describes something by images or symbols. Direct and literal utterances include banter, while indirect and non-literal utterances involve irony and hedges (cf. Leech, 1983; Jumanto, 2011).

How do forms of utterances affect the meanings in pragmatics? Let us talk about distant language and close language in the next account.

**Distant Language and Close Language**

Distant language and close language here refer to and derive from the notion social distance. Social distance is the physical as well as psychological distance between the speaker and the hearer (Jumanto, 2011). Social distance is not distant nor close. It is a flexible concept of relative relationship between the speakers. Social distance is assumed to be zero when the speaker is talking to themselves.

From this context, pragmatics regards a diglossic situation of a speech society as having two variants of language, i.e. distant language and close language. Distant language refers to formal, indirect, and non-literal
utterances, while close language refers to informal, direct, and literal utterances. As referring to formal, indirect, and non-literal utterances, distant language is usually carefully elaborated and uses safe and common topics. Meanwhile, as referring to informal, direct, and literal utterances, close language usually involves contractions, slangs, reverse-ups, changes, taboos, swearings, f-words, and uses any topics, personal and private (Jumanto, 2011a). The speaker tends to use distant language to the hearers with power factor (superiors); on the other hand, the speaker tends to use close language to the hearers with solidarity factor (close hearers).³

What are distant language and close language to do with politeness? Please watch our manners and read the following account carefully.

Politeness and Camaraderie

Apart from various theories of politeness (Leech, 1983; Brown dan Levinson, 1987; Fraser, 1990; Spencer-Oatey, 1992; Lakoff, 1990; Fraser and Nolen, 1981; Yueguo Gu. 1990; Ide 1989; Blum-Kulka, 1992; Arndt and Janney, 1985a; Watts, 1989a; Thomas, 1996: Hipotesis Pollyanna), Jumanto (2011) is trying to define what politeness is. Jumanto (2011) proposed a theory of politeness among Javanese speakers, advocating the theory of Gunarwan (2001). Many of the politeness theories above are the results of violating Grice’s Cooperative Principles (1967, 1975), though some proposed a new atmosphere. However, none has proposed a working definition of politeness. Jumanto (2011) covered this gap with a definition that politeness is everything good that has been uttered as well as acted by the speaker to the hearer within a particular context, to maintain their interpersonal face as well as their social face (2011: 134).

The notion of face in politeness has come into high attention and importance since it was borrowed by Brown and Levinson (1987) from Goffman (1959, 1967). In Goffman’s grand theory, everyone in interaction has two faces, positive face and negative face. Face refers to the will, intention, and other associations of ideas and values in the self of the speaker. In short, positive face refers to appreciation of the speaker’s self and negative face refers to no depreciation of the speaker’s self. The elaboration of face by Brown and Levinson has resulted in face management for two major politeness strategies, positive politeness strategies (which refer to positive face) and negative politeness strategies (which refer to negative face).

Under the light of this face management theory, Jumanto (2011a) argues that the politeness theories in verbal interactions fall into or lead to two major poles, i.e. one is directed to distancing politeness and the other is directed to closeness politeness. Distancing politeness refers to Goffman’s negative face (1959), Brown and Levinson’s negative politeness strategies (1987), Renkema’s respect politeness (1993), and Jumanto’s politeness (2008; 2011). Closeness politeness, on the other hand, refers to Goffman’s positive face (1959), Brown and Levinson’s positive politeness strategies (1987), Renkema’s solidarity politeness (1993), and Jumanto’s friendship or camaraderie (2008; 2011).

³Types of hearer can be further seen in Brown and Gilman (1968) or Brown and Gilman in Jumanto (2011).
This tendency has been well-strengthened and highlighted by the results of Jumanto’s research on phatic communication among English native speakers (2006).

From the accounts above, with high gratitude to the former theorists and researchers, we can see clearly that distancing politeness and closeness politeness are in line with distant language and close language the writer has just proposed above. Here, so far so good, we can sum up that distant language brings politeness, and close language brings friendship or camaraderie. Distant language and close language to show politeness and camaraderie finally meet the demand of language as a means of communication, i.e. a real-life everyday use of language in all situations or pragmatic use of language in a diglossic situation.

A BIG QUESTION is rising here: HOW IS A CHARACTER LANGUAGE ELABORATED THROUGH PRAGMATIC VIEWPOINTS? Please wait a minute and be patient. We still have to deal with object language and metalanguage first below.

Object Language and Metalanguage

The subtitle above of the two levels of language has long been advocated by de Saussurians and Peircians since early 1900. Indeed, as grand theorists of the states of the linguistic arts, their influences have persisted in linguistic areas to date. The first level of language function is called object language. This level is also noted as denotative level, which is the usual and obvious sense of language, based on some convention, which is objective. In this level, language is seen as an object (object language). The word RAT in this level, for example, refers to an animal, i.e. a four-footed mammal of the rodent family.

The second level of language is called metalanguage. This level is also noted as connotative level, which is the level of additional meaning to give an image or imagination based on some convention, which is subjective. This metalanguage level is metaphorical. A metaphor, as mentioned above, is an imaginative way to describe something by referring to something else with the similar characteristics or qualities. The word RAT in this level, for example, may be used to describe a person who breaks or deserts the duty. In this similar context, for another example, the word HEART as object language is the center of blood circulation in the human body, but the word HEART as metalanguage may refer to somebody the speaker is in love with.

Object language and metalanguage, the writer argues, exist in every living language in this world, the two levels of which serve human language as a means of communication, within interpersonal or social context.

Now we are coming to the discussions of a character language through pragmatic viewpoints below. As the Indonesian language is the text raised and talked about here, we are talking about a character Indonesian language, or as the title suggests, the nature of human language in Indonesian context.

A CHARACTER INDONESIAN LANGUAGE

Rethinking the nature of human language in Indonesian context means discussing the character Indonesian language through pragmatic viewpoints. Here, the character Indonesian language
is basically the language in form of everyday verbal interactions, so that distant language and close language are there in real-life practice in the Indonesian diglossic speech situation. Pragmatic viewpoints are applied in the character Indonesian language in four aspects, i.e. (a) elaboration of meaning and form, (b) distant language and close language, (c) politeness and camaraderie, (d) object language and metalanguage. The four pragmatic aspects are like the building blocks of the character Indonesian language, the discussion of which is carried out through two major accounts below.

**Table 1: Formality-based utterances in Indonesian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal utterances</th>
<th>Informal utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saya mengucapkan terima kasih banyak. 'I thank you very much'</td>
<td>Terima kasih; Makasih; Kamsia; Tks; Thanks; Thx. 'Thank you'; 'Thanks'; 'Thx'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples in shorter utterances can also be found in daily use of Indonesian, as illustrated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal utterances</th>
<th>Informal utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>memberikan 'giving'; 'give them'</td>
<td>berikan; beri; kasihkan; kasih 'givin'; 'giv em'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selamat pagi! 'Good morning'</td>
<td>Met pagi!; Pagi! 'Morning'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semoga Anda segera sembuh. 'May you get better soon'</td>
<td>Cepet sembuh; Cepet baikan; Lekas sehat. 'Get better soon'; 'Better soon'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>membantu 'helping'; 'help them'</td>
<td>mbantu; bantu 'helpin'; 'help em'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lelah sekali 'extremely tired'</td>
<td>capek banget; ka-o; ngos-ngosan 'exhausted'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>berlebihan 'superfluous'</td>
<td>lebay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jujur 'honest'</td>
<td>jhablay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tidak 'No, I do not'</td>
<td>tak; tdk; nggak; gak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meskipun 'although'; 'even though'</td>
<td>mskpn meski; mskpn 'though'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tetapi 'however'; 'nevertheless'</td>
<td>tapi; tp; but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayah 'father'</td>
<td>yah; papa; daddy; bokap 'daddy'; 'dad'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ibu</td>
<td>bu; mama; mammy; nyknap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Directness-based utterances in Indonesian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct utterances</th>
<th>Indirect utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saya tidak setuju dengan Anda. ‘I do not agree with you’</td>
<td>Menurut saya, sebaiknya begi... ‘I think that it is better like this...’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other examples of direct and indirect utterances can also be found in daily use of Indonesian, as illustrated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct utterances</th>
<th>Indirect utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saya sedang sibuk dan tidak bisa diganggu sekarang. ‘I am busy. You should not disturb me now’</td>
<td>Bagaimana jika besok saja? ‘What if we do this tomorrow?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolong hidupkan AC-nya! ‘Please turn on the AC!’</td>
<td>Ruangannya kok panas, ya. ‘It is hot here, isn’t it?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinta mereka tidak serius. ‘Their love is not very serious’</td>
<td>Mereka sedang cinta monyet. ‘They are in puppy love’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panggilkan Pak Kebun! ‘Call the gardener!’</td>
<td>Pak Kebun di mana, ya? ‘Where is the gardener?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya tidak minum kopi. ‘I do not drink coffee’</td>
<td>Bisa minuman yang lain? ‘Do you have something else to drink?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lama. ‘Long time’</td>
<td>Tidak sebentar. ‘Not a short time’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terlambat. ‘Late’</td>
<td>Tidak tepat waktu. ‘Not on time’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodoh. ‘Stupid’</td>
<td>Tidak begitu pintar. ‘Not very smart’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mea, saya harus pergi. ‘Excuse me, I have to go now’</td>
<td>MAAF, saya ada urusan lain. ‘Excuse me, I have something else to do’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudah tua. ‘Already old’</td>
<td>Tidak begitu muda. ‘Not very young’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Meaning-based utterances in Indonesian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literal utterances</th>
<th>Non-literal utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tikus membawa penyakit. ‘Rats carry disease’</td>
<td>Tikus berdasi merugikan negara. ‘Rats in the government corrupt a country’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other examples of literal and non-literal utterances can also be found in daily use of Indonesian, as illustrated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literal utterances</th>
<th>Non-literal utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pelari itu tidak kenal lelah. ‘That runner is never tired’</td>
<td>Pelari itu seperti kuda. ‘That runner is like a horse’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selalu datang terlambat. ‘Always come late’</td>
<td>Pakai jam karet. ‘Have a rubber time’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terlalu banyak berbicara. ‘Talk too much’</td>
<td>Tong kosong berbunyi nyaring. ‘A gasbag’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kencing. ‘Urinate’</td>
<td>Buang air kecil. ‘Pass water’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet/WC</td>
<td>Kamar kecil. ‘Restroom’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mau ke kamar mandi. ‘Go to the bathroom’</td>
<td>Mau ke belakang. ‘Go wash one’s hands’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naik pesawat ke Singapura. ‘Take a plane to Singapore’</td>
<td>Terbang ke Singapura. ‘Fly to Singapore’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menyelesaikan masalah kecil secara berlebihan. ‘Settle a minor problem in a superfluous manner’</td>
<td>Membunuh tikus dengan membakar gudang. ‘Burn the warehouse to kill a rat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemuda itu besar, tegap, kuat, dan gagah. ‘That young man is big, strong, and steady’</td>
<td>Pemuda itu Superman. ‘That young man is Superman’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marah dan melabrak apa saja. ‘Be mad and destroy everything’</td>
<td>Membabi buta. ‘Run amuck’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meaning-based utterances

Meaning-based utterances in Indonesian as discussed in the beginning of this paper may also fall into two categories, i.e. literal utterances and non-literal utterances. Literal utterances are the utterances in their usual and obvious sense. The opposite are non-literal or figurative utterances. Non-literal utterances use allegories and metaphors. Allegories are stories, paintings, or descriptions of ideas such as anger, patience, purity, and truth by symbols of persons with those characters. Metaphors are imaginative ways to describe something by referring to something else with the similar characteristics or qualities. A metaphorical language is thus the language with no usual or literal meaning but the language which describes something by images or symbols. Direct and literal utterances include banter, while indirect and non-literal utterances involve irony and hedges (cf. Leech, 1983; Jumanto, 2011). The two variants can be illustrated in the table below:

2. Types of politeness in Indonesian
Politeness is everything good that has been uttered as well as acted by the speaker to the hearer within a particular context, to maintain their interpersonal face as well as their social face (Jumanto, 2011: 134). Politeness in Indonesian is basically distant language and close language together in context, as proposed by Jumanto (2012). Distant language and close language refer to and derive from the notion social distance, i.e. the physical as well as psychological distance between the speaker and the hearer. Social distance is not distant nor close. It is a flexible concept of relative relationship between the speakers. Social distance is assumed to be zero when the speaker is talking to themselves.

Pragmatics regards a diglossic situation in every speech society as having the two variants of language above. Distant language refers to formal, indirect, and non-literal utterances, while close language refers to informal, direct, and literal utterances. As referring to formal, indirect, and non-literal utterances, distant language is usually carefully elaborated and uses safe and common topics. Meanwhile, as referring to informal, direct, and literal utterances, close language usually involves contractions, slangs, reverse-ups, changes, taboos, swearings, f-words, and uses any topics, personal and private (Jumanto, 2011a). The speaker tends to use distant language to the hearers with power factor (superiors); on the other hand, the speaker tends to use close language to the hearers with solidarity factor (close hearers). Examples of superiors are our bosses, our supervisors, our parents, and others, those who can relatively be close or not close to us. Examples of close hearers are our subordinates, our employees, our younger siblings, our servants, and others, those who can relatively be equal or not equal to us.4

From the accounts above, we can see clearly that distant language and close language are in line with distancing politeness and closeness politeness. Here, we can sum up that distant language brings politeness, and close language brings friendship or camaraderie (cf. Goffman, 1959; Brown and Levinson, 1987; Renkema, 1993; Jumanto, 2008, 2011). Distant language and close language to show politeness and camaraderie finally meet the demand of language as a means of communication, i.e. a real-life everyday use of language in all situations or pragmatic use of language in a diglossic situation.

Back to politeness in Indonesian, we should be aware of the two variants of language above; and therefore, to find out a distant Indonesian language and a close Indonesian language, we should relate types of forms of utterances in Indonesian with politeness and camaraderie. A probable illustration is shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of utterances</th>
<th>Politeness (to superiors)</th>
<th>Camaraderie (to close hearers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>formality-based</td>
<td>formal utterances</td>
<td>informal utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directness-based</td>
<td>indirect utterances</td>
<td>direct utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaning-based</td>
<td>non-literal utterances</td>
<td>literal utterances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the categories illustrated in the table above we can say that a distant Indonesian language (politeness) tends to have formal, indirect, and non-literal utterances, while a close Indonesian language (camaraderie) tends to have informal, direct, and literal utterances, the tendencies of which can be shown in another table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of utterances</th>
<th>Politeness</th>
<th>Camaraderie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distant language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4Adopted and adapted from Brown and Gilman (1968).
Types of language | Types of forms of utterances in Indonesian
---|---
Distant Indonesian language | formal utterances, indirect utterances, non-literal utterances
Close Indonesian language | informal utterances, direct utterances, literal utterances

With reference to the distant Indonesian language and the close Indonesian language illustrated in the table above, we can transfer the previous data of utterances in Indonesian into the three tables below. Here, for more ease to say and to learn, we refer the utterances in the three tables to the so-called distant utterances and close utterances. Distant utterances bring politeness, while close utterances bring camaraderie.

Table 6: Formality-based utterances in Indonesian in relation with Politeness and Camaraderie

| Distant Indonesian language (politeness) with formal utterances | Close Indonesian language (camaraderie) with informal utterances |
---|---|
Saya mengucapkan terima kasih banyak. ‘I thank you very much’ | Terima kasih; Makasih; Kamsia; Tks; Thanks; Thx. ‘Thank you’; ‘Thanks’; ‘Thx’ |
memberikan ‘giving’; ‘give them’ | berikan; beri; kasihkan; kasih ‘givin’; ‘giv’em’ |
Selamat pagi! ‘Good morning!’ | Met pagi!; Pag! ‘Morning!’ |
Semboga Anda segera sembuh. ‘May you get better soon’ | Cepet sembuh; Cepet baikan; Lekas sehat. ‘Get better soon’; ‘Better soon’ |
membantu ‘helping’; ‘help them’ | mbantu; bantu ‘helpin’; ‘help’em’ |
lelah sekali ‘extremely tired’ | cepek bangat; ka-ο; ngos-ngosan ‘exhausted’ |
berlebihan ‘superfluous’ | kebay |
jarang dibelai ‘seldom cared for’ | jlabay |
tidak ‘No, I do not’ | tdk; tdk; nggak; gak ‘No’; ‘I don’t’; ‘don’t’ |
meskipun ‘although’; ‘even though’ | meski; mskpn ‘though’ |
tetapi ‘however’, ‘nevertheless’ | tapi; tp; but ‘but’ |
ayah ‘father’ | yah; papa; daddy; bokap ‘daddy’, ‘dad’ |
ibu ‘mother’ | ibu; mama; mammy; ayokap ‘mommy’, ‘mom’ |
Bapak Budi ‘Mister Budi’ | Pak Budi; P Budi ‘Mr. Budi’ |
Ibu Rini ‘Mistress Rini’ | Bu Rini; B Rini ‘Ms. Rini’ |
Saya ‘I would …’ | Aku; Gue; At; Ike ‘I will …’ |
Anda ‘You would …’ | Kamu; Lu; Situ; You ‘You will …’ |
Saudara ‘You would …’ | Sdr ‘You will …’ |
dan sebagainya dsb ‘et cetera’ ‘etc.’ |

Table 7: Directness-based utterances in Indonesian in relation with Politeness and Camaraderie

| Close Indonesian language (camaraderie) with direct utterances | Distant Indonesian language (politeness) with indirect utterances |
---|---|
Saya tidak setuju dengan Anda. ‘I do not agree with you’ | Menurut saya, sebaiknya begini … . ‘I think that it is better like this …’ |
Saya sedang sibuk dan tidak bisa diganggu sekarang. ‘I am busy. You should not disturb me now’ | Bagaimana jika besok saja? ‘What if we do this tomorrow?’ |
‘I am busy. You should not disturb me now’ | ‘I am busy. You should not disturb me now’ |
Tolong hidupkan AC-nya! ‘Please turn on the AC!’ | Ruangannya kok panas, ya. ‘It is hot here, isn’t it?’ |
Cinta mereka tidak serius. ‘Their love is not very serious’ | Mereka sedang cinta monyet. ‘They are in puppy love’ |
Panggilkan Pak Kebun! ‘Call the gardener!’ | Pak Kebun di mana, ya? ‘Where is the gardener?’ |
‘I do not drink coffee’ | Bisa minuman yang lain? ‘Do you have something else to drink?’ |
Lama. ‘Long time’ | Tikad sebentar. ‘Not a short time’ |
‘Late’ ‘Not on time’ | Tikad tepat waktu. ‘Not on time’ |
Tidak tepat waktu. ‘Not on time’ | Tikad tepat waktu. ‘Not on time’ |
Bodoh. ‘Stupid’ | Tikad begitu pintar. ‘Not very smart’ |
‘Already old’ | Tikad begitu muda. ‘Not very young’ |

Table 8: Meaning-based utterances in Indonesian in relation with Politeness and Camaraderie

| Close Indonesian language (camaraderie) with literal utterances | Distant Indonesian language (politeness) with non-literal utterances |
---|---|
Saya tidak minum kopi. ‘Their love is not very serious’ | Tikad sebentar. ‘Not a short time’ |
‘I do not drink coffee’ | ‘I do not drink coffee’ |
Lama. ‘Long time’ | Tikad sebentar. ‘Not a short time’ |
‘Late’ ‘Not on time’ | Tikad tepat waktu. ‘Not on time’ |
Tidak tepat waktu. ‘Not on time’ | Tikad tepat waktu. ‘Not on time’ |
Bodoh. ‘Stupid’ | Tikad begitu pintar. ‘Not very smart’ |
Maaf, saya harus pergi. ‘I do not drink coffee’ | Maaf, saya ada urusan lain. ‘Excuse me, I have something else to do’ |
‘I do not drink coffee’ | ‘I do not drink coffee’ |
Maaf, saya ada urusan lain. ‘Excuse me, I have something else to do’ | Tikad begitu pintar. ‘Not very smart’ |
Sudah tua. ‘Already old’ | Tikad begitu muda. ‘Not very young’ |
3. Impoliteness in Indonesian

Politeness in using Indonesian happens when we use distant language and close language eligibly, i.e. when we use distant language and close language to superiors and close hearers respectively (Jumanto, 2012). Here, as we speak character Indonesian language, we are character Indonesian speakers. Character speakers can adjust their utterances to a particular situation that may call. They can perform the so-called code-switching, whether to use a distant Indonesian language or to use a close Indonesian language.

Impoliteness in using Indonesian happens when we do not learn the distant language and close language. When we use close language to superiors, probably due to our lack of knowledge about distant language, we are being not polite or we are being rude, or impoliteness happens. On the other instance, when we use distant language to close hearers, probably intentionally due to some interpersonal friction, we are being also not polite or impoliteness (or irony) happens. In this case, we are trying to be distant to close hearers. Awkwardness is in the air and there is usually less harmony between us.

Illustrations in using Indonesian on rude situations and awkward situations are given below:

[Rude situations (impoliteness): using close Indonesian language to superiors]

1. ‘Cepet baikan, ya Pak Bud!’ (?)  
   ‘Better soon, OK, Mr. Bud!’(?)
   [It should be: ‘Semoga segera sembuh, Bapak Budi.’]
   ‘May you get better soon, Mister Budi.’

2. ‘Saya tidak setuju dengan Anda.’ (?)  
   ‘I do not agree with you.’ (?)
   [It should be: ‘Menurut saya, sebaiknya begini … .’]
   ‘I think that it is better like this …’

3. ‘Maaf, Pak. Saya mau ke WC dulu.’ (?)  
   ‘Excuse me, Sir. I want to go to the toilet first.’ (?)
   [It should be: ‘Maaf, Bapak. Saya ijin ke kamar kecil dulu.’]
   ‘Excuse me, Sir. May I go to the restroom, please?’

[Rude situations (impoliteness): using distant Indonesian language to close hearers]

5 A query (?) is used here to show a rude or an awkward situation that may happen.
1. ‘Saya mengucapkan terima kasih banyak atas bantuan Anda, ya Susanto!’ (?
‘I thank you very much for your help, OK, Susanto!’ (?
[It should be: ‘Makasih banget bantuanmu, ya Sus!’]
‘Thanks so much for your help, OK, Sus!’

2. ‘Ruangannya kok panas, ya.’ (?)
‘It is hot here, isn’t it.’ (?)
[It should be: ‘Tolong hidupkan AC-nya!’]
‘Please turn on the AC!’

3. ‘Wah, Anda pakai jam karet terus, nih!’ (?)
‘Well, you always have rubber time, don’t you!’ (?)
[It should be: ‘Ngapain kamu kok datang terlambat terus?’]
‘Why the hell d’you always come late?’

In the case that confusion happens due to the factors of power and solidarity in the hearer, i.e. whether a superior is close or a close hearer has power, for example, the so-called code-mixing happens. However, as the terminology suggests, the code-mixing in language use belongs to informality, thus using a close language (camaraderie)6. Cases like these usually happen between close speakers, i.e. a superior to a close subordinate or a subordinate to a close superior. Illustrations on these are given below:

1. ‘Aku mengucapkan terima kasih banyak atas bantuanmu, ya Sus!’
‘I thank you very much for your help, OK, Sus!’

[a probable situation between a superior to a close subordinate]

2. ‘Saya tidak setuju dengan rencana kamu, lho.’
‘I do not agree on your plan, you see.’
[a probable situation between a subordinate to a close superior]

3. ‘Wah, kamu ini pakai jam karet terus, sih!’
‘Well, you always have rubber time, you know!’
[a probable situation between a superior to a close subordinate]

However, as the code-mixing happens only between close speakers, awkwardness does not usually happen and politeness between them is maintained. Camaraderie instills. Language use is a matter of probabilities.

CLOSING

From all the discussions above, conclusions on this paper Towards a character language: rethinking the nature of human language in Indonesian context can be drawn as follows:

(1) A character language is basically the nature of human language as a means of verbal communication, i.e. the language elaborated through pragmatic viewpoints, the language use which is directed to politeness. There are four pragmatic aspects to be applied in a character language, i.e. (a) elaboration of meaning and form, (b) distant language and close language, (c) politeness and camaraderie, (d) object language and metalanguage;

(2) The character Indonesian language is seen through two major aspects, i.e. the types of utterances in Indonesian and politeness in Indonesian;

(3) The character Indonesian language distinguishes three types of utterances, i.e.

---

6 Analogy of this is just like wearing a T-shirt and a tie. Using a language is, indeed, like wearing clothes (cf. Jumanto, 2011).
formality-based, directness-based, and meaning-based utterances; and, therefore, the Indonesian utterances fall into three dichotomies: formal and informal utterances, direct and indirect utterances, and literal and non-literal utterances;

(4) Politeness in Indonesian language use is distinguished in two variants, i.e. distant Indonesian language and close Indonesian language. The distant Indonesian language has formal, indirect, and non-literal utterances, while the close Indonesian language has informal, direct, and literal utterances. The distant Indonesian language is used to bring politeness to superiors, and the close Indonesian language is used to bring camaraderie to close hearers;

(5) Impoliteness in Indonesian language use happens when we do not use the distant language and the close language eligibly, i.e. to superiors and to close hearers respectively. Rude situations (impoliteness) may happen when we use the close Indonesian language to superiors, and awkward situations (impoliteness) may also happen when we use the distant Indonesian language to close hearers. In either one case, an interpersonal friction between speakers is potentially there;

(6) The character Indonesian speakers can adjust their utterances to a particular situation that may call because they can perform code-switching, whether to use the distant Indonesian language or to use the close Indonesian language;

(7) In the case that code-mixing happens between close Indonesian speakers, as confusion happens due to the factors of power and solidarity in the hearer, impoliteness (awkwardness) does not usually happen, and therefore, camaraderie instills. ***
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