I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

This thesis is a research on the sociocultural knowledge of the Batak Toba People (henceforth BTP) on the use and interpretation rules of *Emmatutu* to communicate its functions in the *Ulos* [a traditional woven cloth of the BTP] Delivery Genre (henceforth UDG) of a Batak Toba Traditional Wedding Ceremony (henceforth BTTWC). *Emmatutu* is an utterance of the Batak Toba Language (henceforth BTL). A BTTWC has a sociocultural function in the life of the BTP. They use it to announce, legalize, and bless the family of a newly married couple (Sihombing, 1989; Hutagalung, 1991). The most dominant verbal behavior of the BTP in the UDG of a BTTWC is saying *Emmatutu*. The participants of the UDG of a BTTWC use it to communicate a certain function which is related to the philosophical life of the BTP to have the harmony, unity, off-spring, prosperity, and dignity (Simanjuntak, 2005: 142-154; Sihombing, 1989; Hutagalung, 1991).

Historically, *Emmatutu* is from *imatutu* containing three morphemes i.e., *i* 'that' + *ma* 'particle' + *tutu* 'right or correct'. The semantic meaning of *imatutu* is that is right or that's correct (Cf. Sitanggang, 2006: 147-171). A word as the result of a word formation is an uninterruptible language unit having an independent meaning, although it is in isolation (Jackson and Amvela, 2000: 50). However, *Emmatutu* does not have an independent meaning and cannot be in isolation. In the context of the daily routine, its lexical meaning is It/that is true as in the following illustration:

<A> : *Na bontar i do na ummuli!*

1

The white is the best.

<B>   : *Imatutu*

It/that is true.

Today the BTP still maintain saying *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC. In the context of this situation, *Emmatutu* has new meanings, which are different from its lexical meaning. These new meaning are directly related to the contextual aspects of the UDG of a BTTWC. In this context, the BTP say *Emmatutu* just after a person has said a maxim before he or she delivers an *Ulos* to another person. A maxim is a piece of the BTP's old saying containing two lines with a socio-cultural blessing such as to have prosperity, or off springs, or dignity, or harmony, or unity (Hutagalung, 1991). An *Ulos* is the symbol of all the socio-cultural blessings of all the maxims said to the person(s) who receive the *Ulos* (Sihombing, 1989). It is the representation of that cultural blessing. This means that the production and interpretation of *Emmatutu* based on only its lexical meaning is not enough in the UDG of a BTTWC. That production and interpretation will mislead the speakers and listeners of the BTP in the ceremony. Consequently it creates a problem in the communicative interaction among the BTP in the UDG of a BTTWC.

A survey on the use of Emmatutu in the UDG of a BTTWC in some location in Pematangsiantar was conducted for the sake of the research proposal of this thesis. The findings of the survey indicated that some of the younger generation of the BTP did not understand *Emmatutu* while they were participating saying it in the UDG of a BTTWC. The majority of their older generation said that the younger generations in general today missuderstood the use of Emmatutu in the UDG of a BTTWC. They said this happened

2

because the younger generation thought that the meaning of Emmatutu was the same in both the conversation of the everyday life situation and in the UDG of a BTTWC. However according to these older generation that the meanings in the two situations are different from each other. They said that the meaning of *Emmatutu* in the everyday life situation is the same with its lexical meaning i.e., It/that is true. But in the UDG of a BTTWC, the meanings are related to the interrelationship of the contextual aspects of the UDG of a BTTWC.

Among the BTP, conducting a BTTWC has a very important value in the future life of a newly married couple (Sihombing, 1989; Hutagalung, 1991). By the BTTWC the BTP traditionally celebrate, announce, and legalize, and bless the marriage of a newly married couple (Sihombing, 1989). This importance is signaled by the activities of the BTP who participate the UDG of a BTTWC. They all enthusiastically participate saying *Emmatutu* from the beginning up to the end of the UDG. It is so central and a phenomena in the whole activities of the BTP in the UDG of the BTTWC. All the participants of the UDG regularly and harmonically pronounce the *Emmatutu* just after a maxim in a person's speech, and before an *Ulos* is delivered to the newly weds, or to the other person(s). They all say the *Emmatutu* systematically, but not incidentally. This means that saying *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC is a very important tradition of the BTP.

The BTP say *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC based on their socio-ultural philosophy as mentioned in their old maxim *Ompunta sijolo jolo tubu martungkot sialagundi, napinungka ni ompunta naparjolo siihutonon ni naparpudi* (Sihombing, 1989; Hutagalung, 1991). The concept is that the young generation of the BTP must maintain the culture of their ancestors. This means that saying *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC

3

is a part of the tradition of the BTP, and a person having a misunderstanding on that meanings in the context of the situation can be argued as a person who does not maintain the tradition of the previous generation. It can be said that any person who practice such a misunderstanding is the one who does not commit her/himself under the culture of the BTP. This means that the people, in the case of saying *Emmatutu* in a traditional wedding with a misunderstanding, are the members of the BTP who are not aware of their culture.

The problem of misunderstanding *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC discussed above is predicted to be more serious by the socio-cultural trends among the BTP. Today the family of the BTP has a trend to be a bilingual family speaking the BTL and the Indonesian Language at home both in the rural and urban areas where they live. A survey about the social trend of the famili of the BTP in several developing rural areas in the vicinity of Pematangsiantar city was already conducted for the sake of the proposal of this research. The finding of the survey indicated that the children of the BTP in that areas speak Indonesian dominantly than the BTL at home. These signals also occurred in *Balige*, the capital city of *Tobasa* district, and the adjacent cities in the district, such as *Laguboti* and *Porsea*. Similarly, it also occurred in the capital city of *Tapanuli Utara, Humbang Hasundutan*, and *Dairi*. Based on the reality, it can be predicted that in several years ahead the generation of the BTP will scarcely speak the BTL and they will consequently not understand *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC.

Philosophically if the BTP continue to experience a misunderstanding on the production and interpretation of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC, and if there is no attention given to the solution of the problem at this early time, sooner or later the next generation of the BTP will totally mislead the cultural knowledge about the production

4

and interpretation rules of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC. A wise academic solution offered to this problem is to conduct a formal research to study the correct cultural knowledge about the production and interpretation rules of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC. Politically the result of such a formal research can provide the BTP today and in the future some accountable and scientific information about the correct production and interpretation of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC. The findings of the research can help the BTP to understand the concept of Emmatutu in the UDG of a BTTWC today and in the future. In addition to that, the findings are also important for non-BTP who wants to produce and interpret Emmatutu in the conduct of the cultural communicative interaction of the BTP in the UDG of a BTTWC.

Theoretically, a study on the production and interpretation of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC is categorized as a topic in the field of pragmatics. According to Plat and Plat (1974) pragmatics is a study of the language use in a context of a situation, and one of the main questions to answer is what meaning is communicated to the listener in a certain context of a situation. It is said that the meaning communicated in a certain situation is different from the lexical meaning of what is said, and one meaning in the situation is also different from the one in the other situation. This means that the lexical meaning of *Emmatutu* in the daily life situation can be theoretically different from the situation in the UDG of a BTTWC and the problem can be analyzed and explained by the theories of pragmatics.

According to Saeed (2004: 17-19), pragmatics is a field of study to investigate the meaning of an utterance in different situations. It is said that the uses of an utterance depend on the wishes of the speaker and the situation that the participants find themselves

5

in. This means that the participants of a certain language use share the same knowledge about the language rule. Since the participants experience this knowledge, the listeners do not have any problem to catch whatever wishes communicated by the speaker(s) to them. They can catch the wishes communicated as fast as it is communicated to them.

In line with Saeed (2004: 17-19), saying *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC also depends on the wishes of its speakers, and the listeners of the utterance put themselves in the situation. This means that the wishes of the speakers of a language in an speech situation constitute the rules of saying a certain utterance in that speech situation. In this case, the BTP have wishes to use *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC. They know that they are governed by the wishes. All the members of the society share that knowledge, because it is the rules of saying *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC.

In the viewpoint of ethnography, a study of the language use is related to the context of a cultural life of an ethnic group. According to Hymes (1974) the use of an utterance in the context of a cultural situation is to transfer the intentions of the speakers to the listener. This philosopher says that the members of a society can understand message communicated to them because they share the same knowledge on the language and communication rules in the context of their cultural life situation.

In line with Hymes, Cook (1989) also says that the members of a society who speak the same language of the same linguistic and communicative rules use a certain utterance to communicate a certain intention which is defined as the function of the utterance to their listeners. He also says that the communication of a certain type of function is made possible because the members of the society share the same knowledge on the contextual aspects of the situation in which the utterance is used. According to this

view, the rules of the use and interpretation of a certain utterance to communicate a certain type of function is based on the condition of the common ground knowledge shared by all the members of a society on contextual aspects of the situation of their communicative interaction.

At the present time, the topic of the functions can be classified into an unexplored research domain in the BTL. The reason for this is that such relevant researches in the field of pragmatics are not yet communicated in journals. This issue can be related to the rare application of the pragmatic theory to the analysis of BTL in formal researches.

There are some relevant studies related to this topic that appear in journals. Frank (2000: 31-62) conducted a research to determine the language and communication problem that existed between the staffs of the Students Health Program (SHP) and their International Student Patients on the Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (SIUC). Gimenez (2001) conducted an ethnographic observation using a naturalistic approach to determine the pattern of cross cultural-business negotiation between non-native speakers of English the export department of a medium-sized import-export company based in UK. The two studies above are related to the research of this thesis. They are studies of the field i.e., pragmatics. A research on the use of *Emmatutu* to communicate its functions in the UDG of a BTTWC is a research on a topic in the field of pragmatics too.

In addition to the two researches above, Yanti's (2001) conducted a research on the speech act about apology in the *Minangkabau* society. The research is to investigate the social and cultural norms to express apology in the *Minagkabau* society. It is also a pragmatic research which is similar to the topic of the research in this thesis. Then, Soetopo (2000) conducted a research on the use of the word *Anu* in *Palembang Malay*

dialect. The research objective is to determine the uses of the forms of the word in the appropriate contexts. This also related to the study of this thesis research. Determining the use of a certain word in the appropriate context is similar to the study of the functions of Emmatutu in the UDG of a BTTWC. Another relevant research that can be mentioned is in the field of anthropology. In this research, Soeprayogi (2004) conducted a research on the wild boar hunting as a traditional game among the *Minangkabau* society. The research objective is of the study is to determine the form and functions of the wild boar hunting in the formation of the cultural identity in the life of the *Minagkabau* society. A study on the anthropology and pragmatics are related to each other. They both study the function of people behavior in the context of the cultural activity of an ethnic group.

All the researches reported above, except the last one i.e. the anthropological research are the types of ethnographic communication studies. The first two are about between native and non-native, and non-native and non-native speakers of English. The objectives of the studies are to determine the language and communication problem and the pattern of cross cultural-business negotiation between non-native speakers of English, but they are not about a homogeneous ethnic group. The second two are about in the daily conversation. They are not about the language use in the context of cultural situation of a certain ethnic group. As the opposite, the research conducted in this thesis deals with the language functions in the actual communicative interaction of a homogeneous ethnic group. Accordingly, the topic of research in this thesis deals with the macro language functions of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC. This topic is a study in the field of pragmatics.

1.2. The Research Focus

The general focus of this research deals with the cultural knowledge of the BTP on the use and interpretation rules of the functions of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC. This focus can be specifically broken down into some subdivisions. The purpose of the division is to conceptualize the variables of the research problems.

The cultural knowledge of the BTP on the use and interpretation rules of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC can be broken down into four logical divisions. The first division is the first specific focus of the research dealing with the knowledge of the BTP on the function of *Emmatutu* made by the BTP in the UDG of a BTTWC. The second division is the specific focus dealing with the rules use by the BTP to use *Emmatutu* to communicate its function in the UDG of a BTTWC. The third division is the rules used by BPT to interpret the functions of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC. The last division is the specific focus dealing with the reasons why the BTP use *Emmatutu* to communicate its functions in the UDG of a BTTWC.

1.3. The Research Problem

In congruent with the focus of the research mentioned above, the problem statements of this research can be formulated as follows:

1. What are the functions of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC?
2. How do the BTP use the *Emmatutu* to communicate its functions in the UDG of a BTTWC?

9

3. How do the BTP interpret the functions of *Emmatutu* communicated in the UDG of a BTTWC?

4. Why do the BTP use *Emmatutu* to communicate its functions in the UDG of a BTTWC?

1.4. The Research Objective

Based on the formulation of the four research problems above, so the research objectives can be stated as follows:

1. To find out the functions of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC

2. To find out the rules used by the BTP to use the *Emmatutu* to communicate its functions in the UDG of a BTTWC

3. To find out the rules used by the BTP to interpret the functions of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC

4. To find out the reasons of the BTP to use *Emmatutu* to communicate its functions in the UDG of a BTTWC

1.5. The Research Scope

The scope of this study is limited to some aspects of the research problems. The study is limited to the subjects who participated the UDG of a BTTWC being observed during the collection of the data in the research location in Pematang siantar city. The research object is limited to the use and interpretation of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC during the data collection. The study is also limited to the analysis of the data

10

that is based on the pragmatic theory to find out the functions of *Emmatutu*, the rules to use and interpretate the functions in the UDG of a BTTWC, and the reasons why the BTTWC use to communicate the function in the situation. The study is also limited to its findings which are limited to its time-bound and location-bound characteristics.

1.6. The Research Significance

The findings of this research may have two general significances i.e., theoretical and practical significances.

The findings of this research may have some theoretical findings. The finding may provide a new contribution to the development of the conceptual knowledge on the production and interpretation of the language use in the society. Beside, they may inform how people conduct a communicative interaction in the context of the society's activities. In addtion to that, they may account the aspects of the situation which are related to a speech act occurs in a cultural situation. More over, they may povide the emperical rules how people use and interpret a speech in a cultural situation.

The findings of the research may also have some practical significances. The finding may be used to improve the quality of conscious knowledge (Cf. Tampubolon, 2001) of the BTP on how to use and interpret *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC. Beside, they may be used to help the BTP how to participate saying *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC. In addition to that, they may help the BTP to differentiate the meaning of *Emmatutu* in a daily conversation from its functions in the UDG of a BTTWC. More over, they may help a person to become a fluent speaker of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC.

11

II. THE REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. The Theoretical Base

The related literature presented in this chapter concerns with the theoretical base of the cultural knowledge of the BTP in saying *Emmatutu* to communicate its function in the context of the UDG of a BTTWC. Accordingly, the review of the related literature deals with the theories in the field of pragmatics. The theoretical bases as the result of the review are expected to be able to serve as the direction to collect the four types of the research data. The first data are about the types of the functions of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC. The second data are about the production rules of *Emmatutu* to communicate the functions in the UDG of a BTTWC. The third data are about the interpretation rules of *Emmatutu* communicated in the UDG of a BTTWC. And the fourth data are about the reasons why the BTP use *Emmatutu* to communicate its functions in the UDG of a BTTWC.

The theoretical bases mentioned above are also used as the directions in analyzing the four types of the data in this research. They are used as the temporary classifications of all those data in the data analysis. This means that the theoretical bases used in this research do not function as the predetermined categories in the data analysis. In this case the researcher classifies the data according to their nature, but not on the tendency of the theories. The data are not analyzed on the force of the theoretical bases. For the sake of this idea, the theoretical bases are only taken as an orientation to relate the research problems to the fact of the research object in the field of the research as a natural setting.

2.1.1. Emmatutu as the Object of Linguistics

Linguistics is a branch of science studying any language of the world (Katz, 1966; Elgin, 1973; and O'Grady and Dobrovolsky, 1996). It studies all the aspects of the language. It studies the structural unit of the language to find out the formation rules of the unit. In addition to that it also studies the language use rules in the life situation. Such a study deals with production and interpretation rules of a certain language unit in relation to the contexts of its socio-cultural situation.

In reference to the objects of linguistics as the branch of science to study a language which is discussed above, it is then true to say that structurally *Emmatutu* is a unit of the BTL. This unit can be the object of the study of linguistics. A study on this unit can be focused on its structural formation. The finding of its study will reveal the knowledge of the BTP on its structural formation as well as its semantic meaning. In addition to that structural study, another focus can be on its use in relation to the socio-cultural life of the BTP. The finding of such a study will reveal the knowledge of the BTP on the rules of using it in relation to the socio-cultural contextual aspects of the life of the BTP. Both the structural formation and the use of a language are the objects of the study of linguistics.

Theoretically, the study of *Emmatutu* in this research is in the field of linguistics. As a unit of the BTL, it can be viewed from two different versions. Structurally, it is seen as a formal unit, which constitutes a set of rules in the formation and interpretation of its entity. That rules is a part of the knowledge of the BTP as the native speakers of the BTL. Socially and culturally, it is seen as a life unit which cannot be separated from it environment. It also constitutes a set of rules in using and

13

interpreting it in the act of communicating a certain piece of social and cultural message in life situation of the BTP. That rules is also a part of the knowledge of the BTP as the native speakers of the BTL.

In this research, *Emmatutu* as a unit of the BTL is studied from the viewpoint of its use in its environment. This study investigates the knowledge of the BTL in the production and interpretation of this language unit in relation to the socio-cultural life of the BTP. Therefore, the finding of the research in this thesis is suppose to reveal the set of rules in using and interpreting it in the act of communicating a certain piece of social and cultural message in the life situation of the BTP.

2.1.2. *Emmatutu* in the Field of Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the branch of linguistics dealing with the study of a language function in a communication (Falk, 1971; Plat and Plat, 1975). This definition indicates the types of the language aspect investigated by the pragmatic study. It characterizes that the object of pragmatics is the function of a language in a communication. It differentiates its object from the interest of the structural linguistics. It clearly shows that it is interested not in the structural form of a language. But it is interested in the function of a language form in a communication. As a branch of linguistics, pragmatics scientifically investigates the language functions in a natural communication of the native speakers of a language.

Pragmatics is also defined as a study of the rules used by the speakers of a language to communicate and interpret the function of their language (Brown and Yule, 1983). This means that pragmatics deals with the rules of the language function used by

14

the speakers of a language in their communication. In this case it studies the rules that the speakers of a language use their language in the action of a communication. How the rules exist among the speakers is part of the interest of pragmatics. Beside that, how the speakers obey the rules to make their language functional is the other part of the interest of pragmatics. In addition to that, how they obey the rules to interpret the language function communicated to them is also the other part of the interest of pragmatics. Pragmatics as the branch of linguistics involves with the study on how a certain set of rules exist among the native speakers of a language, and how the rules govern them to communicate and interpret the function of a language.

In the viewpoint of the ethnographic of speaking, the members of an ethnic group share the same socio-cultural knowledge on rules in the production and interpretation of a certain utterance to communicate a certain language function in a certain context of a situation (Hymes, 1974). This indicates that the ethnographic speaking is the study in the field of pragmatics. The reason for this argumentation is that the ethnographic speaking also concerns with the language function in a communication. It deals with how the members of a certain ethnic group share their socio-cultural knowledge on the rules in communicating and interpreting a certain language function of a certain utterance in their language through the context of their socio-cultural activities. This study indicates that pragmatics a more specific area of the language function. It focuses its object on the language function in the communication of a certain ethnic group. The advantage of this study is that its focus can be only on a specific utterance, which is functional in a specific context of a specific socio-cultural situation. Therefore, pragmatics can also be defined as a branch of linguistics dealing with an investigation on the knowledge of a certain ethnic

15

group on the rules that govern them in the production and interpretation of a certain utterance in a certain context of a socio-cultural situation.

An utterance is the most concrete unit in the different levels of the spoken language, and is considered as a piece of language (Saeed, 2004). This means that an utterance in pragmatics is the piece of language use to communicate a certain function. Further, it is also said that as the most concrete unit of a language, an utterance is created with normal voice, and people can catch a certain type of information communicated in a situation by the difference in pitch level due to the social and regional variation (Saeed, 2004). This means that the phonological characteristics of an utterance constitute a set of rules of the utterance as the most concrete unit of a language used by people in a spoken communication. As an opposite, a sentence is an abstract grammatical language unit and is obtained from the utterances (Saeed, 2004). This means that in pragmatics a sentence is not a linguistic unit of the social or regional context. It is an abstract entity of a language. Such an entity does not communicate a socio-cultural meaning. It only contains a free contextual meaning. This meaning is called as the semantic meaning of language in the field of semantics (Palmer, 1981). In relation to this, *Emmatutu* is a concrete unit of the BTL. It is spoken by the BTP with some certain phonological characteristic to communicate a certain type of functions in the UDG of a BTTWC.

As an utterance, *Emmatutu* is a concrete unit of the BTL used by the BTP with some certain phonological characteristic to communicate a certain type of function in the UDG of a BTTWC. The use and interpretation of this utterance in the UDG of a BTTWC are based on a set of rules. The way people use and interpret their language is the reflection of their mind (Cf. Chomsky, 1965). This means that the way the BTP use and

16

interpret *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC is the reflection of their mind of the BTP in that context. Logically, then the use and interpretation of this utterance in that context are governed by a set of rules. Therefore the research objectives of *Emmatutu* as an utterance in the UDG of a BTTWC can be focused to find out the types of function communicated by the BTP, the rules of the production and interpretation used by the BTP, and the reason why the BTP use *Emmatutu* to communicate a type of its function in the context.

As a contrast to the statement claiming that a language is the reflection to the mind of human, there is another statement considering that the language is human behavior (Cf. Hymes, 1974). This view indicates that a language is not mind, but it is behavior. It means that the language which human produce as the tool of their communicative interaction is a social entity. It also means that a language is interpreted as a set of rules that governs the behavior of human. In addition to that, it also means that the production and interpretation of language are governed by the interrelationship of the contextual aspects of a situation in which the language is uttered. Therefore, an analysis of a language according to this view is not in isolation, but in order to use a language as the tool of a communicative interaction and to understand it as a function communicated by its speakers must be in relation to the contextual aspects of the situation in which the language is used.

Although both Chomsky (1965) and Hymes (1974) similarly claim that a language is a set of rules used as the tool of human communicative interaction, but their ideas are very much different from each other to the references which govern the production and interpretation of the language. Chomsky (1965) refers the rules to the mind of an idealized native speaker that governs a grammatically and semantically correct sentence.

17

This means that any sentence, which is produced by a native speaker, must be intuitively correct word order, which makes sense, because it is semantically correct. So, a sentence such as " The dog chased the cat in the garden yesterday." is grammatically and semantically correct. But although a sentence such as "The cat chased the dog in the garden yesterday" is grammatically correct, but is it is semantically incorrect, because it does not make any sense. Human's intuitive knowledge of their world gives them an experience to be able to say that a sentence like "A cat chases a dog" is nonsense. But it is a dog chases a cat. As the opposite, Hymes (1974) refers the rules to the context of the social life situation of the native speakers that governs the appropriate use of the utterance of a language. This means that any speech, which is produced by a native speaker, is meaningful provided it is appropriate to the contexts of the situation in which it is used. In this domain the analysis of a language is beyond the grammatical and semantic rules. The analysis is on the area of the relationship between any utterance and the contextual aspects of the situation in which the utterance is produced and interpreted. Such a view is categorized as the analysis of the function that investigates the uses of utterances in the contexts of situations.

The function of an utterance is contextual in a situation. It is considered as an act of speech in a specific event at a particular time and place involving more than one person (Kreidler, 1998: 26-28). In the field of pragmatics, *Emmatutu* is called an utterance of the BTL. It is used by the BTP to communicate its function in the UDG of a BTTWC. As an utterance, *Emmatutu* functions as an act of speech of the BTP. The act of the utterance is to communicate the function in a BTTWC. This means that *Emmatutu* is considered as a

sentence having certain meanings, or intentions, and those meanings or intentions communicated by the members of the BTP in the context of the UDG of a BTTWC.

The research conducted in this thesis tends to be symmetric with the concept of pragmatics in the field of the ethnographic of speaking. This research deals with an investigation on the knowledge of the BTP as an ethnic group in using *Emmatutu* as a certain utterance of the BTL to communicate some language functions, and interpreting that language function communicated to them in the context of the UDG of a BTTWC as a socio-cultural situation. In the viewpoint of the ethnographic of speaking, the pragmatic study can assess the data of language function types of a certain utterance of a language. Similarly this study the specifically investigated the types of the language functions of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC. It also investigates the rules that govern the BTP in using *Emmatutu* to communicate each of its language function type in the context of the situation. Beside that it also studies the rules that govern the BTP in interpreting each type of language function of *Emmatutu* communicated to them in the context of the situation. Further, it also investigates the data of the reason why the BTP use Emmatutu to communicate a certain type of language function in the context of the situation.

2.1.3. The Uses of *Emmatutu* in the Pragmatic Theories

The term uses in the pragmatic theory refers to the term language function. It is also known as the macro language function in the study of the language functions in the context of a situation. The study is the object of linguistics in the field of pragmatics. Historically, it develops from the pail of the structural linguist to give enough description and explanation of the life language as the tool of human communication. It began from

19

Chomsky (1957; 1965) who defined that a language is the mirror of the mind. For this, there was a strong tradition in viewing the language analysis saying that any sentence produced by human being contains two structures i.e., the deep structure and the surface structure. Even until to day, it is still believed that the deep structure carries the meaning and the surface structure provides the form of the sentence. This concept differentiates the term competence for what the native speakers intuitively know about the sentence they produce from the term performance for how they can produce the sentence based on their competence.

A response to the concept of the logical sentence, the concept which relates a sentence to the idealized native speaker of a language, and the dichotomy between the language competence and the language performance, the concept of the language use was established since the beginning of the sixties. Jacobson (1960) defined the use of language in a social communication as the function of language. Then, Hymes (1962) notified the most important components of a social communication as the context of the language use. Austin (1962) also proposed the theory of speech act describing that by saying a certain utterance having a lexical meaning [locution], commonly the speakers of the utterance is doing a certain thing [illocution] such as making a statement, question, request, command, etc. which is different from the lexical meaning of the utterance that is said. Further it is explained that a speech act is successful if a felicity condition is fulfilled.

By the end of the sixties, Searle (1969) developed Austin's theory both from the perspective of the speakers and the listener of a communicative interaction. This philosopher added one more component of the speech act i.e., perlocution to the previous

20

two components i.e., locution and illocution. From the viewpoint of the speaker, a locution is an utterance with a lexical meaning and an illocution is the speaker's intention that is different from the locution. From the viewpoint of the listener perlocution is the effect of the illocution on the part of the listener. It is also called as the force of the illocution.

Then Lakoff (1973) formulated the speaking principles based on the politeness. He mentioned three aspects of the politeness i.e., by not imposing on the others; giving option, and making the receiver feel good. After that, Dell Hymes (1974) developed the theory of the ethnographic communication about the possible range of the language function. He mentioned the types of the possible functions. He related each of these functions to the contextual aspects of the situation in which an utterance is said. He also explained that a speaker embarked each of the function from the assumption that the speakers in a communicative interaction shared the same knowledge on the language and communication rules they use. Still in relation to the use of language, one year later, Grice (1975) developed a theory on how the participants of a communicative interaction give their contribution in the interaction i.e., on the assumption that they obey the four maxims of speaking. He called this assumption as the co-operative speaking principles.

At last Cook (1989: 24-26) introduced the term the MLF to mean the speakers' intention in saying a certain utterance in a certain context of a situation. This term deals with the transmission of the speaker's intention by considering the felicity condition such as the assumption on the background knowledge and the principle of speaking in a certain context of situation in where the utterance has been said. Up today, linguists treat MLF as, although with different terms i.e., speech act (Austin, 1962; Seale, 1969), language use

(Hymes, 1962; 1974), in the field of pragmatics. This pragmatic topic with different terms but of the same concept are also discussed in other interests, such as semantics (Saeed, 2004; Cruse, 2000; Kreidler, 1998; Palmer, 1981), discourse analysis (Brown and Yule, 1983), the sociology of language (Plat and Plat, 1975; Hudson, 1980; Chaika, 1982; Romaine, 2000; Mesthrie, et all, 2003), and lexicology (Jackson and Amvella, 2000).

2.1.4. The Language Function Theory

This research has four purposes. The first is to know the functions of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC. The second is to know the rules to use *Emmatutu* to do its functions in the UDG of a BTTWC. The third is to know the rules to interpret *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC. And the fourth is to know the reasons of the BTP to use *Emmatutu* to do its functions in the UDG of a BTTWC. These purposes belong to the domain of pragmatics. Accordingly the following will present some theories of the language function. They are expected to widen the theoretical base, which can be used as a direction of the data collection and taken as a temporary classification of the data analysis.

Dealing with the research problems, the discussion of the language function theory concerns with the most important functions of a language utterance in the context of socio-cultural situation. It refers to the classification of the functions. The members of an ethnic group share the same knowledge that there are seven types of the most important language function of an utterance of their language i.e., the emotive function, the directive function, the phatic function, the poetic function, the referential function, the metalinguistic function, and the contextual function, and they produce and interpret each

22

of the type in relation to seven contextual aspects i.e. addressor, addressee, channel, message form, topic, code, and setting of a speech situation (Cook, 1989:23-26). This theory explains that the participants of a communication put a language function to each other. A person expects his listener(s) to interpret his language function accurately. S/he produces that type with a certain utterance that has a literal meaning. In an actual communicative interaction what is important is not that literal meaning, but it is the language function communicated by the speaker to be interpreted by the speakers. Amazingly the listeners do not have any problem to catch the real language function transmitted to them (Cook, 1989), and further he said that there are seven types of the most important functions of an utterance which are used by the members of a society in in the context of their cultural situation as each of them is defined in the following.

1. The emotive function is to communicate the inner states and emotion of the addresser.

2. The directive function seeks to affect the behavior of the addressee.

3. The phatic function opens the channel or checking that it is working either for social reasons or for practical ones.

4. The poetic function is the message.

5. The referential function carries information.

6. The metalinguistic function is for a clarification, or negotiation of information.

7. The contextual function creates a particular kind of communication, and examples of this type are "Right, let's start the lecture, it's just a game."

23

The members of the society do not have any difficulty to use and interpret this functions because its said that they share the same knowledge on the functions in the communication.

2.1.5. Speech Act Theory

One of the pragmatic theories is speech act. This related to the theory of the function of Emmatutu used by the BTP in the UDG of a BTTWC. Speech act is a theory of language use in which by saying (a) certain utterance(s) with a certain lexical meaning [locution], commonly its speakers is doing another thing [illocution] such as making a statement, or a question, or a request, or a command, etc. which is different from the literal meaning of the word(s) (Austin, 1962). This means that in a communicative interaction, a speaker can use a certain type of language, which is called as an utterance, to transfer an intention such as a statement, or a question, or a request, or a command, etc. In line with this theory, *Ematutu* as an utterance with its lexical meaning can be used by the BTP to communicate a certain type of function as an illocution in the UDG of a BTTWC.

By the end of the sixties, Searle (1969) developed Austin's theory both from the perspective of the speakers and the listener of a communicative interaction. This philosopher added one more component of the speech act theory i.e., perlocution to the previous two components i.e., locution and illocution. From the viewpoint of the speaker, a locution is an utterance with its lexical meaning and an illocution is the speaker's intention that is different from the locution (Searle, 1975). From the viewpoint of the listener, perlocution is the effect of the illocution on the part of the listener. It is also

called as the force of the illocution. A reaction of the listener is a signal of the effect. It can be a locution i.e., an utterance with its lexical meaning that becomes as an illocution i.e., an intention that makes a perlocution in turn. Such a reaction is a verbal action (Searle, 1969). The meaning is that a linguistic stimulus i.e. an utterance elicits a linguistic stimulus. Sometimes, a linguistic stimulus elicits a certain type of physical action i.e., doing something physically. Such a perlocution is called a nonverbal action (Searle, 1969). However an explanation of the possibility of the other type of the perlocution is not discussed in the theory. For instance the theory does not include the effects such emotion, belief, expectation, knowledge, skill, etc.

In line with the last component of the speech act theory, a certain type of the functions of *Emmatutu* can have a perlocution to the BTP in the UDG of a BTTWC. The types of the perlocution of *Emmatutu* can be similar to as what is mentioned in the theory above. It means that it can be a verbal action, or a nonverbal action. In addition to that there can be an occurrence of another type such as emotion, belief, expectation, knowledge, skill, etc.

2.1.6. The Ethnographic Speaking Theory

This theory concerns with the function concept of an utterance in the context of a cultural situation of a certain ethnic group. This theory claims that the members of a speech community share the same knowledge on the rules in the production and interpretation of a certain language function of an utterance of their language in the context of their socio-cultural situation (Hymes, 1974). This theory explains that the members of a certain ethnic group speaking the same language share the same knowledge

25

on their language and communication rules. This means that they obey the same rules to produce and interpret a certain utterance in a certain context of a communication.

The theory claims that a communication in an ethnic must be related to four major components i.e., speech community, speech situation, genre, and speech event (Hymes, 1974). This explains that the same socio-cultural rules shared by the members of an ethnic group to govern them in the production and interpretation of their language include the concept of speech community, speech situation, genre, and speech event. Each of these components is discussed below.

2.1.6.1. Speech Community

According to Hymes (1974: 47) a group of people who speak the same language based on the same language and communicative interaction rules is termed as a speech communty (henceforth SC). This definition means that the BTP who speak the BTL based on the same language and communicative interaction rules is also an SC. This society is one of the ethnic groups of the *Batak* People. The rests are the *Mandaiglingnese* with the Mandailing language, the *Pakpaknese* with the Pakpak languae, the *Simalungunese* with the Pakpak language, and the Karonese with the Karo language. The ancestor land of the BTP people is the northern part of the coast of Lake Toba in North Sumatera Provice in Indonesia.

The ancestor lands of each of the ethnic groups of the Batak people are neighborhood in North Sumatera Island. They are all around lake Simalungun. The BTP mainly lives along the coast of the lake. The people also spread up to the other districts of the North Sumatra province, and the other provinces in Indonesia. For instance some of

26

their population live in Pematangsiantar, the capital city of the Simalungun district. Most of the territory of the city today belongs to the administration of city major of Pematangsiantar. The outer territory belongs to the district of Simalungun. The Mandailingnese mainly live in the district of Tapanuli Selatan, in the southeast of the lake, while the Pakpaknese live in the south and southwest of the lake. The Karonese mainly live in the northwest of the lake, while the Simalungunese mainly live in the north of the lake. Although the BTP is one of ethnic groups of the Batak people, but they are classified to one separate SC differentiated from the other ethnic group because they speak the language and communicative interaction rules which are different from the others.

2.1.6.2. Speech Situation

A certain type of utterance in SC is associated with a certain speech situation (henceforth SS). According to Hymes (1974: 51) within a SC many SSs, such as fights, hunts, meals, lovemaking and the like, which are naturally described as ceremonies, are the situations in which a certain type of an utterance occurs. This means that the members of a society always refer the use of a certain utterance to a certain SC. For instance, they refer the production and interpretation of a certain utterance to a fight, or hunt, or meal, or lovemaking as a ceremony.

In accordance with the concept of SS given above, a BTTWC among the BTP is considered as a ceremony. In the conduct of the activity, the members of the society produce and interpret *Emmatutu* they are using to the situation of the ceremony. The rules they obey in the production and interpretation of *Emmatutu* is to be a type of the common

27

ground knowledge that is shared by the members of the society (Hymes, 1974). This means that the members of the society can understand each other in the way they use and interpret an utterance to communicate a certain function because they share the same knowledge on the rules of their language and communicative interaction in the context of their cultural activities. Symmetrically to this, the members of the BTP understand *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC because they also share the same common ground knowledge on the use and interpretation of *Emmatutu* in relation to the situation of the ceremony.

2.1.6.3. Genre

A speech situation commonly contains several genres. According to Hymes (1974: 61-62) the term genre often coincides with a speech event (henceforth SE). This means that the occurrence of a genre in a SE is like SE. It is like a separate SE. However it is only a formal part of the SE in which it occurs since it is also said by Hymes (1974) that it must be treated as analytically independent of the event. Further it is also said that the same genre can occur in some other different SE. For instance a reception as a genre of a harvesting ceremony can occur in some other different SE such as a wedding ceremony, a death ceremony, a promotion ceremony, a launching product ceremony, etc.

Based on the definition of the word genre given above, it can be identified that a BTTWC has some genres. Commonly it has seven genres all together. Chronologically, the genres proceed from welcoming the host relatives and all the guests to the reception, then it proceeds to the dowry delivery, an after that it continues to the meat distribution [commonly the pig part]. Next it turns to the *Ulos* delivery, then to the symbolic visit of

28

the companion the bride's parents. And at last the ceremony is completed in the symbolic departing genre. The turn of the genres is linear.

There are some formal markers, which can be used to identify the characteristics of the *Ulos* delivery genre. The main marker of this genre is that lots of people stand in turn to deliver an *Ulos* to lots of people who sit in turn in front of the people who are going to deliver an *Ulos*. Commonly all the participants who sit say *Emmatutu* soon after the person who has just said a maxim before he delivers the *Ulos* to the person(s) who is (are) sitting in front of him. The participants of the genre say *Emmatutu* harmonically together.

2.1.6.4. Speech Event

The use of a certain type of speech is commonly related to the cultural activities in a speech situation. According to Hymes (1974:52), "the term speech event is restricted to the activities, or aspects of the activities, that are directly governed by rules or norms for the use of speech". This means that the members of a speech community cannot produce or use a certain speech as they wish. But the use of that speech must conform to the rules of the cultural activities of the society. They must not also interpret the speech as they need or prefer. But they must relate their interpretation to what is being communicated according to the conventional rules created by all the members of the society.

In relation to the term speech event discussed above, *Emmatutu* is a SE that occurs in the UDG of a BTTWC. That speech refers to whatever is done by the members of the society in the context of the UDG of a BTTWC as the SS. Whatever they do in saying *Emmatutu* is said as the activities of the society in the ceremony. This means that

29

according to the rules of the BTL, and the communicative interaction rules in the UDG of

a BTTWC, saying *Emmatutu* as a SE is doing a certain activity.

2.1.6.5. The Component of the Speech Event

The functions of an utterance in a certain situation has relation to the contextual aspects of the situation. According to Hymes (1974) the aspect which commonly influence the use and interpretation of an utterance can be any of these sixteen aspects.

1. **Message Form**

It is the way something is said by the members of a SC.

2. **Message Content**

It is the topic, which is being talked about.

3. **Setting**

It refers to the time and place of a speech act.

4. **Scene**

It refers to the psychological setting. For instance, an act of a speech can be in a happy or sad setting.

5. **Speaker or Sender**

A speaker or sender refers to the person (s) who originate(s) a message.

6. **Addressor[s]**

30

It refers to the person who has a task say an utterance that function to communicate a message.

7. Hearer, or receiver, or audience

The term hearer(s) refer(s) to a person or a group of people who are hearing an utterance, which is said. The term receiver(s) refer(s) to the people who receive the message, which is being communicated. The term audience refers to the people listen and pay attention to a message.

8. Addressee

Addressee(s) refer(s) to the people to whom the message is communicated.

9. Purposes—outcomes

These refer to the purpose of saying an utterance with a certain purpose to be accomplished. The examples of the purpose outcomes are a marriage contract, a trade, a communal work task, an invitation to a feast, and a composing of social peace after a death.

10. Purpose—goals

These refer to the goals of an interaction. The examples of those goals, for instances, are to get a favorable settlement, or to get only a settlement.

11. Key

This term refers to the tone, manner, or spirit in which an act is done.

12. Channels

It refers to the choice of oral, written, telegraphic, semaphore, or other medium of transmission of the speech.

13. Forms of Speech

It refers to the organization of the linguistic means at the scale of languages, dialects, and widely used varieties for use of speech forms.

14. Norms of Interaction

These refer to rules that govern speaking to a normative speaking. They are about the specific behavior, for instance that one must not interrupt, or one may freely do so, or normal voice must not use, or turn turns of speaking are allocated in a certain way, etc.

15. Norms of Interpretation

These refer to the process of interpretation from the assessment of communication. For examples Arabs confront each other more directly, sit closer to each other, look each other, and speak more loudly when conversing, one often looks for friendliness in lessened degree of overt hostility, etc. So the norms of interpretation implicate the belief system of a community.

16. Genre

It refers to the formal characteristics of a situation that can be traditionally identified. A certain type of speech for instance is exploited so for a certain type of affect.

2.1.7. The Use and Interpretation Rules of Emmatutu

The production and interpretation rules of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC are the rules that govern the BTP to say and interpret *Emmatutu* to communicate its functions in the UDG of a BTTWC. Theoretically these rules are how the BTP must say and interpret *Emmatutu* to communicate a certain type its functions in the context of the UDG of a BTTWC. A part of the rules are what govern the BTP to use and interpret *Emmatutu* wihith its lexical meaning to do a certain action i.e., the intention that is different from the lexical meaning of *Emmatutu* to their listener (Cf. Austin, 1962).

Another part of the rules is that the BTP also share the same knowledge (Falk, 1978: 267- 268) on interrelationship of the contextual aspects (Hymes, 1974) of the UDG of a BTTWC as a SS. This means that the rules are that the BTP who participate saying *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC must share the same knowledge (Hymes, 1974; Flalk, 1978: 267-268) on the lexical meaning of Emmatutu, which they use to communicate a certain type of the MLF in the UDG of the BTTWC.

The rest of the rules are the assumption that the BTP obey four speaking principles (Grice, 1975) i.e., the principle of quality, the principle of quantity, the principle of relevance, and the principle of manner. By the presupposition (Cf. Falk, 1978) the BTP theoretically obey the principle of quality i.e., the BTP are assumed to be true as in what they say. They are expected to be brief in their contribution to an interaction by obeying the principle of quantity. Through the principle of relevance, the

33

BTP are required to give a related contribution to what is being talked, or to the previous utterance. The principle of manner deals with the BTP's behavior in their interaction.

2.1.8. The Reason of Using *Ematutu*

Why the BTP use *Emmatutu* to communicate a type of its function in the UDG of a BTTWC refers to the reasons of the BTP to use *Emmatutu* to communicate the type of its function in the UDG of the BTTWC. These reasons are the part of the same cultural knowledge (Hymes, 1974) about the use (Cf. Austin, 1962; Cook, 1989) of *Emmatutu* to communicate a certain type of the language function in the interrelationship of the contextual aspects of a situation (Hymes, 1974) of the UDG of a BTTWC as a SS. The interrelationship of the BTP as the participants (Hymes, 1974), with the knowledge (Falk, 1978) on their social stratification among the BTP (Cf. Sihombing, 1989), together with the purpose—goal, purpose—outcome, the norm of speaking, etc, reasonably effect the BTP use *Emmatutu* in the context of the UDG of a BTTWC. So theoretically the cultural knowledge of the BTP is the reason why they use *Emmatutu* to communicate a certain type of the MLF in the UDG of a BTTWC.

2.1.8.1. The Presupposition Theory

This discussion of this theory here concerns with the reason why the BTP use *Emmatutu* to communicate its function in the UDG of a BTTWC. In relation to the reason this theory claims that the speakers of a language relate the selection of a certain utterance in the communication of a certain meaning to what they know about their world. In speaking the speakers of a language make an assumption, perhaps the unconscious

34

assumption, about the knowledge that is shared with the listeners to affect the use of an utterance, which is called presupposition (Falk, 1978: 267-268). This means that the knowledge of the world that is shared by both the speakers and the listeners of the language control certain phenomena of language use. Unless a speaker is sure that a listener knows about a thing, what the speaker say about the thing does not make any sense.

Concerning with the reason why the BTP use *Emmatutu* to communicate its functions in the UDG of a BTTWC, an aspect of the knowledge that is shared by both the speakers and the listener of *Emmatutu* is the life philosophy of the BTP. The destiny of the BTP in their life is related the cultural values containing some components i.e., having prosperity, children, prestige, peace, and unity (Simanjuntak, 2005: 142-154). This means that the life of every BTP is to reach the proportional components of their cultural values. In accordance with the theory of presupposition discussed above, the knowledge on the world is theoretically said to control the BTP to the use of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC. It means why the BTP use *Emmatutu* to communicate a certain type its function in the UDG of a BTTWC is controlled by their knowledge on the expectation of the proportional component of their cultural values happen in their life.

In addition the knowledge of the cultural value, the BTP also know what people must say in the UDG of a BTTWC according to their social stratification rules. In the conduct of a cultural activity (SS), such as in the UDG of a BTTWC, the BTP must explicitly signal their social status through their verbal and non-verbal behavior in relation to the expectation a component of the cultural value for the person or persons who is receiving an *Ulos* from the speaker of a maxim (Simanjuntak, 2005: 142-154).

35

This means that the knowledge on the social stratification in relation to the expectation of a component of their cultural value among the BTP controls their verbal behavior of the BTP. In this research, the two components of the knowledge of the BTP arc theoretically considered as the reasons why the BTP use *Emmatutu* to communicate a certain type of MLF in the UDG of a BTTWC.

2.1.8.2. Speaking Principle Theory

This theory deals with the rules to participate a communicative interaction. It is claimed that a communicative interaction is based on a set of principles. According to Grice (1975) the speakers of a language produce and interpret their language on the assumption that the a speakers obey four principles, i.e., the principle of quality, the principle of quantity, the principle of relevance, and the principle of manner. By obeying the principle of quality, a speaker is assumed to be true as in what is said. A person is expected to be brief in a contribution to an interaction by obeying the principle of quantity. Through the principle of relevance, a person is required to give a related contribution to what is being talked, or to the previous utterance. The principle of manner deals with the speaker's behavior in the interaction. For example, for the clarity of a contribution a person is expected to speak clearly. According to Cook (1989: 29), using these four principles, combined with the general knowledge of the world, the receiver can reason from the literal meaning of what is said to the pragmatic meaning—and induce what the sender is intending to do with his or her utterance.

2.1.9. The Relevant Research

This section presents some relevant researches to the research problems of this study. The first two of them are about the international pragmatic researches. The second two are the local pragmatic researches. The last one is in the field of anthropology study. It is about an SS in an SC. So it is still relevant.

2.1.9.1. Frank's Research

Frank (2000: 31-62) conducted a research to determine the language and communication problem that existed between the staffs of the Students Health Program (SHP) and their International Student Patients on the Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (SIUC). The research data were collected from 123 questioners completed by international students upon leaving the SHP, 100 questioners completed by the SHP staff members, nominal group process feed back involving 7 SHP staff members, and field notes from on-site observation. Result show that the students and staff agree on several problem communication areas including medical vocabulary and pragmatic problems due to the different procedural and cultural expectations. Additionally, each group mentioned areas not addressed by the other such as prejudice, manner of speaking, appropriate feedback and the effective value of a polite, kind communicative approach.

2.1.9.2. Gimenez's Research

Gimenez (2001) conducted an ethnographic observation using a naturalistic approach to determine the pattern of cross cultural-business negotiation between non-native speakers of English the export department of a medium-sized import-export

company based in UK. The data were collected from negotiators from Argentina, Brazil, Chili, Germany, Iran, Italy and Pakistan by "hand-recorded" to refer to typing the conversation into a word-processor'. The result showed that some of the cultural differences seem to be overridden by the status-bound behavior of the negotiators. It also shoed that the more closely connected to culture, seem to be more salient than the roles of the negotiators and therefore suppress the status-bound behavior.

2.1.9.3. *Yanti*'s Research

Yanti (2001) conducted a research on the speech act about apology in the Minaangkabau society. The research objective is to investigate the social and cultural norms to express apology in the Minagkabau society. The research design used in the study is a descriptive explanatory survey. The subjects are the people with the Minagkabau language background speaking the Indonesian in Padang, the capital city of West Sumatera Province in Indonesia. The object of the study is the social and the cultural norm of saying apology. The researcher used an anonym survey questioner technique to collect the data. It is conducted to eight situations in which the subjects might make mistakes and express apology. The questioners are distributed to people without considering the stratification of their social status. The technique of the data analysis is conducted by classifying the corpus on the direction of the speech act theory used in theoretical base of the study. The findings of the research indicate that the social and cultural norms to express apology in the Minagkabau society are as follows: a. Both positive and negative apology are said directly; b. Apology is not said explicitly, but it is communicated implicitly; c. The apology, which is not to express sorry, is in silence.

2.1.9.4. *Soetopo*'s Research

Soetopo (2000) conducted a research on the use of the word *Anu* in *Palembang Malay* dialect. The research objective is to determine the uses of the forms of the word in the appropriate contexts. The study is conducted based on an observation since 1990. The subjects of the research are the speakers of the *Palembang Malay. The object of the study* is the use of the word *Anu* in context. The data of the research is collected by the observation technique. The data is analyzed based on the discourse analysis (Brown and Yule, 1983) and Pragmatic Principle (Leech, 1983). The findings of the study indicate that the word *Anu* appears in various forms i.e., anu-anu, beanu, beanuan, nganu, nganuke, nganui, dianu, dainuke, dianui, teanu, keanuan, seanuan, senunyo, and seanu-anunyo. The meaning of these forms can be determined only after they are used in sentences.

2.1.9.5. *Soeprayogi*'s Research

Soeprayoyogi (2004) conducted a research on the wild boar hunting as a traditional game among the Minagkabau society. The research objective is of the study is to determine the form and functions of the wild boar hunting in the formation of the cultural identity in the life of the Minagkabau society. To answer the problem, the research design used is an anthropology study with a descriptive qualitative approach. The subject of the study is the people conducting the hunting during the research. The object of the study is the functions of the wild boar hunting among the Minangkabau society. The researcher collected the data by interviewing the subject and observing the related literatures. The technique of the data analysis is by describing the data. The

39

findings of the study indicate that the wild boar hunting among the Minagkabau society is conducted as the functions of manifestation, plant pest extinguishments, sport, recreation, tourism, and social.

2.2. The Conceptual Base

The conceptual base presented in the section of this chapter deals with the variables of the problem statements of this research. Those variables includes *Emmatutu*, the function of *Emmatutu*, the BTTWC, the UDG, the Rules Rules of Using *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC, the Rules of Interpreting *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC, and the Reason of the BTP to Use *Emmatutu* communicate its Functions. The conceptualizations of these variables are made based on the review of the related literature in this chapter. Each of those conceptual bases is presented below.

2.2.1. *Emmatutu*

Emmatutu is an utterance of the BTL. Morphologically, it contains two words i.e., *ima* and *tutu*. Semantically, the lexical meaning of *ima* is *it* or *that*, while the lexical meaning of *tutu* is *right* or *correct*. In the context of the UDG of a BTTWC, the BTP pronounce the word harmonically as an uninterruptible unit of the BTL that does not have an independent meaning and cannot be in isolation. In the context it is said to communicate a certain type of its functions.

2.2.2. The Functions of *Emmatutu*

The functions of *Emmatutu* refers to any of the seven most important function of language i.e., the emotive function, the directive function, the phatic function, the poetic function, the referential function, the metalinguistic function, and the contextual function

40

communicated by the BTP in relation to any of the sixteen contextual aspects of the UDG of a BTTWC i.e., the message form, the message content, the setting, the scene, the speaker or sender, the addressor[s], the hearer, or receiver, or audience, the addressee, the addressee(s), the purposes—outcomes, the purpose—goals, the key, the channels, the forms of speech, the norms of interaction, the norms of interpretation, and the genre. Any of these function is communicated based on its locution i.e., saying *Emmatutu* with its lexical meaning, made by the BTP to affect the behavior of its listeners (perlocution) in the UDG of a BTTWC. It is a socio-cultural meaning or value communicated by the BTP in the UDG of a BTTWC.

2.2.3. The BTTWC

The BTTWC is a SS in the SC of BTP. It is conducted to announce and legalize the marriage a newly weds socially, and culturally bless the marriage to have the off springs, i.e., the sons and the daughters, the prosperity, the dignity or the prestige, the unity, and the harmony.

2.2.4. The UDG of a BTTWC

The UDG of a BTTWC is an independent part of the BTWC in which the BTP say *Emmatutu* to communicate a certain type of its fuction after a speaker of the BTP has just said a maxim and before he delivers an *Ulos* to a person or to more than one persons.

2.2.5. The Rules of Using *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC

The production rules of the function of *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC refer to three principles obeyed by the BTP to say *Emmatutu* in order to communicate any of

the seven types of its functions in the UDG of a BTTWC. The first principle deals with the socio-cultural knowledge of the BTP that the function of *Ematutu* is communicating a type of its functions. They socially and culturally know that saying *Emmatutu* with its lexical meaning is a locution, and based on this locution they know that they communicate a certain type of functions, which is called as the illocution. They know that they communicate an illocution i.e., any of the seven type of functions to the listeners, and they know that they use that locution to affect the listeners' behavior or belief, which is called the perlocution. The second principle is that the BTP share the same knowledge that to say *Emmatutu* to communicate any of the seven types of its functions must be in the UDG of a BTTWC. They know that to communicate a type of its function must be in relation with any of the sixteen contextual aspects of a SC the UDG of a BTTWC as the socio-cultural situation conducted by the BTP. The third principle is that the BTP share the same knowledge on the speaking principles to say *Emmatutu* in order to communicate any type of its functions in the UDG of a BTTWC. First, they know that to obey the relevance principle while a person has just said a maxim and before he delivers an *Ulos* to another person or persons in the UDG of a BTTWC is saying *Emmatutu*. Second, they know that to say *Emmatutu* in that situation is to obey the principle of sincerity. Third, they also know that to say *Emmatutu* in that situation is to obey the principle of quantity i.e., to say a contribution as little as possible. And last they know that to say *Emmatutu* in that situation is to obey the principle of manner i.e., to say *Emmatutu* as a contribution in the situation is the only polite way.

42

of the seven type of the language function is the only way to make the simplest contribution in relation to any of the sixteen of contextual aspects of the UDG of a BTTWC. And fourth, they know that to say *Emmatutu* in order to communicate any of the seven type of the language function is the only relevant way to signal the politeness of the BTP in relation to any of the sixteen contextual aspects of the UDG of a BTTWC.

2.2.7. The Reasons of the BTP to Use *Emmatutu* for its Functions

The reasons why the BTP say *Emmatutu* to communicate a certain type of the language function in the UDG of a BTTWC refer to their knowledge on three principles of the socio-cultural communication in the UDG of a BTTWC. The first principle is that the BTP share the same knowledge on that saying *Emmatutu* is communicating a type of MLF in the UDG of a BTTWC. They know that saying *Emmatutu* with its lexical meaning is only a locution, and based on the locution they know that they communicate a certain type of MLF, which is called as the illocution. They know that they affect their listeners by the illocution they communicate to them. This affect is called the perlocution.

The second principle is that the BTP share the same knowledge on that saying *Emmatutu* to communicate any of the seven types of the language function must be in the context of the UDG of a BTTWC. They know that in order to communicate any of the seven types of the language function, they must say *Emmatutu* in a BTTWC as a SS in a SC conducted by the BTP. They know that in order to communicate any of the seven types of the MLF, they must say *Emmatutu* in the UDG of a BTTWC as a SS in a SC conducted by the BTP. They know that in order to communicate any of the seven types of

44

the MLF, they must relate *Emmatutu* with its functions to any of the sixteen contextual aspects of the UDG of a BTTWC as a SS in a SC conducted by the BTP.

The third principle is that the BTP share the same knowledge on the speaking principles to say *Emmatutu* to communicate any type of its functions. They know that to obey the relevance principle after a person has just said a maxim and before he delivers an *Ulos* to another person or persons in the UDG of a BTTWC is saying *Emmatutu*. They know that to say *Emmatutu* in that situation is to obey the principle of sincerity. They also know that to say *Emmatutu* in that situation is to obey the principle of quantity i.e., to say a contribution as little as possible. And they know that to say *Emmatutu* in that situation is to obey the principle of manner i.e., to say a contribution politely.

45