Javanese Royal Kingdom Addressing System in *Kethoprak*

Icha Latifa Hanum

Linguistics Master Program,
Universitas Gadjah Mada

icha.latifa.hanum@mail.ugm.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Javanese language in the context of the royal kingdom has a complex system. This hierarchy-based speech slowly disappears as this system is declined nowadays in order to national and international politics (Blust, 2013). However, the pure form of Javanese language system, especially in the term of kingship, remains and is reflected in folk art as the society's response to its existence. Kings, as Weber (1978:294) argues, have to rely on the basis of legitimacy believed by their subordinates or followers as a way that explains their kingships in order to legitimize their rule as kings or leaders over their realms. Thus, this paper tries to briefly reveal the language and power relations in Javanese kingship by examining the system of addressing terms in kethoprak. Through critical sociolinguistics study of kethoprak discourse, the complex Javanese language system that is influenced by the royal kingdom and its structure are revealed. Overall, the use of addressing terms in the royal kingdom context was found to be dynamic, break and complement the related previous studies.

Keywords: power; addressing term; Javanese Royal Kingdom

INTRODUCTION

Javanese royal kingdom, especially in Surakarta, embodies the heritage of hegemony power. Under this royal culture and social system, the Javanese language has speech levels. As Blust (2013:125) describes, in Javanese culture among the *priyayi*, the cultural elite or courtly noble class, a traditional system governing acceptable patterns of personal interaction has gone beyond mere courtesy to acquire the status of an esthetic ideal. This system, later on, spread into adjacent language communities that came under Javanese domination at various times in Javanese history(Clynes, 1994; Nothofer, 2000). A progressive breakdown of this system of status sensitivity in the Javanese lexicon is could not be prevented as Indonesian independence was achieved (Errington, 1988). This hierarchy-based speech slowly disappears as Blust (2013) stated that this system is declined nowadays in order to national and international politics.

Nevertheless, the researcher argues that the pure form of the Javanese languagesystem, especially in the term of kingship, remains and is reflected in folk art as the society's response to its existence. This reflection appears in the discourse of traditionaltheater, *kethoprak*. As a local cultural heritage of Central Java (Surakarta), *kethoprak*

has the spirit of Javanese tradition, as well as being alive and building the culturalidentity of Surakarta (Dipoyono, 2018).

This cultural identity including social power implies in the *kethoprak* conversation can indicate a relationship between language and power in the term of Javanese kingship. As Weber (1978:294) argues, in order to legitimize their rule as kings or leaders over their realms, those kings have to rely on the basis of legitimacy believed by their subordinates or followers as a way that explains the of their kingships. Thus, this paper tries to briefly reveal the language and power relations in Javanese kingship by examining the system of addressing terms in *kethoprak*.

Focusing on critical sociolinguistics study, this research leads to several research questions (1) what is the addressing terms in the Kethoprak Balekambang's traditional theatrical, (2) how are the

functions of the addressing terms, and (3) why are addressing terms used in the Kethoprak Balekambang's traditional theatrical? In this paper, the researcher chooses the Kethoprak Balekambang as the *kethoprak* group thatsupports this research as it is one of the famous traditional theatrical art groups in the Surakarta area, precisely in the Balekambang area. According to the Ministry of Education and Culture (2015), this group was established by the aristocrats in the Surakarta Kasunanan Palace. The *kethoprak* group was created for the purpose that it could be used as a youth gathering media because at that time the Dutch colonial government's control was very strict on the activities of Indonesian youth associations. As in the beginning, it is initiated by the Surakarta royal party, Kasunanan Palace, researcher measured it has the authenticity of the addressing terms in Javanese kingshiprather than the other groups in Surakarta that might develop some improvisations.

As the lexicons of the complex Javanese language system, address has so many aspects to be discussed. Address term could be the indicator of social status. According to Holmes (2013:142), Javanese social status is indicated not just in the choice of linguistic forms but also in the particular combinations of forms which each social group customarily uses. According to Arimi (2008) there are three groups in the Javanese social strata, namely king, *priyayi* and *kawula*. The descendants of the king's siblings also inherit the status of this *priyayi* nobility regardless position, achievement, or gender. The kingdom secures this status as a status that can only be inherited becauseof descent or marriage so that initially *priyayi* was pure as an inherited status (ascribed status) is not a status obtained through certain efforts (achieved status). Addressing system in the context of royal kingdom conversations can reveal the existence of this social strata.

From this point, it is reasonable to assume that address is one of many languageelements which are very important in social interaction (Soepardo, 2018). Javanese usesaddress form based on the level of their society, kinship, and closeness relationships between speaker and hearer (Krisnanda, 2014). Polite and impoliteness in Javanese isa complex linguistic matter that leads to power entity. Some factors such as age, sex, kinship term, and social status determine politeness and impoliteness. Particular relevant context also affects the word they use. Address lexicon used according to the similarities and differences of the addresser and addressee's social status.

The difference of social status creates asymmetrical power that Mesthrie (2009:201) considers occurs when the one speaker, or group of speakers, is in a more powerfulposition than others. Brown and Gilman (1972: 105) further explain power as a relationship between at least two persons in the sense that both cannot have power in the same area of behavior has the form of semantic that is similarly non-reciprocal, thesuperior says T and receive V. This superiority mainly based on social status.

Through addressing term, it is obvious that the addresser will prefer particular form due to the addressee's social status. *Priyayi* as a form of Javanese kingship and highersocial classis actually a relic of the feudal system in Java that reflects a particularway of thinking which appears in the language of the class (Soepardo, 2018). The use of *ngoko* to group with lower status (*kawula*) shows power entity, while the *krama* usedamong noble class is precisely shows politeness and occasionally noble class uses *ngoko* on their fellows to express solidarity (Arimi, 2008).

In the context of the Javanese royal kingdom, this paper continues to discuss theaddressing system from *kethoprak* as it is a reflection of Javanese kingship and its society. Discussions about addressing system that has been done are mainly connectedto solidarity among the addresser and addressee in the term of family relations or kinships (Soepardo 2018, Krisnanda 2014). Soepardo (2018) in his study concludes thatthe address terms applied in *priyayi* class reflect the system of education and the position or status of the members. From the study, it is known that Javanese *priyayi* family members never address each other in *njangkar*, but they use a certain address term. This study is only focusing on education and position status, not covering the kingship in the monarchy context. Krisnanda (2014) in her study concludes thatnowadays the use of Javanese system has been shifted that kinship terms have been used not only for the member of the family.

Addressing terms have so many cases that Susanto (2014) surprisingly finds that *sampeyan* is also used for kyai to express politeness, contrasts to the Javanese normin which to speak to kyai, common people usually use *penjenengan*. It is obvious that this study emphasizes language use and its development only in the ordinary society context. Relevant to Rendle (2009) that discussed about 'mate' addressing term in ordinary interactions, it is necessary to understand the sequential

environment to understand the reason of flexible term is sometimes positively interpreted as a friendlyterm and other times negatively interpreted as non-friendly or even with hostility. It indicates that from the study of addressing terms, we can conclude a language's patternas Liu, Zhang, and Zhang (2010) argue that the study of language reveals special termsto indicate some particular matters in its own culture and describes the various kinds ofcustoms and social commitment. They claimed that study on addressing terms makes them find out the cultural features. Further, they can find that one nation's morality, values, aesthetic conceptions, and other cultural elements are reflected and expressed by language.

METHOD

The data of this research is transcribed from the video of Kethoprak Balekambang. The data source is a video of Kethoprak Balekambang performance thatis uploaded to their official YouTube channel, Balkam TV (https://youtu.be/WH5eoJlHJz4). The video contains "Suminten Edan" theatrical performance. This episode is considered to be the data source because it has dialoguesbetween various social classes in term of Javanese kingship.

The analysis would lead to the formulations of the address of classification andaddress pattern. All data which are collected are arranged into inventory. The second step in the analysis is determining the address terms. The researcher also analyzes the nonlinguistic factors that lead conversers to select one speech to identify the power relations. In order to indicate the power relations, the researcher agreed with Holmes (2013:11) to use these components: the participants (who is speaking and who they arespeaking to), the setting or social context of the interaction (where they are speaking), the topic (what is being talked about) and the function (why they are speaking).

1.   **Addressing Term in *Kethoprak*: Function and ReasonKing's Addressing Term**

King as someone who has the highest power in the context of the royal kingdomuses difference addressing term according to who he speaking to. As mentioned before,they legitimize their rule as kings rely on the basis of legitimacy believed by their subordinates. It is normal that king has T-V power relation to his subordinate like viceregent. The following table shows addressing term that used by king in the context of royal meeting.

Table 1. Addressing Term by King

Addresser	Addressee	Term	Power
king	vice regent	*patih kakang Yudha*	T-V
		Projo	V-V
		Yudha Pati	T-V
			T-V
king	wife	*ndara,bu*	V-T
		Prameswari	V-V
			T-V
king	prince	*raden mas*	V-T
		le	V-V
king	village headman	*kakang kakang'e*	V-V
		Guna Seca	V-V
			T-V
king	king's relatives	*le*	V-V

Nevertheless, in the setting of royal meetings that attended by royal families andgovernment officials, king appears to shift his power into V-T towards his very closest relatives, which is his wife and his son (prince). The term *ndara* refers to his wife and *raden mas* to his son legitimize the closest royal family social status in front of the whole participants. In order to legitimize their social status, king maintain to shift his power into V-T. Other than that, king refer his wife with *bu* and his son with *le* when they talk about family matters. This particular finding can complement or debate Weber's argument that

the king not only have to save his own rule as the superordinate,but also his very closest relatives in front of the subordinates by sacrifice his power.

The king shows asymmetrical power with his wife and the vice regent by referring them without any addressing form. This way of addressing is called *njangkar*which means the use of a name without any form of honorific (Koentjoroningrat, 1977:90). The king use *njangkar* form when he asks his subordinates to do certain acts,report their job or deliver their opinion towards political problem.

King: *Yudho Praja, bubarno kang padha gathuk seba*! (Yudho Praja, disperse these participants!)

The king also uses the term *kakang* that means honorific brother towards the vice regent and the village headman, making his power shifted into V-V even though they are subordinates. However, the king still uses the *patih* term, that means vice regent, mention their title to legitimize his own power as a king. This term only used when he asks the vice regent about the condition of the kingdom. The *le* term that shortened from *thole* (son) also appears when the king refers his relatives as they havethe royal descendant and considered as close family.

2. Addressing Term towards King

Addresser uses particular form not only based on the addressee status, but alsoconsidering to the addresser's very own social status. Towards king as the highest socialstatus, most addresser uses *kanjeng* that means the majesty. The prince referring the king that also his biological father as *rama* that means father, not because his father is a king, in line with Brown and Gilman (1960:109) that argues the relationship between parents and children is asymmetrical because the one side (the parents) is more powerfulthan the other.

Table 2. King's Addressing Term

Addresser	Addressee	Term	Power
vice regent	king	*kanjeng*	V-T
wife	king	*kanjeng*	V-T
prince	king	*rama kanjeng*	V-T
		rama	V-T
village headman	king	*kanjeng'e*	V-T
king's relatives	king	*kanjeng*	V-T

From table 2 it is obvious that the addressing terms the addressers use towards king are rigid because the king has ultimate highest power. Even so, there is a vernacularform that the village headman uses as he performs as a villager. Village headman adds the *e* phoneme (*kanjeng'e*) that performs a possession function. The term indicates thatvillager including the headman have their own language characteristic that distinguish them from the citizen. Though, this vernacular form is also used by the king—that certainly considered as person from the city—(see Table 1) to refer village headman. The king here legitimizes their closeness.

King: Hahahaha. *Ngaten, Kakang'e*. (Hahahaha. Here is the matter, Kakang'e.)

Village headman: *Pripun*? (What is the matter?)

As Holmes (2013:144) described, vernacular dialects are overt prestige even though they are valued by their users, which in this case king and the village headman.The king, who face the problem of robbery which is troubling the residents, advised bythe vice regent to appoint the village headman as the one who could solve the problem.He even feels his throne is threatened if this problem is not solved. Therefore, the kingdoes not hesitate to lower his prestige by using vernacular language. This addressing form means of expressing solidarity and affective meaning. However, the village headman can only refer the king with the term that perform common manner, which is*kanjeng* (majesty). The village headman still uses *kanjeng* term even the he has such aprivilege as the king

consider him close because he needs to fulfil the common mannertowards king. From this point, it can be proven that the manners of addressing the kingare rigid as everyone use the term *kanjeng*.

3. Addressing Terms among *Priyayi*

Priyayi to *priyayi* indeed to be in the same social status. This social status does not make the intertwined power relations among them parallel. Amongst *priyayi* in theroyal kingdom¸ addressing terms considered to be variative based on their position andoccupation. Table 3 shows the variety of the addressing terms among *priyayi*.

Table 3. Addressing Terms among Priyayi

Addresser	Addressee	Term	Power
queen	prince	*ngger*	T-V
		Subroto	T-V
prince	queen	*ibu*	V-T
prince	village headman	Woguna Seca	T-V
prince	village headman's daughter	SumintenTen	T-V
			T-V
village headman	prince	*den mas*	V-T
		den mas'e	V-T
village headman's daughter	prince	*mas* Broto	V-T
vice regent	lower vice regent	Yudha Pati	T-V
vice regent	village headman	*lurah*	T-V
		Guna Seca	T-V
village headman	village headman's wife	*mbokmu*	T-V
village headman	village headman'sSumintenTen daughter		T-V
			T-V
village headman's wife	village headman	*pak'e*	V-T
village headman'sdaughter	village headman	*pak'e*	V-T

As mother and son, queen refers the prince with *ngger*. The term *ngger* means sweetheart, shows that address term is not merely a medium of interaction but also expressing affection (Soepardo, 2018). The queen also uses the prince's name which considered as *njangkar*. This is different with the king that refer his son with *raden mas*(see Table 1). As a father, king refer to register certain states of intimacy by using titlesto his son. This indicates that the king praises his son's title than his personal name. Theprince himself refer the queen with *ibu* that means mother, shows affection but with respectful term in order to his power as subordinate.

Referring to the village headman, the prince use *njangkar* even though the prince is younger than the village headman. He also uses *njangkar* to the village headman's daughter. In another hand, the village headman use *den mas* and *den mas'e* as the vernacular dialect variation that mentioned before. Same as the queen, the villageheadman's daughter does not involve the prince's majesty title (*raden, den*), she only uses *mas* as she is younger or has the lower status. Vice regent only uses *njangkar* and title to refer the lower vice regent and village headman. These terms legitimize the vice regent's power and the addressees title as he needs them to do some political actions.

Apart from political context, kinship terms that shows relationship between parents and child are found between the village headman, his wife and daughter. The village headman uses *mbokmu* that originally came from *mbok* that means mother. The affix - *mu* shows second-person possession referring to his daughter. *Njangkar* form also used by the village headman to his daughter. This finding breaks Soepardo (2018) conclusion in his study that the Javanese *priyayi* family members never

address each other in *njangkar*. However, this can only be done by the father as in Javanese culture, values tend to be based on patriarchy. This means *njangkar* cannot be done by the wife and daughter because it violates the manners. They refer the village headman with *pak'e* instead. This term is once again is a vernacular dialect variation that indicates them as villagers.

4. Addressing Terms among *Kawula*

As the common people in the context of royal kingdom, *kawula* has the possibilities to perform the V-V relation in order their powerless status. However, in this*kethoprak* theatrical, age and witchery found to be differentiating factors and making gapbetween them.

Table 4. . Addressing Terms among Priyayi

Addresser	Addressee	Term	Power
teacher	student	*warok*	T-V
		rokle	T-V
			V-V
student	teacher	*kyai*	V-T
		kyaine	V-T
elder robber	younger robber(s)	*le*	T-V
		cah	T-V
younger robber	elder robber	*kang*	V-T
		mas	V-T
villager	villager	*jo*	V-V
		kere	V-V

In the context of *kethoprak*, education is strongly related to supranatural and witchery matter. The student refers the teacher with *kyai* and *kyaine*. *Kyai* means someone who has the magic power. The term *kyaine*, same as the term *mbokmu*, has possession affix. The *-ne* affix functions as the third person possessive pronounreferring to the all students. The teacher himself refers his student with *warok* and *rok* as the nickname. *Warok* means warrior. The teacher shifts the addressing term into *le*, the short form of *thole* that means son, when he wants to show his trust and even give his student a sacred inheritance

> **The teacher:** *Para siswa-siswa kae pendhak aku ngadakke pendadaran ilmu tekone mesthi keri, wes meh rampung. Kowe durung wiwit babar ilmu kowe wis njengguk ning Mbadekan. Kowe kudu bisa dadi kaca brenggalane kabeh para warok ing Ponorogo, ya, Le! Ngene, Le.* (All the other students when I hold a course always come late, even almost over. You, before it started until it is done, already present in Mbadekan. You should be able to be the role model of all the warok in Ponorogo, Le!)

This finding can show that someone is considering particular relevant context that affects the word they use. In this case, the teacher considering the student's personality and decides to shift his power relation from T-V into V-V by the addressingterm he chooses.

Age also affects the use of addressing terms between *kawula*, specifically robbers, as shown in table 4. The young robber should perform the politeness towards the elder by using *kang* (respected brother) and *mas* (brother). The elder himself can also control the addressing term he wants, as he protests when one of the younger robbers call him *mas* which considered not respecting as the term *kang*.

> **Elder robber:** *Kowe kuwi ojo ngisin-ngisinke aku. Aku mbiyen wes tau ngajari. Nek ana wong wadon liwat, dicegat, pilih nyowo, opo mati? Nek mati kowe ra entuk bojo, nek pilih nyowo bojomu aku. (Don't embarrass me.* I used to teach if awoman passes by, intercept, choose to marry, or dead? If you die you don't get a husband, if you choose to marry, your husband is me.)
>
> **Younger robber:** *Lha rangerti og, Mas.* (I don't even know, *Mas*.)
>
> **Elder robber :** *Ngisin-ngisinke. Mas dengkulmu kuwi!* (What a shame. *Mas* yourdumb knees!)

In another hand, table 4 shows one villager and another addressing with*njangkar* and even mocking nickname. The *njangkar* style here shows the V-V relations as both villagers have the same status and is intimate. The mocking nickname that appears is *kere* that means poor. They have the possibility to mocking each other as they know that they have the same fortune. Thus, this similarity actually builds solidarity, define the existence of *kawula* and is bordering to Blust's description about*priyayi* circle that has a traditional system governing acceptable patterns of personal interaction to acquire the status of an esthetic ideal. This finding is important as Tauli (1968: 152–153) argues that the possible symbolic value of a language or language variety as an expression of group solidarity and identity is largely ignored.

5. Addressing Term between Different Social Status

In this *kethoprak* theatrical, interactions between social status occurs. These various interactions can indicate the way Javanese royal kingdom influence people to treat the other social status in particular context. The interactions perform different power as shown in the table 5.

Table 5. Addressing Terms between Different Social Status

Addresser	Addressee	Term	Power
prince	villager	*lik Jo*	T-V
		lik No	T-V
villager	prince	*den mas'e*	V-T
		den mas'eBroto	V-T
vice regent	elder robber	*pak*	T-T
		Nidra	T-V
elder robber	vice regent	Setyo Projo *ndika*	T-T
		den	V-T
		gung	V-T
			V-T

The prince as a noble one, chooses *lik* that follows with the shorten name of the addressee. *Lik* comes from *paklik* or *bapak cilik* means younger father. These terms used even though the prince and the villager does not attach by any kinship. Evidently,this finding complement Krisnanda's (2014) study that kinship terms have been used

Different from the king and *priyayi*, the relationship between *kawula* is found to be unique because they use mocking address. This mocking address is not provokingany conflicts as both participants realize that they are in the same status and fortune. Bythis finding, we can conclude that Javanese *kawula* has their own morality, values, andaesthetic conceptions.

Overall, the use of addressing terms in the context of Javanese kingdom was found to be dynamic. We can see that before addresser and addressee know each other,they perform T-T relation but once they know each other by particular aspect, they canshift the addressing term according to the shifting of power relations. The shift also appears between participants that already know each other once they consider some personal matters like trustworthiness, a conflict that occurs, and even political desire. not only for the member of family, moreover in the context of royal family. As the Addresser, villager use *den mas'e* followed by the prince's name in order to legitimizethe prince's status. In line with Edward (1976: 74), modes of address reflect and affirmhow members perceive their relationship and especially the social distance between them.

Vice regent once use *pak* that means sir to address the elder robber in beginningof the conversation to ask his name. This term performs the T-T power relation as the vice regent hold an introductory session.

> **Vice regent**: *Yo, jenengmu sopo kowe, Pak?* (Yes, whats your name, Sir?)

> **Elder robber**: *Kula Nidra.* (I'm Nidra)

Later on, as a royal envoy that has a higher social status than elder robber, the vice regent legitimizes his position by using the elder robber's name. This *njangkar* form which he then uses for diplomatic purposes on behalf of the kingdom, accommodates he to ask the elder robber to stop the acts of *begal* (robbery) that had disturbed the residents. In order to support his actions, opposing diplomacy and self- defense, the elder robber responses involving the lexicon *cah* towards the younger robbers to refer his subordinates and denote collective power (see Table 4).

> **Elder robber**: *Lha nek manut niku, kawit ndek mben manut, ya, Cah?* (Well, if it's about obeyed, we've been obeying since ever, right, Guys?)

> **Younger robber**: *Lha nggih!* (Indeed!)

Validations over collective power from this lower social status formed in the *cah* lexicon that means guys. This third-person address that used by the elder robber as the elder man among the group leads into power entity that support Halliday's (2009) 'anti-social' term, a group of people who reveal their oppositional status to a dominant society by several means, in this context by using address. The context of the conversation and the addressing system that involved can show that elder robber and his group has a strong opposite power to the royal family in this *kethoprak*.

CONCLUSIONS

A critical sociolinguistics study through *kethoprak* discourse, evidently can reveal the complex Javanese language system that is influenced by the royal kingdom and its structure. The study can indicate some particular matters in Javanese own culture and describes the various kinds of customs and social commitment. Focusing on addressing terms, we can find out part of the Javanese cultural features. With further development, morality, values, aesthetic conceptions and other cultural elements can be found as all of them are reflected and expressed by language.

Here in this study, we can also note that Javanese values tend to be based on patriarchy, proven by the basic values that found that the *njangkar* form cannot be done by the wife and daughter of *priyayi* because it violates the manners. This finding breaks Soepardo's (2018) conclusion that the Javanese *priyayi* family members never address each other in *njangkar*. This *njangkar* form also used by the prince towards the elder, showing that power and social status can break the manner as *njangkar* commonly can only use by the elder to the younger. It can be said that such manner can be so flexible if someone has a higher status and manage ultimate power.

Holding up into ultimate power indeed can secure the superordinate position. However surprisingly, in this study, we can see that the king once releases his ultimate power by conducting the V-V relation to the lower status. This can be interpreted as diplomatic and political efforts to achieve certain powers that the king needed. Most likely, this political method the king use is because Javanese people like to be respected, which in this case is manifested in a special relationship with the superordinate.

REFERENCES

Arimi, S., 2008. Pergeseran kekuasaan bangsawan jawa indonesia: sebuah analisis wacana kritis. Jurnal masyarakat dan Budaya, 10(2), pp.1-22.

Brown, R: and A.Gilman. 1972. The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity, in Communication in Face to Face Interaction. John Hover and Sandy Hutchesor (eds). London:Penguin.

Clynes, Adrian. 1994. Old Javanese influence in Balinese: Balinese Speech Styles, dalam Tom Dutton, Darrel T. Tryon (ed.), Language Contact and Change in the Austronesian World, hlm. 141—179. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dipoyono, A., 2018. Revitalisasi Seni Pertunjukan Tradisional Ketoprak di Surakarta.

Lakon Jurnal Pengkajian & Penciptaan Wayang, 15(2).

Edwards, A. D. 1976. Language, Culture and Class. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.

Halliday, M. 2009. Anti-Languages. American Anthropologist. 78. 570—584.

10.1525/aa.1976.78.3.02a00050.

Holmes, Janet. 2013. An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. New York: Longman Group UK. Koentjoroningrat, R. M. 1957. A Preliminary Description of the Javanese Kinship System.

Michigan: University Micro Films International.

Koentjoroningrat, R. M. 1957. A Preliminary Description of the Javanese Kinship System.

Michigan: University Micro Films InternationalKrisnanda, N., 2014. ADDRESSING SYSTEM OF KINSHIP TERMS IN JAVANESE

SOCIETY: A Case Study amongJavanese People Living in Semarang (Doctoral dissertation, Diponegoro University).

Liu, X., Zhang, L. and Zhang, Y., 2010. Study on Addressing Terms and Relevant Culture in America and China. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1(5), pp.753- 756.

Mesthrie, R., 2009. *Introducing sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh University Press.

Ministry of Education and Culture. (2015) Ketoprak Bale Kambang. Available at: https://petabudaya.belajar.kemdikbud.go.id/Repositorys/ketoprak_bale_kambang/ (Accessed: 29 November 2021).

Nothofer, Bernd. 2000. A Preliminary Analysis of the History of Sasak Language Level, dalam Peter K. Austin (ed.), Sasak: Working Papers in Sasak, Vol. 2., 57—84. Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, The University of Melbourne.

Rendle-Short, J., 2010. 'Mate'as a term of address in ordinary interaction. Journal of Pragmatics, 42(5), pp.1201-1218.

Soepardo, S., 2018. Address Term In a Family of Javanese Priyayi. Leksika: Jurnal Bahasa,Sastra dan Pengajarannya, 1(2).

Susanto, D., 2014. The pragmatic meanings of address terms sampeyan and anda.

Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4(1), pp.124-136.

Tauli, V. 1968. Introduction to a Theory of Language Planning. Uppsala: Almqvist andWiksell.

Trudgill, P. 1974. Sociolinguistics. An Introduction to Language and Society. London:Penguin.

Weber, Max. 1978. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, translated and edited by H.H.Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University