

VOCATIVE USE OF PEOPLE'S NAMES AND FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS IN SUNDANESE CONVERSATION IN THREE INTERNET SITES IN 2022

Wahya

Linguistics Department, Universitas Padjadjaran Bandung, Indonesia
wahya@unpad.ac.id

Abstract

Sundanese is a local language spoken by ethnic Sundanese Indonesian. Like any other language in the world, Sundanese also has language devices called vocatives to call addresses by speakers in a conversation. This paper explains the vocative, including the forms, which are the level of speech to show the social relations between speakers and addresses. The method used to collect the data is an observation method. The data analysis used is a distributional method with a sociolinguistic approach. From twenty-six data, there are sixteen people-name vocatives and ten family-relation vocatives. Of the sixteen people-name vocatives, six vocatives are in full-nickname form, namely Giri (1), Gilang (1), Lia (3), and Ani (1); and ten vocatives are in partial-nickname form, namely Lang (2) Nit (2), Tir (4), and Put (4). Meanwhile, ten family-relation vocatives consist of nine partial Sundanese-honorific forms, namely Kang (6), Neng (2), and Ceu (1), and one complete Sundanese-honorific form, namely Si Aa. Furthermore, from sixteen people-name vocatives, thirteen vocatives are used to show respect to others and three others to show familiar code. Meanwhile, all the family-relation vocatives are used to respect others. Hence, people-name vocatives are used to maintain social relationships on friendships. Meanwhile, family-relation vocatives are used to create new friendships.

Keywords: local language, Sundanese, vocative, people-name vocative, family-relation vocative

1. Introduction

Local language anywhere in the world as a communication tool for humans provides various facilities so it can be used in various functions optimally in everyday life, which one of those facilities is vocative. Vocative as a term is already known in languages that know cases, namely vocative cases. The vocative case is part of the case found in case languages such as Latin. In this paper, the vocative is not observed from the side of the case, but is observed as an element of the universality of language, namely as an element of calling that is usually used by speakers in conversations of a language.

Every facility available in language as a means of human communication has a specific function in it. When compared with other facilities in language as a means of human communication, what is the universal function of the vocative in language?

In this connection, sociolinguistically vocative, among others, is used to create intimacy, friendship, and politeness. By using the vocative in conversation, the identity of

the speaker becomes clear. Likewise, the social relationship between the speaker and the addressee will be observable. The following is an example of four Sundanese sentences. Sentences (a) and (b) do not use the vocative, while sentences (a1) and (b1) use the vocative.

- a. *Rek indit ka mana isuk keneh?*
'Where are you going so early?'
- a1. *Rek indit ka mana isuk keneh, Min?*
'Where are you going so early, Min?'
- b. *Abdi ayeuna bade mios ka sakola.*
'I want to go to school now.'
- b1. *Bu, Abdi ayeuna bade mios ka sakola.*
'Mom, I'm going to school now.'

In every language, including Sundanese, there are three important elements that can provide an understanding of a linguistic form, namely expression, meaning, and context (Finegan, 2012). The vocative in the example sentence above is an expression in Sundanese. The data presented is Sundanese language data. Data in language is detachable and autonomous. In contrast to the parole which cannot be released and is not autonomous. Langue is social, while parole is individual. The existence of langue is more stable than parole (Purwoko, 2014).

There is a difference in the meaning of sentences that do not contain vocative expressions with sentences that contain vocative expressions. In sentence (a1), which contains the vocative, there is an understanding of a close social relationship or friendship between the speaker and the speech partner by using the vocative fragment Min. Similarly, in sentence (b1), there is an understanding of the existence of a social relationship between the speaker and the speech partner with the use of the vocative part of Mom. Because in Sundanese, there is a speech level, sentence (b1) indicates the speech level of the code of respect for others. In this case, the code of respect from the child to his mother is because in the sentence used, and there is a choice of words that indicate the characteristics of the code. Similarly, sentence (a1) shows the familiar code used by the speaker towards his interlocutor. The use of word choices indicates the characteristics of the code. The vocative in the sentence (a1) is the people-name vocative; namely, Min is a partial vocative, while the vocative in the sentence (b1) is the vocative of family relationship, namely Bu 'Mom' is also a partial vocative.

The statements above each have a meaning. Sentence (a1) is an interrogative sentence that asks a person named Min fragment where to go. Sentence (b1) is a declarative sentence that means asking goodbye from a child to his mother going to school. The statements above each have a meaning. Sentence (a1) is an interrogative sentence which means asking a person named Min fragment where to go. Sentence (b1) is a declarative sentence that means asking goodbye from a child to his mother going to school. Saussure argues that the linguistic sign has signifiant and signifié, an acoustic image and a concept, respectively. Signe, which consists of the unity of the significant and the signifier, cannot be separated (Saussure, 2021). In other words, form and meaning are two elements that are both faithfully present in the language.

In the two sentences containing different vocatives, namely (a1) and (b1), there is context concerning the social relations of the speaker and his interlocutor. The use of different speech levels between sentences (a1) and (b1) is also related to the different contexts of social relations and topics of conversation among the speech participants.

In Sundanese, the presence of the vocative is often related to the use of speech level. Considering that the level of speech will depend on the context of the social relationship between the speaker and the speech partner, the presence of the vocative will also depend on the social relationship of the speaker and the speech partner. Whether the social relationship among participants is kinship, neighbourhood, friendship, or work ties; whether social factors are age, gender, or position; whether the relationship between participants is symmetrical or asymmetrical. These extralinguistic factors influence vocative selection. Therefore, the types of vocatives vary according to the cultural environment that binds the use of language in the participants' daily lives.

Vocative research in several languages in various approaches has been carried out, including Japanese vocative research, namely "Vocative Forms in Japanese Discourse Dialogue" by Elly Sutawikara and Pika Yestia Ginanjar (2017); French vocative research, namely "French Vocatives in Conversation" by Fierenziana Getruida Junus (2016); English-American vocative research, namely "Vernacular, Expletive, and Vocative Expressions in Dialogue of Three American Novels and Their Translations" by Arie Andrasyah Isa (2006). Similarly, vocative research in Sundanese has also been carried out, for example, "The Elements of Panggentra (Vocative) Sundanese Sentences in the Novel Payung Butut by Ahamd Bakri for Teaching Materials in High School" by Lisna Susilawati (2009), then the research entitled "Euy Particles as Vocative in Sundanese Language Fiction" by Wahya (2019). Furthermore, "The Use of the Vocative of Self-Name in the Story of Nyi Halimah by Samsuodi" (2021) by Wahya et al. and "The Favorite Vocative of Sundanese in a Sociolinguistic Perspective" (2022) by Wahya et al. However, these studies need to discuss vocatives using internet site data sources. Vocative research with internet site sources, among others, aims to determine the types and forms of vocatives used.

Sundanese is a language that recognizes speech levels, so that Sundanese vocative research can be related to speech levels, namely how the speaker calls the addressee by using the vocative in this speech level relationship. The use of the speech level will involve the status and social relations of the speaker and the addressee. Considering that in Sundanese, there are speech levels of respectful and familiar code, the use of this vocative will also be influenced by these two types of speech levels. Thus, to explore this vocative, a speech-level theory is also needed in addition to the need for a vocative theory. This has become one of the vocative research areas for the Sundanese language that recognizes speech levels compared to languages that do not recognize speech levels. This study will collaborate these two theories with a sociolinguistic approach to data sourced from internet sites, namely the theory of vocative and the theory of Sundanese speech levels, namely the theory of vocative and the theory of Sundanese speech levels. Because the use of vocatives

is also related to the function of language for social relations, in this paper, this language function will be explained in addition to vocatives and speech levels in Sundanese.

Natural languages everywhere in the world universally have a function to communicate, both orally and in writing. As a means of verbally communicating between speakers and speakers or between speakers and interlocutors, language provides lingual elements that can be used to greet or call each other between speakers and addressees when they are conversing. With this lingual element, intimacy, politeness, attention, and establishing a relationship between the speech participants are maintained when conversing. Such language elements are called vocatives (Wahya, 2019).

Language has various functions. Many linguists have stated this in different terms. According to Wiratno, language has three functions, namely, ideational functions, interpersonal functions, and textual functions. The three functions are called metafunctional functions and represent different realities. Under the ideational function, language is used to express physical-biological reality as well as the interpretation and representation of experience. Under the interpersonal function, language is used to express social realities and interactions between speakers/writers and listeners/readers. Under the textual function, language is used to express semiotic reality or the reality of symbols as well as the creation of texts in context (Wiratno, 2018).

From another point of view, language has both transactional and interactional functions. The first function is more directed at conveying information, while the second function is more directed at efforts to maintain social relations between speakers and speech partners. These two terms of language function for some linguists are different, but the meaning is the same. For example, by Halliday, for the two functions, the terms ideational and interpersonal functions are used, respectively. What language functions are associated with the use of vocatives? As mentioned earlier, the use of the vocative is related to the social relations between the speaker and the interlocutor. The use of the vocative, among others, aims to maintain social relations between the speaker and the interlocutor. Maintaining social relationships is often also associated with the function of language phatic. According to Ibrahim et al., in this regard, the problem of politeness in a language is in the field of the interpersonal or interactional function (Ibrahim et al., 2021).

In the linguistic tradition, the vocative is not a new term. This term has been known for a long time as a case in Latin in addition to other cases, namely cases relating to vocations (Lyons, 1995). In other languages that do not recognize cases, such as Latin, the term vocative is also known as a universal feature of languages in the world, which is related to calling or exclamation and greeting. Vocative research data can refer to various sources, such as literary works and films (Ratnasari et al., 2016). This paper discusses the vocative not in terms of cases but as a universal element of language known in every language using internet site data sources.

A vocative is a noun phrase that is an optional part of a sentence, which names or indicates something that is intended. For example, the word dear is the vocative in English; the sentence 'Really dear, do you think so? ', dear, you think so?' (Richards, 1987). The word dear is the vocative. The vocative is a noun element that is optionally added to a

sentence or clause, which refers to a person or people and to the person is addressed and marks the fact that it addressed to them. Sudaryat et al., (2013) in more detail state that the vocative (in Sundanese called *panggentra*) is an additional element or satellite in a sentence, in the form of a word or noun phrase that refers to the person being spoken to; is arbitrary, can be present or not, and its position can be in front, in the middle, or at the end of the sentence. Example: *Jang, cing pangmeulikan obat batuk!* 'Son, please buy me cough medicine!' *Iraha sumping ti Batawi, Kang?* 'When did you come from Betawi, Brother?' *Upami teu kaabotan, Bapa, saur pun biang bade nambut motor.* 'If you do not mind, Sir, my mother said I would like to borrow a motorbike.

Based on the author's understanding of some of the linguist opinions above, it can be concluded that vocatives have the following characteristics: (a) are categorized as nouns that refer to people. (b) the form can be in the form of words or phrases, (c) its position in the sentence can be at the beginning, middle, or end of the sentence, (d) its presence in a clause or sentence is in the form of additional elements or is arbitrary or optional, (e) has the function of pointing to friends. Speak or addressee directly during the conversation, and (f) speak in a specific tone in the spoken language, written with a comma in written language. According to Sudaryat et al. (2013: 153), The vocative is used to call the interlocutor so that there is attention, especially if the other party is present. According to Sudaryat et al.(2013) and Junus et al.(2021), the vocative has the following various forms: the name of a person, whether accompanied by a title or not, such as *Angga, Pa Haji 'Pak Haji'*; kinship terms, such as *Ma 'Mum', Pa 'Sir', Bi 'Auntie', Kang 'Brother' (for men), Ceu 'Sister' (for women), Ayi 'Brother', and Aki 'Grandpa'*; professional calling, such as *Pak Kades 'Mr. Village Head', Jang Guru 'Teacher', Bu Bidan 'Mrs. Midwife'*; loving words, such as *Neng (a nickname for a woman who is loved), Geulis 'Beautiful', Kasep 'Handsome', Bageur 'Good'*; swear words, such as *Bebel 'Stupid', Kehed 'Stupid', Begu 'Pig', Kunyuk 'Monkey'*. Vocative studies can also be related to phatic expressions (Glušac, 2017).

Languages in Indonesia are viewed sociolinguistically; some have a speech-level system, and some do not. There are five languages in Indonesia that have speech levels: Javanese, Sundanese, Madurese, Balinese, and Sasak (Sumarlam et al. (ed.), 2012). Sundanese is a language that recognizes speech levels as well as Javanese (Muhid, 2011; Isodarus, 2020). In Sundanese, the level of speech is called *undak usuk*. Sociolinguistically, speech level is related to the use of language because of certain social relationships between speakers and speakers or because of specific social goals in communicating. This speech level is indicated by the paradigmatic use of semantically synonymous vocabulary, which is used according to the code of each speech level (Wahya & Hazbini, 2020). The use of this speech level is divided into two codes, namely the familiar code and the respectful code. Differences in the use of certain vocabulary generally indicate differences in speech level codes. If differences in vocabulary indicate the difference, the familiar code uses expressive vocabulary to indicate familiarity, while the respectful code uses expressive vocabulary to show respect.

Some linguistic experts provide limits on speech level as follows. Tamsyah (2015) defines speech level as a variation of the language used according to the speaker and

partner's age, position, and situation and what they are talking about. Speech level is a code system in a speech community, with the determining factor being the relationship between the speaker and the speech partner. Furthermore, Sudaryat et al (2013) argue that in Sundanese, there are two forms of speech level variety, namely the variety of smooth or respectful language and the variety of coarse or familiar language; The variety of respectful language is further divided into two, namely respect for others and respect for oneself (Sudaryat et al. 2013 p. 4). According to other experts, the speech level of Sundanese recognizes three levels, namely *basa kasar* 'rough language', *basa sedeng* 'medium language', and *basa lemes* 'smooth language' (Tamsyah, 2015) or *basa loma* 'familiar language', *basa lemes (keur ka sorangan)* 'smooth language (for oneself)', *basa lemes (keur ka batur)* 'smooth language (for others)'. As a result of the use of this speech level, certain words that have equivalents or synonyms are adjusted to the use of the speech level as an adjustment to the speech level code. Not all words have variations of this speech-level equivalent.

The use of this speech level is related to the social factors of the speech participants, namely the speaker and the addressee. Also, these factors include level, position, and age. The social factors above include rank, level, and age. Factors of power, position, and the closeness between the speaker and the interlocutor with the person being discussed (Sudaryat et al., 2013), then the age, position, situation of the speaker and the interlocutor, as well as what they are talking about (Tamsyah, 2015) are factors in the use of this speech level. In Language

The use of various levels of respectful and familiar speech impacts the social distance between the speaker and the addressee. The use of the respectful speech level has an impact on the existence of social distance between the speaker and the addressee; on the contrary, the use of the familiar speech level has an impact on the absence of social distance between the speaker and the addressee. Speakers must consider this social distance from the addressee in communicating using the speech level. Social distance is a person's feeling of whether his social position is relatively the same or relatively different from the social position of others. Even though the Javanese language initially influenced it, now the speech level has become the manners of polite language in Sundanese (Wahya et al., 2020).

The use of speech levels in the five languages comes from Javanese. Sundanese, Madurese, Balinese, and Sasak languages are affected by the level of Javanese speech because these four languages are in intensive contact with Javanese. Speech level as a language system has characteristics in the use of certain words to code certain speech levels. Generally, the speech level has a familiar and respectful code. In Sundanese, for example, there are two speech level codes, namely the familiar code and the respectful code, then the respectful code consists of a code of respect for oneself and others. Not all words are used in the use of this speech level. In Sundanese, the three speech levels do not always have different vocabularies. There are the exact words for familiar and respectful speech levels, but some are different. Many words are absorbed from the Javanese language in the Sundanese speech level, for example, the word *dahar* 'eat' and *abot* 'heavy'. There are other words that the Sundanese themselves created. Not all Sundanese-speaking areas are familiar with this level of speech, especially those far from the cultural centre. In

Sundanese, the use of speech level is ingrained, so it becomes the norm of language politeness. Not all Sundanese-speaking areas recognize this level of Sundanese speech, for example, Banten, northern Indramayu, Majalengka, and Kuningan. Some of the younger Sundanese generations rarely use Sundanese because of difficulty using this level of speech when speaking in Sundanese (Djajasudarma T. F., 2018)

2. Method

This research is descriptive qualitative, which describes the identity of the data using neutral words without giving a true-false assessment. Provision of data using the listening method with a note-taking technique, namely listening to the use of Sundanese vocatives on internet sites as a data source, then taking notes. The data analysis method used the distributional method with a sociolinguistic approach. The data sources used are three sites, namely <https://www.sundapedia.com/sample-percepatan-language-sunda-halus-about-bertamu/>, <https://www.freedomsiana.id/percepatan-bahasa-sunda-dan-meaning/>, <https://swissjava.com/conversation-sundanese-language-and-meaning/>. All data were taken in 2022.

The use of a data source in the form of an internet site is based on the reason that, to the author's knowledge, there has yet to be any Sundanese vocative research using this data source. Data from internet sites are digital, which still needs to be studied. The following reason is that this data source is only a sample of research data sources in which there are data needed for this research. The data is presented in sentences written in orthographic script, and then sorted using Arabic numerals. Each data is accompanied by a translation that is placed under the data.

3. Result and Discussion

Based on data analysis by paying attention to how speakers call addressee during conversations, 26 data contain two types of the vocative, namely 16 data containing evocative names of people and 10 data containing evocative family relations. The vocative people's names is a vocative related to a person's self-name. In contrast, the vocative of family relationships is related to calls in the family or what is considered family. In addition, it was found that the use of speech levels by speakers and addressees and social relations between speakers and addressees during conversations. Thus, this discussion includes the types of vocatives, situations at the speech level of vocative use, and social relations between the speaker and the addressee in the conversation.

Thus, this discussion includes the types of vocatives, situations at the speech level of vocative use, and social relations between the speaker and the speaker in the conversation.

3.1 Vocative of People's Names

As mentioned above, there are were found sixteen data containing the vocative of the self names. The sixteen data are as follows.

1. Gilang: *Giri nuju naon*

- 'Gilang: What are you doing?
2. Jamil: *Gilang, ari tadi disakola kunaon pasea?*
'Jamil: Gilang, why were you fighting at school?'
3. Giri: *Lang iraha deui mah ulah kapancing emosina nya.*
'Giri: Lang next time, don't be easily provoked by his emotions, okay?'
4. Jamil: *Muhun lang eta teh teu sae, awon nu kitu teh.*
'Jamil: Well, that's not good, it's ugly like that.'
5. Nita: *Enya kamana wae atuh salira lia?*
'Nita: Yes, where have you been, Lia?'
6. Lia: *Abdi pan tos saminggu ngendong di bumi aki abdi di lembur, nya sakalian wae liburan sakolana diditu nit.*
'Lia: I've been staying at my grandfather's house for a week in the village, huh it's good to have school holidays there Nit.'
7. Nita: *Geuning tebih ogé nya, kumaha salira resep teu liburan sakola diditu lia?*
'Nita: It turns out that it's too far, how are you happy not to have school holidays there Lia?'
8. Lia: *Ari salira liburan sakola ieu kamana waé nit?*
'Lia: Where are you going on school holidays now, Nit?'
9. Nita: *Haturnuhun nya kanggo oleh-olehna lia?*
'Nita: Thank you for the gift, Lia?'
10. Puteri: *Tir, ari dinten Rebo aya tugas, teu?*
'Puteri: Tir, we have work on Wednesday, don't you?'
11. Tiara: *Aya, Put.*
'Tiara: There. Put.'
12. Puteri: *Naon tugasna, Tir?*
'Puteri: What is the task?'
13. Puteri: *Oh muhun, hatur nuhun, Tir.*
'Puteri: Okay, thank you, Tir.'
14. Tiara: *Atos, Put.*
'Tiara: Yes, Put'
15. Puteri: *Seueur pisan, Tir!*
'Puteri: So many, Tir!'
16. Adi: *Ani, di mana bumi teh?*
'Adi: Ani, where is your house?'

The sixteen vocative of people's names in the data above are seen from their form, some are in the form of whole, and some are in the form of fragments. The full vocative name of the self-contained in six data, namely (1) Giri, (2) Gilang, (5), (7), (9) each of Lia, and (16) Ani. while the vocatives of people's names in the form of fragments are found in ten data, namely data (3) and (4) Lang, (6) and (8) Nit, (10), (12), (13), and (15) respectively. Tir, (11) and (14) Put. Lang is a perpetuation of the second syllable of Gilang; Nit is a perpetuation of the first three letters of Nita; Tir is a perpetuation of the first two letters and one fourth letter of the Tiara; Put is the first syllable fragment of Putri. In Table

1, the following vocative names and their forms are presented from the sixteen data above. The vocative morphological forms of people's names are either full or partial.

Table 1: Vocative of People's Names

No.	No. Data	Vocative Name		
		Full	Partial	Beheading Process
1	1	Giri	-	-
2	2	Gilang	-	-
3	5, 7, 9	Lia	-	-
4	16	Ani	-	-
5	3, 4	-	Lang	The preservation of the second syllable of Gilang.
6	6, 8	-	Nit	Perpetuation of the first three letters of Nita.
7	10, 12, 13, 15	-	Tir	The preservation of the first two letters and one fourth letter of the Tiara.
8	11, 14	-	Put	The first syllable fragment of Putri.
	Amount	4	4	

Use of Vocative of People's Names in Speech Level

In the sixteen data above, the vocative of vocative of people's names is used in the speech level of the familiar code and respectful code. There are three data containing the vocative of people's names in the speech level of the familiar code, namely data (2), (3), and (12) and there are thirteen data containing the vocative of people's names in the speech level of the code of respect for others, namely data (1), (4)—(11), (13)—(16). In data (2) and (3) the use of vocatives in the level of familiar code speech occurs in social friendships between speakers and addressee, namely both between Jamil and Gilang and between Giri and Gilang. Similarly, between Putri and Tiara in data (12). In data (1), the vocative of people's names is used in the speech level of the respectful code between the speaker and the addressee, namely between Gilang and Giri. Likewise for other data, namely data (4)—(11), (13)—(16). From the explanation above, it is known that the vocative of people's names can occur in the familiar code speech level and also in the respectful code with a higher frequency of use at the respectful code speech level. From the data above, when viewed from the gender of the speaker and addressee, the use of this respectful code is generally used by female speakers and addressees. To clarify the explanation above, the following Table 2 is presented.

Table 2: Vocative of People's Names in the Use of Speech Levels, Familiar Codes and Codes of Respect

No.	No. Data	Vocative of People's Names		Gender Speakers		Type of Speech Level	
		Full	Partial	Speaker	Addressee	Familiar Code	Respect Code
1	1	Giri	-	Gilang (man)	Giri (man)	-	√
2	2	Gilang	-	Jamil (man)	Gilang (man)	√	-
3	5, 7, 9	Lia	-	Nita (woman)	Lia (woman)	-	√
4	16	Ani	-	Adi (man)	Ani (woman)	-	√
5	3	-	Lang	Giri (man)	Gilang (man)	√	-
	4	-	Lang	Jamil (man)	Gilang (man)	-	√
6	6, 8	-	Nit	Lia (woman)	Nita (woman)	-	√
7	10, 13, 15	-	Tir	Puteri (woman)	Tiara (woman)	-	√
	12	-	Tir	Puteri (woman)	Tiara (woman)	√	-
8	11, 14	-	Put	Tiara (woman)	Puteri (woman)	-	√
	Amount	4	4			3	13

Table 2 above shows the relationship between the use of the vocative form of people's names and the type of speech level. The complete vocative form of the vocative of people's names is more often used in the speech level of the respectful code. Similarly, vocative people's names fragments are more often used in the speech level of the code of respect by female speakers and addressees.

Social Relations of Speakers in Using Vocative of People's Names

The use of the vocative of people's names in the sixteen data above is associated with the vocative form of the vocative of people's names, the type of speech level, and the gender of the speaker and addressee, which can be explained as follows.

- a. There is a vocative use of full of the vocative people's names in the speech level of the code of respect among male speakers.
- b. There is a vocative use of full of the vocative people's names in the speech level of the code of respect among female speakers.
- c. There is a vocative use of full of the vocative people's names in the speech level of the code of respect among male and female speakers.
- d. There is a vocative use of full of vocative people's names at the level of familiar code speech among male speakers.
- e. There is a vocative use of fragmentary of the vocative people's names in the speech level of the code of respect among male speakers.
- f. There is a vocative use of fragmentary of the vocative people's names in the speech level of the code of respect among female speakers.
- g. There is a vocative use of fragmentary vocative people's names at the level of familiar code speech among male speakers.
- h. There is a vocative use of fragmentary the vocative people's names at the level of familiar code speech among female speakers.

Of the eight conditions above, the situation in item (h) is dominant, followed by state (b). This means that the use of vocative people's names, both in whole and in fragments, is dominated in the level of speech code of respect with female speakers in social friendship relationships.

Vocative of Family Relationships

The following are ten data that contain family relationships vocatives.

17. Icih: *Badé aya pikersaeun naon, Kang?*
'Icih: What do you need, older brother?'
18. Icih: *Aya naon kitu kang, bilih badé titip saur.*
'Icih: What's wrong older brother, in case you want to leave a message.'
19. Icih: *Muhun mangga, Kang.*
'Icih: Ok please, older brother.'
20. Asép: *Permios atuh ceu, abdi badé wangsul.*
'Asep: Please allow Sis, I want to go home.'
21. Icih: *Mani énggal-énggalan mulih atuh, Kang.*
'Icih: Why are you in such a hurry to go home, older brother '
22. Asép: *Gaduh kénéh bujengeun, Ceu.*
'Asep: There is still some business, Sis.'
23. Dimas: *Bade kamana Neng, meuni enggal-enggal wae.*
'Dimas: Where are you going, why are you in such a hurry.'
24. Anita: *Eh, si Aa, bade ka Masjid, saked ap deui kan azan Ashar.*
'Anita: Hey you, you want to go to the mosque, the Asr call to prayer is coming soon.'
25. Abdul: *Di Gedong Saté, kang!*
'Abdul: At Gedung Sate, older brother!'
26. Rohmat: *Oh, manawi téh. Icalan naon kang?*
'Rohmat: Oh, I guess. What are you selling, older brother?'

In data 17-26 there are the following four family relationships vocatives: Kang, which is a call to a man who is older than the speaker (data 17, 18, 19, 21, 25, and 26), Ceu, which is a call to a woman who is older than the speaker (data 17, 18, 19, 21, 25, and 26). data 20, 22), Neng, which is a call to a woman who is the same age or younger than the speaker (data 23), and si Aa, which is a call to a man who is the same age or older than the speaker (data 24). If observed based on their form, Kang, Ceu, and Neng are kinship vocatives in the form of fragments, each of which is a fragment of the second syllable of Kakang or Akang, Ceuceu or Euceu, and Neneng or Eneng. Si Aa is a complete kinship vocative. To clarify the description above, Table 3 is presented below.

Table 3: Forms of Vocative of People's Names

No.	No. Data	Vocative of People's Names		
		Full	Partial	Beheading Process
1	17—19, 21,25, 26	-	Kang	Splitting of the second syllable of Kakang or Akang
2	20, 22	-	Cebu	Splitting of the second syllable of Ceuceu or Euceu
3	23	-	Neng	Splitting the second syllable of Neneng or Eneng
4	24	si Aa	-	
	Jumlah	1	3	

Use of Vocative of Family Relationships at The Speech Level

The use of family relationships vocatives in data 17-26 above all occur in the speech level of the respectful code, namely the code of respect for others. If the gender is observed between speakers and addressees, the speakers in the data (17), (18), (19), (21), and (24) are female, while the addressees are male. The speakers in the data (20), (22), and (23) are male, while the speakers are female. In data (25) and (26), both the speaker and the addressee are male. From this data, both female and male speakers when talking to men use kinship vocatives in the speech level of the respectful code. Likewise, male speakers when talking to women use the family relationships vocative in the speech level of the respectful code. Based on the data above, the use of family relationship vocatives in the code of respect is dominated by female speakers with male speakers. To clarify the explanation above, Table 4 is presented below.

**Table 4: Vocative of Family Realisationships in Speech Level Usage
 Familiar Code and Respect Code**

No.	No. Data	Kinship Vocatives		Gender Speakers		Type of Speech Level	
		Full	Partial	Speaker	Addressee	Familiar Code	Respect Code
1	17--19, 21	-	Kang	Icih older girl	Asep male age	-	√
	25	-	Kang	Abdul (man)	male age	-	√
	26		Kang	Rohmat (man)	male age		√
2	20, 22	-	Cebu	Asep (man)	Icih (older girl)	-	√
3	23	-	Neng	Dimas (man)	Anita (peer girl)	-	√
4	24	si Aa	-	Anita (woman)	Dimas (male age)	-	√
	Jumlah	1	4				10

Social Relations of Speakers in the Use Vocative of Family Relationships

The use of family relationships vocatives in the ten data above is associated with the form of family relationships vocatives, types of speech levels, and gender of the speakers-addressees, which can be explained as follows. The use of vocative family relationship fragments can occur between female speakers and male speakers, male speakers and female speakers, or between male speakers and female speakers in certain social relationships. In data 17-19, and 21, communication occurs between female and male speakers, with the age of women being older. The woman called Kang's kinship to the man vocatively, while the man called Ceu to the woman (data 20 and 22). In other situations, male speakers call the older male speakers as Kang (data 25 and 26). The family relationships vocative Neng is used by male speakers against female speakers of the same age, while the woman calls the man the family relationships vocative si Aa. The relationship between the speaker and the addressee in the data 17-26 above is a new acquaintance.

4. Conclusion

Based on data analysis, it was found that vocative of people's names and vocative of family relationships were 16 and 10 respectively. The vocative of people's names and vocative of family relationships from the data could be full or partial with dominance over full vocative. There are four vocative full names, namely Giri, Galang, Lia, and Ani, while there are four vocatives partial names, namely Lang, Nit, Tir, and Put. The use of vocative people's names dominated by the level of speech code of respect with social relations between speakers and addressees of social relations of friendship. There is only one full family relationships vocative, namely si Aa, while there are three partial family relationships vocatives, namely Kang, Ceu, and Neng. These family relationships vocatives are all used in the speech level of the respectful code with social relationships generally friendship.

5. Acknowledgments (Optional)

Thanks are conveyed to the Chancellor of the University of Padjadjaran who has provided research grants so that researchers can carry out research. Furthermore, thanks are also extended to other parties who have supported and assisted in every stage of the research and have facilitated the publication of this article.

6. References

- Djajasudarma, T. F., Indira, D., Wahya, Heriyanto, Citraesmana, E., & Muhtadin, T. (2018). *Pemerolehan Bahasa Daerah Anak di Lingkungan Masyarakat Jawa Barat*.
Edward, F. (2012). *Language Its Structure and Use* (Sixth). Wadsworth.
Glušac, M., & Čolić, A. M. (2017). Linguistic functions of the vocative as a morphological, syntactic and pragmatic-semantic category. *Jezikoslovlje*, 18(3), 447–472.
Ibrahim, Abdol Syukur; Susanto, Gatut; Taufiqurrahman, Febri; Wahyuni, L. (2021). *Antropologi Linguistik* (R. Indrawati (ed.); Cetakan Ke). Refika Aditama.

- Isodarus, P. B. (2020). Penggunaan Tingkat Tutur Bahasa Jawa sebagai Representasi Relasi Kekuasaan. *Sintesis*, 14(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.24071/sin.v14i1/>
- Junus, F. G., Junus, R. F., Kristen, U., & Wacana, S. (2021). *Sangihe Family Vocative : An Adapting Tradition*. 622(Kimli), 218–223.
- Purwoko, J. H. (2014). *Muatan Budaya, Sosial dan Politik dalam Bahasa dan Komunikasi*. Graha Ilmu.
- Ratnasari, Weni, Yuliasri, Issy, Hartono, Rudi (2016). Technique and Ideology of Vocatives and Proper Names in the Hobbit. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*.
- Richards, J., Platt, J., & Weber, H. (1987). *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics* (Second). Longman.
- Saussure, F. de. (2021). *Kuliah Umum Linguistik/Cours de Linguistique Generale* (T. Setiadi (Ed.); Cetakan Pe). IRCiSod. www.divapress-online.com
- Sudaryat, Y., Prawirasumantri, A., & Yudibrata, K. (2013). *Tata Basa Sunda Kiwari*. Yrama Widya.
- Sumarlam; Anggraeni, Asih; Taruni, T. W. P. (Ed.). (2012). *Pelangi Nusantara Kajian Berbagai Variasi Bahasa*. Graha Ilmu.
- Tamsyah, B. R. (2015). *Kamus Undak Usuk Basa Sunda* (10th ed.). Geger Sunten.
- Wahya, & Hazbini. (2020). LEXICON BORROWINGS FROM ARABIC IN SUNDANESE SPEECH LEVEL SYSTEM. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2020.8395>
- Wahya, Wahya. (2019). *Proceeding 7th Annual Internasional Conference on Linguistics Setali 2019 The Existence of Language in The Industrial Revolution Era 4.0* (A).
- Wahya, Wahya, Lyra, H. M., & Permadi, R. Y. (2020). *Fatis Bahasa Sunda dalam Perspektif Sosiolinguistik* (T. Ampera (ed.); 1st ed.). Unpad Press.
- Wahya, Wahya, Permadi, R. Y., & Ampera, T. (2021). Penggunaan Vokatif Nama Diri `Dalam Carita Nyi Halimah Karya Samsodi. *Metahumaniora*, 11(2), 207. <https://doi.org/10.24198/metahumaniora.v11i2.35429>
- Wahya, Wanya, Permadi, R. Y., & Ampera, T. (2022). Vokatif Kesayangan Bahasa Sunda dalam Perspektif Sosiolinguistik. *Kabuyutan: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora Berbasis Kearifan Lokal*, 1, 53--57.
- Wiratno, T. (2018). *Pengantar Ringkas Linguistik Sistemik Fungsional*. Cetakan I. Pustaka Pelajar.