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ABSTRACT

The linguistic repertoire in Java is complex in which the community is marked both by diglossia and bilingualism. Javanese with its own complexity and speech levels is spoken as the local language, Indonesian is spoken as the national language, and foreign languages like English and Arabic are also spoken. Seeing the complexity of the linguistic repertoire in Java, the linguistic condition of an Islamic-based oratorical event in Java, especially Islamic preaching, thus can be equally complex. This research aims 1) to know the structure of code-mixing in Islamic preaching events in Java, and 2) to understand further the social intention of using that code-mixing. The data Islamic preaching event taken from YouTube videos were analyzed structurally using Muysken’s (2000) framework, then were interpreted sociolinguistically. The result suggests that the mixing between Javanese and Indonesian is the most productive code-mixing even in an Islamic discourse. Further, alternational code-mixing turns out to be more prevalent than insertional code-mixing in all language pairs except Arabic – Javanese. Additionally, these code-mixings were done for various purposes in which mixing Indonesian code with either Ngoko or Krama for explaining a specific topic is the most frequent reason behind the mixing the preacher engages in. These results will be a significant addition to the relatively little exploration of the interaction between language and religion concerning bilingualism or multilingualism.
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1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND STUDY

1.1 Introduction

The Islamization process in the Indonesian archipelago began in the late middle ages or ‘early modern period’ as part of the Indian Ocean commercial trade (Feener and Gade, 1998; Gross, 2007), i.e. in the period between the 14th -15th centuries. Citing Feener and Gade (1998), this process apparently still continues to this day even though without actively converting people of other religions. Rather, nowadays, this Islamization process manifests in an event which focuses more on ‘inviting’ people having the same faith to deepen their religious understanding and commitment. One of the examples of this kind of event is Islamic preaching In Java. Islamic preaching events present an interesting linguistic phenomenon, i.e. the interaction among the national language (Indonesian), the local vernacular language (Low or Ngoko Javanese) and the languages of religion (Arabic and High or Krama Javanese; Lewis et al., 2016).

Given the multilingual composition of the community, code-mixing is very likely to happen. Unfortunately, code-mixing and code-switching studies in the religious context in Java are still under-investigated. Two studies related to this topic are the work done by Saddhono (2012) focusing on the Friday sermon in Surakarta and Susanto’s (2006) investigation on the role of ‘Insha’Allah in Musyawarah’. Millie (2012b) did focus on investigating the code choice in Islamic preaching, but it was done in Sundanese. With this reason added by the relatively little exploration of the interaction between language and religion with respect to bilingualism or multilingualism (Spolsky, 2003) in general, makes it really interesting to conduct an investigation on code-mixing in Islamic preaching in Javanese.

This thesis will investigate the code-mixing found in Islamic preaching in Java. The data concern an Islamic preaching event taken from YouTube videos. They will be analyzed structurally using Muysken’s (2000) framework as it is considered as a more economical framework in the vast discussion of code-mixing and then they will be interpreted sociolinguistically. The result will be a significant addition to the relatively limited exploration of the interaction between language and religion on bilingualism or multilingualism. The result further, could also shed light on the status of both Indonesian and Javanese in Java, as now the heavy code-mixing between the two leads to a new ‘hybrid’ language which Errington (1998:98) calls ‘bahasa gadho-gadho’ (“mixed” bilingual Javanese Indonesian usage).
1.2 Java as a multilingual region

Given the existence of the aforementioned languages in Java, it can be said that the Javanese speech community is marked by both diglossia and bilingualism. The languages or codes involved are viewed here as separate varieties or languages with a range of roles in which these are clearly differentiated. Fishman (1967) connected the notion of diglossia with ‘a society that used two (or more) languages/codes for internal (intra-society) communication’. The separation between the codes is usually along the lines of (H)igh language (used for education, religion and other aspects of high culture) and (L)ow languages (used for ‘everyday pursuits of hearth, work, and home’) (Ferguson, 1959).

The Javanese language, as a whole, is often associated with traditionalism and even societal backwardness, when compared to Indonesian as the national language. Javanese is also said to be less flexible, less communicative and less egalitarian by speakers of the younger generations in Central Java (Smith-Hefner, 2009:64). Further, in Javanese-speaking areas, Javanese has already steadily been losing ground to Indonesian (or Malay before Sumpah Pemuda (Youth Oath, 1928)) in commerce, politics, and literature (Anderson, 1990:199). Its less favorable starting point, then, leads Javanese to be considered as the (L)ow language in its own home-areas. Indonesian in contrast with Javanese and in line with its position as the official, state, national, unifying and unification language (Nababan, 1991; Paauw, 2009) is associated with prestige (Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo, 1982), and modernity (Susanto, 2006) and thus becomes the (H)igh language in Ferguson’s scheme. Other than Indonesian, which serves as a prestige language, there are also foreign languages, mostly English and Arabic, spoken in Java. English is spoken mainly for educational and economic reasons (Susanto, 2006) and Arabic is spoken, or is at least familiar, primarily for religious purposes, as the majority of the Javanese population are Muslims.

However, to make the situation even more complicated, in Javanese itself, there exists a system of grammatical honorifics1 with its own role in society. This system of grammatical honorifics is mainly to show “the degree of formality and the degree of respect felt by the speaker toward the addressee” (Poedjosoedarmo, 1968: 56). Saville-Troike (2003: 262) also remarks that “language in Javanese is anything but neutral” and participation and the varying degrees to

---

1 Irvine (1992:252) defines a system of grammatical honorifics as “a system of alternate linguistic expressions which are isosemantic: having the same reference-and-predication values, they differ only in their pragmatic values (expressing degrees of deference, respect, or distance)”. Further, in Javanese case, the alternation operates in lexical system of the language (ibid).
which it is accomplished are socially charged highly meaningful actions. Those honorific registers are Ngoko (Low), Madya (Middle), and Krama (High).

1. Ngoko is the non-polite and informal variety which is used for addressing very familiar audiences. This register consists of Ngoko words or vocabularies and affixes (i.e. the passive prefix *di-*), the determinative suffix *-é*, and the causative suffix *(a)ké*.

2. Madya or Madya-Krama is the semi-polite and semi-formal variety which is used for addressing a person with an intermediate degree of formality. This register consists of Madya vocabularies (sometimes Krama too) and Ngoko affixes and also Krama pronouns and possessions.

3. Krama is the polite and formal variety which is used for addressing distant audiences and for formal situations. This register is composed of Krama vocabularies and affixes (i.e. the passive prefix *dipun-*), the determinative suffix *-ipun*, and the causative suffix *-aken*).

(Errington, 1998; Poedjosoedarmo, 1968: 59-60; Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo, 1982).

However, it is also important to note that in East Java, the highest register, Krama, is less spoken or not at all compared to Central Java where Javanese aristocracy still exists. Thus, what serves as the highest Javanese register in East Java is Madya-Krama. Further, regarding this internal linguistic situation of Javanese, Anderson (1966, in Wajdi, et al, 2013) treats both Krama and Standard Indonesian as (H)igh varieties and Ngoko together with non-standard Indonesian as (L)ow varieties. However, there are still no studies concerning the prestige status of Javanese Krama as compared to Indonesian in a Javanese-speaking area.

In such a multilingual community, it becomes a norm to mix the codes in daily communication. Some insertional instances of code-mixing at least are expected to be found in Arabic and Javanese. This expectation is based on the crucial role of Arabic in the communicative system of piety (Kuipers, 2013) and the ongoing ‘Arabization’ trend which was started over the past decades (Berg, 2007). Even now, Arabic is experiencing a growth since over the last 30 years with the sprinkles of everyday Arabic greetings and sayings into everyday conversation (Kuipers, 2013).

Further, Javanese and Indonesian are quite similar typologically. In addition, the relationship between Javanese as the local language and Indonesian as the national language would make code-mixing between these two languages even more frequent compared to that of Arabic and Javanese. The same thing would also be expected for mixing involving High (Krama) and Low
(Ngoko) Javanese varieties. Heavy code-mixing between Indonesian and Javanese could even lead to a new mixed-language, which Errington (1998) has dubbed the ‘language salad’. Errington (1998:113) further suggested that it is the phonological and morphological similarities between the two languages that facilitate “the transposition of lexical material between them”, even though this structural similarity alone would not be either a necessary nor a sufficient condition for predicting language shift patterns.

1.2 Typological differences between the languages involved

In general, there are syntactic differences between the three languages (Arabic, Indonesian, and Javanese (High and Low varieties)) as can be seen below:

Muhammad went to school (Kaye, 1987:683)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classical Arabic</th>
<th>Dahaba</th>
<th>Muhammadun</th>
<th>?ilā</th>
<th>Imadrasati</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAST.go</td>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>school.GEN.SG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indonesian</th>
<th>Muhammad</th>
<th>pergi</th>
<th>ke sekolah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad go</td>
<td>to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Javanese</th>
<th>Muhammad</th>
<th>tindhak</th>
<th>datheng sekolah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad go</td>
<td>to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Javanese</th>
<th>Muhammad</th>
<th>lunga</th>
<th>menyang sekolah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad go</td>
<td>to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examples above show that the basic word order of classical Arabic is VSO which is “the normal order for rhetorically unmarked sentences” (Thackston, 1994: 34). However, it is also possible in Arabic to begin a sentence with a subject, resulting in SVO order. In doing this, ?inna ‘indeed’ is usually put before the subject which further makes the subject to be in the accusative form (Kaye, 1987). In this construction, the verb has to agree with the subject in both gender and number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>?inna</th>
<th>dahaba</th>
<th>Muhammadan</th>
<th>?ilā</th>
<th>Imadrasati</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indeed</td>
<td>3SG.M.PAST.go</td>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>school.GEN.SG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>?inna</th>
<th>Muhammadan</th>
<th>wa</th>
<th>Zaidan</th>
<th>?ahabā</th>
<th>?ilā</th>
<th>Imadrasati</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indeed</td>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>Zaid</td>
<td>3DualM.go</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>school.GEN.SG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, in Arabic, when the structure is VSO, the verb has to agree with its subject in gender but not in the number of the subject: it has to remain singular (Thackston, 1994).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dahaba</th>
<th>r-rajulu</th>
<th>Xarajati</th>
<th>l-mar?atu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAST.go</td>
<td>DET.man</td>
<td>PAST.exit</td>
<td>DET.woman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dahaba</th>
<th>r-rijālu</th>
<th>Xarajati</th>
<th>n-nisā?u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAST.go</td>
<td>DET.man.PL</td>
<td>PAST.exit</td>
<td>DET.woman.PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In contrast with Arabic word order, Indonesian and both varieties of Javanese word order are SVO. Indonesian and Javanese are two Malayo-Polynesian languages that have SVO typology (Randriamasimanana, 2000). Further, within Javanese itself, High Javanese and Low Javanese syntactically do not differ except in the affirmative imperative as can be seen below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Javanese</th>
<th>Kula</th>
<th>aturi</th>
<th>tindhak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(panjenengan)</td>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>beg</td>
<td>go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2SG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Javanese</td>
<td>lungo-o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>go-IMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In High Javanese as we can see there is an optional second person pronoun, an obligatory phrase ‘kula aturi’ which means ‘I beg’, and a bare verb without any imperative suffix ‘tindhak’. In the Low Javanese construction, however, it only consists of a verb with an imperative suffix -o and there is an absence of second pronoun (Poedjosoedarmo, 1968: 62).

As Indonesian and Javanese come from the same language family, phonological, morphological, and even structural similarities between them are expected to exist. Indonesian and Javanese are similar phonologically as can be seen below:

**Table 1: Indonesian consonants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Labiodental</th>
<th>Dental/Alveolar</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stops/Affricates</td>
<td>p b</td>
<td>t d</td>
<td>tʃ dʒ (ʃ)</td>
<td>k g</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricatives</td>
<td>(f) (v)</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximants</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laterals</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhotics</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( ) = present only in ‘borrowed’ words from another language

**Table 2: Javanese consonants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Retroflex</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stops/Affricates</td>
<td>p ḃ</td>
<td>t d</td>
<td>t tʃ dʒ tʃ dʒ</td>
<td>k ḡ</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricatives</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximants</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laterals</td>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhotics</td>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consonants system of Indonesian and Javanese are mostly the same except that Javanese has a retroflex /ʈ/ and /ɖ̥/ and Indonesian does not (Errington, 1998). In addition, compared
to Indonesian, Javanese slightly differs in its vowel system in which it has an extra variant of a in a final syllable and also two variants of pepet e, é and è (Oakes, 2009: 821-822).

Table 3: Arabic consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Labiodental</th>
<th>Interdental</th>
<th>Dental/Alveolar</th>
<th>Emphatic</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Uvular</th>
<th>Pharyngeal</th>
<th>Laryngeal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stops/Affricates</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>t d</td>
<td>dʒ tʃ</td>
<td></td>
<td>k q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricatives</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>θ δ</td>
<td>s z</td>
<td>sʃ dʒ</td>
<td>x y h</td>
<td>h h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximants</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laterals</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trill</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A lot of differences can be found when comparing Arabic consonant system to both Indonesian and Javanese. Both Indonesian and Javanese do not have fricatives sounds /f/, /θ/, /ð/, /z/, /sˤ/, /ðˤ/, /ʃ/, /x/, /ɣ/, /ʔ/, also emphatic sounds /dˤ/, /tˤ/, and /ɬ/. Moreover, compared to Indonesian and Javanese, Arabic has its well-known ‘classical triangular system’ /a/, /i/ and /u/ (Kaye, 1987: 669).

Furthermore, in term of verb morphology, unlike Arabic verbs which can be inflected by tense, the number and the gender of the subject, verbs in both Indonesian and Javanese are not inflected by those aspects nor the nouns (Oakes, 2009; Prentice, 1987).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Verb 1</th>
<th>Verb 2</th>
<th>Noun 1</th>
<th>Noun 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Bapak</td>
<td>mem-belikan</td>
<td>anak-nya</td>
<td>kuda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>father</td>
<td>AV-buy-APPL</td>
<td>child-POSS</td>
<td>horse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Javanese</td>
<td>Bapak</td>
<td>n-umbasaken</td>
<td>putran-ipun</td>
<td>Jaran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>father</td>
<td>AV-buy-APPL</td>
<td>child-POSS</td>
<td>horse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Javanese</td>
<td>Bapak</td>
<td>nukok-ké</td>
<td>anak-é</td>
<td>Jaran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>father</td>
<td>AV-buy-APPL</td>
<td>child-POSS</td>
<td>horse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sentences above, therefore have a number of meanings. The verbs ‘membelikan’ in Indonesian, or ‘numbasaken’ and ‘numbasaké’ in Javanese could indicate past or present event. The same thing stands for ‘kuda’ which can be either male horse or female horse and also could be one horse or more than one horse. It is the context that defines the exact meaning of the sentences above.

However, in Javanese grammar, Robson (1992) argues that the verb is the most complicated aspect. The verbs can take two arguments (transitive) or one argument (intransitive). Further, transitive verbs can also be inflected by voice marking, either active or passive (Oakes, 2009). The inflection is involving affixation, a nasal prefix for active voice and di- prefix for passive
voice. In this regard, Indonesian also has a similar case in which it has meN- prefix for marking transitive active voice and di- prefix for passive voice (Gil, 2002; Sneddon et al., 2010). Often accompanying this prefixes in Javanese, there are suffixes -kė and -i which have many functions ranging from applicative to valency preserving and increasing. Further, in Indonesian, -kan an object marker for patient and beneficiary and -i has a locative and a repetitive function (Sneddon et al., 2010).

1.3 Islamic Preaching in Java

Islamic preaching is one type of da ’wah ‘invitation’ during which Muslims ‘invite’ their fellow Muslims “to deepen their own understanding and commitment to a way of life that is spiritually fulfilling and which offers the satisfying sense of participating in religious community” (Feener and Gade, 1998:19). This kind of event is still part of the continuation of the Islamization process in Indonesia but without actively trying to convert people with different religions. Since in Java more than 60% of the population are Muslims (Na’im & Syaputra, 2010), Islamic-related events attract high participation. Does this kind of event in Java mirror the big situation mentioned in the previous section linguistically?

Seeing the complexity of the linguistic repertoire in Java, the linguistic condition of an Islamic-related oratorical even thus might be equally complex. As has been mentioned, Indonesian and Javanese co-exist in Java and code-mixing between the two also exist. However, in an Islamic-preaching event, a preacher always chooses one of the two languages as the dominant code which is usually based on the audiences, the place of the event, and the purpose of the event (Millie, 2012b). In such event, besides Indonesian and Javanese, Arabic is also used as there is a close association between Arabic and Islam. In many countries including Indonesia, Arabic is a ‘learned, liturgical language’ (Kaye, 1987:664) for Muslims. In addition, it is also important to note that in this context it is classical Arabic which is featured in Quran and learned by Muslims in Pesantren² (Van Dam, 2010). Given the facts that classical Arabic entextualization of a normative source (i.e. Quran and Hadith) becomes a religious norm (Millie, 2012b) and that even outside Islamic events Arabic plays an important role in the piety communication system, code-mixing between Arabic and Javanese will likely happen in an Islamic preaching event. Seeing the facts presented, thus, it will be interesting to investigate the phenomenon of code-mixing in Islamic preaching events Java.

² Pesantren: ‘A type of school in Southeast Asia offering second-level training in Islamic subjects’ (Federspiel, 2016)
1.5 Research Questions

The goal of this study is to understand the structure and functions of code-mixing in Islamic preaching events in Java. Thus, to fulfill this aim, two questions are formulated:

1) What is the structural pattern of code-mixing in Islamic preaching events in Java?

2) What are the social intentions behind code-mixing in Islamic preaching events in Java?

To answer the two questions above this study will be organized as follows: Chapter 2 provides a description of the methodology of this research. Chapter 3 further presents the structural findings generated from the Islamic preaching YouTube videos. In Chapter 4, the social intentions and functions of the code-mixing are analyzed. Then, Chapter 5 presents a discussion of these findings. Eventually, Chapter 6 concludes this study and presents further suggestions.
2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Materials

The data were taken from five YouTube videos of Islamic preaching events in Java involving the same preacher, an hour and half-length each. The preacher, Anwar Zahid, is a Javanese man who originally comes from East Java. All of the preaching videos were recorded in villages, except for one video which was recorded in Malang, the second largest city in East Java. As expected, Javanese was more dominantly used in those four villages while for one video recorded in Malang it was Indonesian that was used dominantly. Even though Millie (2012b:380) argues that it is the situation and not the audience which determines Indonesian Muslim’s conceptions of ‘linguistic appropriateness’, given those preaching videos, however, the audience may also take part in this dominant code selection.

2.2 Framework for the data analysis

Currently, there are two approaches that can be used in the study of multilingual code-switching in sociolinguistics: the structural approach (Poplack 1993; Myers-Scotton 1993; Muysken, 2000) and the pragmatic approach (Auer, 1998; Woolard, 1998). However, despite the approaches, it is important to note that there still is no consensus on whether code-mixing and code-switching should be used as interchangeable terms or in different ways. Muysken (2000) treats code-mixing particularly as the more general phenomenon compared to code-switching. He argues that code-switching only represents the alternation process of code-mixing in his framework. Code mixing, then, refers to “all cases where lexical items and grammatical features from two languages appear in one sentence” (Muysken, 2000: 1).

This study further attempts not only to investigate the structure of the code-mixing in the Islamic preaching event but also to reveal the pragmatic reasons behind it. Thus, the data were analyzed both structurally and pragmatically. In analyzing the structure of the code-mixing, Muysken’s (2000) framework is chosen as for me it is an economical categorization in a vast and confusing discussion of code-mixing. There are three types of code-mixing described by Muysken: Insertion, Alternation and Congruent lexicalization.

a) Insertion occurs when a single constituent B is inserted into a structure identifiable as belonging to language A. Some of the insertion features that might be useful in the present study can be seen below:

1). Single constituents
2). Nested a b a structure
3). Selected elements
3). Content words
4). Morphological integration

b). Alternation occurs when a constituent from language A is followed by a constituent from language B and the language of the constituent dominating A and B cannot be specified. Some of the alternation features that might be useful in the present study can be seen below:

1). Several constituents
2). Non-nested A B A sequences
3). Long and complex switching
3). Adverbs and discourse particles
4). Tag switching

c). Congruent lexicalization occurs when languages A and B share the same grammatical structure, and words from both languages are inserted more or less randomly. Indonesian and Javanese even in 1998 when Errington conducted his research on the interaction and identity in Javanese, were already in the state towards hybridization, not to mention now. Thus, Muysken’s congruent lexicalization typology is really helpful in investigating the data for the present study. Some of the congruent lexicalization features described by Muysken that are useful in this study can be seen below:

1). Multi-constituent code-mixing
2). Non-constituent mixing
3). Non-nested a b a structures
3). Content and functional words
4). Bidirectional code-mixing
5). Back-and-forth switches
6). Homophonous diamorphs
7). Morphological integration

Muysken’s (2000) typology above is relevant to my data as Indonesian and Javanese are typologically similar and are expected to have the three types of code-mixing. The same thing would also be expected for mixing involving High (Krama) and Low (Ngoko) Javanese varieties. While for Arabic-Javanese mixing, the presence of insertions at least is expected.
I now compare Muysken’s approach to several other often cited approaches.

Table 4: Muysken’s (2000) typology in comparison with Auer (p. 4), Myers-Scotton, and Poplack (p. 32).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muysken</th>
<th>Auer</th>
<th>Myers-Scotton</th>
<th>Poplack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insertion</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Matrix Language +</td>
<td>(Nonce) borrowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Embedded Language</td>
<td>Constituent insertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>constituents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternation</td>
<td>Code-switching</td>
<td>Embedded Language</td>
<td>Flagged switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Islands</td>
<td>Code-switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matrix Language – shift</td>
<td>under equivalence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matrix Language – shift</td>
<td>Code-switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>turn-over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(style shifting)</td>
<td>(style shifting)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows Muysken’s (2000) framework compared to that of Auer, Myers-Scotton, and Poplack. From Table 4 we can see that Muysken’s model is the generalization of the other models. Muysken’s insertion is similar to Auer’s transfer and what Myers-Scotton termed as ‘Matrix Language + Embedded language constituents’. Further, Muysken also considers the process of insertion is similar to Poplack’s concept of borrowing. Regarding the alternation, Muysken refers this to Auer and Poplack’s code-switching model. This is also the reason why code-switching should not be considered as the more general phenomenon compared to code-mixing.

2.3 Procedures

The videos were transcribed as text focusing only on and the ‘content’ part. The opening and the closing part are left out in the analysis as they are done completely in Arabic following the norms of Islamic ritual language. Focusing only on the content part of the Islamic preaching discourse, I believe, is more interesting as the data represents more the code-mixing practiced in everyday conversation. The transcription was done using ELAN 4.9.4., a professional tool for the creation of complex annotations on video and audio resources developed by the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen. Its aim is ‘to provide a sound technological basis for the annotation and exploitation of multi-media recordings’ (Hellwig, 2016). Furthermore, from this transcription, the instances of code-mixing were identified and
classified as cases of Javanese - Arabic, Indonesian - Arabic, Javanese – Indonesian, Indonesian – Javanese, Javanese Krama - Javanese Ngoko or Javanese Ngoko –Javanese Krama code-mixing. In this study, the code-mixing between Javanese Krama and Ngoko are also included as Islamic preaching can range from semi-formal to formal speech in which a constant movement from one level to another level of Javanese register is common (Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo, 1982: 69). Further, since each level has its own role in social interaction, it will be interesting to also include them in the analysis. Afterward, the data collected are classified into grammatical categorization such as noun, noun phrase, particles, expressions, etc. The switching types are also identified so that it will be easier to categorize them as insertion, alternation or congruent lexicalization. After the structure of the code-mixed fragments is identified, the social intention of the code-mixing is explored.

2.4 Previous studies

The study of code-mixing and code-switching in the religious context in Java, unfortunately, is still under-investigated. Two studies related to this topic are the work done by Saddhono (2012) focusing on the Friday sermon in Surakarta and Susanto’s (2006) investigation on the role of ‘Insha’Allah in Musyawarah’. Saddhono (2012) however did not focus solely on code-mixing phenomena in Friday sermon, but also the speech act instances of the sermon and the strategies of the composition of the sermon topics. His study revealed that despite the fact Friday sermons were given in Surakarta (one of the hearts of the Javanese-speaking region), Indonesian was dominantly used in the sermons analyzed. Further, code-mixing instances among languages involved (i.e. Indonesian, Arabic, Javanese, and English) were found to be manifested in words and repeated words and phrases. It turned out that the factors triggering the code-mixing were “speaker, partner, topic, prestige and changes in the situation in general, and the specific Islamic ideology followed by the place where the sermon is given, the mosque” (p. 150). He found out that code-mixing during Friday sermons has some functions such as to express gratitude, to praise God, to show prestige, to pray, etc. Friday sermons and Islamic preaching events are very similar and only differ in terms of formality, in a sense that Friday sermons have a fixed structure of the event and that the Islamic preaching has much of a less fixed format. Seeing this similarity, Saddhono’s (2012) research result regarding the code-mixing function is helpful to understand the code-mixing phenomenon in Islamic preaching in Java.

Susanto (2006) investigated code-switching in Islamic discourse, especially the role of Insha’ Allah in musyawarah, Islamic religious meetings or discussions, which were made in Malang,
East Java. By employing Blom and Gumperz’ (1972) situational and metaphorical approach, he tried to map the code-switching pattern influenced by *insha’ Allah*. **Insha’Allah** occurring after Indonesian utterances tends to trigger the use of either Javanese Krama using *nggih* (yes), *ngoten* (like that) and *saget* (can) or some Arabic expressions after. Further, it triggers Indonesian expressions if it occurs after either Javanese Krama using *nggih* (yes) and *ngoten* (like that) or Arabic expressions. As it is a norm to use Arabic expressions in an Islamic event, these findings are useful as an attempt to explain the nature of code-mixing between Arabic and other languages involved in the present study. Millie (2012b) did focus on investigating the code choice in Islamic preaching, but it was made in Sundanese and not Javanese. Her study focused more on what could influence the code selection in Sundanese Islamic oratory. The code selection in Islamic preaching in Indonesia is very likely based on the situation, as Millie (2012b:380) argues that it is the situation and not the audience which determines Indonesian Muslim’s conceptions of ‘linguistic appropriateness’. She further elaborates that the premises which can determine the dominant code in the event are the preaching outcomes (i.e. Sundanese is used to gain ‘artful effects of emotion’ and a sense of belonging, Indonesian is used to support a religious vision of transformation) and the indexical meaning of Indonesian. In addition, she also remarks that switching from Indonesian to the local language, Sundanese, is mainly for refreshing strategies wherein it is the regional language that provides the strong affective connection. Millie (2012b), however, does not mention which variety of Sundanese that is being involved in the study.

In summary, we can see that some investigations focusing on CM in Islamic discourse in Javanese were only done in Friday sermons (Saddhono, 2012) and Islamic *musyawarah* (Susanto, 2006). Millie (2012b) did investigate the code choice in Islamic preaching events, but she focused on Sundanese and not Javanese. Given the fact that research on code-mixing in Islamic preaching events in Javanese has not been conducted so far coupled with the fact that code-mixing in relation to religion is under-investigated, makes it interesting for the present study. Further, the result will be a significant addition to the relatively limited exploration of the interaction between language and religion with respect to bilingualism or multilingualism.

---

3 Sundanese, similar to Javanese, also has honorific registers, i.e. *lemes* (polite) and *kasar* (non-polite) (Locher, 1996)
3. STRUCTURAL FINDINGS

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the structural findings of the code-mixing in the data examined. This discussion further attempts to answer the first research question mentioned in §1, namely:

What is the structural pattern of code-mixing in Islamic preaching events in Java?

Listed below are the sub-topics that will be addressed in this chapter:

a) Arabic elements in Javanese and Indonesian sentences.

b) Krama elements in Ngoko sentences and vice versa

c) Indonesian elements in Javanese sentences

d) Javanese elements in Indonesian sentences

e) Intense mixing between Javanese and Indonesian

3.2 Arabic elements in Javanese sentences and Indonesian sentences

The use of Arabic has been expanding in Indonesia over the last 30 years and everyday Arabic greetings and sayings are sprinkled into ordinary conversations (Kuipers, 2013). In spite of this, even though Muslims are the majority in Indonesia, Arabic is still not spoken as the main code for daily conversation in Java or in anywhere else in Indonesia. However, a lot of Arabic borrowings, quotations, and expressions, at least, are expected to be found in the data examined. Table 5 shows what type of Arabic elements occur in Javanese and Indonesian sentences.

Table 5: Arabic elements in Javanese and Indonesian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language pairs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VP</th>
<th>Adj</th>
<th>expression</th>
<th>quotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic &gt; Jav</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic &gt; IND</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It turns out that individual nouns are the most frequently inserted Arabic elements within Javanese sentences compared to other categories such as noun phrases (2), verbs (3) or adjectives (4). Arabic sentences are also quite frequently mixed into Javanese sentences. These Arabic sentences are typically Islamic conventionalized expressions (19), which are found slightly more frequently compared to Arabic entextualization (quotation) from Quran or Hadith (15). In contrast, Arabic quotations (30) occurred more frequently in Indonesian sentences compared to Arabic expressions (11). Arabic sentences, in general, were even found more than smaller constituents such as nouns (10), noun phrases (3), verb phrases (4), and adjectives (12).
Some of the examples of Arabic – Javanese mixing can be seen below:

(1) Kunjuk wonten ngersa-nipun sagunging para 'alim para bapak kiai
intended exist before-GEN all DET.PL scholar DET.PL father Kiai
para ibu Nyai masyayikh asaatid lan para sesepuh ingkang winantu
DET.PL mother Nyai leader.PL teacher.PL and DET.PL elder REL together
ing pakuruman ingkang sareng-sareng kita ta'dzim-i
LOC honor REL together 1PL respect.CAUS

‘Intended for the respected scientists, Kiai, Nyai, leaders, teachers and all elders who are here whom we respect.’
[Video 1, 00:03:15.042 -00:03:40.607]

Example (1) shows a greeting that the preacher delivers to the audiences, especially the scholars, the Kiai⁴, the Nyai⁵, the leaders, the teachers and the elders. In addressing some of these audiences, the preacher uses Arabic words such as ‘alim for scholars, masyayikh for leaders, and asaatid for teachers. These are examples of Arabic noun insertions. Beside nouns, it turns out that the preacher also inserts Arabic verbs like ta’dzim ‘to respect’ which can be seen in the example above. The Arabic verb ta’dzim ‘to respect’ is integrated into the Javanese verbal system, from which it gets a causative suffix -i attached to it. Further, example (2) is an example where a lot of Arabic words with different categories are inserted into Indonesian sentences.

(2) Al-hamdu li-llah atas izin Allah atas pertolongan Allah
DET-praise for-Allah because permission Allah because help Allah
malam ini kita dapat sama-sama hadir ber-silaturrahim
night DEM 1PL able together come AV-connect.kinship
ber-dzikir ber-doa ber-sholawat ber-tholabil 'ilmi dalam rangka
AV-mention AV-pray AV-prayers AV-seek.knowledge in occasion
hurmat peringatan maulid nabi agung Muhammad Shalla
respect commemoration birthday prophet great Muhammad blessing
Ilahu 'alai-hi wa salam
Allah on-3SG.M and peace

‘Praise be to Allah, because of His permission and help tonight we are able to come, to connect kinship, to remember (God), to pray, to pray for Muhammad and to seek knowledge on the occasion of respecting the Great Prophet Muhammad’ (Peace and blessing be upon him) birthday.’
[Video 2, 00:04:11.340 - 00:04:44.010]

The preacher uses Indonesian as the main code in the example above and mixes it with Arabic nouns, noun phrases, verbs and verb phrase and even expressions. Sholawat, which literary means ‘prayers’ is used by the preacher in this case for referring ‘to do prayers especially for Prophet Muhammad’. From an Arabic noun, it is further transformed into an Indonesian verb

---

⁴ Kiai is “a scholar-teacher who heads the pesantren” (Jones, 1983:84)
⁵ Nyai is the wife of a Kiai
by attaching the intransitive prefix *ber*- to it. Another noun insertion in the example above is *maulid* ‘birthday’. Similar to *sholawat*, *maulid* is also specifically referred to the sole Prophet’s birthday. Another noun inserted is *dzikir* ‘remembering’, which in this case means ‘the activity of mentioning God’s name/remembering God.’ *Silatu r-rahim* literally means ‘connection of the kinship’, and further becomes the stem of an Indonesian verb *ber-silaturrahim* ‘to connect kinship’. Moreover, verb phrase *tholabil ‘ilmi* is inserted to refer to ‘to seek knowledge’. Yet in this context, by using Arabic, the preacher wants to emphasize that the kind of knowledge that is sought is that of Islam.

There are two Arabic expressions featured in the example (2). *Al-hamdu li-llah* ‘the praise for Allah’, is a conventionalized Muslim expression for expressing gratitude towards God which was originally taken from the second verse of the Quran. Meanwhile, *Shalla llahu ‘alai-hi wa salam* is a conventionally complimentary phrase that is attached to Prophet Muhammad’s name. Other Arabic expressions that are found in the data can be seen below:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Insyia Allah</td>
<td>‘if Allah wills it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A phrase uttered by Muslim when “referring to something he wants to do in the future” (Susanto, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Subhanahu wa ta’ala</td>
<td>‘The most glorified and the most high’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A conventionally complimentary phrase attached to the Allah’s name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Maa sya’a Allah</td>
<td>‘what Allah wants’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A phrase to express appreciation, joy and praise and uttered upon hearing good news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>allhumma sholli ‘ala muhammad</td>
<td>‘O Allah, send Your blessings upon Prophet Muhammad’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An expression that is uttered as a prayer for Prophet Muhammad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Astaghfiru llah</td>
<td>‘I seek forgiveness from Allah’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td>A phrase for praising Allah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glory be to God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>naudubillahi min dzalik</td>
<td>‘I seek refuge in Allah from that thing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An expression uttered when a Muslim is shocked by witnessing something sinful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>innalillahi wa inna ilaihi raajii’uun</td>
<td>‘We surely belong to Allah and to Him we shall return’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An expression usually uttered when there is someone who dies or upon hearing a loss or calamity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of these Arabic expressions instead of either their Javanese or Indonesian version is most likely due to religious merits purposes (Susanto, 2006). Further, example (3) shows the insertion of an Arabic adjective into an Indonesian sentence.

---

6 Prefix *ber*- in Indonesian is usually attached to verb base or noun base to form intransitive primary verbs (Sneddon et. al., 2010)
Similar to example (2), the preacher also uses Indonesian as the main code in example (3). He adds some Arabic adjectives, such as dzohir ‘visible’, afiyat ‘healthy’ and bathin ‘hidden’. The Arabic adjective, afiyat ‘healthy’ for instance, was chosen by the preacher in its Javanese or Indonesian version when it does not mean the same thing as afiyat. Thus, the preacher decides to borrow the Arabic terms. In the overview below, I present typical Arabic nouns, adjectives, and verbs that are inserted into either Javanese or Indonesian sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ġālim</td>
<td>‘scholar’</td>
<td>‘healthy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mafāyix</td>
<td>‘leaders’</td>
<td>‘unjust’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asātīd</td>
<td>‘teachers’</td>
<td>‘visible’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hādīrīn</td>
<td>‘male audiences’</td>
<td>‘hidden’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hādīrirāt</td>
<td>‘female audiences’</td>
<td>‘wasteful’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dzamaʃah</td>
<td>‘assembly/group’</td>
<td>‘monthly’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tāⱪat</td>
<td>‘obedience’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahmat</td>
<td>‘mercy’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfirah</td>
<td>‘forgiveness’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maulid</td>
<td>‘birthday’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sālawat</td>
<td>‘prayers’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dikir</td>
<td>‘to mention’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the Arabic elements shown above are cases of borrowing from Arabic to either Javanese or Indonesian. This borrowing process is evidenced by the presence of morphological integration, as Myers-Scotton (2006:224) remarks that “borrowed words are almost always adapted to the recipient language in morphology (adapted in form)”. Based on the data examined, borrowing from Arabic into Indonesian is characterized by the presence of an intransitive prefix ber- to form a verb (e.g. ber-dzikir ‘to remember God’) or adding a genitive suffix -nya to create a noun phrase (e.g. magfirah-nya ‘His forgiveness’). Likewise, borrowing from Arabic to Javanese to form a verb for instance can be characterized by adding the causative suffix -i into inserted Arabic verb (e.g. ta’dim-i ‘to respect’) or to form a noun phrase by adding Ngoko genitive suffix –é to a borrowed Arabic noun (e.g. rahmat-é ‘His mercy’) or the Krama genitive suffix -ipun (e.g. rahmat-ipun ‘His mercy’).
Further, it turns out that integration in the borrowing process is not only at the morphological level. Phonological integration can also be found in the data examined. This can be seen from the way the preacher pronounces the borrowed Arabic elements in an Indonesian or Javanese way, i.e. replacement of the Arabic voiced pharyngeal fricative /ʕ/ by a Javanese and Indonesian glottal stop /ʔ/ like in ʕālim → ʔalim, replacement of Arabic voiceless pharyngeal fricative /ħ/ and emphatic fricative ħāðirīn by a Javanese and Indonesian glottal fricative /h/ and alveolar stop /d/ like in ħāđirīn → hadirin. Further, the Arabic emphatic stop /tˤ/ is replaced by a Javanese and Indonesian dental stop /t/ like in bātˤin → batin. Looking at the examples above, we can also notice that long vowels in Arabic tend to be replaced by their short version in either Javanese or Indonesian sentences.

Furthermore, as has been mentioned, Arabic entextualization (from Quran or Hadith) is the most frequently occurring type of Arabic - Indonesian code-mixing, as can be seen in example (4) below:

(4) Rasulullah pernah menyatakan idzaa marortum bi riadhi
Rasulullah ever AV-say if PAST.go.through.2PL by garden
l-jannah farta'u ketika kalian men-dapati ada taman-taman syurga
DET-heaven join.IMP when 2PL AV-pass exist garden.PL heaven
ikut-lah nimbrung ikut-lah ber-gabung
follow-IMP join follow-IMP AV-join

‘Rasulullah said, ”idzaa marortum bi riadhi l-jannah, farta'u” when you pass through the Heaven’s gardens, join them, join them.’
[Video 2, 00:16:15.010 - 00:16:24.600]

In addition, this Arabic entextualization in Indonesian sentences (30) is twice as frequent when compared to Javanese sentences (15). This may be due to the fact that Indonesian has a typical function as a language for explaining (Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo, 1982), which will be further explained in the next chapter.

### 3.3 Krama elements within Ngoko sentences or vice versa

Table 6: Krama elements in Ngoko construction and vice versa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language pairs</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VP</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Negation</th>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>imperative</th>
<th>Tag question</th>
<th>sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Krama &gt; Ngoko</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngoko &gt; Krama</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the summary of the grammatical category of Krama elements found in Ngoko sentences or vice versa. As seen in Table 6, pronouns, negation, and tag questions can only be found with Krama elements. One reason for this interesting fact is politeness. In contrast, the
imperative is only found in Ngoko elements and not in Krama at all. It could be because the preacher wants to create a stronger effect of imperative by using Ngoko since Ngoko is the code spoken by the superior to the inferior. Further, verb and verb phrase are not that frequently found in the data. Yet, Ngoko verbs are found more compared to Krama verbs. Many times, this Ngoko verb insertion is for humoristic purposes. The discussion on the function of these code-mixing cases is presented in the next chapter.

Krama pronoun mixing example can be seen in the example (5) below:

(5) Di-dungak-na iku bèn mandi qobul di-ijabah-i Allah
pv-pray-caus dem so.that strong realized pv-answer-caus Allah
njenengan amin
2sg amen
‘(If someone) prays for you, in order it to be strong, realized and answered by Allah, you (need to say) amen.’
[Video 5, 00:08:13.595 - 00:08:20.185]

In the example above, the preacher inserts a Krama pronoun njenengan ‘you’ which is the short version of panjenengan, into a Ngoko construction. Example (5) shows that the preacher actually commands the audiences to say amin when there is someone who prays for them. Yet, the use of this Krama pronoun there, somehow, makes this command softer and more polite. Further, the pronoun is found to have a low degree of borrowability (van Hout and Muysken, 1994). However, it turns out that mixing Krama pronoun in Ngoko constructions is not something rare. In fact, Krama pronouns are found to be the category with the highest occurrences of mixing in the data. Seeing this fact, thus, it seems like Krama pronoun mixing in Ngoko construction is more likely to be congruent lexicalization between Krama and Ngoko.

Similar to the pronoun, tag questions are also only found in Krama elements and not in Ngoko. Observe example (6) below:

(6) lhoh bocah sunat kui bekakas-é kan cilik
particle kid circumcision dem tool-gen particle small
thoh asli-né nggéh mboten?
particle real-det yes no
‘The circumcised boy, his ‘tool’ is actually small, yes no?’

Nggéh mboten? which is literally means ‘yes (or) no?’ is mixed with the Ngoko construction. As we can see in example (6), the Krama tag is used by the preacher to confirm a fact, that a boy’s ‘tool’ before circumcision is actually small. Other two types of Krama tag found are nggéh? ‘yes?’ and nggéh napa nggéh? ‘yes or yes?’ which are actually more frequent than nggéh mboten? type. The discussion of their different function is presented in chapter 4.
Further, in the data examined, this kind of mixing always occurs in the peripheral position of the sentence. With this reason added by the fact that this is a tag-switching case, thus, it is more likely for this to be a case of alternational code-mixing.

Krama negation, although not as frequent as Krama pronouns and tag questions, is also quite frequent and interestingly cannot be found with Ngoko elements.

Example (7) presents a mix of Krama elements that occur between clauses. The mixed Krama elements are not just a single element of negation but also the following verb too. This further creates a clause with an omitted subject which is already provided in the previous clause. Seeing this fact, thus, we can say that this is one of the cases of alternational code-mixing.

Example (8) presents a mix of Ngoko imperative clause with Krama clauses. What is indicated by imperative here covers both positive imperative and negative imperative. As aforementioned, interestingly, imperative clause mixing is only found in Ngoko only and not in Krama.

---

7 *Rakaat* refers to a single unit of Islamic prayers, i.e. there are four *rakaat* in prayer *dzuhur.*
‘Ladies and gentlemen, are you already sleepy or not? Do not be sleepy still! For I will be just for a while.’

[video 5, 00:05:45.170 - 00:05:51.590]

In example (8), Ngoko negative imperative *aja ngantuk sék* ‘do not be sleepy still’ is spoken after a whole Krama question. The preacher switch into Ngoko only for this imperative purpose which quite frequent with 16 tokens. Imperatives are basically about giving commands (Frank, 1972). Thus, by doing it in Ngoko, it seems like the preacher expects a stronger effect of the command on the audiences. More detailed explanation on this is discussed in the next chapter. In addition, based on the fact that the mixed element is a clause and that the mixing occurs between clause, hence we can say that this case is indicative of alternational code-mixing.

Example (9) however, presents an insertional code-mixing case. The mixed element is a reduplicated Ngoko verb *mangap-mangap* to refer to ‘to open the mouth repeatedly without sound’. Moreover, Ngoko verb insertion apparently is not frequently occurred in the data, not to mention Krama insertion which is only half of the Ngoko verb’s token. All of the four tokens of the Ngoko verb insertions in Krama sentence are made for a humoristic purpose. The insertion of Krama verb, however, as expected is for politeness strategy.

Example (9) however, presents an insertional code-mixing case. The mixed element is a reduplicated Ngoko verb *mangap-mangap* to refer to ‘to open the mouth repeatedly without sound’. Moreover, Ngoko verb insertion apparently is not frequently occurred in the data, not to mention Krama insertion which is only half of the Ngoko verb’s token. All of the four tokens of the Ngoko verb insertions in Krama sentence are made for a humoristic purpose. The insertion of Krama verb, however, as expected is for politeness strategy.

3.4 **Indonesian elements in Javanese sentences**

From the data examined, it is found that Indonesian single-word elements mixed in Javanese sentences are more prevalent compared to Indonesian multi-elements. This is due to the frequent mixing of Indonesian negation in Javanese sentences. This Indonesian negation occurs in three forms: *gak, nggak*, or *enggak* ‘not’. Example (10) illustrates this phenomenon.

---

8 *Rebana* is a music instrument like drum usually used in Islamic music in Indonesia.

9 *Sholawatan* is an act of prayer delivered for Prophet Muhammad which is usually done in singing manner and is accompanied by the playing of *rebana*. 

---
Example (10) consists of two sentences in which the first sentence is in Ngoko and the second one is in Krama. The preacher uses negation *gak* in the first sentence, originally an Indonesian element. However, nowadays, this negation, *gak*, *nggak*, or *enggak* ‘not’ is quite commonly borrowed into Javanese structure, especially in East Java. In the preaching data, it is found out that 40% (143 out of 357 occurrences) of the Javanese negative sentences use either *gak*, *nggak*, or *enggak* as the negative marker. This further strengthens Conners’ (2006) claim that this Indonesian negation is slowly assimilated into East Javanese structure.

Furthermore, the Indonesian noun phrase is the category that is the second-most frequently mixed in Javanese sentences, as can be seen in example (11):

(11) Dalu niki acara-né tirakatan tujuh belas agustusan hurmat ramadhan

Night DEM event-DET holy.ceremony seventeen.August.ceremony respect Ramadhan
muga-muga sedaya seng rawuh pinaringan rahmat barakah lan
hope all REL attend get mercy blessing and

dipun-ridha-ni gusti Allah
PV-consent-CAUS Lord Allah

‘tonight, the event is a holy ceremony, seventeen August ceremony (and) respecting Ramadhan month. (I) hope that all of the attendances can receive mercy (and) blessing and are consented by Allah.’

[Video 5, 00:07:40.460 - 00:07:52.370]

In example (11), the preacher uses Krama as the main code and inserts a single Indonesian element, a noun phrase, *tujuh belas Agustusan* ‘the ceremony of celebrating [Indonesian’s Independence Day on seventeen] August’. The mixing clearly happens at the sentence level, which further creates a nested *a b a* structure. As regards its features, this case of mixing is clearly indicative of insertional mixing in Muysken’s (2000) typology.

Indonesian clauses and sentences are also quite frequently mixed with Javanese clauses, as in example (12) below:

(12) Apa yang di-laku-kan pak-lurah awak-déwé kepéngén ny-onto kepéngén niru gampang

What REL PV-do-TR village-chief IPL want AV-imitate

want AV-copy easy

‘what the Chief of the village does, it is easy if we want to imitate and copy it.’

[Video 1, 00:20:13.240 - 00:20:23.457]
The preacher, in the example above, starts with an Indonesian nominal clause *apa yang dilakukan Pak Lurah* ‘what the Chief of the village does’ in the beginning, then speaks Ngoko for the rest of the sentence. Example (12) seems to be a left-dislocation even though the fronted switched element is not clearly referred to in the rest of the sentence. Yet, in Javanese, it is common to omit the object if the information of it has already been provided in the previous clause. Given that this example shows mixing between clauses and presents left-dislocation, thus, alternational mixing is more likely. Similarly, example (13) also shows an example of alternational mixing.

(13) *Sing tak-titip-i ning ndunyo iki wong mukmin*  
REL 1SG-entrust-APPL LOC world DEM person believer  

*Sing bener-bener waé. bén ora kliru. tak-dadèk-ké*  
REL true only to.that NEG wrong 1SG-make-APPL  

*Sing sugéh tapi kekayaan-nya di-manfaat-kan untuk berjuang*  
REL but wealth-GEN PV-utilize-CAUS for fight  

‘(God said), “the one that I entrust in this world (with wealth) is (better to be) the true believer, so that (he) won’t do bad things (with his wealth). I make him rich but his wealth will be used to fight (in a good cause).’

[Video 3, 00:43:44.599 - 00:43:59.766]

The preacher, as if on God’s Own account, talks about the person that He will entrust with wealth in this world in Ngoko at first. Then he switches to the Indonesian clause *tapi kekayaannya dimanfaatkan untuk berjuang* ‘but his wealth will be used to fight (in a good cause)’. Its mixing type which occurs between clauses makes this impossible to be an insertional mix. Therefore, example (13) is more likely to be an alternational mixing.

Further, regarding Indonesian – Javanese sentence switching, it often involves long switches, as can be seen from example (14):

(14) *Kunjuk wonten ngersa-nipun sagunging para 'alim, para bapak kiai*  
intended exist before-GEN all DET.PL scientist DET.PL father Kiai  

*para ibu Nyai masyayikh asaatid lan para sesepuh ingkang winantu*  
DET.PL mother Nyai DET.PL scientist DET.PL elder REL together  

*para ingkang sareng-sareng kita ta'dzim-i para pejabat pemerintah dalam semua tingkatan-nya yang berkesempatan*  
DET.PL honor REL together DET.PL government in all level-GEN REL have.an.oppotunity  

*hadir jajaran Muspika bapak kepala desa para*Muspika<sup>10</sup>  
come range Muspika officer head village DET.PL  

*saya hormat-i*  
ISG respect-APPL

<sup>10</sup> *Muspika* is an acronym of *Musyawarah Pimpinan Kecamatan*. This term refers to a group of the leaders of a district, consisting of the head of the district, Rayon Military Commander and the district head police.
‘Intended for the respected scientists, Kiai, Nyai, leaders, teachers and all elders who are here whom we respect. The governmental officers at all levels who have the opportunity to come, the Muspika range, the head village, the village officers and the community figures whom I respect.’

[Video 1, 00:03:15.042 - 00:04:17.108]

Example (14) shows an example of a greeting that the preacher delivers. At first, he uses Krama with some insertion of Arabic nouns and a verb to address the religiously important audiences. Note that he completely switches into an Indonesian construction to greet the important audiences based on their position in the government. This type of mixing is expected since addressing government-related topics is more familiarly discussed in Indonesian. Further, the example above is obviously an example of an alternational code mixing as this occurs between clauses.

Although they are not as many as noun phrases, Indonesian verb phrases also quite frequently occur in the data examined.

(15) Ana manèh di-sumet karep-è sih katé di-uncal-na
   Exist again PV-ignite intention-GEN particle FUT PV-throw-CAUS
   mau di-lempar tapi sék di-cekel-i tangan hurung
   FUT PV-throw but still PV-hold-TR hand yet
   sampèk di-uncal-na ke-dhisikan mbledhos
   PERF PV-throw-CAUS PV-precede explode
   ‘There is another (firework) which is ignited (by someone), his intention (after igniting it) is he will throw it away, will throw it away. But (when the firework) is still in his hand and has not thrown away, it already explodes.’

[Video 4, 00:23:04.109 - 00:23:19.387]

Example (15) shows the Indonesian element mau dilempar ‘will be thrown away’ which is mixed with a Ngoko sentence. In this example, the preacher explains about a firework accident in which the Indonesian verb phrase is actually the repetition of its Ngoko version. The fact that the Indonesian element mau dilempar ‘will be thrown away’ constitutes a single constituent, i.e. a verb phrase, makes example (15) more likely to be an insertion case even though the mixing occurs in the peripheral position of the sentence. One of the reasons behind the repetition is very likely to emphasize what can be possibly happening before the firework is thrown away after its ignition. Code-mixing for emphasizing purpose is discussed in chapter 4.

However, most of the times when the preacher mixes Indonesian elements with Javanese constructions, it is because the topic discussed is more familiar with Indonesian as shown in examples (11), (12), (13), and (14). These topics are in line with Indonesian’s function as the official and national language (Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo, 1983), such as government-related,
education-related, economy-related, science-related, and technology-related topics indicated in the examples above. See also the next chapter for further discussion.

As mentioned above, Indonesian single-word elements such as nouns, adjectives, verbs, pronouns, adverbs, and conjunctions are less often mixed with Javanese sentences. Example (16) below, for instance, shows the mixing of Indonesian nouns in a Javanese sentence.

(16) Niki seng rawuh tak-delok-i ya wajah-wajah penguin
DEM REL attend 1SG-see-CAUS yes face.PL want
sugeh kabeh rich all
‘This (people) who came, I see (they have) faces (who) want to be rich.’
[Video 5, 00:13:45.140 - 00:13:49.280]

A reduplicated Indonesian noun wajah-wajah ‘faces’ is inserted into a Ngoko construction. This is an obvious example of an insertional code-mixing as the mixed element is a content word and that this mixing yields a nested a b a structure. This insertion is done presumably for a neutral move by the preacher. The Indonesian word wajah-wajah ‘faces’ has a more neutral meaning compared to Ngoko word rai ‘face’ which is sometimes used for swearing in Java. Example (17), on the other hand, presents one of the Indonesian adjective mixing instances.

(17) Lha nèk terompèt-é ora di-resik-i terus kotor sampèk
Particle if trumpet-DET NEG PV-clean-APPL then dirty until
tèyènjen engko pas wajah di-sebul mèk muni separo
Rusty later when time PV-blow only sound half
‘If the trumpet is not cleaned and becomes dirty and rusty then by the time it is blown it will only have half of the sound.’
[Video 1, 00:11:48.934 - 00:11:59.499]

As we can see, an Indonesian adjective kotor ‘dirty’ is inserted into a Ngoko construction. This case is an insertional code-mixing as the mixed element is a single content word and, similar to example (16), also has a nested a b a structure.

A range of function words is also found in the data even though they are less frequent. This is not surprising as this word class has a low degree in borrowability hierarchy (van Hout and Muysken, 1994:41). Example (18) presents Indonesian adverb mixed in Ngoko structure.

(18) Al-hamdu li-llah Tulungagung malam ini ramé nok
DET-praise for-Allah Tulungagung night DEM crowded LOC
pengajian-é timbang sing nok alun-alun
preaching-DET than REL LOC city.squares
‘Praise the God, Tulungagung tonight is more crowded in preaching event compared to (the celebration) in the city squares.’
[Video 1, 00:12:17.542 - 00:12:23.021]
The example above, the preacher begins with an Arabic expression for expressing gratitude that the Islamic event is more preferred than the New Year’s eve celebration. As we can see, an Indonesian adverb *malam ini* ‘tonight’ is mixed in the structure. Adverb mixing tends to be alternational code-mixing type in Muysken’s (2000) typology.

Another Indonesian functional word found is pronoun with only three (3) tokens as exemplified below:

(19)  
Lha saya sendiri yo sak-répotan wong aku
 Particle 1SG alone yes once-business as 1SG
mémang yo dadi rebutan koyo ngéné iki
indeed yes become object competed for like this DEM

‘I, myself, (do preaching here) as a once-business (I was offered to do preaching at a place nearby, and then offered here. I thought why not just do it). As you know, people compete to book me (as I am famous).’

[Video 3, 01:24:50.032 - 01:24:56.032]

Categorizing pronoun mixing types is difficult. Previously, it was argued that Krama pronoun mixing in Ngoko construction is an insertional code-mixing. That was because, in the data, Krama pronoun mixing occurred with the highest instances compared to other categories. However, Indonesian pronouns are rarely found in the data, which further is in line with van Hout and Muysken’s (1994) borrowability hierarchy. Further, the Indonesian pronoun *saya sendiri* ‘I myself’ in example (19) is, as we can tell, a function word. Based on Muysken’s (2000) claim that insertion tends to be content words, thus, example (19) is not likely to be an insertion case. This example, therefore, could be either an alternation or a congruent lexicalization code-mixing. In both of them, function words could occur. However, in congruent lexicalization, the matrix language is not clear, which this is not the case with example (19), i.e. Ngoko is the matrix language. Hence, based on this argument, alternation seems to be the only viable option. Similar to example (19), example (20) also shows function word mixing, i.e. conjunction.

(20)  
Walaupun kétok-é apik tapi kok palsu ora payu
Even though seem-GEN good but particle fake NEG accepted

‘Even though (it) seems good, but it turns out to be fake, then, it is not accepted.’

[video 1, 00:22:26.130 - 00:22:34.477]

The preacher in example (20) starts with an Indonesian conjunction *walaupun* ‘even though’ then switches into Ngoko for the rest of the sentence. For the same reasons as example (19) added by the fact that the code mixing in example (20) is clause-peripheral, it is very likely that this is an alternation case.
3.5 Javanese elements in Indonesian sentences

In contrast with Indonesian – Javanese mixing, multi-words mixing is more frequent compared to single-word mixing in Javanese – Indonesian. Moreover, clause and sentence are apparently the two most mixed Javanese elements in Indonesian sentences. In the data examined, Javanese clause and sentences mixing are typically long and complex, constituted of several constituents, and involve tag-switching. Looking at the features of the mixing, then, they are indicative of alternational code-mixing.

Observe example (21) below:

(21) Manusia itu yang di-tentu-kan Allah yang me-ntentukan
human DEM PV-decide Allah REL AV-decide
oleh karena itu dalam berdoa sifat-é gak
by because DEM in AV-pray character-GEN NEG
oleh mekso nang nggon-é gusti Allah ora
allow AV-force to place-GEN lord Allah NEG
oleh ngatur Gusti Allah lha saman modèl- é
allow command Lord Allah particle 2SG model-GEN
lèk n-dungo lak ng-atur gusti Allah toh
if AV-pray Particle AV-command Lord Allah particle

(It is) the human that is determined by Allah, Allah is the one who determines human. That’s why in praying, (human) is not allowed to force Allah (to answer his pray), is not allowed to command Allah. Yet, when you are praying, seems like you command Allah to answer your pray, right?.’

[Video 3, 00:34:35.066 - 00:34:51.632]

Example (21) starts with a full Indonesian sentence, stating information about the fact that in Islamic belief it is the God that determines human lives. In the next sentence, the preacher starts with a subordinate clause in Indonesian, then completely switches into Ngoko for the rest of the sentence. This Ngoko sentence seems like an elaborate explanation of the first Indonesian information. As we can see, sifat is actually a diamorph that exist in both Indonesian and Javanese. It is very likely that this diamorph acts as the trigger in the switching in example (21) above. Furthermore, some of the instances of Javanese clause mixing are imperative sentences, exclusively Ngoko imperative. Apparently, Ngoko imperatives are not only found in Krama sentences, but also in Indonesian sentences as shown in example (22) below:

(22) Empat belas februari kata-nya sih kata-nya itu
four teen February word-GEN particle word-GEN DEM
hari kasih sayang gak usah ha hu koen di-nama-kan hari
Valentine mercy love GEN need Ha hu 2SG PV-name-CAUS day

‘Fourteen February, they say, is (a) love day, -don’t say ha hu, you!- (and) is named Valentine day.’
The preacher, in example (22), explains what Valentine day is to the audience. When he mentions *hari kasih sayang* ‘a love day’, the audience cheers and say *huuu*. In responding to this, the preacher orders the audience to stop cheering, which he does in Ngoko *gak usah ha hu koen!* ‘do not say ha hu, you!’. Then he continues his explanation in Indonesian. It seems like this Ngoko clause alternation occurs as a disjunction device, to distinguish aside from principal narrative.

Example (23), moreover, presents a mixing of Indonesian and Javanese sentences, with some insertions of Arabic borrowing terms here and there.

(23)

```
Jadi 'afiyat itu arti-nya sehat yang di-gunakan
So 'afiyat DEM meaning GEN healthy REL PV-use
untuk beribadah 'afiyat niku teges-é sehat séng
for AV-worship 'afiyat DEM mean GEN healthy REL
di-gaè ng-lakon-i ta'at 'afiyat itu sehat yang
NEG PV-use AV-do-Caus obedience 'afiyat DEM healthy REL
tidak di-pakai maksyiát
NEG PV-use sinful activity
```

‘So, ‘afiyat means (the) health which is used for worshiping (God). ‘afiyat means (the) health which is used for doing obedience. ‘afiyat means (the) health which is not used for sinful activity.’

Unlike in example (22), the Javanese element mixed in example (23) is a full Javanese sentence. Initially, the preacher begins with an Indonesian sentence to explain the meaning of ‘*afiyat*’ then elaborates it in Ngoko and explains it more in Indonesian afterward.

Also quite frequently mixed with Indonesian sentence is Javanese several constituents as shown in example (24).

(24)

```
Para jama’ah 'afiyat niku bukan sekedar sehat
DET PL assembly ‘afiyat DEM NEG only healthy
biasa kalau sehat itu orientasi-nya dhohir tapi kalau ‘afiyat
usual If healthy DEM orientation GEN visible nut if ‘afiyat
itu orientasi-nya bathin
DEM orientation GEN Inner
```

‘the attending assembly, ‘*afiyat* is not only the usual healthy (state). The usual ‘healthy’ state’s orientation is (what) visible. But ‘*afiyat*’s orientation is (what) inside.’

The preacher, in example (23), explains what ‘*afiyat* is to *para jama’ah* ‘the attending assembly’. As we can see, in addressing the attending assembly and in mentioning the topic of
the utterance, the preacher uses Krama. Afterward, for the rest of the message, he uses Indonesian with some insertions of Arabic term *dhohir* ‘visible’ and *bathin* ‘inner’.

(25) Satu januari itu malam dan hari dimana kemaksiatan paling banyak terjadi di muka bumi nggéh napa mboten.

‘One January is the night and day in which the most frequent sinful activity occurs on Earth surface, yes or no?’

‘Video 4, 00:25:42.635 - 00:25:53.920’

Further, as mentioned, tag-switching is also found in Indonesian sentences even though with low frequency, as shown in example (24) above. The tag element is always found in Krama and not in Ngoko. In addition, this tag-switching also always happens in clause boundary which strengthens the fact that this is an alternational code-mixing case. Another multi-word mixing is in the form of negation clause. Look at example (26) below:

(26) Tapi bukan berarti orang-orang yang sakit itu andaikan dia sehat lantas berbuat maksiat, mboten ngaten.

‘But, it does not mean that the people who are sick when they are healthy they will do sin, not like that.’

‘Video 2, 00:10:38.940 - 00:10:54.010’

Negating a previously stated Indonesian statement is often made Krama, and never in Ngoko. Krama clause like in example (26) above is found quite often in the data examined. Similar to tag-switching, this type of mixing, i.e. negation clause, also occurs in clause-peripheral.

Another less-complex multi-word mixing is noun phrase. Looking at example (27) and (28), the preacher tends to modify an Islamic-related term with Javanese word, i.e. *kanca-kanca* and *ta’mir* (example 27) and *ta’mir masjid jami’ al-istiqdad* + *ingkang minulya* (example 28).


‘My committee friends, the organizer of tonight’s event, my young friends, my Santri friends, my Banser friends who all I proud of.’

‘Video 1, 00:04:18.130 - 00:04:39.543’

(28) Segenap ta’mir masjid jami’ al-istiqdad ingkang minulya para pejabat pemerintah dalam semua tingkatan-nya jajaran.

‘All manager mosque great Al-istiqdad respected officer government in all level-GEN range.

‘Video 1, 00:04:18.130 - 00:04:39.543’
In example (28), *ta' mir masjid jami` al-istiqdad* ‘managers of the great Mosque Al-istiqdad’, a noun phrase, is a borrowed Arabic term in both Javanese and Indonesian. Further, both Javanese noun phrase in example (27) and example (28) are more likely to be insertion cases.

In addition, several single-word category mixings are found such as noun, adjective, verb, single-word adverb, pronoun, kin term, conjunction, and particle. Javanese verb mixing, for instance, creates a nested *a b a* structure. With this reason added by the fact that verb is a single constituent and that it is a content word, thus, Javanese verb mixing is clearly an insertional code-mixing case.

(29) Rasulullah kalau saré wudu-nya ndak batal khusus.
Rasulullah if sleep wudu^11^ NEG invalid special

‘Rasulullah, (even) when he sleeps, his wudu will not be invalid. (it is only) special (for him).’

[Video 4, 00:52:36.739 - 00:52:42.764]

Javanese verb mixing is quite productive Indonesian sentences. Look at example (29) above, for instance, where we can see a Krama verb *sare* ‘sleep’ is inserted into an Indonesian structure. The reason behind this insertion is completely for politeness purpose even when the utterance is talking about someone who is not physically there, i.e. Prophet Muhammad. Yet, this person they are talking about is someone with a high status both in society and in religion. Thus, it is possible that the preacher feels using Indonesian verb for *sare* would not be appropriate as Indonesian is a neutral code. Interestingly, of all instances of Javanese verb mixing, the Krama verb insertion is always for politeness strategy while the Ngoko verb is for humoristic purpose as shown in example (30) below:

(30) Kita di-perintah sholat seperti kita melihat garis besar-nya pada melihat, Rasulullah me-ngerjakan sholat. bukan melihat panitia yang kluyran tadi.
1PL PV-command pray like 1PL AV-see line big-GEN on AV-see Rasulullah AV-do pray NEG AV-see event.organizer REL amble.about just.now

11 Wudu, or ablution, is a ritual a Muslim performs to maintain both physical and spiritual hygiene which are required before performing the prayer, Shalat.
‘We are commanded to pray as we see, generally, as we see Rasulullah does the prayer, not like we see that committee who were ambling about just now.’

[Video 2, 00:46:29.036 - 00:46:45.740]

In example (30), the preacher inserts a Ngoko verb kluyuran ‘to amble about’ in an Indonesian sentence. The verb is inserted clearly for making a joke about the committee who are ambling about while the preacher is giving a preaching.

Furthermore, the preacher use of Indonesian is also featured by the mixing of a Javanese particle and even Ngoko genitive suffix -é.

(31) Ini kan gambaran toh ketika kita men-cinta-i rasulul lla kita me-neladan-i rasulul lla meng-ikut-i sunah-sunah12
Rasulul lla 1PL AV-imitate-CAUS Rasulul lla AV-follow-CAUS sunah.PL
rasulul lla maka pasti allah akan men-cinta-i kita
Rasulul lla thus certainly Allah FUT AV-love-CAUS 1PL
men-curah-kan rahmat kasih sayang-nya kepada kita
AV-pour-CAUS mercy mercy affection-GEN toward 1PL
meng-ampun-i kesalahan dan dosa-dosa kita
AV-forgive-CAUS mistake and sin.PL 1PL.POSS
‘This is (only) a picture, toh?, when we love Rasulullah, imitate him, follow his example, thus, certainly Allah will love us, will pour us His mercy and affection, will forgive our mistake and sins.’

[Video 1, 00:18:32.042 - 00:18:46.564]

As we can see, example (31) is completely in Indonesian except for one Ngoko particle toh which is sometimes used for tag question. In Javanese, particle toh is one of the means to create an interrogative sentence (Vander Klok, 2012) and a tag question. And indeed, the particle toh in the example above indicates an act of seeking confirmation towards the audiences. The particle occurs in the final position of the first clause, which further means this is an alternational code-mixing. Other Javanese particles that can be found in Indonesian sentences are lha, kok, and the combination of lha + kok, lha kok.

In example (32) further, we can see a Ngoko suffix –é is attached to an Arabic loan word majelis ‘meeting’ to form a noun phrase majelis-é ‘the meeting’.

(32) Terlebih majelis yang kita hadir-i yang kita
ikut-i ini bukan hanya majelis-é takmir
follow-CAUS DEM NEG only meeting-GEN manager
masjid Nganguk wali
mosque Nganguk wali

12Sunnah is everything narrated from Prophet Muhammad, i.e. his good word, deed, or approval.
‘What’s more is that this meeting that we attend to and we follow is not only the manager of Nganguk wali mosque’s meeting.’
[Video 2, 00:14:13.670 - 00:14:28.610]

Interestingly, majelis, takmir, and masjid are Arabic loan words that exist in both Indonesian and Javanese. Thus, it is difficult to see the boundary of the code-switch occurring in example (32) above. First, if those Arabic loan words are considered as part of Indonesian inventory, then example (32) is a case of congruent lexicalization. However, if the Arabic loan words are considered as part of Javanese vocabulary, hence, example (32) is an insertional code-mixing case. This is because *majelise takmir masjid Nganguk wali* ‘the manager of Nganguk wali mosque’s meeting’ will form a Javanese noun phrase. However, looking at example (27) and (28), there is an assumption that it is Javanese that tends to be used to modify Arabic loan words. Thus, example (32) is more likely to be the case of Javanese noun phrase insertion, and not Javanese suffix mixing.

3.6 Intense mixing between Javanese and Indonesian

Intense mixing between the two codes is also found in the data. In Muysken’s (2000) term, this type of mixing is called congruent lexicalization. Further, he mentions two things that can trigger the congruent lexicalization: diamorphs and general structural equivalence. These two triggers exist between Javanese and Indonesian, of which the latter has been explained in the first chapter of this study. For the presence of the diamorph, we can see it in the example (32) below:

```
(32) Bapak-bapak mohon maaf misal-nya bapak péngén ng-unjuk
father.PL ask forgiveness example-DET father want AV-drink
jamu di-campur-i madu niki lèh mundut madu mboten
herb PV-mix-CAUS honey DEM the.way take honey NEG
kedah langsung sangking tawon malah kangélan
have.to directly from bee instead difficult
‘Gentlemen, excuse me, for example, you (adult male) wants to drink herb mixed with honey, you do not have to take the honey directly from the bees as it will be difficult for you.’
[Video 2, 00:41:25.036 - 00:41:44.703]
```

In example (32), kin term *bapak* ‘literally father’ occurs after an Indonesian clause *bapak-bapak mohon maaf misalnya* ‘gentlemen, excuse me, for example’. The kin term *bapak* exists in both Javanese and Indonesian, thus, a diamorph, and very often is used as a term of address too. This diamorph is suspected to be the trigger of the switch from Indonesian to Javanese in example (32).
Further, interestingly, between Indonesian and Javanese, there is a lot of word pairs that differs slightly in writing and pronunciation. This is not surprising as Javanese and Indonesian closely cognates languages. In Clyne’s (1967:94) words, these words have “some morphemic correspondences” which further creates an “overlapping area”. Similar to a diamorph, those words can also trigger code-switching (Woolard, 1998). There are some instances similar to this which are found in the data examined as shown in example (33).

(33) Ada minyak wangi melati, itu peresan-é kembang melati
Exist oil fragrant jasmine DEM extortion-DET flower jasmine
di-prosès dadi minyak wangi
PV-process into oil fragrant
‘There is jasmine perfume; that is the extortion from jasmine which is processed into perfume.’
[Video 2, 00:38:58.296 - 00:39:07.870]

Peresan ‘extortion’ in example (33) is a cognate of perasan ‘extortion’ in Indonesian. Then, a Ngoko determinative suffix –é is attached to this Javanese cognate to create noun phrase peresan-é ‘the extortion’. Moreover, this word then becomes a trigger of the switching from Indonesian to Javanese.

Between Javanese and Indonesian, a lot of intense mixing instances are also found, characterized by back and forth switches between the two. Look at example (34) below:

(34) Tahun baru-né umat Islam niku nggëh satu muharram
year new-GEN people Islam DEM yes one Muharram
maka kalau umat Islam mèlu-mèlu ramé-ramé me-ray-kan
thus if people Islam follow together AV-celebrate-APPL
tahun baru satu Januari niku berarti umat Islam séng
year new one Januari DEM mean people Islam REL
gak pati waras
NEG too sane
‘Muslims' new year is one Muharram, so if Muslims happily follow the celebration of the new year on one January, that means they are rather insane Muslims.’
[Video 1, 00:07:37.826 - 00:08:02.043]

As we can see in the example above, the switches between Javanese and Indonesian occur pretty much everywhere. The preacher initiates the speech with an Indonesian noun phrase tahun baru ‘new year’. This Indonesian noun phrase is one of the general terms that is more familiar in Indonesian as compared to Javanese taun anyar ‘new year’. Tahun baru further is wholly assimilated into a Javanese grammatical environment by attaching a Ngoko genitive suffix –ne. In addition, if we look at the noun phrase umat islam ‘Muslims’ which occurs thrice in example (34), we can see that it is always followed by Javanese lexicom. Even though Umat islam exists in both Indonesian and Javanese, it seems like it triggers more Javanese elements.
than Indonesian ones. Similarly, example (35) also presents back and forth switching between Javanese and Indonesian.

(35) Pengumuman! ibadah napa mawon yang diterima oleh allah attention worship what only REL PV-accept by Allah itu adalah ibadah yang apik-é asli asli apik.

DEM is worship REL good-GEN genuine genuine good ‘Attention!, which worship that is accepted by Allah is the worship whose ‘good’ is genuine, genuinely good.’

[Video 1, 00:21:58.521 - 00:22:25.999]

As mentioned in the previous section, Arabic loanwords tend to be accompanied by a Javanese modifier. In example (35), however, even though the Arabic noun ibadah is not fully accompanied by Javanese modifiers, it is still generally followed by Javanese elements.

3.6 Conclusion

I have summarized the above findings in Table 7.

Table 7: the frequency of each mixing category in all language pairs, with highly frequent mixed marked bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Arabic&gt;Jav</th>
<th>Arabic&gt;IND</th>
<th>IND&gt;Jav</th>
<th>Jav&gt;IND</th>
<th>Kra&gt;Ngo</th>
<th>Ngo&gt;Kra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdjP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>particle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expression</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several constituents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence (quotation)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated in Table 7, we can see that the most productive code-mixing is done in the Indonesian – Javanese language pair, followed by Javanese – Indonesian in the second place. Code-mixing in Arabic – Javanese is almost as productive as Arabic-Indonesian mixing with only two tokens difference. However, code-mixing in Krama – Ngoko is almost three times as frequent as in Ngoko – Krama. Why this is will be discussed in chapter 5.
4. FUNCTIONS OF CODE-SWITCHING

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the social intentions and functions of the code-mixing found and tries to answer the second research question posed in the first chapter of this study. There are a number of reasons why the preacher engaged in code-mixing:

a) Repetition  
b) Tag questions  
c) Imperatives  
d) Register marking  
e) The language of prayer  
f) Humoristic purposes  
g) Politeness  
h) Explanation  
i) Specific topics

These various functions now will be discussed in more detail in the following sections.

4.2 Repetition for emphasis

It turns out that switching between codes can be used for emphasizing the message the preacher delivers. In doing this, he repeats the same thing in different codes as evidenced below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language pairs</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IND&gt;Ngo</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND&gt;Kra</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngo&gt;IND</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kra&gt;IND</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kra&gt;Ngo</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic&gt;Ngo&gt;IND</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 8, the repetition to emphasize the utterance can be made in almost every combination of the codes involved in the preaching. However, it seems that the preacher does this strategy more frequently if the first utterance was in Indonesian and is then repeated in Ngoko (10 instances) and in Krama (5 instances) but less frequently the other way around. In addition, it turns out that the preacher does not employ much repetition when the first utterance was made in Arabic. Examples of these repetition phenomenon can be seen below:
The worship which is accepted by Allah, the worship which matters before Allah is the worships which are genuinely good.

In the example above, the preacher wants to stress the kind of worship that matters in front of God. At first, the whole complex noun phrase of *ibadah yang di-terima Allah* ‘the worship which is accepted by Allah’ is uttered in Indonesian and then repeated in Ngoko with the rest of the sentence. In the example (2) below however, instead of only a phrase that is being repeated, the preacher repeats the whole Indonesian sentence in Ngoko, even though it is slightly different in diction but is still equal in meaning.

Thus, ‘afiyat means being healthy which is used for worshiping God,’ afiyat means being healthy which is used for obeying God.’

Further, below we can see the example of the repetition from Indonesian to Krama.

In the example above, the verb phrase *kepingin men-imitasi perilaku-nya* ‘wanting to imitate their attitude’ (3), and prepositional phrase *untuk mendapatkan rahmat dan maghfirah Allah* ‘for achieving Allah’s mercy and forgiveness’ (4) in Indonesian are repeated in Krama. In (3),
the preacher is talking about how consorting with good people will stimulate us to imitate their good behavior. The phrase of ‘wanting to imitate their good behavior’ is said first in Indonesian and then in Krama. This strategy seems to imply that the preacher is at first asserting the importance of consorting with good people, and then further suggesting politely to imitate their good behavior by repeating it in Krama. Similar to this, example (4) also shows the assertion of the importance of what the people might get if they follow the Prophet in Indonesian and the implied polite suggestion to actually follow the Prophet by repeating the phrase in Krama. Similar to this, example (4) also shows the assertion of the importance of what the people might get if they follow the Prophet in Indonesian and the implied polite suggestion to actually follow the Prophet by repeating the phrase in Krama.

As mentioned, Indonesian utterance is the most repeated utterance compared to Krama, Arabic or Ngoko. However, based on Susanto’s (2006) questionnaire results in Malang (East Java), it was found that Javanese people generally do not want to be addressed in Ngoko by a preacher in a preaching event. Thus, considering this fact, this case where the preacher tends to go from Indonesian to Ngoko would seem to be rude at first glance. However, there might be other explanation for the repetition that the preacher does, except the regular repetition function, i.e. emphasizing an utterance. Looking at example (1) and (2), we can see that repeating from Indonesian to Ngoko is usually for defining something, i.e. the worship that matters for God (1) and what ‘afiyyat means (2). Thus, this might be because after using Indonesian for its assertive function (Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo, 2002) in defining things, the preacher wants to make it softer by repeating it in Ngoko which is a ‘normal social intercourse’ code and feels more ‘intimate and lively’ (Quinn, 2011:366).

Repeating from Indonesian to Krama is also quite preferred by the preacher. Also, seeing the examples (3) and (4) above, it seems like this kind of repetition is used for both assertion and polite suggestion. First, as had been mentioned, Indonesian has a function to increase the assertiveness level. Further, Krama is mentioned to be the respect and polite register in Javanese (Poedjosoedarmo, 1968; Quinn, 2011; Wolff & Poedjosoedarmo, 2002). Thus, repeating the Indonesian phrases in Krama probably means that the preacher subtly (and most likely politely) advocate the idea expressed in the repeated phrases to the audiences.

4.3 Using Krama for tag questions

Switching from Ngoko to Krama at the end of a clause was often done by the preacher to gain affirmatives from the audience. Some of the Krama words that are often used by the preacher for affirming something to the audiences are as follows:
Table 9: Types of question tags

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question tags</th>
<th>frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nggéh?</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nggéh napa nggéh?</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nggéh mboten?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most frequent word used for this function is *nggéh?* literally ‘yes?’, followed by *nggéh napa nggéh?* ‘yes or yes’ in the second place. Question tags with a positive meaning are used more frequently than ones with a negative meaning, i.e. *nggéh mboten?* ‘yes no?’ in this kind of discourse.

While Lakoff (1975) and White (2003) identify tag questions as a hedging device, Holmes (2001: 307) presents more various functions for this device: expressing uncertainty, facilitating, softening and confrontational. Out of the four functions, however, the question tag employed by the preacher is more likely to have either a softening function to diminish the critical comment or a confrontational function as a boosting device. Consider the example below:

(5) *Wong sak Sumbergempol yo ora ono sing iso sholat wong ora tau n-ingali sholat-é kanjeng nabi nggéh napa nggéh?*‘All people around Sumbergempol are not able to pray as they never seen by themselves how the Prophet prayed, yes or yes.’
[Video 1, 00:34:53.782 - 00:35:01.716]

*Nggéh napa nggéh?* ‘yes or yes?’ is used to soften the fact that no one in Sumbergempol (a district in Tulungagung, East Java) can do *Shalat* (Islamic prayer) as no one there has ever met the Prophet Muhammad. The example below, however, has a tag question *nggéh?* ‘yes?’ as boosting device, to confront and to suggest the audiences to give their neighbors their food when they cook delicious food.

(6) *Njenengan nèk masak rodok énak tangga-né di-paring-i nggéh?* ‘If you cook quite delicious meals, you also give your neighbor, yes?’
[Video 1, 01:10:20.333 - 01:10:26.899]

Yet the use of *nggéh?* ‘yes?’ in the example (6) instead of *nggéh napa nggéh?* ‘yes or yes?’ may also indicate a lesser degree of truth of the matrix clause. Example (5) shows that no one in Sumbergempol has ever met the Prophet is entirely accurate, while example (6) shows if the audiences cook quite delicious meals they may or may not give their neighbor some. Similarly, the tag question *nggéh mboten?* ‘yes no?’ in example (7) is used in the same manner as *nggéh?*
‘yes?’ in the sense that it boosts and suggests the audiences to take care of, to support and to fund the religion teachers.

(7) Tapi guru-guru Ngaji gak di-ramut gak di-dukung but teacher.PL religion.learning NEG PV-take.care NEG PV-support gak di-ragat-i sepi masjid-é nggéh mboten NEG PV-fund-CAUS quiet mosque-GEN yes no

‘But (if) the religion learning teachers are not taken care of, are not supported, are not funded, then the mosque will be quiet, yes or no? ’

[Video 2, 00:59:57.036 - 01:00:11.888]

Above all, however, tag question is mainly used for a politeness strategy (Holmes, 2001; White, 2003). Thus, it makes sense that in Javanese the preacher switches from Ngoko (the non-polite register) to Krama (the polite register) for this function.

4.4 Using Ngoko and IND for imperatives

The imperatives always involve giving commands (Frank, 1972) and also advice, request, invitation, suggestion, prohibition (Hornby, 1975) to the hearer(s). In Javanese, Sudaryanto (1992) adds ‘to give warning’ to this imperative function list. However, in this Islamic preaching discourse, the imperatives that are used by the preacher are typical to command the audiences to do something. Table 10 summarizes the frequency of the imperative instances found in the data.

Table 10: Types of imperative clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ngo</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The imperative markers found are the prefix di- and the suffixes -na, -o, and -en, while the negative imperatives are marked by the use of aja ‘don’t’; all of them are Ngoko affixes and words. Consider the example below:

(8) Kula tanglet di-jawab sing banter!
    1SG ask PV-answer REL loud
    ‘I ask you, answer loudly!’
    [Video 1, 00:35:18.064 - 00:35:26.020]

In (8), the preacher commands the audience to answer his question loudly. In doing this, he switches from Krama to Ngoko and uses the passive construction of jawab ‘answer’ by adding the passive marker di-, yielding di-jawab ‘answered’. In addition, the preacher uses the third person passive marker di- specifically instead of second person passive marker kok- or mbok-
presumably to make the command subtler. As has been mentioned, the suffix -\textit{na} is also one of the Ngoko imperative markers used by the preacher as shown in (9):

\begin{verbatim}
(9) Kanggo kanjeng nabi nikah lebih dari empat itu khususiyah
    untuk Rasulullah tidak berlaku bagi umat-nya rungok-na wong lanang-lanang iku
    "For the Prophet, marrying more than four (women) is (his) special (gift from God) and
    cannot be applied to his followers. Listen to this O men."
\end{verbatim}

In (9), the preacher switched to Ngoko from Indonesian to create an imperative. In doing this, he attaches the suffix -\textit{na} to Ngoko word \textit{rungu} ‘to listen’ becoming \textit{rungok-na} ‘listen’. This construction of a Ngoko word with the suffix -\textit{na} suggests a stronger command compared to the one with prefix \textit{di}-\. Further, in creating a negative imperative, the preacher uses Ngoko negative imperative marker \textit{aja} accompanied by a Ngoko verb \textit{reneh} ‘to underestimate’ which is preceded by second person agentive marker \textit{mbok}- (example 10). After uttering the imperative sentence, the preacher switches into Krama for the rest of his sentence.

\begin{verbatim}
(10) Aja mbok-reneh-ké njenengan saget moco Quran lancer lanyah
    do.not 2-underestimate-CAUS 2SG able AV-read Quran smooth fluent
    niku sing m-ulang-i sopo?
    DEM REL AV-teach-APPL who
    ‘Do not underestimate! You can read Quran smoothly and fluently, who teaches you?.
\end{verbatim}

Even though it is not as many as Ngoko, it turns out that in using the imperatives the preacher also uses Indonesian as shown below:

\begin{verbatim}
(11) Lèh makna-ni ayat Quran maham-i hadist jangan hanya secara tekstual
    the.way define verse Quran to.understand hadist do.not only in textual
    ‘The way that (you) define the meaning of a Quran’s verse, do not do it textually!.’
\end{verbatim}

In addition, all of the three Indonesian occurrences found are in the form of negative imperative where the preacher uses negative imperative marker \textit{jangan} ‘don’t’.

The preacher can choose either Ngoko or Indonesian for imperatives. This is presumably due to the fact that in Javanese, there is asymmetric communication which reflects a politeness hierarchy. The existence of this asymmetric communication suggests different codes for different speakers, i.e. Ngoko and Krama, depending on the presence of power and with or without distance (Wajdi et al., 2013). This means that superiors speak in Ngoko to inferiors.
and inferiors speak Krama to superiors. In this case, the preacher is superior to the audiences in term of religious knowledge. Thus, he can use Ngoko to the inferior, i.e. the audience. Furthermore, one possible explanation for the use of Indonesian beside Ngoko for imperatives is that Indonesian has an assertive function (Susanto, 2006). The Ngoko and Indonesian code choice can be explained by the fact that commands uttered in these two codes may give a stronger effect on the audience.

4.5 Register Marking

As has been mentioned, there is asymmetric communication in Javanese, and this is further evidenced by the code switching that the preacher engages in. The preacher code-switches from Krama to Ngoko or vice versa to tell a narrative as an example of his teaching. In Wajdi et al.’s (2013:9) terms, this is called a code-crossing phenomenon in which two unequal speakers use two different codes, i.e. Ngoko and Krama. The evidence of code-switching for indicating a shift in the register can be seen in (12):

(12) Wuluk salam as-salamu 'alai-ka ya Rasulullah di-jawab wa 'alai-ka
say salam DET-peace on-2SG.M O Rasulullah PV-answer and on-2SG.M
s-salam nuwun sewu badé tindak pundi kanjeng nabi? aku
DET-peace ask forgiveness FUT go where lord Prophet 1SG
arep m-èlu ngaji lan dzikir-é Abdullah bin alwi al hadad
FUT AV-join religious.learning and Remember.God -GEN Abdullah bin Alwi al-Hadad
‘(The Friends) said salam “peace be upon you O Rasulullah,” Rasulullah answered, “and peace be upon you,” “Excuse me, where will you go Prophet?,” “I will join religious learning and remembering God (lead) by Abdullah bin Alwi al-Hadad.”
[Video 3, 00:06:16.900 - 00:07:05.100]

In example (12) the preacher tells a narrative, a conversation that might happen between Rasulullah (the Prophet Muhammad) and one of his friends. The greetings were made in Arabic by both of them, typical Islamic greetings. In this case, Rasulullah has a higher rank socially than the friend. Thus, it makes sense that the friend talks to him in Krama and that he talks back to the friend in Ngoko. Further, in (13) the narrative is between a father and a son.

(13) Bapak ny-uwun ngapunten bapak, niki wanci-nipun m-bayar LKS
father AV-ask forgiveness father DEM time-DET AV-pay LKS
pira lé m-bayar-é lé kaléh doso ewu tambah
how.much son AV-pay-GEN son two ten thousand add
iuran-é tigang doso dados seket ewu o iyo lé
contribution-DET three ten thus fifty thousand oh yes son
‘(The son ask) ”Excuse me, Father, this is the time for paying the LKS,” “how much son?,” “twenty thousand and also for the contribution thirty thousand, so it becomes fifty thousand,” “O okay son.”
[Video 3, 00:33:08.032 - 00:33:24.283]
This example above shows that the son talks to his father in Krama while the father talks to his son in Ngoko. This indicates the father as the superior and the son as inferior in Javanese society.

(14) Ya Allah kula nyuwun rejeki ingkang kathah ya
O Allah 1SG AV-ask sustenance REL many O
Allah ya Allah bisnis kula niku lho njenengan
Allah O Allah business 1SG DEM particle 2SG
paring-i lancar ya Allah jaré Gusti Allah nyapo kowé
give-APPL smooth O Allah say Lord Allah Why 2SG
kok ng-atur aku
particle AV-rule 1SG

“O God I ask you (to give me) abundance sustenance, O God I ask you to make my business smooth, O God, “ God said, “(who are) you tell me what to do.”

[Video 3, 00:34:56.999 - 00:35:11.433]

The example (14) above illustrates a man is talking to God through praying that he asks God to make his business successful. God then talks back to him saying who is he telling Him what to do, of course, in Ngoko. This example of dialogue between God and human clearly indicates that the superior (God) speaks Ngoko “downward” to the inferior and that the inferior (human) speaks Krama “upward” vertically to the superior.

4.6 The language of prayer (du’a)

In Bash’s (2015) words, du’a, praying, is “an important spiritual medium in the Muslim’s emotional and spiritual needs” and that it may be performed in Arabic as an Islamic ritual medium or the language of religion (Anderson, 1966) and other language(s) that one chooses. In the data examined, the preacher presents a lot of praying narratives which were made not only in Arabic but also in Indonesian and Krama. Concerning the status of Krama compared to Indonesian, there is not much study after Anderson’s (1966) claim that (standard) Indonesian equals Krama and that Bahasa Jakarta (Jakarta colloquial Indonesian) equals Ngoko. Thus, by looking into the code-switching that the preacher engages in may help us in understanding the further relationship between the two codes.

In example (15), the preacher tells a story in Ngoko as the main code, where there is a sick person and he prays to God to heal him. In his praying, we can see code-switching from Indonesian where he uses Indonesian imperative sentences, to Arabic conventionalized praying for recovery.

(15) Ya ana wong lara parah n-dungo thok ora
yes exist person sick severe AV-pray only NEG
gelem golèk tombo ora gelem berobat, ya Allah
willing search medicine GEN willing AV-treat O Allah
Example (16), moreover, shows the prayer of a young man who prays to God so that Siti Plekenut can be his wife, his soul mate. In doing this, as we can see, he uses Krama completely.

(16) Ya Allah kula cinta kalih Siti Plekenut ya Allah O Allah 1SG love with Siti Plekenut O Allah kula ny-uwun supados Siti Plekenut niki njenengan dosa-ken bojo 1SG AV-so that Siti Plekenut DET 2SG make-APPL wife kula ya Allah 1SG.POSS O Allah ‘O Allah I love Siti Plekenut O Allah, I ask you to make her my wife O Allah.’

[Video 3, 00:35:39.533 - 00:35:55.466]

In example (17) above, the prayer is performed in all three codes, Arabic, Indonesian and Krama altogether. This prayer is basically the repetition of the Arabic imperative sentence wa qinnaa ‘adzaab annar ‘and save us from the hell’s torture’ then repeated in Indonesian and in Krama. Also, notice the example (18) below, where at first the praying is done in Indonesian and then is repeated in Krama. Similar to the other examples, this (18) also presents imperative sentences, asking God to make him (the student) to graduate both in Indonesian and in Krama.

(17) Wa qin-naa ‘adzaab an-nar dan pelihara-lah kami ya Allah panjenengan reksa kula ya Allah panjenengan jagi Allah 2SG watch over 1SG O Allah 2SG guard kula ya Allah sangking siksa neraka 1SG O Allah from torture hell ‘And save us from the hell’s torture, and save us O Allah, You watch over me O Allah, You guard me O Allah from the hell’s torture.’

[Video 3, 00:21:15.866 - 00:21:55.566]
Note from the given examples above, there is no use of Ngoko in praying. The asymmetric communication style of Javanese ensures this fact. The prayer clearly is a dialogue between a mundane human being to the superior God. Thus, a man in his praying must leave out Ngoko from his code choice, leaving him Krama, the polite register. Indonesian is also a possible option since it has a status as religious language too (Purwoko, 2011). This discussion further strengthens Anderson’s (1966) claim that Indonesian equals Krama in terms of the language of the Islamic religion.

4.7 Switching to Ngoko for humoristic purposes

From the data examined, it turns out that the preacher often switches either from Indonesian or Krama to Ngoko for joking purposes. This phenomenon can be seen in the examples presented below:

(19) Tiang mriki nèk sholat sujud-é nggélh n-jungkel-njungkel
person here if pray prostration-DET yes AV-somersault
ngoten nggélh
like.that yes
‘People around here, when you do prostration in your prayer, did you do it in somersault way, like that yes?’

Example (19) shows how the preacher inserts a Ngoko verb n-jungkel-njungkel ‘to somersault’ within a Madya register structure. In the example, the preacher asks the audiences whether they somersault in doing prostration in their prayer. There is nothing about doing a somersault in prostration. Thus, clearly, it seems like the preacher wants to create a humorous atmosphere by inserting a Ngoko verb that is violating the true action of prostration. In example (20), however, the preacher inserts a rather vulgar Ngoko noun silit ‘anus’ in his Indonesian construction, and then switches to Ngoko afterward.

(20) Lha kalau bapak ingin ny-esep madu yang langsung berasal dari
particle if father want AV-suck honey REL directly come from
silit-nya tawon lambe-mu malah abuh
anus-GEN bee lip-2POSS instead swollen
‘If you want to suck the honey that comes directly from the bee’s anus, your lips will be swollen instead.’

Example (20) shows how the preacher inserts a Ngoko verb n-jungkel-njungkel ‘to somersault’ within a Madya register structure. In the example, the preacher asks the audiences whether they somersault in doing prostration in their prayer. There is nothing about doing a somersault in prostration. Thus, clearly, it seems like the preacher wants to create a humorous atmosphere by inserting a Ngoko verb that is violating the true action of prostration. In example (20), however, the preacher inserts a rather vulgar Ngoko noun silit ‘anus’ in his Indonesian construction, and then switches to Ngoko afterward.

---

13 Sujud is a movement within Islamic prayer in which in doing this the hands must be placed parallel to the ears, the forehead and the nose must be placed to the ground too. (Qara’ati, n.d)
Sudarmo (2014) mentions ‘slapstick’ as part of the jocular anatomy in Indonesia. Slapstick is a rude joke usually using vulgar words for creating laughter and is usually an appropriate technique for certain audiences with certain education, social and economic background. It seems like the preacher employs this strategy for his joke. Also, note example (21) below where, again, he inserts a rather vulgar Ngoko word in Javanese culture in an Indonesian construction.

(21) Itu lho buk suami-mu anak-nya mertua-mu yang sering me-ngelon-i dirimu layan-i dengan baik
DEM particle mom husband-2POSS son-3POSS mother.in.law-2POSS REL AV-cuddle-APPL 2SG serve-LOC with good ‘Your husband, your mother-in-law’s son, who cuddles with you often, serve him well.’

[Video 1, 00:17:34.912 - 00:18:00.564]

In general, talking about sex or things related to it, in this case, verb *ng-elon-i* ‘to cuddle’, in traditional Javanese culture is taboo (Hanum, 2007). In addition, in Javanese culture, talking about those things should be done in a symbolic way and not in a blunt manner (Suwardi, 2009). However, with this knowledge, the preacher still inserts the rather taboo Ngoko verb for joking purposes. In Rahmanadjji’s (2007) words, this kind of joke is called *humor rendah* or low humor.

4.8 Use of Krama pronouns as a politeness strategy

As mentioned before, the highest Krama variety in Javanese is less spoken, if at all, in East Java. Serving as this function, thus, mostly is Madya where this register is composed of Krama vocabulary, Ngoko affixes such as the passive prefix *di-*, the determinative suffix *-é* and the causative *-ké*, and Krama pronouns. However, in the data examined, many Krama pronoun insertions are found in Ngoko structure. This combination between Krama pronouns and Ngoko words and affixes is not the same as Madya structures since the construction does not have any other Krama words except for the pronouns. Look at the examples below:

(22) Kanjeng nabi pesen kula sampeyan di-kongkon apik karo
Lord prophet order 1SG 2SG PV-ask good with
lima setruktur
five structures

‘Lord prophet leaves a message that I and you are asked to be good to five structures.’

[Video 1, 00:27:10.695 - 00:27:29.478]

(23) Njenengan nèk masak rodok énak tangga-né di-paring-i
2SG if cook quite delicious neighbor-GEN PV-give-APPL
nggeh yes

‘If you cook delicious meals, you also give your neighbor, right?’
Kula sampeyan ‘I you’ is inserted in (22), which is a Ngoko construction inserted with an Indonesian noun phrase lima setruktur ‘five structures’. In example (23), furthermore, the preacher uses the second singular (also used for plural) pronoun njenengan which is the short version of panjenengan to refer ‘you’. Example (23) also has Krama nggéh? ‘yes?’ for tag questions as had been discussed earlier in section 2. Also, observe the three examples below:

(24) Kula jaluk lèk remaja Islam ora usah m-èlu-mèlu

1SG ask if youth Islam NEG need AV-follow

‘I ask you, Muslim adolescents, not to follow (the New Year celebration in January).’

[Video 1, 00:10:02.674 - 00:10:06.674]

(25) Akhiré kula jawab malaikat Isrofil kui saiki penggawéan-é

finally 1SG answer angel Isrofil DEM now job-3POSS

ng-resik-i terompèt

AV-clean-APPL trumpet

‘Finally, I answer, “Now the Angel Isrofil’s job is to clean the trumpet.”’

[Video 1, 00:11:38.152 - 00:11:45.369]

(26) Bu, mosok lali pesen kula?

Ma’am how.can forget message 1SG

‘Ladies, how can you forget my message.’

[Video 1, 00:46:58.644 - 00:47:03.210]

In these three examples, the preacher uses a first person singular pronoun in Krama kula ‘I’ in a completely Ngoko construction in (25) and (26) and Ngoko with an inserted Indonesian noun phrase construction in (24). Further, from the examples presented we can see that the preacher inserts a Krama pronoun into a Ngoko structure. It would be normal if the structure he inserts the Krama pronoun in is a Madya structure. Thus, given the facts presented, one explanation for this Krama pronoun insertion in a Ngoko construction is for politeness. Even though it has already been established that in this case, the preacher is the superior agent in which it is not necessary for him to speak in Krama to the audiences, the inferior. However, he still uses a Krama pronoun, as it will sound rude for him to address the audiences with a Ngoko pronoun.

4.9 Switching to explain Arabic quotations

There are a lot of Arabic quotations found in the preaching text, as is expected in an Islamic religious discourse. Moreover, it turns out that in explaining these Arabic quotations, the preacher switch into either Indonesian, Ngoko or Krama. Table 11 lists the frequency of the occurrences of the switching done by the preacher to explain a quotation.
Table 11: Switching type for explaining Arabic quotation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language pairs</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic&gt;IND</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic&gt;Ngo</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic&gt;Kra</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see that it is Indonesian that is the most preferred by the preacher to explain the Arabic quotation, as exemplified in (27) and (28).

(27) Rasulullah pernah me-nyatakan idzaa marortum bi riyadh bi garden l-jannah farta'u ketika kalian men-dapati ada taman-taman syurga ikut-lah nimbung ikut-lah ber-gabung heaven follow-IMP join follow-IMP AV-join
‘Rasulullah said "idzaa marortum bi riyadh l-jannah, farta'u" when you pass through the Heaven’s gardens, join them, join them.’
[Video 2, 00:16:15.010 - 00:16:24.600]

(28) In-quntum tuhibbuna llaha jika kalian men-cinta-i Allah fa ttabi’u-ni, maka ikutilah aku
‘If you love Allah, if you love Allah, so follow me (Allah), so follow me.’
[Video 2, 00:25:35.510 - 00:25:41.580]

In example (27), the preacher textualizes an Arabic sentence from the Hadith about what the Muslims should do when they pass through the Heaven’s garden, that is to join it. In example (28) however, the Arabic entextualization is taken from the Quran instead of the Hadith. The entextualization is about the thing one (Muslim) should do to prove that he loves God, that is by following Him. Both of the entextualizations in examples (27) and (28) are then explained in Indonesian as the audiences are not very likely to understand the meaning of the Arabic quotation.

The prominent pattern in this phenomenon is the preacher’s preference for Indonesian over Ngoko or Krama for explaining Arabic quotations. This may be due to the fact that Indonesian is described as the normal code for giving definitions, which Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo (2002:54) argue to be “a practice which reflects the use of Indonesian in schools”. Further, even though it is not used as often as Indonesian for giving explanations, Ngoko is still quite preferred by the preacher compared to Krama. Look at the example below:

---

14 Hadith is the compilation of prophet Muhammad sayings and deeds (Rosowsky, 2006)
Example (29) shows the Arabic quotation which is taken from the Hadith about the Prophet commenting on who usually blows a trumpet (in that time), which were the Jews. This Arabic clause is then explained in Ngoko. One thing that can explain how Ngoko is still preferred over Krama but less preferred than Indonesian is that it does not have the privilege of being the educational language in the community but still has the function as the basic, familiar code (Smith-Hefner, 2009). This, further, makes Ngoko still acceptable for explaining a foreign quotation.

Krama, on the other hand, is the least used for explaining Arabic quotations. This could be because of its role in the society as the formal and distancing register (Poedjosoedarmo, 1968; Wadji et al., 2013; Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo, 2002), which then would not be appropriate to be used for explaining things.

Looking at example (30) above where the Arabic quotation is explained in Krama, we can see that this actually has something to do with register marking. The Arabic quotation is actually a question asked by a friend to the Prophet. Socially (and religiously) we can assume that the Prophet would be the superior and the friend would be the inferior. Thus, it is logical to translate the friend’s Arabic question into Krama, the appropriate register for addressing a superior counterpart.

4.10 Switching to Indonesian for discussing a specific subject matter

In line with its function as official, state, national, unifying and unification language (Nababan, 1991), Indonesian, thus, is typically used in or explaining governmental, economy, education and general knowledge matters (Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo, 2002). This fact is also reflected
in the switching that the preacher engages in to explain the aforementioned matters. Some of the examples found can be seen below:

(31) Sedaya ta’mir masjid Nganguk wali ingkang kula hurmat-i para
all management mosque Nganguk wali REL 1SG respect-CAUS DET.PL
pejabat pemerintah dalam semua tingkatan-nya, yang berkesempatan hadir bapak
officer government in all level-GEN REL have.chance come father
camat bersama forum pimpinan kecamatan kota Kudus bapak kapolske
Camat15 together forum leadership district City Kudus father Kapolsek16
bapak danramil dan para anggota yang saya hormat-i
father Danramil17 and DET.PL member REL 1SG respect-CAUS

‘All the Mosque Nganguk wali managers whom I respect, all the government officers in all its levels who attend (this event), the district chief with the leadership district forum of Kudus city, the police chief, the rayon military commander and the members whom I respect.’
[video 2, 00:03:07.980 - 00:03:43.900]

The example above shows a series of greetings delivered by the preacher. At first, in addressing the mosque ta’mir18, he uses Krama, a typical code choice in acknowledging audiences in Java. Then he switches into Indonesian in addressing the audiences with important governmental positions such as district chief, police chief, etc. Also, consider the following example:

(32) Dengan cinta, yang murah dan rendah menjadi mahal
with love REL cheap and low become expensive
dan bernilai tinggi permén niku regi-né pinter lima
and worth high candy DEM cost-GEN how.much five
ratus rupiah tapi permen itu kalau atas
hundred rupiah but candy DEM if on
dasar cinta yang ng-asih orang yang di-cinta-i yang
based love REL AV-give person REL PV-love-CAUS REL
cuman lima ratus rupiah jadi mahal dan bernilai
only five hundred rupiah become expensive and worth
tinggi di-uwet-uwet gék di-pamèr-pamèr-ké kanka-né
high PV-make.long.lasting and PV-show.off-CAUS friend-GEN

‘With love, the cheap and low thing will become expensive and worthy, how much a candy will cost you?, five hundred rupiahs, but if the candy’s worth is based on love, because someone (he) loves who gives it (to him), then the five-hundred-rupiah candy will feel like it is expensive and worthy. (he) will take care of it and show it off to his friend.’
[Video 2, 00:30:09.322 - 00:30:44.734]

We can see from the example (32) above that some keywords related to the economy are uttered in Indonesian. Some of the keywords are murah ‘cheap’, mahal ‘expensive’, lima ratus rupiah ‘five hundred rupiahs’. Regi ‘cost’ is also an economic related keyword, yet the clause is spoken in Krama. One reason for this is may be due to the nature of the clause, which is an

15 Camat is the chief of a district
16 Kapolske is an acronym of Kepala Kepolisiang (Police Chief)
17 Danramil is an acronym of Komandan Rayon Militer (Rayon Military Commander)
18 Ta’mir is a term used for calling the people who are usually responsible for the mosque management
interrogative. The preacher, then, employs Krama in order to be polite in delivering the interrogative. Further, example (33) shows a quite intense mixing between Indonesian and Javanese Ngoko.

(33) Kenapa sih kalau anak sekolah kalau anak kursus di-dukung di-opén-i di-awas-i tapi lèk ngaji PV-support PV-take.care-CAUS PV-watch-CAUS but if religion.learning kok ga pati di-perhatikan bahkan demi anak ujian particle NEG too PV-pay.attention even for kid exam sekolah ngaji-né libur nok kéné yo ngunu? school religious.learning-DET holiday LOC here yes like.that ‘Why if it is for the kids’ school, extra course, they will be supported, taken care of, watched, but if it is for religious learning, it is not quite paid attention for, even for the kid’s school exam, the religious class will be called off. Is it like that too here?’ [Video 1, 00:45:32.086 - 00:45:53.434]

However, we can still see a switching pattern in the example above. In Indonesia, school is part of formal education and the so called ngaji ‘religious learning class’ is part of informal education. Thus, this might be one of the reasons of why the preacher uses Indonesian in talking about school and Ngoko in talking about ngaji. Yet, somehow in the first switch, the switching point goes back a little from the actual word ngaji. This is presumably because of the existence of a diamorph di-dukung ‘supported’ which is in line with what Clyne (1967) argues that words having similar form and meaning in two languages can facilitate a codeswitch from one language to the other. In addition, it is also found switching instances into Indonesian which is done by the preacher for talking about general knowledge terms; or in Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo’s (2002:51) words it used for “topics where the Javanese forms are not as well-known as the Indonesian”. This kind of switching can be seen in the following example:

(34) Sekulerisme itu sebenarnya bukan cuma sekarang jaman Rasulullah secularism DEM actually not only now era Rasulullah sudah ada sekulerisme itu orang PERF exist secularism DEM person yang orientasinya cuma dunia tujuan-é ming ndunya thok orientation-GEN only world purpose-GEN only world only itu sekulerisme DEM secularism ‘Secularism happens not only now but it also already existed in Rasulullah’s era. Secularism is (a term referring to) people whose orientation is only in Herein, their purpose is only Herein. That’s secularism.’ [Video 3, 00:25:31.783 - 00:25:57.200]

The preacher is explaining about secularism in example (34) above. As we can see, the whole utterance is made in Indonesian mostly, except a repetition of tujuan-é ming ndunya thok ‘their purpose is only Herein’, which is made in Ngoko. Indonesian is chosen by the preacher to
explain about secularism as this topic is more familiar for discussion in Indonesian than in Javanese. Further, the fact that there is a Ngoko repetition is presumably for emphasis purposes as has been mentioned in section 1. Thus, it can be said that the presented examples above further strengthen Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo’ (2002) research result that Indonesian is used for describing government, education, economy and general knowledge.

4.11 Conclusion

Table 12: Summary of the functions of the code-mixing found in the data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Language pairs</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>IND&gt;Ngo</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND&gt;Kra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ngo&gt;IND</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kra&gt;IND</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kra&gt;Ngo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic&gt;Ngo&gt;IND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag questions</td>
<td>Krama</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperatives</td>
<td>Ngoko</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register marking</td>
<td>Ngo,Kra</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The language of prayer</td>
<td>Arabic, IND, Kra</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humoristic purposes</td>
<td>Ngoko</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td>Kra</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>Arabic&gt;IND</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic&gt;Ngo</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic&gt;Kra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific topics</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at Table 12, we can see that mixing Indonesian code with either Ngoko or Krama is the most frequent reason behind the mixing the preacher engages in, for explaining a specific topic such as government-related, economy-related, education-related, and general terms that is more familiar in Indonesian. Code-mixing for giving an explanation, register marking, politeness strategy, imperatives, and repetition are also often employed by the preacher. However, code-mixing for tag questions, praying and humoristic purpose is less used. An explanation of this results will be given in the next chapter in more detail.
5. DISCUSSION

Based on the findings in both chapter 3 and 4, this chapter will focus on linking two sets of findings:

a. The structural patterns of code-mixing in Islamic preaching events in Java
b. The social intentions behind code-mixing in Islamic preaching events in Java

5.1 The structural patterns of code-mixing in Islamic preaching events in Java

Based on the structural analysis in chapter 3, this sub-chapter discusses three points: the CM of Arabic – Javanese and Arabic – Indonesian, the CM between Javanese and Indonesian, and the CM between Krama and Ngoko.

The CM of Arabic – Javanese and Arabic – Indonesian is presented in Table 13.

Table 13: Types of mixes and the word categories in both Arabic – Javanese and Arabic – Indonesian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Arabic &gt; JAV</th>
<th>Arabic &gt; IND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insertional CM</td>
<td>Alternational CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP, VP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34 (50%)</td>
<td>34 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 13, it seems like in an Islamic preaching discourse, there is no significant preference of mixing Arabic with either Javanese or Indonesian. Looking closer, it can be seen that nouns, adjectives, and verbs are the only cases of single-word mixing found in Arabic – Javanese corpus, with nouns as the most frequent category. While in Arabic – Indonesian mixing, it is only found nouns and adjectives. The fact that Arabic verbs are mixed with Javanese and not with Indonesian could mean nothing significant. This is due to the fact that in Arabic – Javanese itself, Arabic verbs are found with only three tokens. To be certain of this tendency, may be a more elaborate study needs to be done.

Insertion

Further, of these single-word mixing both in Arabic – Javanese and in Arabic - Indonesian are mostly Arabic borrowings. These Arabic borrowings can be defined by the presence of both
phonological (i.e. replacement of the Arabic voiced pharyngeal fricative /ʕ/ by a Javanese and Indonesian glottal stop /ʔ/ like in ǧālim → Salir) and morphological integration (i.e. adding a genitive suffix -nya to form an Indonesian noun phrase in magfirah-nya ‘His forgiveness’) and semantical adjustment (i.e. Arabic noun maulid ‘birthday’ which is specifically referred to the sole Prophet’s birthday). Based on Muysken’s (2000) typology, this borrowing phenomenon is included into an insertional code-mixing case.

**Alternation**

Furthermore, insertional and alternational code-mixing are equally prevalent in Arabic – Javanese language pair, yet it is alternational code-mixing that dominates the mixing pattern in Arabic – Indonesian corpus. The alternations between Arabic and Javanese and Arabic and Indonesian, both are identified by Arabic expression and quotation. Arabic expressions mixed with both Javanese and Indonesian are typically conventionalized Islamic expression such as the expression of gratitude, Al-hamdu li-illah ‘the praise for Allah’, the expression of appreciation and joy Maa sya’a Allah ‘what Allah wants’, the expression spoken for seeking forgiveness from God Astaghfurullah ‘I seek forgiveness from Allah’, etc. Interestingly, as indicated in Table 13, there is only a slight tendency to mix Arabic expression with Javanese compared to Indonesian. But then again, a further investigation is still needed to be sure of this.

Additionally, Arabic quotation is typically a form of entextualization from either Quran or Hadith. Featuring the Arabic language taken from normative sources is a religious norm in this kind of Islamic discourse (Millie, 2012b). Looking at the analysis result, however, there is a quite strong tendency to mix Arabic quotation with Indonesian as twice instances of Arabic quotation are found in Indonesian. This is not surprising as Indonesian is a language for definition (Wolff & Poedjosoedarmo, 1982), thus, is more appropriate to be used for explaining the Arabic quotation to the audiences.

**Congruent lexicalization**

Moreover, the result also confirms the initial assumption that congruent lexicalization is rather unlikely to be found in Arabic – Javanese and Arabic – Indonesian. No single instances of congruent lexicalization were found in the data. This happens because between Arabic and Javanese or Arabic and Indonesian, they do not have the two factors that can trigger congruent lexicalization, namely diamorphs and general structure equivalence (Muysken, 2000).
The CM between Javanese and Indonesian

Table 14 presents the mixing types and word category in both Indonesian – Javanese and Javanese – Indonesian corpus. The code-mixing in Indonesian – Javanese is found considerably more than in Javanese – Indonesian which is not entirely surprising as Javanese is the main code used in all of the videos examined. Thus, this fact does not mean that the preacher tends to mix Indonesian elements with Javanese rather than the other way around. However, this result does show us that Javanese is still preferred as the main code in daily communication, including an Islamic preaching event, in a less urban region in East Java.

**Insertion**

As indicated in Table 14, single – word insertions are found in nouns, adjectives, and verbs. Meanwhile, multi-word insertions are found in the form of noun phrases, verb phrases, adjectival phrases, and prepositional phrases. All of these insertion cases display a nested a b a structure. Further, inserting Indonesian single-word into Javanese construction seems like about five times less productive compared to multi-word insertion. This is, however, not the case in Javanese – Indonesian. There is an almost equal tendency to insert either Javanese single-word or multi-word into Indonesian constructions.

In Indonesian noun insertion, it involves morphological integration (i.e. adding Ngoko's genitive suffix –e into the Indonesian noun, *kehidupan* + -é (the life)) and direct insertion of...
the original Indonesian noun. However, there are no occurrences of morphological integration in Indonesian adjective and verb insertion cases. Furthermore, regarding the Javanese insertion case, there is no morphological integration at all.

*Alternation*

Subsequently, alternation seems like to be a more prevalent mixing type compared to insertion in both Indonesian – Javanese and Javanese – Indonesian corpora. Even the alternation mixing in both corpora is almost three times more frequent than the insertion occurrences. Alternational code-mixing in Indonesian – Javanese is dominated by Indonesian negation which occurs in three forms, either *gak*, *nggak*, or *enggak* ‘no’. This Indonesian negation nowadays has become commonly integrated into East Javanese structure. In addition, Indonesian full sentence, clause, and several-constituent switches are quite frequent too. On the whole, the alternations in Indonesian – Javanese have several characteristics such as peripheral switches (i.e. left-dislocation), several constituents switched, long switches, and adverbs switched.

In Javanese – Indonesian, further, single-word switches such as conjunctions, single-word adverbs, suffixes, and particles are found to be the most frequently occurred. Among these categories, Javanese particles and conjunctions are the most productive ones. The Javanese particles are realized in four forms, i.e. *toh*, *lha*, *kok*, and *lha kok*. Meanwhile, the Javanese conjunctions are always in clause-periphery position. Multi-word switching, further, is mostly realized by full sentence and clause switching (i.e. negation and imperative clause). These two switching types in the data are always long and complex and occur in intra-clause level. Another characteristic of Javanese – Indonesian alternation is several-constituent switching and tag-switching. These switching characteristics displayed both in Indonesian – Javanese and Javanese – Indonesian are all indicative alternations in Muysken’s (2000) typology.

*Congruent lexicalization*

As initially assumed, congruent lexicalization instances were found between Javanese and Indonesian. Apart from the general structural equivalence between the two languages, homophonous diamorphs and cognates also facilitate the mixing. Both diamorphs and cognates create an overlapping area in which further can trigger the code-switching (Clyne, 1967; Woolard, 1998). Further, it is also found that Arabic-origin Islamic related-words tend to
trigger Javanese more than Indonesian. In any event, this intense mixing between the two is also characterized by back and forth switches and bidirectional code-mixing.

The CM between Krama and Ngoko

Table 15: Mixing types and word category in both Krama – Ngoko and Ngoko – Krama data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Krama &gt; Ngoko</th>
<th>Ngoko &gt; Krama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insertional CM</td>
<td>Alternational CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full sentence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation clause</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag clause</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 (13.3%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>26 (86.7%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 15, overall, code-mixing is not quite productive both in Krama – Ngoko and in Ngoko – Krama. However, Krama slightly tends to be mixed with Ngoko rather than the other way around. Moreover, in both language pairs, we can see that insertional code-mixing is three to four times less frequent than alternational code-mixing.

Insertion

The insertions in both language pairs can only be found in verbs and verb phrases with very low frequency. The Krama verb and verb phrase insertions into Ngoko constructions are for politeness purposes while the Ngoko verb and verb phrase insertions are for a humoristic purpose. There is no morphological integration that can be found in both categories. However, the insertion cases display a nested $a b a$ structure.

Alternation

Interestingly, alternational mixing in both Krama – Ngoko and in Ngoko – Krama is dominated by clause category with very few occurrences of full sentence switching. However, there is a very strong tendency to mix Krama tag clause with Ngoko construction and not the other way around. By the same account, a very strong tendency to mix Ngoko imperative clause with Krama structure is also found. Furthermore, it turns out that switching for Krama negation clause is not only found in Indonesian structure but also exclusively in Ngoko structure. these
overall alternation cases are characterized by long and complex switching, peripheral switching, and tag switching.

**Congruent lexicalization**

Given the fact that Krama and Ngoko have a very similar general structure typologically and many homophonous diamorphs, congruent lexicalization would be very likely to exist. However, across the data examined, there is no instance of mixing triggered by the presence of homophonous diamorphs. Further, congruent lexicalization between the two codes is found with only one characteristic, i.e. the mixing of Krama pronoun with Ngoko structure. This could be because the presence of Madya structure which is technically a register in between Krama and Ngoko. Structurally, Madya is also a combination between Madya and Krama vocabularies, Krama pronouns and possessions and Ngoko affixes. Hence, the preacher, instead of doing congruent lexicalization code-mixing between Krama and Ngoko, tends to speak Madya.

5.2 The social intentions behind code-mixing in Islamic preaching events in Java

Table 16: Summary of code-mixing functions found in the data examined (adapted from table 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Language pairs</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>IND&gt;Ngo</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND&gt;Kra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ngo&gt;IND</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kra&gt;IND</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kra&gt;Ngoko</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic&gt;Ngoko&gt;IND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag questions</td>
<td>Krama</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperatives</td>
<td>Ngoko</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register marking</td>
<td>Ngo,Kra</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The language of prayer</td>
<td>Arabic, IND, Kra</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humoristic purposes</td>
<td>Ngoko</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td>Krama</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>Arabic&gt;IND</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic&gt;Ngoko</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic&gt;Kra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific topics</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 16, mixing Indonesian code with either Ngoko or Krama for explaining a specific topic that is more familiar in Indonesian, is the most frequent reason behind the
mixing the preacher engages in. The specific topics are usually government-related, economy-related, education-related, and general terms. Mixing Indonesian with Javanese for this kind of purpose apparently is not something surprising. Errington (1998), Saddhono (2012), Susanto (2006), and Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo’s (1982) research also exhibit similar result.

Further, as mentioned in chapter 3, Arabic entextualization from normative sources is very productive in Islamic discourse. Switching for explaining this Arabic entextualization would be equally productive since these entextualizations eventually need an explanation so that the message could be delivered to the audiences clearly. As can be seen, for explaining the Arabic quotation, the preacher uses Indonesian most of the time and less frequently uses Ngoko and Krama. The fact that Indonesian is used more for explaining the quotation is not surprising. This is in line with Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo’s (1982) claim that Indonesian is said to be the language for giving definitions. Moreover, mixing for register marking, politeness strategy, and imperative purposes is also quite frequent. Register marking in the data examined is closely related to a narrative, a type of storytelling to make an example out of a point explained. This narrative is apparently a common strategy in Islamic preaching even since the beginning of Islam (Khalifa, 2010). Even more, Quran, the Muslim’s main guiding book, also uses storytelling as a mean to “deliver knowledge and achieve Islamic education” (Al-Khatib, 2012:488). In the Javanese Islamic preaching, mostly there exists code-crossing between Krama and Ngoko that defines the narrative story the preacher delivers. This register marking really depends on the characters involved in the story. A narrative dialogue between the Prophet and his companion, for instance, will use Krama (spoken by the companion) and Ngoko (spoken by the Prophet).

Religious sermon or preaching is apparently one of the persuasive discourses which Lakoff (1982) defines it as an attempt of one party “to change the behavior, feelings, intentions, or viewpoint of another by communicative means”. Thus, finding code-mixing for strategies which are in line with the purpose of the religious discourse such as using polite pronouns, polite tag questions, using strong imperatives, and repetitions is not surprising. Further, regarding positive politeness strategy, Brown and Levinson (1987) suggest that this strategy is used for “metaphorical extension of intimacy”. However, instead of using Ngoko as the intimate code in Javanese, the preacher, almost all the time, mixes Krama pronouns and Krama tag questions with Ngoko structure for politeness. This is clearly because Krama is the polite register in Javanese and not Ngoko, although Krama “serves to create distance (either a generational gap or lack of intimacy)” (Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo, 2002:26).
Subsequently, the imperative is quite productive in this kind of discourse as imperative “accentuates the persuasive feature of religious sermons” (Emike and Abdulraheem, 2015: 28). In conveying the imperative, the preacher uses mostly Ngoko and few instances of Indonesian. The viable reason of this code choice is because of the nature of imperative which is used for instructing or ordering the listener(s) to do certain commands. Ngoko as the intimate and at the same time non-polite code and Indonesian which is known for its assertive nature, are more appropriate for creating a strong imperative. The strong imperative is necessary to emphasize “the divine injunctions to be obeyed by the listeners” (Emike and Abdulraheem, 2015: 28). Similarly, repetition is also one of the strategies used in a persuasive discourse. In the data examined, six styles of repetitions are found: Indonesian – Ngoko, Indonesian – Krama, Ngoko – Indonesian, Krama – Indonesian, Krama – Ngoko, and Arabic – Ngoko – Indonesian.

Meanwhile, examining the code-mixing in the data also reveals the languages used for praying in Java. Even though with only a few occurrences, code-mixing for praying purposes is actually not something rare in an Islamic discourse such as preaching. Saddhono’s (2012) research also shows a similar result. Further, in this study, it was found that the preacher uses Arabic, Indonesian and Krama for praying. Praying is technically a sacred medium for a human to ‘ask’ to God. Thus, it is obvious why Ngoko is not used at all as one would not use a non-polite code for ‘asking’ to God. Additionally, by looking into the code-switching that the preacher engages in may help us understand the relationship between Javanese and Indonesian. The results where Indonesian is used alongside with Krama for praying further strengthens Anderson’s (1966) claim that Indonesian equals Krama in terms of the language of Islam.

Lastly, few instances of code-mixing for a humoristic purpose are found in the data examined. To create this humorous atmosphere, the preacher tends to switch from either Indonesian or Krama into Ngoko. Apparently, Ngoko is preferred for this strategy for it is a ‘normal social intercourse’ code and feels more ‘intimate and lively’ (Quinn, 2011:366). As revealed by the result, it can be said that the preacher views humor as a good strategy in preaching. Millie’s (2012a:137) research shows that humor can “arouse a torpid audience”. In addition, it is also possible that the preacher uses humor for it is “a powerfully persuasive device” (Rushing and Barlow, 2009:65).

5.3. Conclusion

Looking at the mixing frequency between all the language pairs involved, the mixing between Javanese and Indonesian is the most productive code-mixing even in an Islamic discourse.
However, compared to the mixing between Ngoko and Krama, the mixing between Arabic – Javanese and Arabic – Indonesian is found to be more frequent. This result is not surprising since (1) It is Javanese and Indonesian that are spoken as the main code in the discourse; (2) From the very beginning, Arabic was learned not as a daily communication code, but rather more “as a form of religious duty” (Jones, 1983:87); (3) the preacher uses Madya a lot which technically can be said to be a congruent lexicalization type of mixing between Krama and Ngoko. Further, in all language pairs except Arabic – Javanese, alternational code-mixing apparently is more prevalent than insertional code-mixing. Additionally, these code-mixings were done for various purposes. Mixing Indonesian with either Ngoko or Krama for explaining a specific topic is the most frequent reason behind the mixing the preacher engages in. This result is not surprising despite the fact that the data examined are Islamic religious discourse tokens, the main codes used in the data are Indonesian and Javanese. Mixing for a specific purpose, further, is quite common in the Javanese and Indonesian corpora, as indicated by some previous research results (Errington, 1998; Saddhono, 2012; Susanto, 2006; and Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo, 1982). Other functions of code-mixing are giving an explanation, register marking, politeness strategies, imperatives, and repetition. Code-mixing for tag questions, praying, and humoristic purposes are also found with only a few occurrences.
6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The linguistic repertoire in Java is really complex. The community is characterized both by diglossia and bilingualism. Javanese, with its own complexity and speech levels, is spoken as the local language, Indonesian is spoken as the national language, and foreign languages like English and Arabic are also spoken. Seeing the complexity of the linguistic repertoire in Java, the linguistic condition of an Islamic-based oratorical event in Java, especially Islamic preaching, can be therefore equally complex. This research aimed to answer two research questions:

1) What is the structural pattern of code-mixing in Islamic preaching events in Java?
2) What are the social intentions behind code-mixing in Islamic preaching events in Java?

In answering these questions, the data of Islamic preaching events, taken from YouTube videos, were analyzed structurally using Muysken’s (2000) framework and were later interpreted sociolinguistically. The result contributes as a significant addition to the relatively limited exploration so far of the interaction between language and religion with respect to bilingualism or multilingualism.

Chapter 1 dealt with Java as a multilingual region in which several languages are spoken such as Javanese (as the local vernacular language), Indonesian (as the national language), and the languages of religion (Arabic and High or Krama Javanese; Lewis et al., 2016). The typological differences between the languages involved and on Islamic preaching in Java were also discussed. Chapter 2 presented the methodology employed in this study including the materials, the conceptual framework, and the analytical procedures. A brief discussion of the previous studies is also presented in Chapter 2.

Chapter 3 provided the structural analysis based on Muysken’s (2000) typology. The discussion focused on the Arabic elements found in both Javanese and Indonesian, the Krama elements in Ngoko structure and vice versa, the Indonesian elements in Javanese and the Javanese elements in Indonesian. Arabic expressions and quotations and Arabic single-word borrowings are the elements mixed most with both Javanese and Indonesian. The Arabic borrowings show phonological integration, morphological integration, and even semantic adjustment. Mixing between Krama and Ngoko is characterized mostly by pronoun, imperative clause, and tag question categories. Moreover, in Javanese – Indonesian and Indonesian – Javanese language pairs, the most diverse element categories are mixed between the two, ranging from nouns to
full sentences. Additionally, since Javanese and Indonesian have a general structural equivalence and many diamorphs, the intense code-mixing found between the two codes is also addressed in this chapter. It turns out that other than the two factors above, cognates also trigger intense mixing between the two. Additionally, Arabic-origin Islamic-related word which is borrowed in both Javanese and Indonesian will trigger more Javanese rather than Indonesian. However, further study on this is still necessary.

Chapter 4 presented a discussion on social functions of code-mixing found in the data examined. Among all the functions found, mixing Indonesian elements with either Ngoko or Krama for specific topics (i.e. government-related, economy-related, education-related, and general terms) are the most frequent reasons behind code-mixing. Other functions such as giving an explanation, register marking, politeness strategies, imperatives, and repetition are also found quite often. Yet, code-mixing for tag questions, praying and humoristic purposes is less productive compared to the other functions.

Chapter 5 provided a more detailed discussion on both structural findings in Chapter 3 and code-mixing functions in Chapter 4. Overall, the most productive code-mixing is performed in the Indonesian – Javanese language pair and in Javanese – Indonesian. This is as expected as it is Javanese and Indonesian that are spoken as the primary code in the discourse. Moreover, despite the fact that mixing between Krama and Ngoko is expected to be frequent, the code-mixing between the two code is apparently the least frequent of all language pairs. The preacher uses Madya a lot, which technically can be said to be congruent lexicalization mixing between Krama and Ngoko. Regarding the mixing type, it turns out that alternational code-mixing is more prevalent than insertional code-mixing in all language pairs except Arabic – Javanese.

In relation to code-mixing functions, several functions were found. As mentioned in Chapter 4, the most prevalent function found is mixing Indonesian with Krama and Ngoko for specific purposes. Despite the fact that the data examined are Islamic religious discourses, this result is not surprising and is in line with the research results of some previous studies (i.e. Errington, 1998; Saddhono, 2012; Susanto, 2006; and Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo, 1982). Other functions found are in line with the nature of the Islamic preaching event as a persuasive discourse, which is well exemplified by the mixture of polite pronouns and the use tag-clauses (i.e. Krama), strong imperatives (i.e. Ngoko), and repetitions. Code-mixing for register markings in a narrative storytelling to make an example out of a point explained is also quite frequent.
Further, code-mixing for explaining Arabic quotations is also found with Arabic – Indonesian as the most frequent pattern.

Additionally, by looking at the code-mixing that the preacher engages in praying, this study may contribute to strengthening Anderson’s (1966) claim that Indonesian equals Krama in terms of the language of the Islamic religion. This is because other than using Arabic, the norm of Islamic praying, the preacher also used Indonesian, Krama, or the mixing between two or three of them. This is not surprising as Krama is the highest register of Javanese while Indonesian according to Purwoko (2011), also has a status as a religious language.

Even though Arabic expressions and terms frequently featured in Islamic preaching, however, it is very unlikely that Arabic will be spoken as one of the main codes in daily conversation in Java. One reason for this is that from the very beginning, Arabic was learned not as a daily communication code, but rather more “as a form of religious duty” (Jones, 1983:87). Further, in Islamic preaching discourse in Java, Indonesian has a role as a national, official and unity language. It is evidenced by the high occurrence of mixing Indonesian elements with either Krama or Ngoko for government-related, economy-related, and education-related topics. The fact that most of the time Indonesian is used for explaining Arabic quotation further strengthen this. As mentioned, Indonesian also acts as a religious language.

Moreover, most of the time Krama is used as a politeness strategy. This can be seen by the use of Krama tag questions, Krama pronouns, and Krama register marking which is used by an inferior speaking to a superior. This fact is in line with Krama’s function as a High language in Java. The result of this study further confirms the status of Ngoko as the non-polite and also intimate variety of Java. This is indicated by the preacher’s preference of using Ngoko over other codes for imperatives and humor.
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