

RELIGIOUS LANGUAGE
Code-mixing in Islamic Preachings in Java



Fitria Aida Marfuaty

s4579836

Master General Linguistics

Faculty Of Arts

Radboud University Nijmegen

2016-2017

Supervised by

Prof. Pieter Muysken

Second reader:

Luis Miguel Rojas Berscia

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.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the people that supported and encouraged me for the completion of my thesis.

First of all, I would like to dedicate my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Pieter Muysken, for all of the support, guidance, ideas and feedbacks during the process of writing my thesis. To Luis Miguel Rojas Berscia, apart from being my secondary thesis supervisor, I would like to thank him for his helpful ideas and suggestions for my thesis.

I would like to thank Sophie Villerius, my internship supervisor, for introducing me to her project and ELAN which would later inspire me for my thesis topic.

As well, to my previous lecturer in Indonesia, Ribut Wahyudi, I would like to express my sincere gratitude for his support and encouragement in my academic life since many years ago. His help truly brought me to gain the opportunity to study a master's degree in the Netherlands at the first place. Also, my special thanks to my friend Dewi Irene who kindly helped me in the process of transcribing my data.

Apart from the academic support, I would like to thank my beloved family in Indonesia and my dearest friends for their love, prayers, and encouragement. My gratitude also goes to my friends in Nijmegen especially Syarif, Mirsa, and Jusuf for the amazing discussions of both academic and non-academic issues. My special thanks go to Boris for supporting me in many ways. Finally and most importantly, I would like to give my great thanks to the LPDP scholarship for the financial support which allowed me to accomplish the dream of studying abroad.

Table of Contents

<u>ABSTRACT</u>	2
<u>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</u>	3
<u>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</u>	6
<u>LIST OF TABLES AND COLOR GUIDE</u>	7
<u>LIST OF TABLES</u>	7
<u>COLOR GUIDE</u>	7
<u>1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND STUDY</u>	8
<u>1.1 Introduction</u>	8
<u>1.2 Java as a multilingual region</u>	9
<u>1.2 Typological differences between the languages involved</u>	11
<u>1.3 Islamic Preaching in Java</u>	14
<u>1.5 Research Questions</u>	15
<u>2. METHODOLOGY</u>	16
<u>2.1 Materials</u>	16
<u>2.2 Framework for the data analysis</u>	16
<u>2.3 Procedures</u>	18
<u>2.4 Previous studies</u>	19
<u>3. STRUCTURAL FINDINGS</u>	21
<u>3.1 Introduction</u>	21
<u>3.2 Arabic elements in Javanese sentences and Indonesian sentences</u>	21
<u>3.3 Krama elements within Ngoko sentences or vice versa</u>	25
<u>3.4 Indonesian elements in Javanese sentences</u>	28
<u>3.5 Javanese elements in Indonesian sentences</u>	34
<u>3.6 Intense mixing between Javanese and Indonesian</u>	39
<u>3.6 Conclusion</u>	41
<u>4. FUNCTIONS OF CODE-SWITCHING</u>	43
<u>4.1 Introduction</u>	43
<u>4.2 Repetition for emphasis</u>	43
<u>4.3 Using Krama for tag questions</u>	45
<u>4.4 Using Ngoko and IND for imperatives</u>	47
<u>4.5 Register Marking</u>	49
<u>4.6 The language of prayer (du'a)</u>	50
<u>4.7 Switching to Ngoko for humoristic purposes</u>	52
<u>4.8 Use of Krama pronouns as a politeness strategy</u>	53
<u>4.9 Switching to explain Arabic quotations</u>	54

4.10	<u>Switching to Indonesian for discussing a specific subject matter</u>	56
4.11	<u>Conclusion</u>	59
5.	<u>DISCUSSION</u>	60
5.1	<u>The structural patterns of code-mixing in Islamic preaching events in Java</u>	60
	<u>The CM of Arabic – Javanese and Arabic – Indonesian is presented in Table 13.</u>	60
	<u>The CM between Javanese and Indonesian</u>	62
	<u>The CM between Krama and Ngoko</u>	64
5.2	<u>The social intentions behind code-mixing in Islamic preaching events in Java</u>	65
5.3.	<u>Conclusion</u>	67
6.	<u>SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION</u>	69
	<u>References</u>	72

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

APPL	applicative
AV	active voice
AUX	auxiliary
CAUS	causative
DEM	demonstrative
DET	determiner
FUT	future
GEN	genitive
IMP	imperative
LOC	locative
M	masculine
NEG	negation
PAST	past
PERF	perfective
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
PV	passive voice
REL	relative marker
SG	singular
TR	transitive
1	first person
2	second person
3	third person

LIST OF TABLES AND COLOR GUIDE

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Indonesian consonants

Table 2: Javanese consonants

Table 3: Arabic consonants

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

Table 5: Arabic elements in Javanese and Indonesian

Table 6: Krama elements in Ngoko construction and vice versa

Table 7: Frequency of each mixing category in all language pairs, with highly frequent mixes marked bold.

Table 8: Repetitions in different language pairs

Table 9: Types of question tags

Table 10: Types of imperative clause

Table 11: Switching types for explaining Arabic quotation

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

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

Table 14: Mixing types and word category in both Indonesian – Javanese and Javanese – Indonesian corpus

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

Table 16: Summary of code-mixing functions found in the data examined

COLOR GUIDE

JV- Krama/Madya	JV-Ngoko	Diamorph
Arabic	IND	

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)

Classical Arabic	Ḍahaba	Muḥammadun	ʔilā	Imadrasati
	PAST.go	Muhammad	to	school.GEN.SG
Indonesian	Muhammad	pergi	ke	sekolah
	Muhammad	go	to	school
High Javanese	Muhammad	tindhak	datheng	sekolah
	Muhammad	go	to	school
Low Javanese	Muhammad	lunga	menyang	sekolah
	Muhammad	go	to	school

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, *ʔinna* ‘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.

ʔinna	ḏahaba	Muḥammadan	ʔilā	Imadrasati	
Indeed	3SG.M.PAST.go	Muhammad	to	school.GEN.SG	
ʔinna	Muḥammadan	wa	Zaidan	ḏahabā	ʔilā Imadrasati
Indeed	Muhammad	and	Zaid	3DualM.go	to school.GEN.SG

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).

Ḍahaba	r-rajulu	Xarajati	l-marʔatu
PAST.go	DET.man	PAST.exit	DET.woman
Ḍahaba	r-rijālu	Xarajati	n-nisāʔu
PAST.go	DET.man.PL	PAST.exit	DET.woman.PL

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:

High Javanese	(panjenengan) (2SG)	Kula 1SG	aturi beg	tindhak go
Low Javanese	lungo-o go-IMP			

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

	Labial	Labiodental	Dental/Alveolar	Palatal	Velar	Glottal
Nasals	m		n	ɲ	ŋ	
Stops/Affricates	p b		t d	tʃ dʒ (j)	k g	ʔ
Fricatives		(f) (v)	s			h
Approximants	w			y		
Laterals			L			
Rhotics			R			

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

Table 2: Javanese consonants

	Labial	Dental	Retroflex	Palatal	Velar	Glottal
Nasals	m	n		ɲ	ŋ	
Stops/Affricates	p b	t d	ʈ ɖ	tʃ dʒ	k ɡ	ʔ
Fricatives			s			h
Approximants	w			y		
Laterals			ɭ			
Rhotics			ɻ			

The consonants system of Indonesian and Javanese are mostly the same except that Javanese has a retroflex /ʈ / and / ɖ / 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

	Labial	Labio-dental	Inter-dental	Dental/Alveolar	Emphatic	Palatal	Velar	Uvular	Pharyngeal	Laryngeal
Nasals	m			n						
Stops/Affricates	b			t d	d ^ʕ t ^ʕ	dʒ	k	q		ʔ
Fricatives		f	θ ð	s z	s ^ʕ ð ^ʕ	ʃ		x ɣ	ħ ʕ	h
Approximants	w					y				
Laterals				l	ɭ					
Trill				r						

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/, /s^ʕ/, /ð^ʕ/, /ʃ/, /x/, /ɣ/, /ħ/, and /ʕ/, also emphatic sounds /d^ʕ/, /t^ʕ/, and /ɭ/. 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).

Indonesian	Bapak	mem-beli-kan	anak-nya	kuda
	father	AV-buy-APPL	child-POSS	horse
High Javanese	Bapak	n-umbas-aken	putran-ipun	Jaran
	father	AV-buy-APPL	child-POSS	horse
Low Javanese	Bapak	nukok-ké	anak-é	Jaran
	father	AV-buy-APPL	child-POSS	horse

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 *-ké* 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 *Pesantren*² (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).

Muysken	Auer	Myers-Scotton	Poplack
Insertion	Transfer	Matrix Language + Embedded Language constituents	(Nonce) borrowing Constituent insertion
Alternation	Code-switching	Embedded Language Islands Matrix Language – shift	Flagged switching Code-switching under equivalence
Congruent lexicalization		Matrix Language – shift Matrix Language – turn-over (style shifting)	Code-switching under equivalence (style shifting)

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 Sundanese³ 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

Language pairs	N	NP	V	VP	Adj	expression	quotation
Arabic > Jav	25	2	3		4	19	15
Arabic > IND	10	3		4	12	11	30

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 saguning 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 pakurmatan 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 *Kiai*⁴, the *Nyai*⁵, the leaders, the teachers and the elders. In addressing some of these audiences, the preacher uses Arabic words such as *'alim* for scholars, *masyaayikh* 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
llahu '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 *Kyai* 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-*⁶ 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:

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

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)

- (3) Kalau sehat itu orientasi-nya dzohir kalau afiyat itu
 If healthy DEM orientation-GEN visible if healthy DEM
 orientasi-nya batin jadi afiyat Itu arti-nya sehat yang
 orientation-GEN hidden so healthy DEM mean-GEN healthy REL
 di-guna-kan untuk beribadah dan men-dekat kepada Allah
 PV-use for worship and AV-approach to Allah
 ‘Sehat is about physical appearance, and afiyat is about inner ‘health’. Thus, afiyat
 means the health that is used for worshipping and approaching God.’
 [Video 2, 00:06:03.990 - 00:06:26.310]

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.

Noun		Adjective		Verb	
<i>ʿālim</i>	‘scholar’	<i>ʿāfiyat</i>	‘healthy’	<i>taʿdʿim</i>	‘to respect’
<i>maʿāyix</i>	‘leaders’	<i>dʿālim</i>	‘unjust’	<i>ittibaʿ</i>	‘to follow’
<i>Asātid</i>	‘teachers’	<i>dʿāhir</i>	‘visible’	<i>ijabah</i>	‘to answer’
<i>hāḍʿirīn</i>	‘male audiences’	<i>bātʿin</i>	‘hidden’		
<i>hāḍʿirāt</i>	‘female audiences’	<i>mubaḍir</i>	‘wasteful’		
<i>dʒamaʿah</i>	‘assembly/group’	<i>fahriyah</i>	‘monthly’		
<i>tʿāʿat</i>	‘obedience’				
<i>Rahmat</i>	‘mercy’				
<i>mayfirah</i>	‘forgiveness’				
<i>Maulid</i>	‘birthday’				
<i>sʿālawat</i>	‘prayers’				
<i>Ḍikir</i>	‘to mention’				

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. *taʿdim-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 *ħāḍirīn* by a Javanese and Indonesian glottal fricative /h/ and alveolar stop /d/ like in *ħāḍirīn* → *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 me-nyatakan idzaa marortum bi riyadhi*
 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 riyadhi 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

Language pairs	V	VP	Pronoun	Negation	Clause	imperative	Tag question	sentence
Krama > Ngoko	2	2	34	6	1		17	2
Ngoko > Krama	4	1			1	16		1

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 bekas-é kan cilik
 particle kid circumsice DEM tool-GEN particle small
 toh asli-né nggéh mboten?
 particle real-DET yes no
 ‘The circumcised boy, his ‘tool’ is actually small, *yes no?*.’
 [Video 2, 01:22:31.518 - 01:22:38.184]

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.

- (7) Ndék nggon-é alquran niku surat apa juz piro sing
 LOC place-GEN Quran DEM chapter what section which REL
 m-bahas sholat Dhuhur patang Rokaat ayo ng-omong-o lambé-mu
 AV-discuss prayer Dhuhur four rokaat⁷ come.on AV-say-IMP lip-2POSS
 mboten wonten
 NEG exist
 ‘In which part of Quran, what chapter, which section, that discusses that *dzuhur* prayer (needs to be done) in four *rakaat*. Come on! Say it (with) your lips!. (Such thing) *does not exist*.’
 [Video 1, 00:35:59.912 - 00:36:20.390]

The preacher at first asks the audience in what chapter and section of Quran that they can find the information about prayer *dhuhur* fully in Ngoko. The question is rhetorical in the first place and does not need answering. This is because Muslims generally know technical information like this would not exist in Quran, rather in Hadith. However, the preacher still provides the answer to his own question in Krama *mboten wonten* ‘does not exist’. This could be a strategy to assert that the rhetorical question is actually a fact.

Further, we can see that the Krama mixing example (7) occurs 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.

- (8) Bapak ibu sampun ngantuk napa dèrèng aja
 father mother PERF sleepy or yet NEG.IMP
 ngantuk sék kula sekedap mawon
 sleepy still 1SG awhile only

⁷ *Rakaat* refers to a single unit of Islamic prayers, i.e. there are four *rakaat* in prayer *dhuhur*.

‘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.

- (9)

Lha	niki	wau	kanca-kanca	grup	rebana	sami
Particle	DEM	PERF	friend.PL	group	rebana ⁸	together
sholawatan	njenengan	nggéh	ndèrèk	maos	sholawat	napa namung
sholawatan ⁹	2SG	yes	join	read	prayers	or only

mangap-mangap?
 open.the.mouth.repeatedly.without.sound
 ‘Just now, (when) our friends from Rebana group sing sholawatan together, do you also join them reading sholawat or just open your mouth repeatedly (without sound)?.’
 [Video 2, 00:22:45.670 - 00:22:53.790]

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.

- (10)

Mangka-né	mesjid-é	bangun-en	sak gedhé-gedhé-né	guru-guru	ngaji
That’s.why	mosque-DET	build-IMP	as.big-GEN	teacher.PL	Islamic.learning
gak	diramut	sepi	masjid-é.	sakniki	mpun
NEG	PV-take.care	quiet	Mosque-DET	now	PERF
					kathah kasus
					many case

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*.

ngoten niku.

Like.that DEM

‘That’s why, build the mosque as big as you can, (but) the Islamic learning teachers are not taken care of, the mosque will be quiet. Now there are already many cases like this.’

[Video 2, 01:00:39.073 - 01:00:49.406]

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 Connors’ (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 séng 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
What REL PV-do-TR village-chief 1PL want AV-imitate
kepéngén niru gampang
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. bèn ora kliru. tak-dadèk-ké
REL true only to.that NEG wrong 1SG-make-APPL
sugéh tapi kekayaan-nya di-manfaat-kan untuk berjuang
rich 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 saguning para 'alim, para bapak kiai
intended exist before-GEN all DET.PL scientist DET.PL father Kiai
para ibu Nyai masyayikh asaaid lan para sesepuh ingkang winantu
DET.PL mother Nyai leader.PL teacher.PL and DET.PL elder REL together
ing pakurmatan ingkang sareng-sareng kita ta'dzim-i para
LOC honor REL together 1PL respect.CAUS DET.PL
pejabat pemerintah dalam semua tingkatan-nya yang berkesempatan
official government in all level-GEN REL have.an.opportunity
hadir jajaran Muspika bapak kepala desa para
come range Muspika¹⁰ father head village DET.PL
perangkat desa dan tokoh- tokoh masyarakat yang
officer village and figure.PL community REL
saya hormat-i
1SG respect-APPL

¹⁰ *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-é** **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 sèng rawuh tak-delok-i ya wajah-wajah péngén
 DEM REL attend 1SG-see-CAUS yes face.PL want
 sugéh kabèh
 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
 tèyèngen engko pas wayah di-sebul mék 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
 memang 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-nentukan
human DEM REL PV-decide Allah REL AV-decide
oleh karena itu dalam berdoa sifat-é gak
by because DEM in AV-pray character-GEN NEG
olèh mekso nang nggon-é gusti Allah ora
allow AV-force to place-GEN lord Allah NEG
olèh ngatur Gusti Allah lha saman modèl- é
allow command Lord Allah particle 2SG model-GEN
lèk n-dungo lak ng-atu 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
day mercy love GEN need Ha hu 2SG PV-name-CAUS day
valentine
Valentine
‘Fourteen February, they say, is (a) love day, -don’t say ha hu, you!- (and) is named Valentine day.’

[Video 4, 00:33:11.240 - 00:33:31.335]

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
PV-use	AV-do-CAUS	obedience	'afiyat	DEM	healthy	REL
tidak	di-pakai	maksiyat				
NEG	PV-use	sinful.activity				

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

[Video 4, 00:08:29.210 - 00:08:53.550]

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
usual	If	healthy	DEM	orientation-GEN	visible	nut
itu	orientasi-nya	bathin				kalau
DEM	orientation-GEN	Inner				if

‘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.’

[Video 4, 00:07:39.925 - 00:08:01.310]

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
 one January DEM night and day REL sinful.activity
 paling banyak terjadi di muka bumi nggéh napa mboten
 most many happen LOC surface earth yes or No
 ‘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
 but GEN mean person.PL REL sick DEM
 andaikan dia sehat lantas berbuat maksiat. mboten ngaten
 if 3SG healthy then do sin NEG like.that
 ‘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* + *santri* (example 27) and *ta'mir masjid jami'* *al-istiqqad* + *ingkang minulya* (example 28).

- (27) Rekan-rekan panitia penyelenggara acara pada malam hari
 friend.PL committee organizer event on night day
 ini kawan-kawan remaja kanca-kanca santri sahabat-sahabat banser
 this friend.PL youth friend.PL Santri friend.PL Banser
 yang saya bangga-kan
 REL 1SG proud.of
 ‘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-istiqqad ingkang minulya
 all manager mosque great Al-istiqqad REL respected
 para pejabat pemerintah dalam semua tingkatan-nya jajaran
 all officer government in all level-GEN range

Muspika	bapak	kepala	desa	bersama	para	perangkat
Muspika	father	head	village	together	DET.PL	officer
desa	dan	tokoh- tokoh	masyarakat	yang	saya	hormat-i
village	and	figure.PL	community	REL	1SG	respect-APPL

‘All the respected managers of the great Mosque Al-istiqdad, the governmental officers at all levels, the Muspika range, the head village, the village officers and the community figures whom I respect.’

[Video 4, 00:03:41.760 - 00:04:12.505]

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 -GEN	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
1PL	PV-command	pray	like	1PL	AV-see	line
besar-nya	pada	melihat,	rosulullah	me-ngerjakan	sholat.	bukan
big-GEN	on	AV-see	Rasulullah	AV-do	pray	NEG
melihat	panitia		yang	kluyuran	tadi.	
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*
This particle picture particle when 1PL AV-love-CAUS
*rasululla kita me-neladan-i rasululloh meng-ikut-i sunah-sunah*¹²
Rasululla 1PL AV-imitate-CAUS Rasulullah AV-follow-CAUS sunah.PL
rasululloh maka pasti allah akan men-cinta-i kita
Rasulullah 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 *majelisé* ‘the meeting’.

- (32) *Terlebih majelis yang kita hadir-i yang kita*
More meeting REL 1PL attend-CAUS REL 1PL
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 *majelis 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 nggéh satu muharram
 year new-GEN people Islam DEM yes one Muharram
 maka kalau umat Islam mèlu-mèlu ramé-ramé me-rayakan
 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 *-né*. 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 lexicon. 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 mixes marked bold.

Category	Arabic>Jav	Arabic>IND	IND>Jav	Jav>IND	Kra>Ngo	Ngo>Kra
Noun	25	10	3	6		
NP	2	3	38	9		
Adj	4	12	6	5		
AdjP			2	2		
Verb	3		2	14	2	4
VP		4	19	8	2	1
PP			2	5		
pronoun			3	2	34	
Adv			4	5		
Conjunction			2	10		
Suffix				2		
particle				29		
Negation			143			
Negation clause				6	6	
Imperative			3	9		16
Tag question				2	17	
clause			29	36	1	1
expression	19	11				
Several constituents			7	9		
Sentence (quotation)	15	30	23	34	2	1
Total	68	70	286	193	65	22

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 8: repetitions in different language pairs

Language pairs	Frequency
IND>Ngo	10
IND>Kra	5
Ngo>IND	3
Kra>IND	3
Kra>Ngo	3
Arabic>Ngo>IND	1

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:

- (1) *Ibadah yang di-terima Allah ibadah sing payu nang ngarsa-né*
 worship REL PV-accept Allah worship REL matter LOC before-GEN
Allah niku ibadah sing apik-é asli.
 Allah DEM worship REL Good-GEN genuine
 ‘The worship which is accepted by Allah, the worship which matters before Allah
 is the worships which are genuinely good.’
 [Video 1, 00:21:44.608 - 00:21:44.608]

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.

- (2) *Jadi 'afiyat itu arti-nya sehat yang di-guna-kan untuk beribadah*
 thus healthy DEM mean-GEN healthy REL PV-use-CAUS for worship
'afiyat iku teges-é sehat séng di-gaè ng-lakon-i ta'at
 healthy DEM mean-GEN healthy REL PV-use PV-use obedience
 ‘Thus, ‘afiyat means being healthy which is used for worshiping God,’afiyat means being
 healthy which is used for obeying God.’
 [Video 4, 00:08:29.210 - 00:08:46.445]

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

- (3) *Lho nèk kula penjenengan mpun kempal kalih tiang-tiang*
 particle if 1SG 2SG PERF gather with person.PL
sholih maka hati kita akan ter-gerak dan ter-dorong untuk
 good so heart 1PL FUT PV-move and PV-push for
kepingin men-contoh perilaku-nya pengen saget ny-onto tuminda-ké.
 want AV-imitate attitude-GEN want able AV-imitate attitude-GEN
 ‘If you and me already gathered with good people, thus our heart will be moved and pushed
 to wanting to imitate their attitude, wanting to be able to imitate their attitude.’
 [Video 2, 00:19:33.200 - 00:19:55.910]
- (4) *Untuk mendapatkan rahmat dan magfiroh Allah supados kula penjenengan*
 for achieve mercy and forgiveness Allah so.that 1SG 2SG
pikantuk kawelasan saha pangapura-nipun Allah ini modal
 achieve mercy and forgiveness-GEN Allah DEM modal
utama-nya adalah ittiba' kepada Rasulullah
 main-GEN AUX follow to Rasulullah
 ‘For achieving Allah’s mercy and forgiveness, so that you and I achieve Allah’s mercy and
 forgiveness, the main modal is if we follow Rasulullah.’
 [Video 2, 00:26:37.500 - 00:26:48.620]

In the example above, the verb phrase *kepingin men-contoh 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.

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 *‘afiyat* 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

Question tags	frequency
Nggéh?	7
Nggéh napa nggéh?	6
Nggéh mboten?	4

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
 person around Sumbergempol yes NEG exist REL can pray person NEG
 tau n-ingali sholat-é kanjeng nabi nggéh napa nggéh?
 ever AV-see pray-GEN lord Prophet yes or yes
 ‘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
 2SG if cook quite delicious neighbor-GEN PV-give-APPL
 nggéh?
 yes
 ‘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

Language	Frequency
Ngo	27
IND	3

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 *-na* is also one of the Ngoko imperative markers used by the preacher as shown in (9):

- (9) Kanggo kanjeng nabi nikah lebih dari empat itu khususiyah
 for lord prophet marry more than four DEM special
 untuk Rasulullah tidak berlaku bagi umat-nya rungok-na wong
 for Rasulullah NEG applied for follower-GEN listen-IMP person
 lanang-lanang iku
 male DEM
 ‘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!’
 [Video 4, 00:56:00.372 - 00:56:11.740]

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

- (10) Aja mbok-remeh-ké njenengan saget moco Quran lancar 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?’
 [Video 1, 00:40:36.652 - 00:40:47.999]

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:

- (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!’
 [Video 2, 00:42:43.221 - 00:42:51.443]

In addition, all of the three Indonesian occurrences found are in the form of negative imperative where the preacher uses negative imperative marker *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

sembuhkan-lah aku ya Allah Allahumma isyfi anta syaafi
 heal-IMP 1SG O Allah Allah cure.IMP 2SG.M Most.healers
 la syifaa'a illa syifaau-ka
 NEG cure except cure-2.M

'There is a badly sick person only prays without consuming medicine and without medical treatment (prays) "O Allah heal me O Allah, Allah cure me, you are the Most healers and no cure except the one which comes from you."

[Video 3, 00:17:23.000 - 00:18:06.300]

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 dadosa-ken bojo
 1SG AV-ask 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]

(17) Wa qin-naa 'adzaab an-nar dan pelihara-lah kami ya
 and save-1PL torture DET-hell and save-IMP 1PL O
 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]

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 annaar* '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.

(18) Bocah sekolah wayah ujian ora gelem belajar ora
 kid school time exam NEG want study NEG
 gelem sinau, ming n-dungo waé ya Allah lulus-kan
 want study only AV-pray just O Allah pass-IMP
 hamba ya allah beri-kan hamba kelulusan ya allah,
 1SG O Allah give-IMP 1SG graduation O Allah
 ny-uwun dipun-paringi lulus ya allah
 AV-ask PV-give graduate O Allah

'A student in his exam time doesn't want to study, doesn't want to study. He only prays "O Allah make me pass O Allah, give me a graduation O Allah, (I) ask (You) to make me pass O Allah."

[Video 3, 00:16:03.300 - 00:16:26.700]

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** **nggéh** **n-jungkel-njungkel**
 person here if pray prostration-DET yes AV-somersault
 ngoten **nggéh**
 like.that yes
 ‘People around here, when you do prostration in your prayer, did you do it in
 somersault way, like that yes?’
 [Video 2, 00:51:16.703 - 00:51:29.814]

Example (19) shows how the preacher inserts a Ngoko verb *njungkel-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 prostration¹³. 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.’
 [Video 2, 00:41:44.777 - 00:42:03.184]

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
 DEM particle mom husband-2POSS son-3POSS mother.in.law-2POSS REL
 sering me-ngelon-i dirimu layan-i dengan baik
 often 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 Rahmanadji’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
 nggéh
 yes
 ‘If **you** cook delicious meals, you also **give** your neighbor, **right?**.’

[Video 1, 01:10:20.333 - 01:10:26.899]

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

Language pairs	Frequency
Arabic>IND	30
Arabic>Ngo	13
Arabic>Kra	2

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 riyadhi**
 Rasulullah ever AV-say if PAST.go.through.2PL by garden
l-jannah farta'u ketika kalian men-dapati ada taman-taman
 DET-heaven join.IMP when 2PL AV-pass exist garden.PL
syurga ikut-lah nimbrung ikut-lah ber-gabung
 heaven follow-IMP join follow-IMP AV-join
 ‘Rasulullah said "idzaa marortum bi riyadhi 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**
 If-2PL 2PL.love.PRS God if 2PL AV-love-CAUS
Allah fa ttabi'u-ni, maka ikutilah aku
 Allah so follow.IMP.2PL-1SG so follow-IMP 1SG
 ‘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 Hadith¹⁴ 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)

- (29) **Huwa min amri l-yahud nyebul-nyebul terompèt kui**
 3SG.M from job DET-Jew AV-blow trumpet DEM
 penggawéan-é wong Yahudi
 Job-GEN person Jew
 ‘It is one of the Jews’ job, blowing trumpet is the Jews’ job.’
 [Video 1, 00:10:06.848 - 00:10:20.544]

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.

- (30) **Ayyul akmaali ahabbu ila-llah ya rasulallah amal perbuatan napa**
 which deed PAST.3SG.M.love by-Allah O Rasulallah deed deed what
 ingkang paling dipun-cintai dèning gusti Allah
 REL most PV-love by lord Allah
 ‘(The prophet’s friend asked) “**which deed that will be loved by the God O Rasulallah?**”,
 what deed that will be loved by the Lord God?’
 [Video 5, 00:15:06.630 - 00:15:17.450]

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 kapolsek
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'mir*¹⁸, 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 permèn niku regi-né pinten 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 gèk di-pamèr-pamèr-ké kanca-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 *Kapolsek* is an acronym of *Kepala Kepolisian* (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
 why particle if kid school if kid course
 di-dukung di-opèn-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 NEG only now era Rasulullah
 sudah ada sekulerisme itu sudah ada sekulerisme itu orang
 PERF exist secularism DEM PERF exist secularism DEM person
 yang orientasinya cuma dunia tujuan-é ming ndunyo thok
 REL 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 ndunyo 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

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

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.

Category	Arabic > JAV		Arabic > IND	
	Insertional CM	Alternational CM	Insertional CM	Alternational CM
Expression		19		11
Quotation		15		30
Nouns	25		10	
Adjectives	4		12	
Verbs	3			
NP, VP	2		7	
Total	34 (50%)	34 (50%)	29 (41.4%)	41 (58.6%)
Total	68		70	

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 *ʕālim* → *ʔalim*) 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-llah* ‘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 *Astaghfiru llah* ‘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: Mixing types and word category in both Indonesian – Javanese and Javanese – Indonesian corpus

	IND > JAV		JAV > IND	
	Inst CM	Alt CM	Inst CM	Alt CM
Full sentence		23		34
Several constituents		7		9
Clause		29		36
Negation clause				6
Imperative clause		3		9
Tag question				2
Pronoun		3		2
Conjunction, adverb, suffix, particle		6		46
Negation		143		
Nouns, adjectives, verbs	11		25	
NP, VP, AdjP, PP	61		24	
Total	72 (25.2%)	214(74.8%)	49 (25.4%)	144 (74.6%)
Total	286 (60, 26%)		193 (39.74%)	

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

	Krama > Ngoko		Ngoko > Krama	
	Insertional CM	Alternational CM	Insertional CM	Alternational CM
Full sentence		2		1
Clause		1		1
Negation clause		6		
Imperative clause				16
Tag clause		17		
Verbs	2		4	
VP	2		1	
Total	4 (13.3%)	26 (86.7%)	5 (21.7%)	18 (78.3%)
Total	30		23	

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)

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

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.

References

- Al-Khatib, M. A. (2012). Politeness in the Holy Quran: A sociolinguistic perspective and pragmatic perspective. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 9(4), 479-509.
- Anderson, B. (1966). The languages of Indonesian politics. *Indonesia*, 1, 89–116. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3350786>
- Anderson, B. (1990). *Language and power: Exploring political cultures in Indonesia*. United States: Cornell University Press.
- Auer, P. (1998). *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London & New York: Routledge. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.csun.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=8940772&site=ehost-live&scope=cite%5Cnhttp://en.bookfi.net/book/1091699>
- Bash, E. (2015). Code-mixing and code-switching in Malay Muslim multilinguals' personal Du'a. *2nd International Research Management & Innovation Conference (IRMIC 2015) langkawi*, 26 – 27 august 2015, 1(August), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Berg, B. (2007). Presence and power of the Arab idiom in Indonesian Islamic musical arts. *Conference on Music in the World of Islam, Assilah*, 2007).
- Brown, P. & Stephen L. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chen, K. H. Y. (2015). Styling bilinguals : Analyzing structurally distinctive code-switching styles in Hong Kong. In G. Stell & K. Yakpo (Eds.), *Code-switching Between Structural and Sociolinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 163–184). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110346879.163>
- Clyne, M. (1967). *Transference and Triggering*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Connors, T. J. (2006). Contact induced change: The varying effects of Indonesian on Javanese dialects. *International Symposium on Malay/Indonesian Linguistics* 10, 21-23 April 2006. Retrieved from <http://ismil.shh.mpg.de/10/abstracts.html>.
- Errington, J. J. (1998). *Shifting Languages: Interaction and Identity in Javanese Indonesia*. Cambridge: The University Press.
- Feener, R. M. & Gade, A. M. (1998). *Patterns of Islamization in Indonesia: a curriculum unit for post-secondary level educators*. Cornell University Southeast Asia Program Outreach, 1998. Retrieved from <https://seap.einaudi.cornell.edu/teaching-materials-on-December-15>, 2016.
- Federspiel, H.M. (2016). "Pesantren." In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Islamic World. Oxford Islamic Studies Online*, <http://www.oxfordislamicstudies.com/article/opr/t236/e0632> (accessed Dec 14, 2016).

- Fishman, J. A. (1967). Bilingualism with and without diglossia; Diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23 (2), 29-38.
- Frank, M. (1972). *Modern English: A Practical Reference Guide*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Gil, D. (2002). The prefixes di- and N- in Malay/Indonesian dialects. In Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross (eds.) *The history and typology of western Austronesian voice system*, 241-283. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Gross, M. L. (2007). *A Muslim Archipelago: Islam and Politics in Southeast Asia*. National Defense Intelligence College: NDIC Press.
- Hanum, F. (2015). Pendidikan Seks Terhadap Wanita Menurut Tradisi Jawa Di Pedesaan. *Humaniora*, 12(2), 31–50.
- Hellwig, B. (2016). *ELAN - Linguistic Annotator version 4.9.4*. Downloaded from <http://www.mpi.nl/corpus/manuals/manual-elan.pdf> 02 December 2016
- Holmes, J. (2013). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). London and New York: Routledge.
- Hornby, A.S. (1975). *Guide to Patterns and Usage in English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, S. (1983). Arabic instruction and literacy in Javanese Muslim schools. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 42, 83–94.
- Kaye, A. S. (1987). Arabic. In B. Comrie (ed.) *The world's major languages*, 1st edn. 664-685. London & Sydney: Croom Helm.
- Khalifa, N. (2010). *Hardship and deliverance in the Islamic tradition: Theology and spirituality in the works of Al-Tanūkhī*. London & New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers.
- Kuipers, J. (2013). Linguistic piety in Islamic Java. Presented in *The Sigur Center for Asian Studies* in 2013.
- Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and woman's place*. New York, Hagerstown, San Francisco, & London: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Lakoff, R. (1982). Persuasive discourse and ordinary conversation, with examples from advertising. In Deborah Tannen, ed., *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk*. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
- Lewis, M. P., G. F. Simons, and Ch.D. Fennig (eds.). 2016. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, 19th Edn. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com>.
- Locher, M. A. (1996). The "speech levels" of Sundanese: disfluency and identity. *The Annual Meeting of the American Association of Applied Linguistics*, March 1996.

- Millie, J. (2012a). Oratorical Innovation and Audience Heterogeneity in Islamic West Java. *Indonesia*, 93, 123–145. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5728/indonesia.93.0123>
- Millie, J. (2012b). The languages of preaching: Code selection in Sundanese Islamic oratory, west Java. *The Australian Journal of Anthropology*, 23(3), 379–397. <https://doi.org/10.1111/taja.12006>
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual Speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: The University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Malden, Oxford & Victoria: Blackwell Publishing. <https://doi.org/citeulike-article-id:1208237>
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). A markedness model of code-switching. In *Social motivations for codeswitching : Evidence from Africa* (Oxford studies in language contact). Oxford: Clarendon.
- Na'im, A & Syaputra, H. (2010). *Kewarganegaraan, suku bangsa, agama, dan bahasa sehari-hari penduduk Indonesia*. Jakarta: Badan Pusat statistik.
- Nababan, P.W.J (1991). Language in education: The case of Indonesia. *International Journal of Education*, 37, 115-127.
- Oakes, M. P. (2009). Javanese. In B. Comrie (ed.) *The world's major languages*, 2nd edn. 819-832. London: Routledge
- Ogoblin, A. K. (2005). Javanese. In A. Adelaar & N. P. Himmelmann (eds.) *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*, 590-624. London: Routledge.
- Poedjosoedarmo, S. (1968). Javanese speech levels. *Indonesia*, 6, 54-81.
- Poplack, S. (1993). Variation theory and language contact: Concepts, methods and data. In D. Preston (ed.), *American Dialect Research*, 251–286. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Prentice, D. J. (1987). Malay (Indonesian and Malaysian). In B. Comrie (ed.) *The world's major languages*, 1st edn. 913-935. London & Sydney: Croom Helm.
- Purwoko, H. (2011). If Javanese is endangered, how should we maintain it? *International Seminar "Language Maintenance and Shift,"* (1), 22–30.
- Qara'ati, M. (n.d.). *A Commentary on Prayer*. Ahlul Bayt World Assembly. Retrieved from <https://www.al-islam.org>.
- Quinn, G. (2011). Teaching Javanese respect usage to foreign learners. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 8, 362-370.
- Rahmanadji, D. (2007). Sejarah, teori, jenis, dan fungsi humor. *Bahasa Dan Seni*, 35, 213–221.
- Randriamasimanana, Ch. (2000). Word order typology and Malayo-Polynesian languages. In C. Randriamasimanana and R. Haddon (eds.) *Proceedings of the 12th International*

- Conference of the New Zealand Asian Studies Society*, 266-288. Palmerston North: Massey University.
- Robson, S. 1992. Javanese Grammar for Students. *Monash Papers on South East Asia* 26 (Monash University, Clayton, Victoria, Australia).
- Rosowsky, A. (2006). The role of liturgical literacy in UK Muslim communities. In T. Omoniyi & J. Fishman (eds.) *Explorations in the sociology of language and religion*. Pp. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Rushing, B., & Barlow, J. (2009). Humor In Preaching: A Funny Thing Happened On The Way To The Pulpit. *The Journal for Baptist Theology and Ministry*, 6(2), 63–74.
- Saville-Troike, M. (2003). *The ethnography of communication: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Saddhono, K. (2012). The discourse of Friday sermon in Surakarta: A socio-pragmatic study. *Wacana*, 14(1), 145-153.
- Smith-Hefner, N. J. (2009). Language shift, gender, and ideologies of modernity in Central Java, Indonesia. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 19(1), 57-77.
- Sneddon, J. N., Adelaar, A., Djenar, D. N. & Ewing, M. C. (2010). *Indonesian: reference grammar*, 2nd edn. New South Wales: Allen & Unwin.
- Spolsky, B. (2003). Religion as a site of language contact. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 23, 81-94.
- Sudarmo, D. M. (2014). *Anatomi Lelucon di Indonesia*. Jakarta: KOMBAT Publishers.
- Sudaryanto. (1992). *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Jawa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Susanto, D. (2006). Code-switching in Islamic religious discourse: The role of Inshaa'Allah. *The Second Annual Rhizomes: Revisioning Boundaries Conference of the School of Languages and Comparative Cultural Studies, the University of Queensland*, 2006.
- Suwardi. (2009). Kramanisasi Seks dalam Kehidupan Orang Jawa Melalui Ungkapan Tradisional. *Humaniora*, 21(3), 274–284.
- Tadmor, U. (2009). Malay-Indonesian. In B. Comrie (ed.) *The world's major languages*, 2nd edn. 791-818. London: Routledge.
- Thackston, W. (1994). *An Introduction to Classical and Koranic Arabic*. Bethesda: Iranbooks.
- Van Dam, N. (2010). Arabic loanwords in Indonesian revisited. *Bijdragen tot de Taal, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 166(2/3), 218-243. ISSN: 0006-2294.
- van Hout, R., & Muysken, P. (1994). Modeling lexical borrowability. *Language Variation and Change*, 6, 39–62.

- Vander Klok, J. (2012). *Tense, aspect, and modal markers in Paciran Javanese*. McGill University, PhD.
- Wajdi, M, I. K. D. Laksana, I. M. Suastra, and M. Budiarsa (2013). Code-crossing: Hierarchical politeness in Javanese. *E-Journal of Linguistics*, 7 (1), 1-16. Retrieved from <http://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/eol/article/view/11196>.
- White, A. (2003). *Womens' usage of specific linguistic functions in the context of casual conversation: Analysis and discussion*. Module Assignment: University of Birmingham. Retrieved from <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/cels/essays/sociolinguistics/White5.pdf> on 16 February 2017.
- Wolff, J. U. & Poedjosoedarmo, S. (1982). *Communicative codes in Central Java*. United States: Cornell University Press.
- Woolard, K. A. (1998). Simultaneity and Bivalency as Strategies in Bilingualism. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 8(1), 3–29. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jlin.1998.8.1.3>.