

Speech Act of Prohibition in Minangkabau Language

Widya¹

Universitas Indraprasta PGRI

Email: widya.center@gmail.com

Erika Agustiana²

Universitas Indraprasta PGRI

Email: erik44gustiana@gmail.com

Submitted: June 10, 2024

Accepted: June 30, 2024

ABSTRACT

One sort of speaking behavior that puts the other person's face in danger is prohibiting; therefore, a strategy is needed in saying it so that the interlocutor does not lose face when interacting. The purposes of this study were to characterize the lingual form of speech act of prohibition and the politeness strategies employed in the Minangkabau language to communicate prohibition. The data was taken from the interaction of Minangkabau people who live in Bukittinggi area of West Sumatra. The results demonstrated that prohibiting is realized in three modes of utterances namely declarative, interrogative for indirect speech act of prohibition and imperative form for direct speech act of prohibition. In addition, the politeness strategy used when expressing the speech act of prohibiting consists of bald on records, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record strategy. It is challenging to conclude that a certain technique is unique to a given context because, in general, the choice of each method depends highly on the utterance's context.

Keywords: speech act, speech act of prohibition, politeness, politeness strategy

INTRODUCTION

Language and culture are inseparable, like two sides of the same coin. Language is a by product of human civilization, yet human culture also has an impact on language. Culture is formed and developed in part as a result of language. Furthermore, a society's culture can be seen in its language. Language use in a community might reveal aspects of that community's culture. Language shapes people's personal identities and establishes behavioral norms because it expresses and reinforces society. Deviyanti (2017) states that language serves culture in so many ways, including as a tool for cultural development, a way to foster culture, a route for cultural development, and a means of cultural inventory.

The Minangkabau way of speaking applicable to virtually all speech acts, particularly those that threat others' faces, such speech act of prohibition. Since everyone would prefer to have his requests, invitations, offers, and suggestions approved, prohibition is essentially a speech act that puts the interlocutor's face in danger. In other words, acceptance is typically favored to prohibition when responding to offers, invitations, requests, and suggestions.

Expressions of prohibition can be direct or indirect, with indirect prohibition being less threatening. The form of these utterances varies by context. Direct speech acts usually use negative imperative sentences by using "*jan*" 'do not', while indirect speech acts may not directly convey the meaning or when there is no relevance between form and function

of the utterance. In Minangkabau language, the context (participants, time, and place) influence the form and strategy of prohibiting speech acts. Because prohibition can threaten the face of the speech partner, politeness strategies are essential to mitigate this.

In general, this study aims to apply linguistic theory, namely pragmatic theory, to the study of language. In particular, this research aims to (i) to describe the lingual forms of prohibiting speech acts in Minangkabau language and (ii) to analyze how the realization of the selection of politeness strategies in the speech act of prohibition in Minangkabau language.

This study has significant implications for future research, serving as a benchmark and information source. It integrates speech acts theory into Minangkabau language and provides an overview of Minangkabau speech patterns in their sociocultural context. The findings can guide related studies and potentially form the basis for further research. It explains politeness strategies in prohibiting speech acts in Minangkabau language, reflecting changes in prohibition methods over time, especially in Bukittinggi. This research aids understanding of Minangkabau cultural speech laws and benefits those studying the language, contributing to the advancement of linguistics and pragmatics.

LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Cutting (2002), prohibition is a feature of the directive speech act. According to Leech (in Rustono, 1999) and Rahardi (2009), imperative/directive speech acts are those that beg, propose, invite, forbid, or compel the other person to do a particular action. The speech act of prohibiting is an imperative speech act that has an indicator of prohibition (prohibitives). Essentially, the goal is for the speech partner to either react to the speaker's attitude and speech or take action to refrain from doing something that is forbidden. Prohibitions contain modalities such as should not and do not.

Some previous researchers have discussed this speech act. All of these researchers analyzed forbidding speech acts in different languages. These studies generally aim to see the form or lingual form of forbidding speech acts in each language studied. After that, the focus of the research is also on the level of politeness (Dessari et al., 2021); the type of interaction of forbidding speech acts (Yayuk, 2015); comparative analysis of speech act forms between two languages (Al-shaibani & Al-saaiddi, 2013); strategy and level of politeness in forbidding speech acts Sasanti (2013) and politeness strategy (Gunarwan, 2007). From these previous studies, it can be seen that there is no single study that we have found that specifically discusses the lingual form and politeness strategies in speech act of prohibition in Minangkabau language.

RESEARCH METHOD

In this descriptive qualitative research Bukittinggi was selected as the study region because it is one of the major cities in West Sumatra and has a heterogenous population. The people who live in Bukittinggi are from several dialect-speaking regions of West Sumatra. The data was collected by recording interactions between people in Bukittinggi by using *simak bebas libat cakap* technique (SBLC) and the *simak libat cakap* (SLC) technique (Sudaryanto, 2015). In this technique, the researcher, a native speaker of Minangkabau language, also provokes other speech participants to say utterances related to prohibitions. These utterances were then recorded and transcribed.

Data analysis is done by sorting excerpts, recognizing them, and addressing issues. Given that there are numerous excerpt sources and it is probable that the same excerpt would emerge repeatedly in the same context, sorting the excerpt is done to make analysis easier. Sorting is done as a result to prevent repeated analysis of the same excerpt. Excerpt are categorized in order to be grouped according to their linguistic form and the strategy employed in the speech act prohibition. The selected excerpt will be analyzed in order to provide solutions to research concerns. The excerpt is first examined in order to determine the type of sentence that was used to impose the prohibition. Next, contextual analysis was done to determine to which strategy of politeness an utterance belongs. The contextual approach is analyzing the excerpt by looking at how it relates to the context in order to determine what a speech form signifies. The results of analysis will be presented formally in the form of description.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Lingual Forms of Speech act of prohibition in Minangkabau

The following table shows some examples of prohibiting speech acts in Minangkabau language

Table 1
Lingual Form of Speech act of Prohibition

No	Utterance	Mode of Utterance	Speech Act Strategy
1	“ <i>Bisuak-bisuaklah ka pasa jo Ibu, yo.</i> ” ‘You will go latter, with me.’	Declarative	Indirect Speech Act
2	A: “ <i>Baa kok ayah tuka lo channel TV tu? Bunda sedang manonton.</i> ” ‘ Why did you change the TV channel? ’ I am watching.’	Interrogative	Indirect Speech Act
3	“ <i>Pa, jan marokok jo lai pa. Sakali apa marokok, 40 taun mailangan nikotin no dalam paru-paru.</i> ” ‘Father, don’t smoke. Once you smoke, it will take 40 years to clean the lung from the Nicotine.’	Imperative	Direct Speech Act

Lingual form or modes of an utterance can be declarative, interrogative, or imperative. The numerous utterance modes basically represent the speaker's preferred strategy in various speaking contexts Wijana (2021), including in speech act of prohibition. The findings show that the speech act of prohibition in Minangkabau language can be expressed in the form of declarative, interrogative, or imperative sentence. The mode of the utterance can appear in various situations. Excerpt (1) shows a mother forbidding her son to go to the market, excerpt (2) a wife forbidding her husband to change the TV channel, and excerpt (3) a son forbidding his father to smoke.

From the examples above we can see that the speech act of prohibition can be expressed in the form of direct speech act or indirect speech act. In Minangkabau language direct speech acts usually take the form of imperative sentences characterized by the word “*jan*” or “*ijan*” 'do not' followed by a verb. Meanwhile, if the speech act of prohibition is delivered in the form of declarative and interrogative

one, it is said that the strategy used is indirect speech act because the mode of the utterance does not match the function of the speech act. Usually, this indirect strategy is used to make the speech act more polite.

B. Politeness Strategies Used in Speech Act of Prohibition in Minangkabau

The speech act of prohibition often threatens the face of the speaker or the interlocutor. This threat prompts the speaker to choose a strategy based on the situation, such as who they are speaking to and the context. Brown & Levison (1987) identify five main strategies for expressing intent, including prohibition: (i) speak frankly (bald on record); (ii) use positive politeness; (iii) use negative politeness; (iv) speak vaguely (off record); and (v) speak internally. Each excerpt analyzed will be related to the spoken situation with 3 parameters, namely power, solidarity, and the public. Power refers to who has more power which is measured based on who is more in rank, older, etc. The solidarity parameter refers to the social distance between speakers. Relationships can be divided into short/ intimate or distant. Then the public parameter is measured by the presence or absence of other people (audience), at least 1 person, who witnessed the speech event (Gunarwan, 2007).

The following are some excerpt showing variuos politeness strategies used to perform speech acts of prohibiting in Minangkabau language.

1. Prohibiting Speech Acts with Bold on Record Strategy

In the Minangkabau language, the speech act of prohibition using the bold on record strategy is usually carried out by using the word "*jan*" 'don't', the word "*anti(lah)*" 'don't', and the word '*ndak*' 'no'. This strategy is commonly found in speech that occurs between two or more people who have a close relationship or have power (rank, age, education, etc.) over others. Here is an example of utterances using the bald on record strategy.

Excerpt 4

A : *Pai maanta uang kama?* 'Where will we go to give the money?'

B : *Gulai Bancah.* 'Gulai Bancah.'

A : *eh, biko kicekkan ka si As tu, kalau bajanji jan sudah luhua, sudah asa. Pukua no kicekkan. Pasti-pasti.*

'Tell As, if she wants to make an appointment, don't do it before dhuhur. Do it after Ashr. Make it sure.

The conversation occurred between two siblings, a brother and a sister. The brother asked the sister to forbid their other brother from making an appointment before the Zuhr prayer, using the direct prohibition word "*jan*" ('don't'). The speaker is older, and the social distance between the siblings is close. The conversation took place in the presence of other people.

It is also found that in Minangkabau culture, the word "*jan*" is usually not specific, it is not only used in speech situations that show parameters of power (rank, age, education, etc.) but can also be used when parameters of power do not exist (no higher rank, no older, not higher education, etc.) or one of the powers is missing, such as younger age but higher education. This does not show impoliteness, but rather emphasizes the prohibition.

Excerpt 5

A : *Pa, jan marokok jo lai pa. Sakali apa marokok, 40 taun mailangan nikotin no dalam paru-paru.*

'Father, don't smoke. Once you smoke, it will take 40 years to clean the lung from the Nicotine.'

B : (tertawa). 'laughs'

The speaker, a daughter who is a doctor, forbade her father to smoke due to health concerns, using the direct prohibition word "jan" ('don't'). Despite being younger, she spoke directly because of their close relationship. The conversation took place in the presence of other people.

Judging from the parameters of power, from excerpt, it can be seen that the speaker is a person of a younger age than the speaker, the relationship between the two is close, and in general there are other people who witness or hear the conversation. Here it can be seen that the bald on record form with the word "jan" 'do not' can be used with the intention not to be impolite, but to emphasize a prohibition.

The use of the word "jan" ('do not'), a direct prohibition, occurs even in non-intimate relationships. This can be seen in interactions between sellers and buyers or between sisters-in-law, where there is social distance. Despite the low level of solidarity in these relationships, "jan" is used to emphasize the speaker's intention, not to show impoliteness.

2. Speech Acts of Prohibiting with Positive Politeness Strategies

Positive politeness aims at enhancing the positive image of the speech partner by showing shared desires and treating them as a group member or friend. In Minangkabau, prohibitive speech acts using positive politeness highlight closeness and good relations between speakers and listeners. The following excerpts illustrate these strategies, categorized by Brown and Levinson's positive politeness framework.

a. Notice, Attend to H (his interest, wants, needs, good)

The speaker pays special attention to the speech partner, for example, by paying attention to the interests, desires and behavior of the speech partner. The speaker pays attention to the condition of the speech partner which includes physical changes, ownership of goods, and so on.

Excerpt 6

A: *Lah sudah mancuci piriang wi?* 'Have you finished washing the dishes?'

B: *Alah, Ni.* 'Yes, I have.'

A: *Panek bana Wi nampaknyo. Tinggaan sin lah piriang tu di situ. Bia uni manyudahan biko.*

'You look so tired. Leave it there. Let me do the rest.'

This speech event occurred between two cousins. A notices that B looks very tired after washing many dishes. Therefore A forbade B to continue his work and offered to continue the work. Here it is seen that A pays attention to B's need to rest immediately. Attention is given by A to B with positive politeness, the strategy is to pay special attention to the speech partner.

b. Use In-group Identity Markers

Speakers use markers that show identity or group similarities. This strategy is used to show solidarity between speakers and speech partners. In this example this strategy is done by telling the truth that the speaker himself is also a smoker.

Excerpt 7

Ondeh iyo lamak na paisok nampaknyo. Ambo lai jo maroko baru. Tapi di lua

lah wak taruihan nah.

'It looks so good to smoke. I myself also smoke. But let's smoke outside.'

c. Seek Agreement

The speaker seeks agreement with the speech partner. The speaker can repeat part of the speech partner's speech to show that the speaker agrees and follows whatever information is said by the speech partner.

Excerpt 8

"Ancak wak tahan dulu ndak buliah ndak bata puaso wak."

'It is better to hold up for a while so that we can continue fasting, isn't it?'

This utterance was produced when a mother ask her children to hold their thirst because if they drink their fasting will be cancelled. She forbade her children to drink. But she did not say the prohibiting directly. She ask for their agreement instead.

d. Avoid Disagreement

The speaker avoided conflict with the speech partner. In contrast to the case in strategy c, this strategy is used when the speaker actually disagrees with the speech partner. However, in order to save the positive face of the interlocutor, the speaker minimizes his disapproval.

Excerpt 9

A: *Kalau awak japauik si Nil tu untuak si Andi ba no, Ma?*

'How do you think If we ask Nil to marry Andi.

B: *Kalau dicaliak iyo lai saumua urang baduo tu mah, Tek. Tapi rancak no bialah awak caliak-caliak dulu, iyolah salero si Nil tu anak wak ko.*

'It seems that they are in the same age. But let's see first, if Nil likes him or not.'

On one occasion at a wedding, a mother who had an unmarried son expressed her wish to propose to a woman known to the family. Yes, he asked his sister if it was possible for them to propose to the woman to marry their son. B answered carefully trying to keep his brother's positive face. B actually did not agree with his brother's wish because he thought that the woman would not be suitable for his brother's child. However, the ban was conveyed with care, keeping disapproval to a minimum.

e. Joke

Speakers use jokes. Jokes can be used to save face when the speaker wants to disrupt his good image.

Excerpt 10

In a wedding event an older brother said to his cousin sister. The younger cousin is wearing new clothes that are still good. The older brother saw that his younger sibling was also busy preparing dishes. The older sister was worried that if her sister's nice clothes would get dirty with the dish she was preparing. Then the older brother said

A : *Dewi bialah ndak di siko, baju wak rancak gai. Tu untuak di ateh tu ma.*

'Dewi, this beautiful clothes is not for working here.'

B : *uni ko...* (sambil tertawa) . 'laughs.'

The speech act of prohibition uttered by the older brother contains a joke that provokes his younger sibling to laugh. Jokes are used as a prohibitive strategy to save the face of the interlocutor.

f. Assert or Presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants

The speaker shows that he understands the wishes of the speech partner. This strategy is commonly used when you want to invite/forbid the speech partner to do something. The speaker tries to show that he understands the needs of his speech partner.

Excerpt 11

Fauzi was invited by his friends to go up the mountain. However, when he asked permission from his parents, it turned out that Fauzi did not get permission because his parents knew that Fauzi could not stand the cold. His parents said

"Ibu tau kalau Uji ingin bana pai mandaki jo kawan-kawan tu. Tapi kan Uji tau, Uji ndak tahan dingin. Di ateh tu kan dingin, biko kadinginan di ateh, baa aka?"

'I know that you really want to go climbing with your friends. But you've known, you can't stand cold weather. it will be so cold on the montain peak. What if you feel so cold uo there.'

In this situation, mother showed that she fully understood her son's wishes but she also very well knew that her son would not be able to stand the cold air on the mountain. Therefore this strategy is used to save the positive face of their children.

g. Offer, promise

The speaker makes an offer or promise to the speech partner. Promising is a pleasant action for the speech partner. Sometimes promises are also made when refusing the offer of the speech partner so that with that promise the face of the said partner is saved.

Excerpt 12

A: *Bu, buliah Ana pai jo kakak bisuak ke pasa, Bu?* 'Mom, can i go with Kakak to the market, tomorrow?'

B: *Bisuak-bisuaklah ka pasa jo Ibu, yo.* 'We will go latter.'

This speech was uttered by a mother to her child who asked permission to follow her brother to the market. Instead of forbidding her son outright, the mother promises to go to the market with him someday.

h. Be Optimistic

The speech act of prohibition in the Minangkabau language can sometimes also be expressed with the strategy of showing optimism. Someone's good image sometimes needs to be shown with a sense of optimism from others. This is shown in the following example.

Excerpt 13

A child expressed his desire to take tutoring to his parents. But it seems that his parents did not agree so that he forbade his son to take the tutoring. Instead of forbidding it outright, the father shows his son's strengths and is optimistic about his daughter's abilities. The father thinks that the child does not need to take tutoring at this time, because the child is smart enough. The father said:

"Kakak kan lai bisa mah maikuti pelajaran di sekolah. Lai mangarati kakak kalau guru manjalehan di sekolah, kan? Ndak sato bana bimbil tu kini, bisa kakak, mah. Bisuak kalau lah kelas 3 , baru satu bimbil ndak baa do."

'You can understand the lesson, can't you? you understand when teacher explain the lesson, do you? You will be good even you dont join in that tutoring session. Later, when you are at the 3 grade, you can join it.'

i. Give (or Ask) for Reasons

The speaker gives or asks for reasons or considerations. In order for a person's self-existence to be increasingly recognized, sometimes his opinion also needs to be asked. By asking the opinion of the speech partner, the speaker shows that the said partner is valued.

Excerpt 14

A : *Ante ambiakkan nasi yo, Ya?* 'I'll take some food for you.'

B : *Alun litak lai, Nte. Bialah Iya ambiak surang biko, Nte.*

'I am not hungry yet. Let me take it by myself.'

This event happened at an aunt's house during a family event. The aunt offered her nephew to eat and offered to get food for him. By giving the excuse that he was not hungry, the nephew forbade his aunt to bring food for him.

Excerpt 15

A: *Baa kok ayah tuka lo channel TV tu? Bunda sedang manonton.*

'**Why did you change the TV channel? I am watching.**'

B: *Eh, maaf-maaf lai urang manonton kirono mah. Kicek ayah ndak do nan manonton.*

'**I am so sorry.** I think there is no one watching.'

In contrast to excerpt 17 above where prohibitions are stated by giving reasons, in excerpt 18 prohibitions are stated by asking reasons. A asked the reason why her husband changed the TV channel while he was watching on the channel.

3. Speech Acts of Prohibiting with Negative Politeness Strategies

Negative politeness strategies indicate social distance between speakers and listeners, aiming to respect and protect the listener's negative face, their desire to maintain their territory and self-confidence. This approach shows respect for the listener's wishes and is common between people who are not familiar or have significant social distance. It can also occur between familiar individuals who, for some reason, need to maintain distance. Following are some examples of excerpt showing speech acts forbidding with negative politeness strategies in the Minangkabau language which have been classified based on negative politeness substrategy proposed by Brown and Levinson.

a. Be Conventionally Indirect

The speaker expresses something indirectly. The trick is to change imperative sentences into declarative sentences to order or forbid others. This is done so that the speech partner does not feel directly ordered.

Excerpt 16

"Pak, maaf Pak. Indak buliah mambuang sarok di situ kini lai do, Pak."

'**I am sorry, Sir. It is not allow to throw rubbish in here.**'

A child saw a man about to throw garbage near their house, where trash was often left for collection. The child used a highly polite utterance, addressing the man as "Pak" (a respectful term for unknown adult males), saying "sorry," and issuing the prohibition in a declarative sentence rather than using direct prohibitive words like "*jan*" ('don't'), "*indak buliah*" ('not allowed'), or "*anti(lah)*" ('do not').

b. Question, Hedge

The speaker uses questions. This strategy is similar to the first strategy above. It's just that, the imperative sentence is changed to an interrogative sentence. In addition, fences are also used in this strategy

Excerpt 17

A : *Kami sudah ko ka Sanjai.* 'We will go to Sanjai after this.'

B : *eeh.. ndak do. Bisuak lah, pagi atau makan malam.* 'no. Its better tomorrow.'

A : *ndak, kami ndak ndak makan-makan do ni. Makan kan alah siko go a.*

'No. No need to worry, dont serve any food for us.

B : *ndak, ndak.* 'No.'

C : ***Kok mantun baa no? Ko kan ba ari rayo yo namono? Kok awak cukuikkan sin siko. Baa no? Bakarilahan sin lah.***

'How do you think if we stop here.'

This speech event occurred among a group of people who still have a relationship between brother-in-law and brother-in-law. The conversation arose while visiting my son-in-law's house on Eid. One mother said that after leaving the house, the group would go straight to the other daughter-in-law's house. But the son-in-law finely forbade it because he had not made proper preparations to welcome guests. Then the woman's husband intervened by using indirect speech, namely by asking and using fences. This was done because it protected the feelings of the mothers who were present at that time. Avoiding that the mothers are offended by their words.

c. Minimize the Imposition

The speaker reduces the burden on the speech partner. There are times when a speaker does have to ask for help from a speech partner. To save the negative face of the speech partner, the speaker finally tries to reduce the burden on the speech partner by simplifying his request.

Excerpt 18

"Kalau ndak salah, Den, si As tu lah pernah pai. Kok lai ndak ka manga do, bialah nan lain nan pai kini lai."

'If I'm not mistaken. As has gone before. If its ok, let the others go now.'

This speech was uttered by an uncle who wanted to forbid one of his nephews from participating in an event. Because the uncle knew that his nephew had participated before, he forbade him to come back because of the limited capacity of the vehicle they were going to use. In this story, there are actually several politeness strategies used. The first is the hedge that is "if I'm not mistaken". Next, give a reason which is a positive politeness strategy. Finally, there are utterances that reduce the burden of pressure or coercion on the speech partner. So, from these 21 excerpt it can be seen that it is possible that positive politeness strategies are directly used together with negative politeness strategies.

d. Give Difference

The speaker pays homage. The speech partner has a negative face that does not want to be disturbed. However, if forced to disturb him, the speaker often pays homage to his speech partner so that his negative face is not smeared if he is asked to do something.

Excerpt 19

"Pak, kalau marokok di lua ndak baa, Pak? 'Sir, is it ok if you smoke outside?'"

The use of the term of addressee sir here shows respect for a stranger. The use of deference as a politeness device is not limited to the use of respectful terms such as Pak

or Apak in Minangkabau language, but can also use words or terms such as the following examples.

Excerpt 20

“*Mohon izin, Da. Ambo ka maangkek kursi ko lai. Maaf yo, Da.*”

‘Excuse me, Da. I’ll carry the chair. I’m so sorry.’

“*Mohon izin*” is used to show respect for the addressee. The point is that in the above speech the speaker forbids the speaker to remain sitting there because he intends to tidy up the place. Speech politeness is also added by using the greeting “*Da*” and by ending the speech with an apology.

e. Apologize

The speaker uses an apology. Instructing the interlocutor certainly interferes with his freedom. Therefore, speakers sometimes need to apologize first before submitting requests/orders. For examples of using negative politeness strategies with apologies, this has been shown in many previous excerpt such as excerpt 16 and 20 above.

f. Impersonalize S and H

The speaker impersonalizes both the speaker and the speech partner. When there are a large number of speech partners who will receive orders, an impersonalization strategy can be carried out by making passive sentences so that the speech partners as actors do not need to be mentioned.

Excerpt 21

“*Untuak kito basamo nan ado di ruanganko, lah malam hari, lah du galak-galak. Anak daro ka lalok lai.*”

‘For all of us in this room. This is late at night, stop laughing. The bride will sleep soon.’

This utterance uttered by a man to a group of people who are still talking and laughing in a room. This is the event happened after a wedding party was over. They got together and had fun together while chatting about various things. The man reminded that the night was late and the bride and groom would soon rest. Speech act of prohibition was uttered by impersonalized the speaker and hearer by using the phrase “*kito basamo*” ‘we, together’.

g. State FTA as General Rule

The speaker states the act of threatening face as a social provision that generally applies. Sometimes, an order addressed to a particular person can be engineered into a threatening statement that seems to apply to the general public.

Excerpt 22

“*Ladiang untuak nan mambuang sarok di siko.*”

‘Machetes for those who throw garbage here.’

The sentence above is an inscription that is placed in a place that is usually used as a temporary garbage disposal site. Lately there has been a desire by local residents to clean up the area and no longer use it as a temporary waste disposal site. Subtle warnings have been given but there are still those who throw trash there. Annoyed, one of the residents wrote a sentence with a threatening tone, “*Ladiang for nan mambuang sarok in siko!*” ‘a machete for those who throw garbage here.’ Instead of being addressed personally, the prohibition is addressed in general to anyone who reads it.

4. Speech act of prohibition with Off Record Strategies

Off record strategy is often observed, especially when the speaker is older and the relationship with the listener is not intimate, such as in in-law relationships. Gunarwan's method (2007) is employed to analyze off-record strategies, where the speaker's use of irrelevant speech acts requires interpretation of illocutionary force, aligning with Grice's maxim of relevance. Relatively longer time is needed to interpret illocutionary force. Below are excerpts illustrating the use of off-record strategy in Minangkabau prohibitive speech acts.

Excerpt 23

A : *Lalok siko si Men, Ya?* 'Does he sleep here?'

B : *Indak, Yah. Abang dijapuik adiak abang.* 'No, father. He will be picked up by his brother.'

A : *Ndak eh, maleh lo wak.* 'No, its not comfortable for us.'

This dialogue took place between father and daughter. At that time the daughter was being hospitalized and her future husband accompanied her at the hospital. Because it was late at night, the father asked if his daughter future husband would be staying at the hospital. Apparently not. "*no, eh, maleh wak.*" Is the speech act of prohibition uttered by the father. His daughter needed time to interpret his father's intentions.

Excerpt 24

The following utterance was uttered by a woman who was sitting between two men who were smoking in a public place. Instead of forbidding them to smoke directly, the woman uttered the following utterance

"Ndeh, sasak angok wak duduak siko."

'I am breathless sitting here.'

Sensitive people will easily understand the meaning of this woman's utterance but for people who are less sensitive it will take time to interpret the woma's words that actually forbade them to smoke in that place.

CONCLUSION

In Minangkabau, speech act of prohibition is uttered in the forms of declarative, interrogative and imperative mode of sentences. In daily usage, it is often found that the functions of the three sentence modes are no longer in accordance with their basic functions so that the speech that occurs is indirect speech.

Related to politeness strategies used in speech act of prohibition, it can be concluded that not all of the sub-strategies postulated by Brown and Levinson are found in the data. The results also show that there is a combination of two politeness strategies in one utterance such as a combination of using positive politeness strategies and negative politeness strategies in one data. This shows that in the Minangkabau language there is no sanctity in the use of strategy. All depends on the speech situation and the needs of the participants in conveying the intention of the utterance.

A further research is needed to find broader and deeper results. For further research, perhaps data collection using a questionnaire instrument is needed in order to obtain more diverse data. The results are certainly expected to broaden the readers' knowledge, especially in prohibition strategies. Besides, In an effort to broaden and deepen understanding of this prohibition speech act in relation to the underlying concepts and theories, it is necessary to carry out more detailed studies. There are parts that need special discussion such as intonation forbidding in the Minangkabau language. In addition, it is

also necessary to discuss the functions of prohibiting speech acts in Minangkabau language because some data show that apart from containing the function of prohibiting, these utterances also contain other illocutionary force that need to be discussed specifically. Thus, by this suggestion, the researcher expects this present study can give a contribution for the future researches.

REFERENCES

- Al-shaibani, G., & Al-saaidi, S. (2013). Speech act of prohibition in English and Arabic : A contrastive study on selected Biblical and Quranic verses. *Arab World English Journal*, 4(4), 95-111.
- Brown, P., & Levison, S. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. New York: Routledge.
- Dessari, W., Hendayanti, O., & Haristiani, N. (2021). *Politeness in Japanese Prohibition Speech Act*. 595(Icollite), 715–721.
- Deviyanti, R. (2017). Bahasa sebagai cermin kebudayaan. *Tarbiyah*, 24(2), 226–245.
- Gunarwan, A. (2007). Tindak tutur melarang di dalam bahasa Indonesia di kalangan penutur jati bahasa Jawa. In *Teori dan Kajian Nusantara* (pp. 77–101). Jakarta: Universitas Atma Jaya.
- Rahardi, K. (2009). *Pragmatik*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Rustono. (1999). *Pokok-Pokok Pragmatik*. Semarang: CV IKIP Semarang Press.
- Sasanti, Y. N. Tindak tutur melarang dalam bahasa Indonesia. *Penelitian Journal*, 16(2), 196–206.
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan aneka teknik analisis bahasa: Pengantar penelitian wahana kebudayaan* (1st ed.). Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Wijana, I. D. P. (2021). On speech acts. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 03(01), 14–27.
- Yayuk, R. (2015). Wujud dan interaksi tindak tutur melarang bahasa Banjar. *Sirok Bastra Journal*, 3(2), 189–194.