

A SINCERE SUGGESTION

Gabriella Novianty Soedjarwo

STIKS Tarakanita

email: novianty.gabriella@gmail.com

Abstract

One of the hardest parts in communication is delivering the meaning as it is uttered. Considering the fact that in communication we are supposed to be able to deliver the message well to make the other party get the message, we need to pay attention to other's image. The case that this study is going to analyse is the use of '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' (sorry, just remind you) to comment on someone's appearance and/ or behaviour. One of *Bahasa Indonesia* experts gave an explanation that actually the meaning of '*sekadar mengingatkan*' is neutral. This study wants to analyse how giving suggestion and the use of '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' can harm someone's face. The data was analysed using pragmatics study of FTA (Face Threatening Act). This study found that the factor that makes the meaning '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' be offensive is the expressions used together with this expression.

Keywords: '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*', suggestion, face threatening act.

Abstrak

Salah satu tantangan terbesar dalam berkomunikasi adalah menyampaikan maksud dari perkataan kita dengan baik; apakah pendengar dapat memahami dan menangkap maksud dari perkataan kita sama seperti apa yang kita inginkan. Sebuah kejadian yang viral akhir-akhir ini tentang penggunaan ekspresi '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' menunjukkan bahwa untuk mencapai tujuan berkomunikasi dengan baik perlu memperhatikan beberapa hal penting. Dalam kasus ini, penggunaan kata maaf tidak lantas membuat pendengar merasa lebih baik setelah mendengar kritik atau saran yang disampaikan. Tulisan ini ingin memberikan analisis ilmiah tentang bagaimana makna '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' terbentuk dalam penggunaan untuk menegur dan mengkritik. Lebih lanjut, tulisan ini ingin menanggapi penjelasan Ivan Lanin yang mengungkapkan bahwa makna sekadar mengingatkan bersifat netral. Untuk menjawab permasalahan tersebut, penelitian ini menerapkan teori pragmatik tentang Face Threatening Act (FTA). Dari hasil penelitian, dapat diketahui dan disimpulkan bahwa makna negatif yang terkandung dalam ekspresi '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' terbentuk dari ucapan yang menyertai ekspresi tersebut.

Kata Kunci: '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*', saran, face threatening act. \

A. Introduction

Communication is the essential interaction of human beings. Even other creatures also communicate in their own language. The purpose of communication is to deliver the message to other person without having a hindrance, so that the message can be received well. The purpose of saying I love you to your partner means you want to be with him/her and your partner will be happy to hear that. However, if this expression comes along with the explanation that this is the last time you say I love you because you have to marry another person, this expression can only bring sorrow or anger. The meaning I love you can be varied depends on the situation and/or the expression follow.

The word communication is derived from Latin word *communis* means common or shared. From the definition, the core of communication is transmitting message between individuals. Harder, as cited in Verschueren (2009), language is regarded as one means of communication. Language is associated with logic and proportional thinking, thus a language must be understood. Further, Harder cited Allwood's explanation, communication only starts where a sender is saying and doing the same things as what he intends to communicate. In term of grasping the meaning in communication, the hearer should recognize sender's intention. The way how the hearer recognizes the sender's intention is by recognizing the attribute that follows the intention. When the attribute is out of the intention, the hearer will question the sender's true intention.

Some moments ago, there was a viral expression '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' (Sorry, just remind you) in social media. This expression became viral since some people perceived this expression as an insult. However, *Bahasa Indonesia* expert Ivan Lanin wrote that the meaning of *sekadar mengingatkan* is neutral. He added this expression can be perceived in two ways, positive and negative, since people tend to have a different perception toward this expression.

This expression was posted for the first time by account twitter @ry4nn_ who posted a tweet "*Aruna: Besok coba mie Pontianak yuk! ☹️: Lho kamu kan Muslim. Kok makan makanan ga halal sih?:Iya. Ga pake jilbab, lagi. Gimana sih.:Umur udah kepala 3 masih suka keluyuran, jalan-jalan. Bukannya nikah, mba. Maaf,*

sekadar mengingatkan aja -ArunadanLidah Netizen-" (Aruna: Let's try Pontianak noodle tomorrow. ☹️: *You're Muslim, aren't you? Why do you want to eat non-halal food? Even, you don't wear hijab. What kind of person do you want to be? You've reached 30s but you still enjoy wandering around and you aren't married yet. Sorry, just remind you.*) Other viral tweet was posted on October from the account @arman_dhani which posted a tweet about how the old friends meet each other in other country and how they meet in Indonesia. This account twitter wrote that the old friend in Indonesia reminded her friend to wear hijab on their first meeting after a long time. HandokoTjung. The account owner commented on the picture of woman who does not wear hijab. He tweeted that the woman will look more beautiful if she wore hijab. This account added *Sorry just remind you* in the end of the critic.

This study found out that the expression '*maaf sekedar mengingatkan*' (sorry, just remind you) mostly was used as a parody in the situation in which a person reminds a Muslim woman to wear hijab. Another situation is to remind people to not celebrate Halloween since it is not suitable for Indonesia culture. In general, this study concluded that the expression '*maaf sekedar mengingatkan*' is used in situation in which there is a gap between what is considered good with the reality. Many people commented this post since they felt insulted. They feel being justified for not wearing hijab and this matter is considered as personal.

This paper wants to analyse these expressions, '*maaf sekedar mengingatkan*': syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. The aim of the analysis is to reveal how certain expression works toward people's perception. Further, this study also wants to explain theoretically its disagreement with Lanin's statement that the expression '*maaf sekedar mengingatkan*' actually has a neutral meaning and it is hard to know its intrinsic meaning. By implementing some theories from some linguistics branches, this study is going to provide a thorough analysis toward the expression '*maaf sekedar mengingatkan*' which is viral in social media. This analysis aims to unravel how the meaning of expression '*maaf sekedar mengingatkan*' is formed.

B. Purpose of the Study

This study was conducted in order to find out the offensive meaning behind the use of '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' (sorry, just remind you). This study was interested to analyse this expression since Ivan Lanin, one of *Bahasa Indonesia* experts, gave an explanation that the words *sekadar mengingatkan* has a neutral meaning. However, it turns out that the use of this expression can offend someone else. The case happened in social media, *twitter*, proves that the meaning of certain expression depends not only on its lexical meaning but also in its use. This study wants to reveal what factors that make the expression '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' offend the hearer. By conducting this analysis, the researcher hopes that people will be more aware of the word they choose. Lanin explains further that it is hard to unravel the intrinsic meaning of the expression '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*'. By conducting this research using FTA, this study aims to reveal the speaker's purpose. Implementing syntax and semantics to support the pragmatics analysis helps this study to find out how the meaning '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' is formed. Choosing the appropriate words can give a huge impact on the way the hearer perceives our intention. Further, the researcher also hopes that by paying more attention to the language use, we can build a good communication with other people in the society; thus we can show our good value as a human being.

C. Theoretical Framework

The analysis in linguistics field can be seen from many linguistics branches. The discussion of face threatening acts (FTA) includes in pragmatics. Yule (1996) defines FTA as a situation in which a person says something that threatens another person's expectations related to self-image. In order to save someone's face, people need to speak politely in communication. The definition of politeness in communication was theorised for the first time by Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson in 1987. The idea of politeness can be varied from one culture of another; even from one person and other. Even so, the idea of not threatening someone's face in communication is certain. The way a certain utterance is considered as FTA is based on internal and external factor namely: what we say, how we say it, how

we are interpreted, and how our behaviour is evaluated such as whether our behaviour is considered rude, inconsiderate, thoughtful, sexist, or racist.

Syntax is one of linguistics branches which studies of sentence structure. Kim and Sells (2008) explained human language follows a set of rules or principles. By following this rule or principle, human language forms a meaning. Studying rules of the sentence, we can scrutinize the pattern clearly.

A sentence has a head and modifier and those two things shape the meaning of the sentence. Miller (2002) stated the head carried the main information, while the modifier carries the additional information. Another thing discussed in syntax is mood. Based on syntax perspective, people use sentence order to talk about situation and adopt different perspective in a given situation. Analysing the mood of the sentence gives the explanation on how the speaker gives a reaction toward a situation; to determine whether the reaction is in the form of statement, question, or command.

Semantics is the study of sentence meaning. Leech (1990) explained there are seven types of meaning: conceptual meaning, connotative meaning, social and affective meaning, reflected and collocative meaning, and associative meaning. Conceptual meaning sometimes refers to denotative or cognitive meaning. Connotative meaning is the communicative value an expression has by virtue of what it refers to, over, and above its purely conceptual content. Social meaning is taken from the use of the word in the social circumstances. Affective meaning is conveyed explicitly through conceptual or connotative content of the word. Reflected meaning is the meaning formed based on the multiple conceptual meaning; in other words, this meaning is derived when one sense of a words forms part of our response to another sense. Collocative meaning is formed based on the words that occur together in a particular environment. Associative meaning is defined as understanding the meaning of the sentence in term of the combination of the six other meanings.

In order to draw a conclusion whether the utterances analysed here is violating the idea of universal politeness, this paper implemented other theory in other linguistics branches. Syntax explains about in what sentence structure the

expression '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' occurred. Semantics analysis gives a theoretical explanation on how other expression occurred together with this expression give the negative meaning of this expression. These two analyses grounded the pragmatics analysis in FTA on how the use of *maaf sekadar mengingtakan* can harm someone's face.

D. Methodology

This paper is a pragmatics study. This paper focus on analysing the case of giving suggestion and adding expression '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' can be regarded as threatening someone's face. The study of pragmatics was chosen since this paper is going to analyse and disagree with Lanin's statement that the expression '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' is supposed to be interpreted as a neutral. In fact, in communication we cannot solely refer to the lexical meaning of certain expression. In this case, the meaning that is interpreted by the reader or the hearer matters and determines the meaning of certain utterance in communication. In order to support the analysis on FTA, this study implemented another theory form other linguistics branches, namely: syntax and semantics.

The data was taken from the articles talking about the case '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*'. This study also took information about how the expression *maaf sekadar mengingtakan* became viral in social media from one Facebook user who wrote the appearance of this event in chronological order. Ivan Lanin's statement was taken from one online news platform which wrote an article about Lanin statement on the correct spelling of *sekadar* not *sekedar*. It was reported on the news also on how the meaning of *sekadar mengingatkan* can be interpreted differently and this case can be analysed through the pragmatic analysis.

E. Discussion

This part presents the analysis the expression '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*'. The discussion begins with the analysis from syntax, semantics, and the last one is

pragmatics. The later analyses were conducted in order to support the pragmatics analysis.

1. Syntax Analysis

Syntax is a study of sentence structure. Miller (2002) explains that in syntax study, it is essential to know head and modifier of a clause. If this idea is implemented in data analysis of this study, the sequence of giving suggestion occurred with the expression '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' is important in order to reveal the meaning. The head carries the main information, while modifier carries the additional information.

Based on syntax perspective, it is important to analyse the structure of sentences in which the expression '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' occur. From the case of the *Twitter* account, it is clear that the expression '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' occurs after the person criticized that a Muslim woman will look prettier if she wears hijab. This utterance means to give a critic and comment on someone's look. It can be concluded that the true intention of the speaker is to give critic toward someone's appearance, not to be polite or sorry that someone else has an inappropriate appearance.

Bahasa Indonesia structure follows the pattern head+modifier. Bahasa Indonesia, based on the explanation from *Badan Pengembangan Bahasa dan Perbukuan Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*, follows the structure putting the more important information in the beginning then it is followed by the additional information. The utterance of criticizing and adding '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*', the head is on the critic; whether the writer criticizes the hearer for not wearing hijab or not doing something following the rule such as celebrating Valentine. In other words, the information carried by this utterance is giving a critic to other person; it is not merely reminding someone to do or not to do something.

Another aspect that can be analysed through syntactic analysis is mood. Miller (1991) defines mood as how the language user adopting different perspective on a given situation. In the case of '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*', the speaker faces the situation in which some women do not dress properly based on Muslim teaching in

which a woman should wear hijab. However, wearing hijab can have a deep meaning and burden for some people thus they decide not to wear hijab since they are not ready to be seen as a devoted follower of Muslim and behave accordingly.

It seems the speaker just see that a woman who does not wear hijab does not appropriately follow the rule, thus it is necessary for other people to tell her wearing hijab. Based on the previous explanation, wearing hijab is personal matter since for some people wearing hijab is not as simple as covering their hair, but it carries a social burden such as she feels that she needs to behave well and she has not been able to fulfil that expectation.

2. Semantics Analysis

Semantics is the branch of linguistics who studies meaning. Leech (1990) proposes seven types of meaning. From the case discussed in this paper, collocative meaning and thematic meaning will be the most appropriate tool to analyse the expressions. Leech explains collocative meaning is the meaning that is formed based on the words used that have an association with a word. Thematic meaning is what message wants to deliver based on the organization of the sentence.

From collocative meaning perspective, the expression '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' is associated with the situation in which a person wants to criticize and/ or suggests the hearer to do something. While from thematic meaning, these expressions are placed after the person delivers his critic or suggestion. This perspective gives a situation that in language the meaning does not stand alone. A meaning of certain expression cannot be solely understood by its meaning and neglecting the expressions followed or preceded it.

Based on this, it is clear that the speaker wants the hearer focus on the first part of the utterance; in this case the critic and suggestion. The expressions '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' is used after in order to soften the voice of criticism. From semantics analysis, it can be seen that the meaning of the expression *maaf sekadar megingatkan* is not neutral anymore since this expression is occurred with the expression of criticizing and suggesting which, in some cases, can have a negative meaning which is shown through the negative reaction towards this expression.

3. Pragmatics Analysis

The previous part stated that in some cases, criticism and suggestion can have a negative meaning which is followed by a negative reaction. This phenomenon can be analysed further using the pragmatics analysis. Pragmatics is the study of the meaning which is interpreted by the hearer or the reader. In other words, semantics allows a person to interpret the meaning from the text itself, however in pragmatics; the meaning of some utterances is seen from the hearer or the reader's perspective.

One of the most used theories in pragmatics is speech act. Speech act is a study about the utterance that conveys thoughts. From the speech act theory, the analysis does not focus on the expression '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*'. The analysis focuses on how the speaker wants to convey his thought about a certain action needs to be done in order to be a better condition; in this case the speaker thinks that wearing a hijab for a Muslim woman is better than wearing more open clothes.

Further, in speech act, Austin (1975) proposed three kinds of speech act: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary. Locutionary act is an act by saying. Illocutionary act is defined as an action performed along with the utterance. In order to have a successful illocutionary force, the utterance must meet with its felicity condition. In saying something, the utterance may give an impact to the hearer. The impact brought by the hearer proves the perlocutionary act. The performance of perlocutionary act is proven by the real action taken by the hearer.

The expression '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' has an illocutionary force since it is occurred with the expression of suggestion or critic. In order to perform a successful illocutionary speech act, a speaker must fulfil the felicity condition. Felicity condition is defined as the action is considered successful if it is delivered by the correct person in the appropriate condition. In the case of '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*', the condition is the old friend who met another friend after a long time and the first thing that person said is reminding his/ her friend to wear hijab. Wearing a hijab is considered a personal matter since it is related to each person's action in valuing their own religious belief. Since it is a personal matter, friends nor even family can give a suggestion or comment to wear or not to wear hijab. Further,

the condition in which allows them to have such conversation is inappropriate. She has not met her friend, who is not wearing hijab, for a long time. The common politeness is she should have asked how is her friend doing and such, not criticizing or commenting on her look.

The study of pragmatics allows us to know how the hearer perceives the utterances. After the account 'HandokoTjung' posted his critic towards the woman who does not wear hijab on his *twitter* account, many people criticize him back. People think that the matter of wearing or not wearing a hijab is a personal matter. A person cannot justify that a woman who wears hijab is prettier or has a better moral value rather than those who are not. From this case, a sounds good utterance can be understood as the negative critic.

There are two memes that the writer can find related to the expression '*maaf sekedar mengingatkan*'. Both memes show the gesture which is holding two hands together (like clasping). It is a common gesture of forgiveness in Japanese culture. One of the memes gives an explanation that this gesture gives to effect of a logic argument. The use of the expression '*maaf sekedar mengingatkan*' is more like the person who hears or reads the suggestion feels offended because the speaker criticizes his/ her personal space.

Further explanation on pragmatics is the discussion of face threatening acts (FTA). Implementing this theory, this paper answers whether the suggestion given is sincere or not. It is obvious that the speaker may not thoughtfully deliver his suggestion or in fact he does not have any intention to suggest but just to criticize.

Brown and Levinson (1987) define face as the image that someone wants to maintain in front of the public. In order to maintain the face, based on the theory it is usually in maintaining a positive face, someone defend himself in there is a threat.

Further, in communication in society, it is necessary to maintain each other's face. In order to do so, every society member is expected to act likewise other member wants him to act. However, fulfilling every member's satisfaction is difficult since every culture and even every individual have its own rule on the limit of being or not being threatened. Brown and Levinson stated knowing every member's desire is essential to main a positive act.

The case discussed in this paper happened in social media. Since it is so-called social media means it is a high chance our online record be known to public, not only our follower or our friend in social media. It is common to make something viral by screen shooting or copying-pasting the status then share it into our account then more people will read it and there is also a chance to re-share the post. This social media behaviour is inevitable, even we cannot simply make a regulation to or not to re-share a status. Some people might argue that he re-shares something important and informative, but others might not think so. Thus, it is important to post our thought wisely.

In case of giving suggestion or remind someone to do something in social media can be interpreted differently. Based on FTA theory, act that a person feels necessary or needs to refrain other person to or not to do something includes in action that threatens positive face. The actions that include into this are, for example, suggestion, advice, and reminding. This carries a consideration that our positive intention to suggest, advice, or remind someone to do something can be seen as a threat towards their positive face.

Referring to Lanin's explanation that in fact the expression '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' (Sorry, just remind you) has a neutral meaning turns out to be questioned why this neutral meaning perceive as a threat. Based on syntax analysis, the expression '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' occurs after the speaker suggests or criticizes someone. The word *maaf* (sorry) is used to show politeness or to make the reader less offended by the suggestion or criticism. However, whether the speaker says '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' in the end, it does not simply make the previous statement of suggesting and criticizing gives no effect in threatening someone's face. In other words, the act of politeness by saying sorry can be seen as a threat since this expression comes with a suggestion and criticism; based on Brown & Levinson these actions can threat a positive face.

It is interesting to think further on this matter. Is there any way we can criticize or advice someone without threatening his face? How can we make a sincere criticism and advice in polite manner? There are two ways to do a FTA: on record and off record. On record in FTA means giving suggestion or else directly on the

other hand, off record means giving suggestion or asking for help without directly saying it. Brown & Levinson gave an explanation that there is a polite way in doing on record FTA. In order to have a positive politeness, the speaker must treat the other party as someone who is within the circle of the community. By doing so, the speaker is expected to treat the hearer as the way the hearer wants to be treated, while the negative politeness is addressing a suggestion without minding a hearer's face.

4. Politeness as a portrayal of the society

Politeness in pragmatic context does not aim to determine the appropriate or the inappropriate form of an utterance. Leech (1990) explained that the analysis on politeness gives the portrayal of how the society behaves. Seeing the phenomenon of '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' (sorry, just remind you), it seems like people tend to neglect the intention why someone to do something. Specifically in social media communication, people tend to easily post a harsh comment since they think that it is a media for them to share their thought freely. However, they forget that everything can go viral in social media since everyone can access almost everything through internet. In other words, people cannot control who will read the harsh comment they post. In Indonesia context, it is commonly believed that if we post a comment to remind a particular person, the other person can feel that the comment attacks him; this happens especially when we do not mention to whom we give a comment to.

From the case of '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*', we can have a small portrayal of Indonesia society especially on how they want to maintain their face. Indonesian who are famous of being friendly and do not easily get angry seem to be more easily getting irritated when s/he is criticized by someone else. There is one factor triggering this behaviour, based on the analysis presented in this study. The factor is people do not like being criticized in public. They feel like everyone judges him if someone criticizes their appearance or behaviour. Moreover, if people criticize their action or appearance from religion point of view such as wearing hijab or eating non-halal food or celebrating Halloween or Valentine. It is because religion

is regarded as the most sacred aspect in Indonesia. By stating religion information in citizen identification card (*Kartu Tanda Penduduk* or *KTP*) gives the image that every Indonesian citizen has to choose following one religion among six religions and belief that have been already accepted before law.

Since religion is seen as a sacred matter for everyone, the critic attacking that personal matter can be seen as an insult although the purpose is good and the expression we use has a neutral meaning. Regarding the previous explanation, in order to give a sincere suggestion, one must consider the felicity condition. If one indeed wants his suggestion being taken into account by the hearer, the speaker should see the felicity condition is. When a person thinks someone else's appearance needs to be corrected, it is better to consider who the person is, who I am to that person, and what occasion we are in; especially in this case what things that matters the most by the hearer: religion, other belief or action, and so on.

In the end, what matters is how our utterances, including giving suggestion, affect someone's feeling and face. Bartłomiejczyk (2016) explains that in communication, she took example in parliament, in order to meet everyone's satisfaction, we need to have a good diplomacy. She explained further, if we need to talk about a sensitive topic, we need to think about the way to say it as polite as possible.

This study proves that saying sorry cannot simply make the utterance sound polite. It is because, as it has been explained before, this word comes along with other utterance which aims to criticize something personal. If we think we cannot avoid the effect of harming someone's face and it is not an urgent matter to say it right now, it is better to avoid this kind of conversation.

Both bold-record and off-record strategies in FTA can be successful if the strategy is used appropriately by an appropriate person. One of the example is a lecturer directly suggests a student to dress appropriately and the next day that student follow the suggestion without any complain or hurt feeling. This situation can be regarded as a sincere suggestion since the lecturer sincerely wants the student to be discipline and follow the rule, while the student can accept this suggestion

since it is the student's duty to obey the rule and the lecturer has an obligation and authority to do so.

The same case can have different effect to the hearer if the suggestion is said by her friend, especially the friend whom she does not like. The person will hold grudge since she thinks her friend does not have any obligation and authority telling her to dress properly. However, some other friend may be able to give a suggestion and make the student follow it since it is her best friend and her best friend dresses more appropriately than her.

We can still give a sincere suggestion to a stranger or someone whom we are not close to, however the strategy should be chosen wisely. Off-record FTA strategy can be implemented to give a suggestion to a stranger or not-so-close friend. Off-record strategy means we say something that might hurt someone's face but without delivering it in impolite way. The example in doing off-record FTA strategy is by stating the fact or asking for more information about that person. By doing so, we can know that person better or we can prove that our suggestion is not just a lip-service, but we sincerely want that person to do better or live better because many people have done like we suggest.

Saying *maaf* (sorry) cannot minimize the threatening act since what matters is the statement(s) before we say sorry. The expression '*maafsekadar mengingatkan*', in this context, has an illocutionary force and the illocutionary force can be problematic since this force may be successful or not in making the hearer take an action. Moreover, since the expression has an illocutionary act, it means not everyone has the willingness to take an action to change. For those who want to change themselves, the critic can be seen as purely a reminder on the other hand, for those who do not, the critic is seen as a threat toward their face.

In short, a sincere suggestion means we truly want to tell other person to be a better person. Our intention to do it must be pure meaning to say we sincerely want that person to be better. In order to deliver a sincere suggestion, we must pay attention to the situation which we and the other person are in, what our relation is. We cannot suggest a person to eat vegetable only and claim that the diet is healthy if we never do it ourselves and in order to not to be blamed for our given suggestion

we end our suggestion by saying *maaf hanya sekadar mengingatkan untuk hidup sehat*. The suggestion will sound more sincere if we say that a healthy diet means you do not eat junk food and eat less fried food. We can add that we have done it and our cholesterol is down or we can lower our weight. By saying so, the hearer can see that we sincerely want him to eat less junk food and fried food since we have done it and it is a successful diet.

F. Conclusion

Based on the analysis on the expression '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' (sorry, just remind you), this paper drew a conclusion that what matters in delivering the message is not the expression itself, but it is more on what utterances occurred before this expression. By suggesting or criticizing someone's action, the speaker may threaten that person's face. In other words, there is another message to deliver along with the expression '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' that matters to the hearer. Regarding this situation, the expression '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*', which is supposed to have a neutral meaning, turns to have a negative meaning.

This paper found out that saying '*maaf sekadar mengingatkan*' will not negate the effect of critic and suggestion, which can harm someone's face, not even close to be more polite because the action of criticizing and suggesting can be the face threatening act when this critic and suggestion points out a private matter, in this case is wearing or not wearing hijab. This finding is supported by syntax analysis; the mood of the sentence occurred together with the expression *maaf sekdar mengingatkan* is to give reminder to the hearer and it is related to personal matter such as wearing hijab.

If someone wants to give a sincere suggestion or critic without having any intention to hurt an image, he can use more indirect way. Based on the theory of politeness, bold-record tends to be less polite than off-record. Based on this statement, off-record way to criticize and suggest can be the solution to send a message without threatening someone's face even the purpose is the same. The highlight is in communication and in many situations, what matter is not the message but the way we deliver the message. Although politeness does not have a

certain standard, the way we treat other through the utterance we speak define our value as a member of community. In order to give a high value to ourselves, it is just right if we are supposed to speak politely without threatening someone else's face.

References

- Austin, J. L. 1975. *How to Do Things with Words*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Badan Pengembangan Bahasa dan Perbukuan Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. *Urutan Kata dan Maknanya*. <http://badanbahasa.kemendikbud.go.id/lamanbahasa> (8 April 2019).
- Bartłomiejczyk, M. 2016. *Face threats in interpreting: a pragmatic study of plenary debates in European Parliament*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Brown, P., & Stephen, C. L. 1987. *Politeness Some universals in language use*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ivan Lanin soal Kalimat Viral 'Sekadar Mengingat': Enggak Negatif. <https://kumparan.com/@millennial/ivan-lanin-soal-kalimat-viral-sekadar-mengingat-enggak-negatif-1544791054514869374> (4 Maret 2019).
- Kim, Jong-Bok & Peter, S. 2008. *English Syntax: An Introduction*. Standford: Center for the study of language and information.
- Leech, G. 1990. *The Study of Meaning*. London: Penguin Books.
- Miller, J. 2002. *An Introduction to English Syntax*. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press Ltd.
- Verschueren & Otsman. 2009. *Key Notions of Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.