

Philanthropy Language Construction

Iqbal Nurul Azhar
University of Trunojoyo, Madura, Indonesia

Abstract

This paper proposes a theory the-so-called philanthropy language theory through linguistic perspective. Philanthropy language is defined in simple way as "a language style that expresses love and care to others." There are two maxims of philanthropy languages namely, maxim of proposition and maxim of affection. An expression contains proposition maxim when its proposition point at six situations, namely: the proposition shows the feelings of love and affection, the proposition puts the subject matter as a shared property, the proposition puts the expression makers/writer and the listeners/readers in a brotherhood situation, the proposition does not attack the others' face, the proposition introduces reformations yet the form of expression does not violate maxim 1, 2, 3, and 4, and the proposition contributes something to others even though it is only in the form of an expectation. An expression contains affection maxim when it carries three characteristics that give a feeling of comfort since it affects others to: (1) agree with the proposition to act or react positive, (2) follow proposition not to act or react negative, and (3) not do anything to avoid negative attitude. Philanthropy language utilizes some peculiar lexical markers such as: love, compassion, peace, prosperity, comfort, unity, truth, equality, friendship, happiness, unity, we, us, all of us, you and I, and many others of language philanthropist. Philanthropy language also has a unique syntactic rule that is "it is better to immediately disobey syntactic rules rather than to say something cruel to others".

Keywords: philanthropy language, maxims, construction

Introduction

This paper is inspired by my students' emails which demand answers on a sort of Indonesian expression pattern which contains love, affection and compassion. The examples of the expressions have already been published in my article (see Azhar, 2008). Here is one of the examples:

Mari Kita Wujudkan Jawa Timur Yang Makmur, Aman, Tenteram, Bersama (Manteb) Merdeka (Azhar, 2008) (Let us realize East Java to be prosperous safe, tranquility, by doing it together (acronym), Freedom.

The emails were on inquiries related to on which linguistic field; one could hold a discussion about the pattern. Having retraced some printed and electronic literature available in some libraries and e-libraries, I encountered a fact that the pattern can be accommodated in a special terminology or a scope the-so-called "philanthropy" or namely "the language style of philanthropy". It is so unique that Fusari (2006) considered it to have a power to humanize humans by banishing their misery and cultivating their love.

Although it has been set up the umbrella to accommodate the pattern, there is a bit disappointment associated with the existing information in the literature. This dissatisfaction arises because of two things. First, existing information about philanthropy language are very inadequate and less comprehensive as they are only stated in articles of journals which of course less qualified to answer the inquiries which explicitly aim at theoretical answers. Second, the literature is not really connected to the topic since it mostly deals with social-humanitarian issues while the inquiries are demanding linguistic academic answers.

Researchers studying the nature of philanthropy have been those of different disciplinary backgrounds and, correspondingly, have attended to various aspects of philanthropy. There have been a number of valuable studies of philanthropy as by Bhativa (1997), Bhatiava (1998), Connor (1997), Connor and Wagner (1998), Crismore (1997), Lauer (1997), Myers (1997), Payton, Rosso, and Paste (1991), Fusari (2005), Fusari (2006) and Amabile (2012). The studies portrayed philanthropy in many communities through discourse analysis perspective. However, none of these photographed philanthropy within the scope of theoretical linguistics. All of them related languages in texts to philanthropic activities and aimed at social affairs which were about how to process language so as to generate donations for philanthropic purposes. None of them studied the languages independently.

One study that has little contact with linguistics is the study conducted by McCagg (1997) which examined philanthropy through linguistics sphere. This study was still not able to answer the inquiries since it merely discussed the moral values of metaphors in the discourse of philanthropy. Since there have been literally no report documenting studies on philanthropy through linguistics perspective (except by McCagg) attempts to disclose philanthropy through linguistics perspective are warranted.

Due to the time limitation to complete this article, the writer considers library study fits to all procedures which must be undergone before arriving at the theory of philanthropy language. The data were philanthropy expressions which came from some particular scientific articles about political campaign discourses. Some of them were in the form of Jargons, and some of them were in slogans. Since the type of this study was a library study, the method of data collection was Content Analysis, with the basic techniques was tapping and the further technique was recording (Kotari, 2004). The instrument used to retrieve the data was the writer himself. The method of data analysis was Correlation Method with Segmented-Element-Determinant-Technique. The determinant elements were the discourses. Since there had never been a linguist who conducted researches on this topic, the approach of this study was Bottom Up (grounded), which started from data and ended to a theory. The data which had been collected and analyzed, at the end were formulated in the form of a proposal theory.

Discussion

The Maxims of Philanthropy Language

Etymologically, the word philanthropy was derived from the Greek word '*philos*' which means love and '*anthropos*' which meant human. The combination of the two words produced new meaning "Love or to love human". In philosophical history, philanthropy was closely linked to the spirit of human freedom. It was believed as a manifestation of the story of the god Zeus tyranny who long time ago bind human in ignorance, fear, darkness, and helplessness, Then, there came a good God named Prometheus who were willing to save mankind by giving them fire and hope.

In the story of Prometheus resistance, fire symbolized technology, skills, and knowledge, while hope had always been associated with the spirit of improvement of the human condition. And that was where the story of human civilization began. It was originated from the love "philanthropy" of Prometheus to human kinds (<http://ditpolkom.bappenas.go.id>).

The word Philanthropy is often interpreted as "an expression of love to other human beings". Webster's Dictionary does not impose limits to the disclosure of love, whether it is shown by sharing money or materials to others, but rather it is "works or efforts that are intended to increase the sense of love of neighborhood and of humanity".

Philanthropy definition recently develops itself into two boundaries, namely action, and concept. The first boundary is still deeply entrenched in societies and can be viewed in a variety of containers of humanitarian movements such as the Philanthropic Will Company, Duafa Wallet, Zakat House, BSMI (Indonesian Red Crescent), and so forth. In this boundary, philanthropy is interpreted as the acts of someone who loves donating his/her wealth to his/her associates. In everyday situation, philanthropy is practiced as alms, custody/parenting of orphans, charity, benevolence, donation, and other actions which have similar purposes. Philanthropy in this boundary is also interpreted as a

"voluntary acts of transferring resources for the purpose of community or social charity which consist of two main forms; utilization of social grants and of social construction."

The second boundary, although it stills a minor flow, is gradually increasing to appear along with the emerging of many discourses containing philanthropy. This boundary shifts from the original form of philanthropy which are actions, into rather abstract (here we call it as a concept) which orients to "goals of love and compassion for others," whether they are performed solely or in groups. Since the second is in the form of concept, it mostly behaves like adjectives, so that the word philanthropy can be attached to other words (nouns) to form new entities. Thus, based on this new concept, later we know some new terms such as philanthropy literature, philanthropy arts, philanthropy drama, philanthropy style, philanthropy language and other kinds of philanthropy. In the second boundary, we can see a fundamental shift from the original definition of philanthropy which deals with a concrete action of groups of people, or works for the sake of humanity, into a broader area which is the concept of love and individual/group affection. This definition also shifts retro on materialistically, since philanthropy was actually originated from the Greek definition of intangible abstract feeling of a Greek good God, then turned into concrete activities to deliver tangible material given freely to others for a good cause, then moves back again into an abstract concept which is attached closely to nonspecific entries of language (nouns).

Using the definition of philanthropy of the first boundary to discuss languages as indicated by the electronic mails is clearly not appropriate. The first branch of philanthropy has no relation at all to the topic of the e-mails. Here are four factors that cause the topic of the e-mails cannot be put in the first boundary: (1) The first branch is more likely under the shade of social realm, humanitarian and religious, while the topic only focuses on the realm of language, (2) the first branch discusses concrete products that can be used for humanitarian purposes, whereas the topic discusses the language products that contain human love and compassion, (3) the first branch discusses human actions, while the topic discusses human expressions, (4) the first branch discusses how to empower people to be beneficial to others, while the topic discusses how language can be empowered so as to indicate the charge of love, affection and compassion.

Philanthropy that we discuss in this article is the philanthropy in the second boundary. The definition of Philanthropy language that we use as a parameter of discussions in this article is "the style of language that shows expression of love for human beings." From the definition above, we can see that the definition raises two maxims namely, maxims of proposition, and maxims of affection.

Philanthropy language contains particular information that is love, compassion and generosity. Although it has different sentence structures, as long as the sentences contain the three propositions above, the sentences can be put in the category of philanthropy. This is how the Maxim of Proposition appears. There are six characteristics that distinguish philanthropy language with other types of languages based on the first maxim. Those are; the language must: (1) show the feelings of love and affection, (2) show the subject matter covered as a shared property, (3) put the

makers and readers of a discourse in the same brotherhood, (4) not attack the face of the others so that no philanthropy language hurts other feelings, (5) add invitation to reform something but the invitation must not violate the solicitation of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th character. (6) give something to others even though it is only in the form of a hope. The examples of discourses that contain proposition maxim can be seen as follows:

Table 1. The Examples of Discourse that Contain the Maxim of Proposition

| o | The Example of Discourse (in bahasa Indonesia) | English Translation |
|----|--|---|
| .1 | Mari kita wujudkan Indonesia yang mandiri dan sejahtera, Rakyat harus terlepas dari belenggu penderitaan, kemiskinan dan ketidakadilan tanpa membedakan suku, ras dan golongan (Azhar, 2009) | Let us realize Indonesia as an independent and prosperous country, The people must be free from the shackles of misery, poverty and injustice regardless of ethnicity, race and class (Azhar, 2009) |
| .2 | Mari Berkarya Bersama Rakyat (Azhar, 2009) | Let us produce something Together with the People (Azhar, 2009) |
| .3 | Bersama Kita Bisa (Azhar, 2009) | Together We Can (Azhar, 2009) |

The three data above are included in the category of philanthropy language since they contain proposition maxim. Example 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 clearly show the love to others (as it is the 1st characteristic of the maxim of preposition). Example 1.1 shows the love to Indonesia and to the people, while example 1.2 shows the love to work for the people and the love to always be together in doing something. The three examples above possess the characteristic of maxim of proposition number 2 because 'Indonesia', 'the people' and togetherness are the topics that are commonly shared by group of people and not by an individual. The three examples above meet the 3rd characteristic due to the fact that the discourses invite the readers to build friendship not separation. The three examples above also meet the characteristics number 4 because they do not attack others' face and do not make others angry. The three examples above meet the characteristics number 5 since they invite the readers to change the status quo in society yet the forms of the expressions are not aggressive because they attack none. The three examples above meet the characteristic of maxim of proposition number 6 because they give hope to others in the form of reformation and improvement in the future.

The second maxim is the Maxim of Affection. Affection in this context is defined as the response of the reader or the listener towards philanthropy discourse by feeling comfortable, calm, and happy. There are at least three characteristics within the scope of this maxim that readers respond to the discourses by: (1) complying the proposition to apply positive attitudes, (2) following

proposition not to apply negative attitude, and (3) not doing anything to avoid negative and aggressive attitude. As examples of the Maxim of Affection can be seen in the following discourses:

Table 2. The Examples of Discourse that Contains Maxim of Affection

| o | The Example of Discourse (in bahasa Indonesia) | English Translation |
|----|---|--|
| .1 | Menjelang pagi dan malam Tuhan membuka dan menutup jendela bumi. . . kemudian, TUHAN melihatku, lalu bertanya. Apa yang engkau inginkan? Kemudian, akupun menjawab, SAYANGI orang yang membaca tulisan ini selamanya, AMIN (Sulistyaningtyas, 2009) | Right before dusk and dawn, God opens and closes the window of the earth. . then, the Lord sees me, then He asks: What do you want? Then, I answer, give mercy to the people who read this writing forever, AMEN |
| .2 | Impianmu impianku impian kita Bersama (Sulistyaningtyas, 2009) | Your dream and my dream are our dreams |
| .3 | Bersih itu damai (Sulistyaningtyas, 2009) | Clean is peaceful |

The three discourses above are included in group of philanthropy language because they contain the maxim of affection. Example 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 are clear to the reader that they give comfortable feeling. Example 2.1 provides a comfortable feeling for the reader since the reader will feel that he/she is being loved by the maker of the discourse. Example 2.2 provides a comfortable feeling to the reader because the readers are considered friends who have similar dreams by the discourse makers. Example 2.3 provides a comfortable feeling to the reader that although there is a weep-cleaning activity, yet the activity is still in the corridors of peace.

Lexical and Structural peculiarities of Philanthropy Language

Besides having maxims, philanthropy language also has a tendency to form typical of statements and solicitations (whether affirmative or negative). However, imperative or interrogative sentence construction can also contain philanthropy as long as the proposition also characterizes philanthropy.

Philanthropy language has lexical peculiarities. The construction of philanthropy can not only be identified through the compliance of its maxims, but also can be identified through its lexical choice. Particular lexicons such as: love, compassion, peace, prosperity, friendship, unity, truth, equality, friendship, happiness, prosperity, unity, for human, for peace, equality, and many others are the markers of philanthropy language. Additionally, pronouns such as; us, all of us, you and I, are also encountered in the construction of philanthropic language.

The structure of philanthropy language also has a specific feature in it that is the structure may: "violate grammar rules to avoid saying something cruel to others, as it is suggestible". As an example of the typical philanthropy structure of a style language can be seen as follows:

Tabel 3: The Examples of Discourse that Contains Philanthropy Maxim

| o | Discourses that Contain Philanthropy Maxims | Discourses that do not Contain Philanthropy Maxims |
|----|---|--|
| .1 | <p><i>Jika orang benar bertambah (tidak menyebutkan nama), bersukacitalah rakyat. Jika orang fasik memerintah (tidak menyebutkan nama) berdukacitalah rakyat (Azhar, 2009)</i></p> <p>When the righteous increases (not mentioning any names), the people rejoice. When the wicked rules (not mentioning any names) the people bereaved</p> | <p><i>Jika orang benar bertambah (seperti Bapak A), bersukacitalah rakyat. Jika orang fasik memerintah (seperti bapak B) berdukacitalah rakyat</i></p> <p>When the righteous increase (as Mr. A), the people rejoice. When the wicked rule (like Mr. B) the people bereaved.</p> |
| .2 | <p><i>Jangan lihat orangnya, lihat yang telah diperbuat (Sulistyaningtyas, 2009)</i></p> <p>Do not see who the person is, see what he has done</p> | <p><i>Jangan lihat orangnya (yaitu bapak/ibu A), lihat yang telah diperbuat (melakukan A atau B)</i></p> <p>Do not see who the person is (i.e Mr. A/Ms.A), see what he has done (done A or done B)</p> |

The form of linguistic unit above is a sentence (example 3.1) or a combination of sentences (3.2). The two discourses above break grammatical rules (even pragmatic-semantic rules) because it does not mention any names, a little vague, since it can be anyone. The violation aims to not to say something painful that may cause division. In 3.1, "when the righteous increase, the people rejoice," There is the-so-called "*divertis*" that is the avoidance to directly mention the righteous (names that are considered stand in the right path). If the name is mentioned, the impression that arises is negative (cocky, arrogant, pretentious) both in the so-called, and on which is not called. Likewise, the expression "If the wicked rule, the people bereaved" also does not mention the name of the persona that has a wicked nature. If the name is mentioned, of course, will make the person offended. Likewise, at 3.2 "do not see the person, see who has done" also tries to divert persona name to avoid negative effects. Avoidance to mention good deeds that have been done by a person also minimizes negative effects.

The Application of Philanthropy Language Construction Theory

The theory of philanthropy language in the previous section according to the limitation of this study is focused on data which relate to political discourses. From the above explanation, the theory is applicable in this context. The question is; can this theory be used to analyze other types of discourse?

In practice, it turns out that this philanthropy language theory can also be used to distinguish discourse, such as the four lyrics in table 4 below. In the table it can be seen that there are four lyrics. Two lyrics use philanthropy language (because it meets two philanthropy language maxims), while the other two, do not contain philanthropy language maxims and therefore cannot be regarded as philanthropy language discourses.

Tabel 4: the comparison of philanthropy language and nonphilanthropy language

| o | Philanthropy Lyrics | Nonphilanthropy Lyrics |
|----|---|---|
| .1 | <p style="text-align: center;">(a)</p> <p><i>heal the world, make it a better place, for you and for me, and the entire human race, there are people dying, if you care enough, for the living, make a better place, for you and for me</i> (sumber:., http://lirikdansair.blogspot.com)</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">(b)</p> <p><i>Dirty Diana, nah, Dirty Diana, nah, Dirty Diana, no, Dirty Diana, Let me be!</i> Sumber: (http://www.rizkyonline.com)</p> |
| .2 | <p style="text-align: center;">(c)</p> <p><i>('cause we all live under the same sun, We all walk under the same moon, Then why, why can't we live as one)</i> (http://lirik.kapanlagi.com)</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">(d)</p> <p><i>(Here I am, Will you send me an angel, Here I am, In the land of the morning star)</i> (http://lirik.kapanlagi.com)</p> |

Example 4.1 (a) and 4.1 (b) are the chorus of the two Michael Jackson's song (4.1 (a) heal the world, 4.1 (b) dirty Diana). The second chorus of the song though it is also the chorus of Michael Jackson song, but it has different language style. 4.1 (a) contains philanthropy language maxims whereas 4.1 (b) does not. 4.1 (a) meets the maxim of proposition. Likewise, 4.2 (c) and 4.2 (d), the two such discourse are the chorus of the song sung by Scorpion. Although they are produced by the same group, they have different language styles. In 4.2 (c) the language contains philanthropy language whereas 4.2 (d) does not.

In the context of maxim of proposition, example 4.1 (a) and 4.2 (c) show the love to the world and to others. World and concern for others are topics that belong to common people and not to individuals. The discourses above also invite the readers to respect companionship not to

separation. Example 4.1 (a) and 4.2 (c) above also do not attack other people's faces and do not make the people angry. In addition, 4.1 (a) and 4.2 (c) invites the public to change for the betterment. 4.1 (a) and 4.2 (c) also give hope to others by initiating the existence of changes in the future. On the other hand, 4.1 (b) and 4.2 (d) do not contain any of philanthropy maxims. 4.1 (b) and 4.2 (c) do not contain any expression of love to the world and to the others. Even, the two discourses above are quite personal because they use pronouns "me" and "I" as the subject of the sentence. The propositions also do not refer to shared topic since they are individualistic and do not talk about everyone's problem. Although they do not attack others' face, they do not give any hope to people about betterment in the future.

In the context of maxim of affection, example 4.1 (a) and 4.2 (c) provide comfortable feeling for the reader since they are put on the equal level and are invited to collaborate with the writer to improve the future, both by protecting the world and by maintaining friendship. Example 4.1 (a) and 4.2 (c) also provide comfortable feeling to the reader because the reader feels that the discourse makers care about the problems of the world (which he/she feels that it is also his/her problem) such as peace, friendship, world preservation and many more. While in 4.1 (b) and 4.2 (d), these two discourses do not contain maxims of affective. Although the readers do not feel threatened, but the readers do not feel comfortable either because he/she is not involved in the topics discussed.

Conclusion

Philanthropy language is "the style of language that shows expression of love for human beings." From the definition above, we can see that the definition raises two maxims namely, maxims of proposition, and maxims of affection.

Maxim of proposition has six characteristics: (1) show the feelings of love and affection, (2) show the subject matter covered as a shared property, (3) put the makers and readers of a discourse in the same brotherhood, (4) not attack the face of the others so that no philanthropy language hurts other feelings, (5) add invitation to reform something but the invitation must not violate the solicitation of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th character. (6) give something to others even though it is only in the form of a hope.

The second maxim is the Maxim of Affection. There are at least three characteristics within the scope of this maxim that readers respond to discourse by: There are at least three characteristics within the scope of this maxim that readers respond to the discourses by: (1) complying the proposition to apply positive attitudes, (2) following proposition not to apply negative attitude, and (3) not doing anything to avoid negative and aggressive attitude.

Philanthropy language has lexical peculiarities. The construction of philanthropy not only can be identified through the compliance of its maxims, but also can be identified through its lexical choice. Particular lexicons such as: love, compassion, peace, prosperity, friendship, unity, truth, equality, friendship, happiness, prosperity, unity, for human, for peace, equality, and many others are

the markers of philanthropy language. Additionally, pronouns such as; us, all of us, you and I, are also encountered in the construction of philanthropy language.

References

- Amabile, L. (2012) *Teaching Philanthropy To Children And Youth: A Resource for Unitarian Universalist Religious Educators*. www.uua.org/documents/stew-dev/apf/teaching_philanthropy.doc
- Azhar, I. N. (2008) Political Language Used by Female Candidate in the Campaign for East Java Governor Election 2008” in *GENDER DAN POLITIK (Gender and Politics)*. Jogjakarta: Pusat Studi Wanita Universitas Gajahmada dan penerbit Tiara Wacana.
- Azhar, I. N. (2009) Bahasa Jargon Calon Legislatif 2009 dalam Face Book (Jargon Language of Legislature Candidate 2009 in Facebook) in the prosiding of *Konferensi Linguistik Tahunan Atma Jaya 7: Tingkat Internasional*. Jakarta: Pusat Kajian Bahasa dan Budaya Unika Atmajaya.
- Bhatia, V. K. (1997). Discourse of philanthropic fund-raising. *Written discourse in philanthropic fund raising. Issues of language and rhetoric* (pp. 27-44). Indiana University Center on Philanthropy. Working Papers, 98-13. Indianapolis, IN.
- Bhatia, V. K. (1998). Generic patterns in fundraising discourse. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, 22, 95-110.
- Connor, U. (1997). Comparing research and not-for-profit grant proposals. *Written discourse in philanthropic fund raising. Issues of language and rhetoric* (pp. 45-64). Indiana University Center on Philanthropy. Working Papers, 98-13. Indianapolis, IN.
- Connor, U. & Wagner, L. (1998). Language use in grant proposals by nonprofits: Spanish and English. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising: Understanding and Improving the Language of Fundraising*, 22, 59-73.
- Crismore, A. 1997. Visual rhetoric in an Indiana University Foundation “Annual Report.” *Written discourse in philanthropic fund raising. Issues of language and rhetoric* (pp. 64-100). Indiana University Center on Philanthropy. Working Papers, 98-13. Indianapolis, IN.
- Frumppkin, P. (2003). Inside venture philanthropy in *Society*, 40 (4), 7-15.--:-
- Fusari, S. (2005). "Philanthropic Direct Mail in An English-Italian Perspective". Paper presented at the seminar *Research on Fundraising Letters: Focus on Research Methods*, World Conference of the International Association of Applied Linguistics (AILA 2005), Madison, Wisconsin, 25 July 2005.

- Fusari, S. (2006). *The Discourse Of Philanthropy in Italy and The United States: A Case Study Of Interparadigmatic Translation*. University of Bologna at Forl Italy.
<http://www.immi.se/jicc/index.php/jicc/article/view/81/50>
<http://lirikdansair.blogspot.com/2009/07/michael-jackson-heal-word.html>
http://lirik.kapanlagi.com/artis/scorpions/under_the_same_sun
<http://www.rizkyonline.com/barat/michael-jackson/dirty-diana-lyrics.html#ixzz2VrJp9o8a>
http://ditpolkom.bappenas.go.id/basedir/Kajian%20Ditpolkom/2%29%20Peran%20Filantropi%20Untuk%20Keberlanjutan%20OMS/BAB%20II_Bappenas_Final1.pdf
- Kothari, C.R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. New Delhi: New Age International (P) Limited, Publishers
- Lauer, J. (1997). Fundraising letters. *Written discourse in philanthropic fund raising. Issues of language and rhetoric* (pp. 101-108). Indiana University Center on Philanthropy. Working Papers, 98-13. Indianapolis, IN.
- McCagg, P. (1997). Metaphorical morality and the discourse of philanthropy. *Writtendiscourse in philanthropic fund raising. Issues of language and rhetoric* (pp. 109-120). Indiana University Center on Philanthropy. Working Papers, 98-13. Indianapolis, IN.
- Myers, G. (1997). Wednesday morning and the millenium: Notes on time in fund-raising texts. *Written discourse in philanthropic fund raising. Issues of language and rhetoric* (pp. 121-134). Indiana University Center on Philanthropy. Working Papers, 98-13. Indianapolis, IN.
- Payton, R. L., Rosso, H. A., & Tempel, E. R. (1991). Toward a philosophy of fund raising. In D. E. Burlingame & L. J. Hulse (Eds.), *Taking fundraising seriously: Advancing the profession and practice of raising money* (pp. 3-17). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sulistyaningtyas, T. (2009) Bahasa Indonesia dalam Wacana Propaganda Politik Kampanye
- Pemilu 200. Satu Kajian Sosiopragmatik in *Jurnal Sosioteknologi* Edisi 17 Tahun 8. Agustus