ARGUMENT STRUCTURE IN BIMANESE

Made Sri Satyawati   I Nyoman Kardana
Udayana University   *Warmadewa University*
srisatyawati@gmail.com   ikardana@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Jonker (1896) has observed the simple syntactic structure of Bimanese. Bimanese is one of the Austronesian Malay Polynesian languages (Arafik, 2005). This language generally has two traits, it has affixes and compounding (Owens, 2000). With such characteristics, the language is alleged to have affixes that have many functions.

The focus of this study is the argument structure in the syntactic construction of Bimanese. This study was conducted using the Lexical Functional Grammar theory proposed by Kroeger (2008). In the theory, Kroeger uses three aspects of syntax, namely functional structures, constituent structures, and argument structures. In collecting data, method of interview and observation was conducted. Interview method was done to collect oral data which was then rewritten in order to be analyzed, while observation method was applied to to collect written data. Both methods are assisted by recording and note taking techniques.

The result of the data analysis shows that the argument structure of Bimanese has a peculiarity because there are markers used to mark arguments, such as labo, kai, wea, and ba. The main function of the markers is as a valency marker. Generally, the four markers are used for the mandatory arguments. However, some data shows different behavior from the argument. The different behaviors belong to the main functions of the markers. One of the functions is as a preposition.

Keywords: *Bimanese, Argument Structure, marker*

INTRODUCTION

The study of Bimanese is inseparable from grammatical philosophy, namely function, form, and meaning (Satyawati, 2011). Based on the grammatical philosophy, it is found the universal and uniqueness of languages. The uniqueness of Bimanese becomes its particular feature, while the universal are related to the similarity of Bimanese and other languages.

Bimanese is one of the languages that is existing in West Nusa Tenggara, besides Sasaknese and Samawa language. Bimanese shows a distinct feature from Sasaknese. Bimanese does not have any affixes, whereas Sasaknese has some affixes. In marking the grammatical relation, Bimanese uses a syntactic strategy.

Syntactic strategy marks the clause argument structure, e.g in English, the word 'dance' <agent> is a verb that has one argument whose role is an agent (Kroeger, 2004:10). Then, Kroeger gives an example of clause construction as follows.

(1) *John   gave Mary   a boquet of roses*
    AGENT   RICIPIENT THEME

(2) *John   baked Mary   a chocolate cake*
    AGENT   BENEFICIARY PATIENT   (Kroeger, 2004:10)

In some verbs, it is not very difficult to identify an argument role and another argument. However, under different conditions, there are also verbs that have arguments but it is difficult to identify the role of their arguments. In addition, in a clause there are obligation and oblique constituents, i.e in recognizing the adjunct because the adjunct can have double function. Related to this phenomenon, the question is, how is the argument structure of Bimanese?

METHODOLOGY

The study of the argument structure of Bimanese belongs to a descriptive research and that's why the data of this research is the used Bimanese utterances. The data was collected by preparing a list of questions that match the research needs and possibilities. The prepared question list consists of some clause constructions in Indonesian. The question is Why should be the clause constructions in Indonesian? It is because the researchers tried to use the language that that is well known by both researcher and informants.

The next stage is the selection of key informants. Data were collected from key informants through interview methods or power elicitation assisted by note taking and recording techniques. When the key informants have finished answering all the questions in the question list, data was recollected from the supporting informants. The supporting informants were needed until the sentence variations were not found anymore. Generally, the supporting informants were 6 people to know the similarities and differences of lexicon and the structure of Bimanese clause. If there are differences, then most structures will be taken as research data (Mithun, 2001).

When the data had been collected, the research was proceeded with data analysis. In analyzing the data, comparing method was applied in order to compare Bimanese and another language known by both researcher and informants so that the characteristics of the language can be compared with the searched language. In addition, a distribution method was used to find out the constituent's curiosity (Sudaryanto, 1993, 1995).

ARGUMENT ROLE

The analysis of the language is supported by Bimanese utterances taken in the District of Bima, West Nusa Tenggara Province. In the data analysis it is known that the structure of argument verbs in Bimanese is similar to other languages, depend on the verb used as the predicate core (Kroeger, 2005). Prior to the analysis phase of the data, in this study will be presented the theory of Functional Grammar. In the theory, there are three aspects of syntax, namely constituent structure, argument structure, and functional structure. These three structures are quite similar to those introduced by (Lyons, 1999). The constituent structure is related to the word category, whereas the functional structure is the structure of constituent functions, and the structure of the argument is the structure associated with the roles of the argument.

Argument roles become a topic that is very often discussed because each linguist has a different approach to the role of argument characterized by a semantic concept or conceptual category that describes events or situations. The roles of arguments introduced by Kroeger are the agents (causes of something), experiencer, recipient, beneficiary, instrument, theme, patient, stimulus, location, accompaniment / comitative. Some examples are given by Kroger (2005) as in examples (1) and (2) above as well as (3) and (4) below.

(3) *John   opened the lock   with key*.
    AGEN   PASIEN   INSTRUMEN

(4) *The key   opened the lock*.
    INSTRUMENT   PASIEN

From examples (3) and (4), the change in constituent function does not change the role of semantic arguments in the same event or situation. In other words, constructs using open verbs will always require arguments for the instrument and the patient.

Bimanese has the roles proposed by Kroger. However, in this study not all roles will be presented. Here is an example of argument role in Bimanese.

(5) *Sia ma- dompo kuni*.
    3T HAB-potong kunir
    'Saya memotong kunir itu'

(6) *Nahu tunti-ku   sura*.
    1T   tulisa-1/perf. Surat
    'Saya telah menulis surat'

The argument role of *sia* 'he' in (5), *nahu* 'I' in (6) is as agent The arguments are the initiator the actions in the event declared by the verb *dompo* 'cut' and *tunti* 'write' so that it causes other arguments to be under the influence or to experience an event.

The name of agent on the arguments can be proved by observing the behavior of the clause nucleus expressed by the PRED verbs *dompo* 'cut' in (5). The argument involved is an argument that performs a "cutting" activity and an argument that will experience a "truncated" event. Based on the facts expressed by the circumstances of the language, the arguments that have the role of carrying out the activity expressed as PRED, which is generally a SUBJ in a canonical pattern, i.e *sia* 'he' in (5). The same is also expressed by the PRED verb t*unti* 'write' and *nduku* 'hit'. Both PREDs require two arguments in a

syntactic structure. The two required arguments are: an argument that performs an activity expressed by PRED and an argument under the influence or argument that is subjected to an event stated by PRED.

ARGUMET STRUCTURE

Argument structure analyzed in this study is argument structure based on situation stated by verbs and *aksionsart*. The followings are the examples of Bimanese.

(7) *La Wiwi dahu*.
    Ks Nd   takut
    'Wiwi takut.'

(8) *La Wiwi dahu tio   lako*.
    Ks Nd   takut lihat anjing
    'Wiwi takut melihat anjing.'

(9) *Nahu maru*.
    1T   tidur
    'Saya tidur.'

(10)   *Nahu ra-maru*.
        1T   RES/PERF
        'Saya tertidur.'

(11)   *Nahu ku-   maru ana nahu* .
        1T   1/IMPER tidur anak 1T
        'Saya menidurkan anak saya.'

(12)   *Nahu tŭba-ku   nggomi*.
        1T   tikam-1/PERF 2T
        'Saya menikam kamu.'

Construction (7) and (8) represent a construction that states the *state of affairs* situation. Despite declaring the same *state of affairs*, the two constructions show different dimensions to the participants involved and on the cause of the situation. Participants involved in (7) only one participant, *La Wiwi* 'Wiwi', while at (8) involved two participants, namely *La Wiwi* 'Wiwi' and *lako* 'dog'. Construction (7) is a construction that describes the fear that comes out of without any definite cause, while the fear described in construction (8) is the fear of the dog. Based on these data, it is seen that the argument structure of examples (7) and (8) is *dahu* <agent> and *dahu* <agent> <patient>

The other three constructions, (10), (11), and (12) illustrate different *state of affairs* situations. Construction (10) is a *state of affairs* construction that states the situation of *nahu* 'I' in a state of *maru* 'sleep'. With the same verb, the circumstances change when the element ra 'already' is added and become *nahu* 'I' sleep accidentally and just happen without realizing he was asleep. Both constructions involve only one argument. From the involved argument, construction (11) is different from the two constructions mentioned above. Construction (11) is a construction that PRED involves two arguments, namely *nahu* 'I' and *ana nahu* 'my son'. The situation described is the process of making the argument *ana nahu* 'my son' sleeping from his state that has not been asleep. The process is a situation that certainly requires an ending point because in the end the situation will end when *ana nahu* 'my son' is asleep. Furthermore, the latter construction, i.e (12) is a *state of affairs* construction which states an action, i.e *nahu* 'I' stabs *nggomi* 'you'. This construction involves two arguments. The first argument is the participant who takes action in that situation and the second argument is an action-charged argument in the situation. The structure of arguments described in 10, 11, and 12 is *maru <agent>, maru <agent> <patient>, tuba <agent> <patient>*.

When verbs and other PRED elements express the state of affair, lexical representation theories should be able to express important differences that distinguish different types of state of affairs, such as state of affairs that PRED states are states of affairs that take a long time, dynamic, or have an ending point. In addition, when the role of an argument is a function of state of affairs, the reference semantic

function of the argument must correspond to the representation of the verb or other PRED elements encoded by the state of affairs. To know these things, the RRG built a system known as lexical decomposition. Lexical decomposition is a lexical representation system for PRED and the arguments involved in the stated conditions. This system includes the paraphrase of verbs in terms of the fundamental elements in the semantic definition of meta language. For example, *kill* in English can be paraphrased to 'cause to die' and *die* can be 'become dead'. Then, the lexical *kill* representation is something 'x that causes [y to be dead]' (Van Valin and La Polla, 1997:90-92).

Related to the semantic type of verbs, this lexical decomposition system will be used as a basis for *aktionsart* differences. The term *Aktionsart* is derived from the German language which refers to the action originally stated by VEBDLER (1957/1967). It states that verbs and other PRED elements can be classified in terms of their own inherent temporal properties and four basic classes of verbs are proposed, namely state, achievements, accomplishment, and activity. Each is described as follows.

1) The state of affairs situation expressed by state verbs is a non-dynamic, temporally non-bound linguistic situation, such as be sick, be tall, and love.

2) The state of affairs situation expressed by the achievement verb is a linguistic situation that encodes sudden changes, both state and activity, such as pop, exploded, and shatter.

3) The state of affairs state expressed by the accomplishment verb is a temporally linguistic situation that shows slow progress (not suddenly) changing the initial state to the final destination, such as melt, freeze, and dry.

4) The state of affairs situation expressed by the activity verb is a dynamic verb and is temporally unbound, eg walk, roll, and read.

Tabel 1 Representasi Leksikal Verba untuk Tipe *Aktionsart* Dasar

Tipe Semantik Verba	Struktur Logika
State	**PRED'**(x) atau (x,y)
Activity	**do'**(x,[**PRED'**(x) atau (x,y)])
Achievement	INGR **PRED'**(x) atau (x,y)
Accomplishment	BECOME **PRED'**(x) atau (x,y)

Berdasarkan data di atas, dibuat tabel seperti berikut.

Tabel 2 Tipe Semantik Verba

State of Affairs	Keadaan	Peristiwa	Proses	Aksi
Type of Semantic Verb	**State** [+static], [-telic], [-pungtual]	*Achievement* [-static], [-telic], [-pungtual]	*Accomplishment* [-static], [+telic], [-pungtual]	**Aktivitas** [-stative], [+telic], [+pungtual]
1.	*dahu* 'fear'	*Mbia* 'broken'	(*ka*)-*mami* 'cook'	*tŭba* 'tikam'
2.	*maru* 'sleep'	*leli* 'hancur'	*soŏ* 'melted'	*ngaha* 'eat'
3.	*maki* 'tired'	*Wotu* 'exploded'	*mango* 'dry'	*nuntu* 'speak'
4.	*neě* 'love'	*Ma<u>b</u>u* 'fall down'	*tanaŏ* 'study'	*tei* 'teach'
5.	*mbani* 'angry'	*safinta* 'terpeleset'	*ndawi* 'make'	*tio* 'look for'

CONCLUSION

The four language situations are expressed by verbs of which meaning is based on the type of *aksionsart*. Therefore, the four verb classification based on the types of *aksionsart* are *state*, activity, *achievement*, and *accomplishment*. *RRG* has in detail divided the verb into ten types, and not only for as mentioned before. However, in this study the verbs are grouped into four types.

Argument structure in every word category is different one to another. In Bimanese the argument structure is determined by using lexical representation based on the four types of verb semantic. The lexical representation of the state verb are (1) **be'**(x,y), (2) **PRED'**(x) or **PRED'**(x,y), (3) **be loc'**(x, y), and (4) **be'**(x, [PRED]). For activity verb, its representation logical structure is represented as (1) **do'**(x, [**PRED'**(x,y)]) and **do'**(x, [**PRED'**(x)], while *achievement* and *accomplishment* are INGR **PRED'**(x) or INGR **PRED'**(x, y) and BECOME **PRED'** (x) or BECOME **PRED'** (x,y). with the four semantic types, it is known that in Bimanese the argument structure of state verb is <agent>/<patient>/<experiencer> and

or <theme> <goal>, activity verb <agent> <patient> and or <benefaktive>, achievement <agent> and or <patient>/<experiencer>, *accomplishment* < agent>/<patient>/<experiencer>.

REFERENCES

Arafiq. 2005. "Relasi Gramatikal Konstruksi Kausatif dan Aplikatif Bahasa Bima" (tesis). Denpasar. Universitas Udayana.

Bungin, Burhan. 2003. *Analisis Data Penelitian Kualitatif*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.

Halliday, Michael A.K. 1967. *"Notes on Transitivity anf Theme in English".* Part 1. Journal of Linguistics.

Jonker, J.C.G. 1896. *Bimaneesche Spraakkunsj*. Uitgegeven door.

Kroger, Paul L. 2004. *Analyzing Syntax*: *A Lexical--Functional Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kroeger, Paul L.2005. *Analyzing Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, John. 1995. *Pengantar Teori Linguistik*. (*Soetikno*. Pentj). Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Mithun, Marrianne. 2001. *"Who shapes the record: the speaker and the linguist".* In Newman, Paul and Martha Ratliff, editors. *Linguistics Fieldwork*. First Edition. Cambridge: Cambrigde University Press.

Owens, Melanie.2000. "*Agreement in Bimanese"* (Tesis). University of Canterbury.

Sudaryanto, 1986. *Metode Linguistik*. *Ke Arah Memahami Metode Linguistik*: Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode Linguistik: Ke Arah Memahami Metode Linguistik*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Van Valin Robert D., Jr. and William A. Foley, 1980. Role and Reference Grammar dalam Moravcsik and Wirth, editors.

Van Valin, Robert D.,Jr dan Randy J. la Polla. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, Meaning, and Function.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Valin, Robert D., Jr. 2005. *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. First Edition. Cambrige: Cambrigde University Press.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Complete Name	Institution	Education	Research Interests
Made Satyawati	Udayana University	S3 (Doktor)	Linguistics Typology Syntax Discourse Analysis Ecolinguistics
I Nyoman Kardana	Warmadewa University	S3 (Doktor)	Morphology Syntax Semantics