

Morphological Causative Construction in Rote Language

Agnes Maria Diana Rafael¹

¹Program Doktor Linguistik, Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Udayana

rafaelagnesmariadianai@gmail.com

KEYWORDS

Causative verb,
Proclitic, Affixation,
Rote Language

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the study of morphology causative constructions Rote Language (RL). As a language which belongs to Austronesian language family, typologically, the morphology type of RL is an agglutinating. It is a language that has an affixation process as a strategy to form new words. The primary data in this study were written document data, such as folklore, the online article written used the language, and Bible written in RL. The secondary data are interviews, in aim to confirm the accuracy of the primary data with the linguistic intuition of RL native speakers. In the data processing process, all recorded data, either written or verbal, are observed, classified, sorted, and grouped based on the similarity of verb behavior and structure. The result of analysis shows RL uses pronoun copy system, which is a phenomenon of subject and verb agreement. The causative verbs in RL marked by the presence of pronoun copys \emptyset -, *m*-, *n*-, *l*- and *t*- and marked by the presence of prefix *aka*-. This condition is caused by the strength of the pronoun copy in attaching to more than one syntactic category. Pronoun copys also have the ability to attach to numbers of basic verbs. The construction of causative verbs as the following: pronoun copy \emptyset + prefix *aka*- becomes *aka*-, pronoun copy *m* + prefix *aka*- becomes *maka*-, pronoun copy *n*- + *aka*- becomes *naka*-, pronoun copy *l*- + prefix *aka*- becomes *laka*-, and pronoun copy *t*- + *aka*- becomes *taka*-. Hence, *aka*-, *naka*-, *laka*-, and *taka*-, will marked the verbs to form causative verbs in the language as the morphological process in forming a new causative verb in RL.

INTRODUCTION

This study discusses the causative construction in the Rote Language (abbreviated as RL). Causative construction is formed from two elements, the first element is the causer (individual or event) and the second element is the caused event (caused by causer), (Mulyadi, 2019). Each language has a unique strategy to form a causative construction, as described by (Artawa, 2004). Goddard, in (Budiarta, 2013), causative means an expression that contains an event where someone does something or causes something to happen. Comrie in Tanjung (2017:6) explains that causative constructions are grouped into types based on two parameters, they are morphosyntactic parameters and semantic parameters. The morphosyntactic parameters classify causative into three groups, they are the analytic causative, morphological causative, and lexical causative. Analytical causative is a causative that contains a separate predicate. The separate predicate is a causative construction, that can express a causal relationship, while the cause is manifested by a separate word that shows the effect. Morphological causative is a causative that displays the relationship between a non-causative predicate and a causative predicate marked with affixation. The third type of causative is lexical causative, which is a causative type in which the verb lexicon means cause and effect without being marked by affixation.

In addition to the morphosyntactic parameter, another parameter used by Comrie Tanjung (2017:6) in differentiating causative types is the semantic parameter. Based on this parameter, the causation is distinguished based on the level of control received by the cause and the close relationship between the components of cause and effect in the macro situation or the causative itself. Based on the level of control

received by the cause, Comrie Tanjung (2017:6) distinguishes causative into true causative and permissive causative. In both constructions, the cause component, in this case, the agent has control over the effect component. In true causation, the cause component has the ability to cause an effect, while in permissive causation, the cause or agent component has the ability to prevent the effect from occurring. For clarity, consider the example below. (4) Ardi RLoke his arm. (5) Ardi let the ball roll. On the one hand, Ardi's cause in sentence (4) can't do anything to avoid the consequences of his arm is RLoke, while on the other hand Ardi in sentence (5) is able to prevent the ball rolled from happening. The terms true and permissive causative used by Comrie can be equated with the term manipulative causative proposed by Shibatani.

Furthermore, Comrie, in Purwiati (2012:71) provides an understanding that in several languages in the world, the causative construction consists of three types of clauses. The clauses that Comrie meant were intransitive clauses, transitive clauses, and intransitive clauses. When the causative process occurs, there is a shift in the relation at each clause level. What is meant by grammatical relation is the relationship between the verb and the arguments that are present, because the verb is asked for its presence. Spencer (1993:268), explains that syntactically causative construction consists of a transitive clause and a bitransitive clause. Ackennan da Webelhunt proposed an approach to test a number of tests (1998: 271), in order to test whether the construction of the clause is a transitive clause, then each grammatical function must function significantly, cannot be duplicated, and the cause must be able to bind the patient from the verb. The final test is to see if the patient should take the subject position if the causative verb is passive. Typologically, causative construction is divided into three types, they are morphological causation, syntactic causation, and semantic causation, see Comrie, 1983:19-161; Elson and Pickett, 1987:103; Katamba, 1993:274).

Comrie, 1983:19-161, morphological causation is the relationship between the causative predicate and the non-causative predicate through morphological markers. Syntax causation is the relationship between two different predicates in expressing the idea of cause and the idea of effect. Semantic causation is the relationship between the idea of cause and the idea of effect that is specifically contained in one predicate. The following is an example of morphological causation in Indonesian: (a) *kucing itu mati* "the cat is dead" and (b) *Kamu mematikan kucing itu* "you killed the cat." In the construction (a), it is clear that the subject in the intransitive verb, it means the clause experiences an event as mentioned by the intransitive verb. While clause (b) shows that the intransitive verb 'mematikan' undergoes a morphological process, namely the affixation process (in this case an insertion) of two bound morphemes, they are the allomorph prefix *me-* and the suffix *-kan*. This morphological process is one of the strategies in changing the intransitive verb '*mati*' to a transitive derivative form of '*mematikan*', which presents two core arguments, which is *kamu*, that functions syntactically as the subject [SUBJ] and functions semantically as an agent. Then the next argument in construction (b) is *kucing*, which is the object and patient in construction (b). *Kamu* in the construction (b) is the causer and *kucing* is caused. The structure of the causative construction can be explained by using the theory of Government and Binding.

This article focuses on the discussion of the morphological causative construction of RL. Goddard, (1998:266), explains that morphological causation is a causative construction indicated by the relationship between non-causative and causative predicates marked by morphological devices, for example by affixation. Each language has its own way of forming a causative, therefore this study discusses RL causative construction. RL is an Austronesian family. The sentence construction of RL has some similarities with other languages in East Nusa Tenggara (ETT). RL is one of the languages spoken most in the southern part of Indonesia, precisely on the Rote Island. RL has nine variations, but it is still a unified language. Fox, in (Balukh 2008:30), explains that RL is grouped into nine dialects, they are (1) Oepao, Ringgou, and Landu dialects; (2) Bilba, Diu, and Lelenuk; (3) Korbafo; (4) Termanu, Keka, and Talae; (5) Bokai; (6) Baa and Loleh; (7) Dengka and Lelain; (8) Thie; and (9) Oenale and Delha. RL is used in the Central Rote sub-district, precisely in Nusak Termanu, Nusak Keka and Nusak Talae. Typologically morphologically, RL belongs to agglutination language, which is a language family that has a word formation system by an affixation process. From the morpholexical process, there is a change

in the lexical form of morphemes in RL, for example the morpheme *sopu* “hunt,” which is an active verb morpheme, when it has been attached by prefix *mana-*, becomes *manasopu*. *Manasopu* ‘hunter,’ is a morpheme belongs to noun class category, so it has an impact on changing word classes, from verbs to nouns. Therefore, the study of the RL morphological causative construction is very interesting to study, with the aim of finding out what morphological processes are contained in the RL causative predicate construction. A language causative construction has been studied by many researchers with the object of studying is the local languages in Indonesia, however the causative construction in RL has never been studied by other researchers, therefore this study was conducted to examine the RL causative construction.

METHOD

The primary data in this study were written document data, such as folklore, the online article written used the language, and Bible written in RL. The secondary data are interviews, in aim to confirm the accuracy of the primary data with the linguistic intuition of RL native speakers. In the data processing process, all recorded data, either written or verbal, are observed, classified, sorted, and grouped based on the similarity of verb behavior and structure. The data analysis will be conducted by applying the distributional method whose determining tool lies in the structure of the verb argument. Suppose the number of arguments in the causative construction is explained based on the behavior of the verb that requires the presence of the number of arguments. Furthermore, the types of RL affixation that form causative verbs are determined and explained for mutation in grammatical function, the ability of the causer to bind caused from transitive and bitransitive verbs. Furthermore, insertion and permutation techniques are applied to see changes grammatical functions in causative constructions, so that they can identify the behavior of causative verbs whether they can move the subject arguments in basic construction to object arguments in derivation constructions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Verbal clauses can be distinguished based on the presence of arguments, especially the core arguments that require a verb, for instance: (1) intransitive clauses which are clauses that require a core argument and (2) transitive clauses which are clauses consisting of two or more core arguments, (Arka, et al. 2007). The following shows the marking process in forming the causative construction in RL, which can change the intransitive verb into transitive verb.

1. Marking Proclitic Θ + Prefix *-aka-* + Suffix *-k*

The basic transitive construction is a clause construction whose verb binds two main arguments. Consider the following data which is a RL verbal construction whose predicate is a transitive verb.

(01) *Au tatongo ndia nai Kupang*
1SG meet 3SG PREP Kupang
“I met him in Kupang”

(02) *Au Θ akatatongok ana ndia no silala nai Kupang*
1SG prok-Pref--Suf child 3TG with 3PL-Enk PREP Kupang
“I took the boy to met them in Kupang”

In general, it can be said that the term valence in linguistics is referred to the ability of a verb, which occupies the predicate element of a sentence, in interpreting an argument. Aisen (in Hopper and Thompson, ed., 1982:8) suggests that valence is used to refer to the number of nominal arguments in a clause at any level.

From data (01) it can be seen that the verb *tatongo* 'meet' is a two-valence verb that can present two core arguments, which are *au* 'I' which functions as a subject (SUBJ) and *ndia* 'he/she' which functions as an object (OBJ). SUBJ *au* at the semantic level is the actor while he is semantically the goal. Meanwhile, *nai Kupang* 'in Kupang' is oblique (OBL) which is a complement that refers to the location of the action of the verb.

Meanwhile, in the data construction (02), the verb *tatonggo* turns into a causative verb, after being marked by proclitic *a-* (the proclitic type for the pronoun *au* 'saya', it shows that RL is a language that recognizes the agreement between the subject and the verb, then followed by with the prefix *-aka-* to mark the causative verb RL. From the construction of the verb (02), it can be explained that the verb *θakatatonggok* 'to make someone meet' is a causative verb, where the main argument is SUBJ *au* 'I' which acts as an agent and as a causer who took *ana ndia* 'the male child' who plays as the patient (caused) to meet *sila* 'them,' in Kupang (*nai Kupang*).

2. Marking Proclitic *m+* Prefix *-aka-* + Suffix *-k*

The following construction is a clause construction with the adjective *sufu* 'cold' as the predicate. *Sufu* 'cold' is an adjective, but it can occupy the predicate position in the RL predicate construction.

(03) *au kama esa sufu.*
ISG bedroom one cold
"my bedroom is cold"

(04) *ami makasufuk ami kama ndia no AC*
1PL Prok-pref-cold-Suf 1PL bedroom 2SG CONJ AC
'We made our bedroom to be cold by using AC'

Data the construction (03) is a construction with an adjective act as the predicate of the intransitive clause. The verb *sufu* can only bind one core argument, that is *ami* 'we' functions as SUBJ. While in the data construction (04) the predicate *sufu* 'cold' which is an adjective that transform into the predicate to form a causative verb *makasufuk* 'to make something to be cold.' The verb '*makasufuk*' presents two main arguments, they are *ami* 'we' which is the causer and *kama ndia* 'our bedroom' as the caused. To form the verb *makasufuk*, the proclitic *m-* must be added in the beginning of the causative verb, and the proclitic should be agreed with the pronoun. After, the proclitic, the prefix *-aka-* attached comes before the base predicate *sufu* and the suffix *-k* will be placed at the end of the construction.

3. Marking Proclitic *na* + Partial Reduplication *la-* +Prefix *-aka-* + Suffix *-k*

The following data is a construction of the verb *laa* 'fly' which is an intransitive verb that only binds one core argument, that is SUBJ *manupui kaa esa* 'a crow.' The verb *laa* 'to fly' can be transformed into a causative verb *nakalalaak* 'to make something to fly' which binds two core arguments, that are *ndia* 'he' who is SUBJ and the causer of the act of flying or releasing a crow-*manupui kaa esa* flying into the air. Causative construction *nakalalaak* is formed from the proclitic marking *n-* which copies the pronoun, after that it is marked by the prefix *-aka-*, then marked by reduplication of some of the initial syllables of the basic morpheme of the verb *laa*. After the verb *laa* 'to fly,' then the suffix *-s* is added, as a final marker to form the causative verb *nakalalaak* 'to fly.

(05) *manapui kaa esa laa*
Bird crow one fly
'a crow is flying'

(06) *ndia nakalalaak manupui kaa esa*
2SG Prok-Pref-Redpar-fly-Suf bird crow one
“He make a crow fly to the air”

4. Marking Proclitic *la-* +Prefik *-aka-* + Sufik + *-k*

From the construction of the verb data (07) *luku* 'bow down', it is clear that the construction is an intransitive verb construction which only presents one core argument. The verb *luku* turns into a causative verb in the form of a transitive verb *lakalukuk* 'to put one self-down,' which presents two core arguments, that are *ala* 'they' which functions as SUBJ, and *sila-la* 'them,' which functions as OBJ. The construction of the causative verb *lakalukuk* 'to put one self-down,' is formed from the proclitic marker *la-* which copies the pronoun *ala* 'they' and then marked by the causative marker *-aka-* which is a prefix. Furthermore, after the base predicate *luku* 'wound,' is ended by the suffix *-k*, which is also a quasi-suffix marker. Thus, the predicate *luku* 'wound,' turns into the verb *lakalukuk* 'to put one self-down,' which is a causative verb.

(07) *Ala laluku*
3PL Prok-bow down
“They membungkuk

(08) *Ala lakalukuk sila-la*
3SG Prok-Pref-down-Suf they-Enk
“They put their self down”

5. Marking Proclitic *ta* +Prefik *-aka-* + Sufik + *-k*

From the construction in data (09) *da'di* 'become', it is clear that the construction is a transitive verb, which presents two one argument, that is *ita* 'we,' while *mae* 'shy' is a complementary argument to the subject, which must be present so that the construction that can be accepted. Meanwhile, in the data (10) below, it appears that the verb *da'dik* 'become' is changed to the verb *takada'dik* 'to create' which is a causative verb in the form of a transitive verb, which presents two main arguments, *ita* 'they' which function as SUBJ, and *mei tutuna hohotuk* 'offering table' which serves as OBJ. The construction of the causative verb *nakada'dik* 'to create,' is formed from the proclitic marker *ta-* which copies the inclusive pronoun *ita* 'we' and then marked by the causative marker *-aka-* which is a prefix. Furthermore, after the basic verb *da'di* 'become,' is ended by the suffix marker *-k*, which is also a quasi-suffix marker. Thus, the verb *da'di* 'become,' turns into a causative verb *nakada'dik* 'to create,' which means to create something from nothing into presence.

(09) *Boema ita da'di mae*
Then 1PL be shy
“We are shy”

(10) *Boema ita nakada'dik mei tutunu hohotuk fo Manetualain.*
Then 1Sg Prok-Pref-be-Suf tabel burn roast for God
“Then, we make a worshipping table for God”

CONCLUSION

Causative construction in RL can be formed through a morphological process, in this case through adding proclitic, an affixation process, and reduplication. Based on the results of the research and discussion, it can

be concluded that the morphological causative construction of RL can be formed by marking the pronoun copy or proclitic *a-* which copies the pronoun *au* 'I', proclitic *ma-* which copies the pronoun *ami* 'you,' proclitic *na-* which copies the pronoun *ndia* 'he/she,' proclitic *la-* which copies the pronoun *ala* 'them,' and proclitic *ta-* which copies the pronoun *ita* 'we.' After attaching the proclitic that is adjusted to the SUBJ agreement, the causative verb will get the prefix *-aka-* before the presence of RL base verbs. The next stage of forming causative verbs is by adding the suffix *-k*, which appears after the presence of the basic verb. The construction of RL causative verbs is also formed without a partial reduplication process as contained in data (01), (02), (04), (05), (07), (08), (09) and (10), but also, it can occur through the process of reduplication of some of the initial syllables in the basic verb morpheme. If the RL causative verb formation process occurs with the insertion of a partial reduplication process, the construction will be like this: Proclitic + Prefix *-aka-* + Partial Reduplication + Basic Verb + Suffix *-k*, the example of the insertion of partial reduplication can be seen in data (03) and data (06).

REFERENCES (HEADING 1 STYLE)

- A Asridayani, 2017. "Analisis Konstruksi Kausatif Verbal Dialek Batak Toba Di Kabupaten Bungo Provinsi Jambi." *Krinok Jurnal Linguistik Budaya* Vol 2, No 2.
- Ackennan Da Webelhunt Proposed an Approach To Test A Number Of Tests (1998: 271),
- Goddard, Cliff. 1998. *Semantic Analysis – A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Artawa, I Ketut. 2004. *Balinese Language: A Typological Description*. Denpasar: CV. Bali Media Adhikarsa
- Balukh, Jermy. 2008. Pembentukan Verba Nana- -K Dalam Bahasa Rote: Antara Pasif Dan Antikausatif. *Linguistika* Vol. 15 No. 29 Hal. 257-275.
- Blake, Barry J. 1990. *Relational Grammar*. London: Routledge
- Comrie, B. 1983, 1989. *Language Universal and Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Budiarta, I Wayan. 2013. *Tipologi Sintaksis Bahasa Kemak (Disertasi)*. Denpasar: Program Pascasarjana Universitas Udayana
- Comrie, Bernard. 1983, 1989. *Linguistics Universals and Linguistics Typology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher Limited
- Elson, B, Dan V. Pickett. 1987. *Beginning Morphologi and Synrax*. Texas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Goddard, Cliff. 1998. *Semantic Analysis – A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Ibnu Ajan H Dan Mulyadi, 2019 "Kontruksi Kausatif Dalam Bahasa Mandailing: Kajian Tipologi Sintaksis 318 Konstruksi Kausatif Dalam Bahasa Mandailing: Kajian Tipologi Sintaksis" *NUSA*, Vol. 14 No. 3
- Katamba, Francis. 1995. *Morphology*. Kent: Mac Keys of Chatam PLC.
- Mulyadi. 2009. "Kalimat Koordinasi Bahasa Indonesia: Sebuah Ancangan Tipologi Sintaksis", *Logat Medan: USU*, 3 (2): 61-72.
- Purwiati, LA. M. 1999 "Klausa Intransitif Bahasa Bali Sebuah Kajian Tipologi Bahasa Teis Program Studi Magister Linguistik, Universitas Udayana.

Rafael, Agnes Maria Diana, (2022). Morphological Causative Construction in Rote Language. *STRUKTURAL (Seminar on Translation, Applied Linguistics, Literature, and Cultural Studies)*. 1(1), 51–57.

Shibatani, Masayoshi (Ed.). 1976. *Syntax and Semantics: The Grammar of Causative Construction*. New York: Academic Press.

Spencer, A. 1993. *Morphological Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.