



Classification of Munanese Verbs

AUTHORS INFO

La Alu
Universitas Sembilanbelas November Kolaka
alulaalu123@gmail.com
+6281245578274

ARTICLE INFO

ISSN: 2548-222X
Vol. 2, No. 1, June 2017
URL: <http://usnsj.com/index.php/JILEL/article/view/2.1.29-35>

© 2017 JILEL All rights reserved

Abstract

This study aimed to reveal the facts of language, especially related to the classification of Munanese verbs. Based on the semantic type of argument of Munanese verbs so can be classified into stative verbs, process verbs, and action verbs. The semantic stative verb type has at least one core argument and a maximum of two core arguments. The stative argument of a stative object is an argument that states nouns as entities that have a particular state or trait. The process verb is a verb that semantically denotes a process of entity change that occurs in the object argument (O). Argument O is tangible animate noun like human, animal, plant, and other nouns that are familiar in human life. The action verb as a verb expressing a causative event involves two events, namely: the event that causes something and the second is the result of the first event.

Keywords: Munanese verbs, stative verbs, process verbs, action verbs

A. Introduction

Grammar Case has several versions. Fillmore arranges the basic rules of Grammar Case with the explanation that the sentence consists of propositional and modalities. Propositional is the relationship of verbs (predicates) to a number of cases marked by nouns which are then called cases. In other words, propositional cases are bound by verbs and their presence is not optional. The case consists of *Agentive*, *Experiencer*, *Benefactive*, *Instrumental*, *Object*, *Locative*, *Source*, *Goal*, dan *Time* (Fillmore, 1971:42).

Chafe (1970:163) presents seven cases, namely *Agent*, *Experiencer*, *Beneficiary*, *Patient*, *Complement*, *Location*, and *Instrumental*. From both of TBK's expert opinion above, Cook modified the case *patient* and *complement* from Chafe becomes object for Fillmore. From the modifications made, Cook uses only five cases, namely *Agent*, *Experiencer*, *Beneficiary*, *Object*, and *Locative* (AEBOL) (Cook, 1989:125).

Based on the semantic type of argument of Munanese verbs so can be classified into stative verbs, process verbs, and action verbs. The semantic stative verb type has at least one core argument and a maximum of two core arguments. The stative argument of a stative object is an argument that states nouns as entities that have a particular state or trait. The Os argument is

grammatically unlikely to occupy the function of the subject. Stative verbs state four basic points, namely cognition, knowledge, emotion, and perception. Stative verbs that express cognition, such as verb *lentu* 'to count', verbs that express knowledge, for example, the verbs *fahamu* 'to understand', *pandehao* 'to recognize', *limpu* 'to forget', emotional verbs such as verb *koghendu* 'shocked', and verbs of perception e.g verbs *ghondo* 'to see', *parakisaa* 'to check'.

The process verb is a verb that semantically denotes a process of entity change that occurs in the object argument (O). Argument O is tangible animate noun like human, animal, plant, and other nouns are familiar in human life. The change of entity of argument O takes place intentionally or unintentionally. The change of entity argument O inadvertently takes place on a verb in the physical process, for example in a verb *nokamukula* 'getting older, *norangku* 'getting younger'. Changes in non-animate noun entities processed intentionally, for example on the verb *noseke* 'getting narrow', *nolalesa* 'getting wide', *nobhala* 'getting bigger', *noringke* 'getting charred'. The process of entity change in this argument is done intentionally to produce the desired condition. The entity change in an argument occurs because of the effectors involvement of human nouns. Generally the argument for the verb process of the Muna language is the non-animated noun.

The action verb as a verb expressing a causative event involves two events, namely: the event that causes something and the second is the result of the first event. The first event states something done by ... and the second event is something that happens to The action verb expresses three important points namely, movement, speech, and displacement. Verb action movements for example *kala* 'to go', *wanu* 'to wake up', *ghondohi* 'to find', *uta* 'to pluck', *bhogha* 'to split', Verbs of speech acts for example *kamunti* 'to whisper', *tola* 'to call', *fetingke* 'to hear', *feena* 'to admonish', and locative action verbs such as *ala* 'to take', *turu* 'to drip', *kambeti* 'to splatter', *suli* 'to comeback', *hobha* 'to pour'.

The problem in this paper is "How is the classification of Munanese verbs?" In general this research aimed to reveal facts linguistic especially related to the classification of Munanese verbs. The expected benefit in this research is the documentation of classification of Munanese verbs. The theory used in this research is Case Theory of Cook (1989).

B. Findings and Discussion

1. Classification of Munanese Verbs

Based on the semantic type of argument of Munanese verbs, so it can be classified into stative verbs, process verbs, and action verbs. The classification of the Munanese verbs can be explained in detail as follows.

a. Stative verbs

Cook (1989:135) explains the stative verb is a verb that states condition (stative) and requires a stative object. Stative verbs have characteristics, that is (1) cannot be used in command sentences, and (2) cannot be used in progressive aspects. The two features of the above stative verbs expressed by Cook (1989) fit the attributes attached to the Munanese stative verbs that can be seen in the following examples.

a. *Inodi aoha*

I 1T thirsty
'I am thirsty'

b. *Inodi aogharo*

I 1T hungry
'I am hungry'

c. *Inodi aokesa*

I 1T beautiful
'I am beautiful'

The stative verbs *aoha* 'thirsty', *aogharo* 'hungry', and *aokesa* 'beautiful' declared a state owned by the argument *Inodi* 'personal noun'. The stative verbs *aoha*, *aogharo*, and *aokesa* declare a state owned by human nouns or noun phrases (man). This stative verb has semantically one core argument, argument O. The object argument as the case of Os. The Munanese stative verbs in its birth structure does not have a special marker that indicates a

state or stative. Subject marker **ao** on the phrases **aoaha**, **aogharo**, and **aokesa** grammatically implies 'in a state of'. Subject marker **ao** is positioned before the stative verb and serves to affirm the state of the argument (human).

Munanese stative verbs have only two of the above characteristics namely, the Munanese stative verbs **aoaha**, **aogharo**, and **aokesa** cannot be used to form process verbs. The formation of meaningful stative verbs into meaningful verbs of the process must replace the subject function of a first singular person (*inodi*) became the first dualist subject function (*intaidi*) with subject marker **dao**. The subject marker **dao** grammatically serves to express the meaning of the process of the occurrence of a state change in the argument (noun). To test whether a verb is a process verb, then there are two ways that can be done. First, the way proposed by Chafe (1970: 100). He explains that a verb is a process verb if the verb can be the answer to the question "what happened to N?" (N is an entity). Second, the way that Lakoff puts it (1966). According to him, a verb is a verb process if it can be preceded by an adverb of time **being**. The change in the meaning of a stative verb to a meaningful verb of process can be explained in the following clause example.

- d. *Intaidi* **daoaha**
we both 1Dls thirsty
'We are both thirsty'
- e. *Intaidi* **daogharo**
we both 1Dls hungry
'We are both hungry'
- f. *Intaidi* **daokesa**
we both 1Dls beautiful
'We are both beautiful'

Argument *intaidi* 'we' is a noun that undergoes a process of changing the entity of a given state proceeding into another state. On verbs **daoaha** 'getting thirsty' contains the process meaning from unthirsty processed to thirsty, verbs **daogharo** 'getting hungry' contains the meaning of the process of be not hungry processed to getting hungry, and verbs **daokesa** 'getting beautiful' contains the meaning of the process of be not beautiful proceed to be beautiful. The process of altering entities undergone by the argument in the above verb is implicitly acting as an effector which cannot be expressed in the physical structure of the clause. In the above stative verb shows the correspondence between the meanings of verbs with the noun identity that becomes the argument, namely the personal noun.

b. Verbs of process

The process verb shows or declares a change in the entity object (Cook, 1989: 135). Process verbs in Munanese have characteristics, that is (1) can be used in command sentences; (2) can answer the question what happened to the subject; and (3) can be used with progressive aspects. Thus, the process verb describes a change of entity from one state to another. The characteristics of the Munanese process verbs can be explained in the following examples.

- a. *Q* *kambulu* **noleu**
Determiner vegetable 3T withered
'The vegetable is getting withered'
- b. *Q* *pinda* **nobhogha**
Determiner plate 3T broken
'The plate is broken'
- c. *Q* *karambau* **norombu**
Determiner buffalo 3T fat
'The buffalo is getting fatter'

The verbs *leu* 'getting withered', *bhogha* 'broken', *rombu* 'getting fatter' in the above clause is a process verb that denotes a change in the entity that the argument encounters *kambulu* 'vegetable', *pinda* 'plate', and argument *karambau* 'buffalo'. The process of changing the entity that the noun suffers as an argument to the above verb takes place naturally or not deliberately. The process of entity change occurring in the verb argument in the above clause is implicitly acting as an effector. Process verbs **noleu** implicitly acting as an effector is the sun. The process verb **nobhogha** implicitly acting as an effector is the man. The process verb **norombu** implicitly acting as an effector is the food. Further testing of the meaning of the process in the above verbs

can be done by giving the causative subject marker with the grammatical element expansion technique as in the following example.

- d. *Amaku* *nefekaleu* *kambulu*
 my father 3T Prep CAUS withered vegetable
 'My father withers the vegetables'
- e. *Wa Ani* *nebhogha* *pinda*
 wa Ani 3T CAUS break plate
 'Wa Ani breaks the plate'
- f. *Inaku* *nefekarombu* *karambau*
 my mother 3T Prep CAUS fat buffalo
 'My mother fattens the buffalo'

Affixing the causative subject marker *nefeka*, *ne* and the expansion of the grammatical element in the process verb confirms the verb position above as a process verb. The causative subject marker *nefeka*, and *ne* in the above clause gives value to the position of each argument in the physical structure. Verbs of the causative process *nefekaleu* plainly declaring that the role of effector is *Amaku*. Verbs of the causative process *nebhogha* requires the argument tangible personal noun who acts as an effector that is *Wa Ani*. Verbs of the causative process *nefekarombu* requires an argument in the form of personal noun *Inaku* which acts as an effector. The process of changing the object argument entity in the clause (d) *kambulu* 'vegetable' processed to getting withered, (e) *pinda* 'plate' processed to be broken, and (f) *karambau* 'bufflo' processed to getting fatter done intentionally.

Another characteristic of the Munanese process verbs is that it can be used to form imperative sentences while still using the same sentence construct. The derivative sentence derived from process verbs can be done by dissolving the subject or the agent. This can be explained in the following example.

- g. *Fekaleu* *kambulu* *itu*
 withering vegetable that
 'Withering that vegetable!'
- h. *Bhogha* *pinda* *ini*
 breaking plate this
 'Breaking this plate!'
- i. *Fekarombu* *karambau* *itu*
 fattening buffalo that
 'Fattening that buffalo!'

The normal construction of the above command sentences can be simplified into a simpler form by deleting an object argument. The construction of the Munanese command sentences that are subjected to an object argument can be seen in the following example.

- j. *Fekaleu!* (deletion O)
 withering!
 'Please withering!'
- k. *Bhogha!* (deletion O)
 breaking!
 'Please breaking!'
- l. *Fekarombu!* (deletion O)
 fattening!
 'Please fattening!'

Despite these arguments object deletion and deletion markers in the subject argument physical imperative sentence structure of the Munanese does not give effect to the semantic value of the verb semantically. Munanese process verbs can also be used in progressive aspects by inserting progressive marker *nando*. The progressive marker *nando* is positioned before *nefeka*, and *ne*. The marker *nando* grammatically serves to declare a process in progress on the argument. An imperative sentence with the use of markers *nando* can be explained in the following example.

- m. *Amaku* *nando* *nefekaleu* *kambulu*
 my father Progressive 3T Prep CAUS withered vegetable
 'My father is withering the vegetable'

- n. *Wa Ani nando nebhogha pinda*
 wa ani Progressive 3T CAUS break plate
 'Wa Ani is breaking the plate'
- o. *Inaku nando nefekarombu karambau*
 my mother Progressive 3T Prep CAUS fat buffalo
 'My mother is fattening the buffalo'

The progressive sentences m, n, and o can be simplified by deleting an object argument as in the following example.

- p. *Nando nefekaleu* (deletion O)
 Progressive 3T Prep withered
 'being withering'
- q. *Nando nebhogha* (deletion O)
 Progressive 3T break
 'being breaking'
- r. *Nando nefekarombu* (deletion O)
 Progressive 3T Pref fat
 'being fattening'

c. Verbs of Action

The action verb is a verb expressing activity. The action verb expresses the activity of a noun or a noun phrase as an argument. Verbs of action in a minimal logical structure include one core argument and a maximum of three core arguments. The argument in question is (1) a noun or noun phrase that acts as an agent (actor); (2) in the form of nouns or noun phrases that act as objects of action; and (3) in the form of noun or phrase which acts as location of action or location of destination.

Noun or noun phrase that is likely to be the actor or producer of action is an animated noun. Nouns or noun phrases that are likely to be recipients of action are animated nouns. Nouns or noun phrases that act as location are animated and non-animated nouns. Munanese action verbs have characteristics, namely (1) can be used in command sentences, (2) can be used in progressive aspects. The features of the Munanese action verbs can be explained by the following example.

- a. *Inodi aeala sau*
 I 1T take wood
 'I take wood'
- b. *Inodi aeseli kantobha*
 I 1T dig hole
 'I dig hole'
- c. *Inodi aebasa boku*
 I 1T read book
 'I read book'
- d. *Inodi aeburi sura*
 I 1T write letter
 'I write letter'

The verbs *aeala* 'to take', *aeseli* 'to dig', *aebasa* 'to read', and *aeburi* 'to write' is an action verb that has two core arguments, i.e. *inodi* 'I' as the agent argument (A) and *sau* 'wood', *kantobha* 'hole', *boku* 'book', and *sura* 'letter' as object argument (O). Munanese action verbs can form a command sentence without giving special pointers. The Munanese has no imperative markers. The relationship between agent argument (A) and argument (O) is characterized by the use of intonation in uttering a sentence as in the following example.

- e. *Pina ala sau itu*
 pina take wood that
 'Pina, take that wood!'
- f. *Ani seli kantobha*
 ani dig hole
 'Ani, dig a hole!'
- g. *Lina basa boku*
 lina read book

'Lina, red that book!

- h. *Uri buri sura*
 uri write letter
 'Uri, write a letter!'

The construction of the command phrase in the above example can be simplified by deleting Agent arguments as in the following example.

- i. *Ala sau itu* (deleting A)
 take wood that
 'Take that wood!'
- j. *Seli kantobha itu* (deleting A)
 dig hole that
 'Dig that hole!'
- k. *Basa boku itu* (deleting A)
 read book that
 'Read that book!'
- l. *Buri sura itu* (deleting A)
 write letter that
 'Write that letter!'

The Munanese command sentence has a simpler variation in its physical structure by deleting argument A and argument O as seen in the following example.

- m. *Ala* (deletion A and O)
 take
 'Take it!'
- n. *Seli* (deletion A and O)
 dig
 'Dig it!'
- o. *Basa* (deletion A and O)
 read
 'Read it!'
- p. *Buri* (deletion A and O)
 write
 'Write it!'

The Munanese action verbs can be used on the progressive aspect by inserting progressive markers *nando* (Progressive) before verb. The relationship between verbs and arguments is marked by the use of marker *nando* which is positioned after the noun (argument). The relationship between the verb and the marker required to produce a progressive sentence can be explained in the following example.

- q. *Pina nando neala sau*
 pina Progressive 3Take wood
 'Pina is taking wood'
- r. *Ani nando neseli kantobha*
 ani Progressive 3T dig hole
 'Ani digging hole'
- s. *Lina nando nebasa boku*
 lina Progressive 3T read book
 'Lina is reading book'
- t. *Uri nando neburi sura*
 uri Progressive 3T write letter
 'Uri is writing letter'

C. Conclusion

Munanese verbs can be classified into stative verbs, process verbs, and action verbs. The semantic stative verb type has at least one core argument and a maximum of two core arguments. The stative argument of a stative object is an argument that states nouns as entities that have a particular state or trait. The process verb is a verb that semantically denotes a

process of entity change that occurs in the object argument (O). Argument O is tangible animate noun like human, animal, plant, and other nouns that are familiar in human life. The action verb as a verb expressing a causative event involves two events, namely: the event that causes something and the second is the result of the first event. The first event states something done by ... and the second event is something that happens to ...

D. References

- Chafe, W.L. (1970). *Meaning and the Structure of Language*. London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cook, W.A. (1989). *Case Grammar Theory*. Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press.
- Fillmore, C.J. (1971). "The Case for Case". Dalam E. Bach dan R.T. Harms (eds) *Universal in Liguistik Theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart Winston.
- Lakoff, G. (1966). Stative Adjectives and Verbs in English. In *Report NSF-17*, Harvard Computation Lab.