CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTION OF ACEHNESE LANGUAGE: A TYPOLOGICAL APPROACH

Neni Umar, Mulyadi, Nurlela
University of Sumatera Utara
Medan, Indonesia
E-mail: neni.umar@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study discusses causative construction in Acehnese language typologically. The problems studied were (1) the type of causative construction based on formal parameters, and (2) the type of causative construction based on semantic parameters. Research data, both oral and written, were obtained by instrument through syntactic questionnaire. All data was analyzed by *padan* and *agih* methods, served with formal and informal methods. The results of the study showed that, based on formal parameters, causative construction of Aceh language consists of morphological causative, and lexical causative; based on semantic parameters, causative construction of Aceh language is analytic causative. This construction was produced by combination of clause and conjunction '*kerna*' or '*seubap*'; using analytical causative verb '*peugot*' and '*geuyu*'; morphological causative affixes '*meu-*', '*peu-*' and '*seu-*'; and using certain lexical causative in which they have causative meaning.

1. Introduction

Language is an important communication tool in expressing ideas through speaking and writing. A language must meet the communication requirements in order to avoid misunderstandings in communication. Errors occurring in the communication are categorized as language problems. This should be noted by language users and language researchers. Various researches have been done regarding micro and macro linguistics on a philosophical and theoretical basis such as Comrie (1983) and Song (2001) focusing on typology.

Comrie (1983) developed a cross-language study that led to the generalization and grouping of languages. It is a new study called linguistic typology. This model of study offers a new dimension and contributes to the field of linguistic typology studies. The study classifies language based on certain types relating to the universality and grammatical characteristics across languages. The domain of studies that includes linguistic typology is the sequence of words, case sharpening, grammatical relations, relative clauses, subjects, causative constructions, ergativity--accusativity, semantic roles, valence change and morphological-syntactic typology.

The Indonesian local languages have their own uniqueness and distinctiveness relating to linguistic typology. It is necessary to conduct careful and earnest research because of the multitude of grammatical characteristics of these local languages. This is a very interesting and important study to be done in order to preserve local languages.

Acehnese language is the largest local language in Aceh province, Indonesia. The speakers of this language are almost evenly distributed throughout the districts of Aceh Utara and Lhokseumawe, Bireuen, Pidie and Aceh Besar. The Aceh language (BA) is one of the rich vocabulary languages. Several studies on linguistic typology have been conducted by various linguists and researchers but to the best of the author's knowledge no research done earlier was related to causative construction. Based on this, the authors will try to study the causative construction in Aceh language. This study will examine the Aceh language by describing the causative situation itself.

The purpose of this study is to discuss and explain the causative constructions of Aceh language. Theoretically, this research is useful for enriching the literature of linguistic knowledge, especially the field of grammatical typology. The typology approach used in this study is a reference for other studies in classifying languages based on certain types. In addition, this study also became a reference material in recognizing the uniqueness of Aceh language, especially in the syntactic level. This is considered necessary to suffice the lack of research conducted on the syntax of Acehnese language.

The practical benefits of this research are the preparation of Aceh language teaching books, both in formal and informal education institutions. In addition, this research is useful as a source of information and references for further research and as a comparison material to conduct further studies so as to enrich the literature of social studies; language, culture, and environment of Indonesia.

2. Literature Review

Kridalaksana (2001: 61) states that causative sentence is concerned with the act (verb) that causes a state or event. He cited the sentence "*mereka menggiatkan gerakan pramuka*". The meaning of Indonesian confix *me-kan* in the sentence is causative.

Causative construction as part of a grammatical typology study is an interesting topic. This is based on several reasons; first, the construction has convergence with other disciplines, such as philosophy and anthropology (Comrie, 1983: 158). Second, the construction has two components or events in forming a situation that expresses the relationship between the cause (an individual or an event) and a cause (an event caused by a causative) (see Comrie, 1983: 158; Song, 2001: 257) which contains the structure of the argument from the causative predicate in the cause. Third, the construction indicates the involvement of formal syntax and semantic analysis (Comrie, 1983: 159).

Causative constructs formation is related to the relation of meaning, grammatical functions, and also the valence contained in the language. A typology review causative construction of BA has not been mentioned at all. Therefore, the urgency of this research is related to (1) the specificity of causative constructions as typology studies, and (2) the peculiarities of BA as a language that has its own grammar system.

This research is based on the theory of language typology, especially causative construction. Generally, causative construction is a construction which expresses a complex macro situation containing two micro situations or events consisting of (1) the causer causing an event to occur and (2) an event occurring or a result arising (caused) from a cause of action (causee) (Shibatani [ed.] 1976: 239; Comrie, 1983: 330; and Song, 2001: 253). Shibatani distinguishes the causative formation into two kinds, namely the productive causative and the lexical causative. The productive causative is the causative that is formed into a causative verb such as *make* and *cause* in English or by using a morphological marker of affix. The lexical causative is the causative expressed by a lexicon without any productive

process. The lexicon can express a causal relationship at once. The causative situation encompasses two components of the situation namely 'cause' and 'effect', these two micro-situations combine to form complex macro situations, causative situations (Comrie, 1983: 158).

Causative construction is an expression of complex macro situations consisting of two micro situations, i.e. (i) causal events (causer) doing something to produce a different event (event effect); (ii) events resulting from causer causes action or changes in circumstances due to causative action (Song, 2001: 257-258). For example,

(1).   Elizabeth(**Causer**) makes the chef(**causee**) eating leftover food.

Each language has a different grammatical construction in revealing the causative. However, it is cross-language that the equivalence of causative constructions can be expressed syntactically and analytically (see Comrie, 1983: 159). This is what causes the causative type distribution based on formal parameters and semantic parameters.

Formal Parameter, Comrie (1983) classified causatives based on formal parameters, namely the lexical causative, the morphological causative, and the analytic causative which is called causative periphrasis. These parameters are similar to the division of Goddard (1998) and Song (2001). Further, Shibatani (1976) stated that the analytic causative (periphrasis) is a bi-clausal construction, whereas the morphological causative and lexical causative are mono-clausal constructions. On the other hand, based on semantic parameters, the causative is distinguished by the level of control received by the cause and the proximity between causer and causee in macro situations (Comrie, 1983: 164). Accordingly, Song (2001: 278) stated that among the three types, the lexical causative occupies the shortest distance in connecting causer and causee, while the other two types are in positions thereafter.

Payne (2002: 176) revealed that almost all causatives in English use separate causative verbs, such as *make, cause, force,* and *compel*. For example,

(2).   I caused   John to   go.
         1TG TOP V-KAUS   John Prep AKT-go.

The cause component of example (2) is marked by the caused verb which explicitly explains that I did something to John and the resultant component is explicitly marked by the *go* predicate on *John to go*. So in an analytic causative construct, cause *I did something to John's* cause that led to *John's* consequence *to go* explicitly in the structure. Thus, morpho-syntactically, the analytic causative cannot be said to be a valence addition operation, but it can be interpreted semantically (Payne, 2002: 177).

The next type is morphological causative. This Causative reflects the relationship between the non-causative predicate and the causative predicate that is marked by the morphological device, for example by affixation (Comrie, 1983: 159). Consider the following example.

(3) a. *Palka   slomala-s'.*
        The stick-TOP AKT-broke.
        'The stick was broken'.
   b. *Tanja   slomala   palku.*
        Tanja-TOP AKT-broke-KAUS the stick.
        'Tanja broke the stick'.

In morphologic causative construction, the seeming component is merely the causative component (*Tanja slomala palku*), whereas the consequent component does not appear explicitly (*Palka slomala-s'*). The meaning that *Tanja does something so the stick is broken*; stick is contained in the *slomala* causative verbs.

In contrast to other types, morphologic causatives involve changes in the form of verbs. In addition to the derivative verbs, morphologic causatives can be formed using affixes. As in Turkish (Altaic), it has two very productive causative morphologic forms using the suffix *-dIr* (and its allomorphs) and *-t* (Payne, 2002: 176).

The last type is the lexical causative. This causative is the causative that is expressed by a lexicon without going through any productive process. The lexicon can independently state a causal relationship at once. Comrie (1983: 159) gives the following example.

(4) Jhon   killed   Bill.
       Jhon PAS-bunuh-KAUS Bill-TOP.

In example (4) the micro situations in the lexical causative construction are poured in one instance. The cause and effect components can be interpreted from the causative verb itself, i.e. *kill*. The two events in sentence (11) are 'John killing Bill' as the explicitly causal component and 'Bill dies' can be understood as an effect component although not explicitly stated. So, the meaning that *John did something so that Bill died* was covered in a causative *kill* verb.

According to Payne (2002: 179), almost all languages have a lexical causative. There are three lexical causative subtypes:

No change in verb
Non-causative: The vase broke.
Causative: Macbeth broke the vase (=Macbeth caused the vase to break)
Some idiosyncratic change in verb
Non-causative: The tree fell (Verb = to fall)
Causative: Bunyan felled the tree (Verb = to fell)
Different verb
Non-causative: Stephanie ate the beans.
Causative: Gilligan fed Stephanie beans.
Non-causative: Lucretia died.
Causative: Gloucester killed Lucretia.

Comrie (1983: 164) distinguished causative types based on semantic parameters. This semantic parameter distinguishes causative based on the level of control received by the cause and the proximity between the causer and the causee in the macro or causative situation itself. Based on the level of control received by the causee, Comrie (1983: 165) distinguished true causative and permissive causative. In both of these constructions, the causer - in this case the agent - has control over the occurrence or effect of the causee. In the true causative, the causer only has the ability to cause effect to the causee, whereas in the permissive causative, the causer has the ability to prevent the occurrence of effect on the cause.

Furthermore, by virtue of the proximity of cause and effect components, Comrie (1983: 160) distinguished the direct causative and indirect causative. The direct causative is the causative that describes the proximity of the causer with the causee (eg. Anton broke the stick), whereas in indirect causative the relationship goes further (eg, Anton brought it about

that the stick broke). Although the causer is always followed by the causee, in indirect causative, the causee occurs sometimes after the causer occurs.

In line with the above description, Whaley (1997: 195) mentions that direct causativization refers to situations where the action of causer has a direct effect on the causee, while indirect causativization refers to a situation of causativization whose degree of survival is very far away. For example, lexical causative *kill* and causative construction [*cause to die*] in English (see also Payne, 2002: 175; Song 2001: 276).

3.   Research Methods

The data used in this research were oral data and written data. Oral data were the primary data obtained from BA informants in Lhokseumawe who were selected based on some conditions according to the age, native speakers, and knowledgeable about BA. The data were obtained by using interview method and observation to informant through recording technique. Written data were obtained from a number of Acehnese Language newspapers such as Serambi Aceh. The data were useful as secondary data to compare oral data collected from informants. Informants were selected by age, gender, and ethnic groups.

4.   Results and Discussion

There are several ways that can be done to declare causative construction. The most common way is to use complex sentences, i.e. one clause to state the cause and one clause to express the effect. Both clauses are used to connect two conjunctions that are meaningful causative. In the Acehnese language both constructs (clauses) were combined using the *kerna* or *seubap* conjunction. The usage of *kerna* or *seubap* conjunction is shown in the following description.

(5)   *Adam hana ijak sikula   kerna aki jih saket.*
NAME-not-Part-go-school-   because-leg-3Tg-sick
'Adam did not go to school because his legs hurt.'

The clause that states the cause of sentence (5) is *aki jih saket* and the clause stating the effect is *Adam hana ijak sikula*. The components of cause and effect are called macro situations. Micro situations are incorporated by using *kerna* conjunction to form macro situations.

The sentence (5) above can be changed by placing *kerna* conjunction to the front of the sentence. The result of the change becomes (6) below..

(6)   *Kerna aki jih saket,   Adam hana ijak sikula.*
because-feet-3Tg-sick, NAME-not-Part-go-school
'Because his feet hurt, Adam did not go to school.'

In addition to *kerna* conjunction, to incorporate clauses that express causative can also be used conjunction *seubap* 'because'. The use of this conjunction is seen in sentence (7) below.

(7)   *Ulee jih beukah, seubap jih irhom   Andi.*
head-3Tg-break- because-3Tg-Part-throw-NAME
'His head broke because he was thrown by Andi.'

In contrast to sentence (6), sentence (7) cannot be altered. In the Acehnese language, there is no construction of the *jih irhom Andi, seubab ulee jih beukah*. If you want to change

the arrangement, it should make use of the conjunction *kerna*. So sentence (7) becomes *Kerna jih irhom Andi, ulee jih beukah*.

Based on the above description, the use of conjunction *kerna* is more commonly used to combine two clauses that express causative meanings, whereas the use of *seubab* is very rare. *Seubap* is more often used in the interrogative sentence (ask). For example, consider the sentences (8) and (9) below.

(8) *Peu seuba   Adam   hana sikula?*
     What cause -   NAME-not-school
     'What causes Adam not to go to school?'

(9) *Peu seubap Andi irhom jih?*
     What cause- NAME-throw-3Tg
     'What causes Andi to throw him?'

Kerna conjunction cannot be used in interrogative sentences. This is different from the Indonesian language. In Indonesian we can use both *what* and *why*, for example, *Why did Andi throw Ali?* to ask something that requires an answer: cause. In Acehnese language such an interrogative sentence is formed by using the question *'peu seubap* 'what cause', eg. *Peu seubap Andi irhom Ali*?

Causative Based Formal Parameters

Based on formal parameters, causative is divided into analytic causative, morphological causative, and lexical causative. The following will describe how the causative type is found in Acehnese language.

Analytic Causative

In Acehnese language, the causative verbs of *peugot* 'make' and *geuyu* 'told' are used in the analytic construction. The use of these verbs can be seen in the following example.

(10). *Abang peugot pageu.*
       Brother-CAUS-make-fence
       'Brother makes fence.'

(11). *Adoe   peugot   tugas.*
       Sister-CAUS-make-homework
       'Sister makes homework.'

(12). *Jih   peuklik   Cut.*
       He-CAUS-cry-NAME
       'He makes Cut cry.'

(13). *Nita magun gulee.*
       NAMA-cook-gulai
       'Nita cooks beef-stew.'

(14). *Ibu Nur   geuyu Nita   magun gulee.*
       Mother-NAME-CAUS-tell-NAME-   cook curry.
       'Mrs. Nur told Nita to cook curry.'

The data above show the difference between (10-11), (12) and (13-14) whereas (10) and (11) have the same sentence pattern where the word *peugot* 'makes' is followed by a noun object. In sentence (12) the word 'make' is replaced by the affix *peu-* and followed by the *klik* verb 'cry' when combined, have the meaning of 'making a cry' in this case goes to the

morphologic causative part (see 4.1.2). The presence of a *peugot* verb in sentence (10) requires the presence of the *pageu* as the object (noun), and the presence of the affix *peu-* of sentence (12) requires the presence of a *klik* verb 'cry' as a predicate.

Sentences (13) and (14) have almost the same meaning. In the causative construction of sentence (13) there is a verb *magun* 'make' as the predicate. In (14) two predicates appear, namely *geuyu* and *magun* which both have the meaning of 'make so'. This happens because of the influence of the argument on the sentence. This shows the tendency that the construct was formed not merely because of the role of the causative verbs, but the structure of the argument in the causative verb also plays an important role. Based on the structure of the constituent argument, the analytic causative constructions in Acehnese are composed of [NP-VPCausative-NP-VP-NP] for the causative which is a transitive verb with the structure of the NP-VP-NP argument.

Morphological causative

The affixes as the causative markers in Acehnese language are *meu-* (with the allomorphs), *peu-* (with the allomorphs) and *seu-.* Each of these affixes can be attached to adjectives, nouns and numerals as in (15) below.

(15). {peu} + Verb as a base
    klik 'cry'   ⟶   *peuklik* 'make someone to cry'
    {meu} + Noun as a base
    aneukmit 'children' ⟶ *meuaneukmit* 'become childish'
    binatang 'animal'   ⟶ *meubinatang* 'make something like animal'
    {meu} + Adjective as a base
    kureng 'zigzag'   ⟶ *meukureng* 'make something to be zigzag'
    keulabee 'grey'   ⟶ *meukeulabee* 'make something become grey'
    {peu} + Verb as a base
    eh 'sleep'   ⟶ *peueh* 'make someone to sleep'
    {peu} + Adjective as a base
    beuo 'lazy'   ⟶ *pubeuo* 'make oneself to be lazy'
    {peu} + Word as a base
    meulek 'slow'   ⟶ *peumeulek* 'make slow'
    rayeuk 'big'   ⟶ *peurayeuk* 'make big'
    {peu} + Number as a base
    dua 'two'   ⟶ *peudua* 'become/make two'
    lhee 'three'   ⟶ *peulhee* 'become/make three'
    {seu} + Adjective as a base
    baro 'new'   ⟶ *seubaro* 'make a new'
    malee 'shame'   ⟶ *seumalee* 'make embarrassed'

Lexical Causative

Like the morphological causative, micro situations in the lexical causative are also poured in one instance. The components of cause and effect can be interpreted from the lexical causative verb itself. Pay close attention to the following sentence.

(16). *Sarah buka pinto.*
    NAME Akt-open door
    'Sarah opens the door.'

(17). *Abit chop Ali.*

NAMEAkt-stab NAME
'Abit stabs Ali.'

Each sentence (16) and (17) have two events. The first occurrence of sentence (16) is Sarah opening the door as the explicitly explicit component of cause and the second occurrence is the door being in open state can be understood as a consequence component although this component is not explicitly raised. Sentence (17) also has two events, the first occurrence is *Abit stabs Ali* as the explicit cause component and the second component is Ali in a stabbed condition as a consequence component not explicitly generated.

Causative based on Semantic Parameters

Causative analysis based on semantic parameters needs to be done because the causative constructs generated through affixes display similar meanings but are not the same. At a glance, for example, the *peurayeuk* verb, *dipeurayeuk* shows my meaning of 'making something big', but if further explored the three derived verbs have different semantic features.

(18). *Arif peurayeuk bajee.*
NAME-CAUS-enlarge-shirt
'Arif enlarged his shirt.'
(19). *Didi   peuubita pui*.
NAMA- CAUS-extinguish-fire
'Didi extinguished the fire.'
(20). *Bajee dipeurayeuk   Arif.*
Shirt-   PAS-extinguish   NAME
'The shirt is being extinguished by Arif.'
(21). *Apui   dipeuubit   Didi.*
Firei-   PAS-UBIT-   NAME
'The fire is being shrunk by Didi.'

In terms of the sentence mode, *peu-* and *dipeu-* which attached to a particular word as a predicate filler is in a different sentence. *Peu-* is used when showing active sentences. *Dipeu-* is used when showing passive sentences. Both are equally using the same argument that distinguishes the distribution of the sentence that is as active or passive.

5. Conclusion

Based on the above exposition, it can be concluded that in Acehnese language for making causative constructions can be done in several ways, namely (1) using complex sentences, two clauses coupled with conjunction *kerna-seubap*, (2) using analytic causative, with verbs markers *peugot* and *geuyu*, (3) using a morphological causative by adding *meu-* affix (with its allomorphs), *peu-* (with its allomorphs) and *seu-*, (4) selecting a particular lexical causative verb with causative meaning.

Semantic parameters in this study can distinguish the synonymy of the Acehnese causative verbs. The analysis is done by distributing the causative verbs first into the sentence. This is done so that the causative verbs are substituted into wider construction. Subsequently, there appear to be limits to the substituted capabilities of the synonymous forms, for example certain constructs may be interchangeable and in other constructs not interchangeable.

References

Comrie, Bernard. (1976).The syntax of causative construction: Cross language similarities and divergences. Dalam Shibatani (Ed). *Syntax and Semantics.* 6: 261-2312.

Comrie, Bernard. (1983). Language universals and linguistics typology. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher Limited.

Djunaidi, Abdul. (2004). Persesuaian dalam Bahasa Aceh. Jurnal. Bahasa dan Seni, Tahun 32, Nomor 2. Banda Aceh.

Hadi, Wisman. (2000). Konstruksi kausatif bahasa Serawai. Linguistika, 8 (68): 8 -18. Medan.

Kridalaksana, H. (2001). Pembentukan kata dalam bahasa Indonesia. Jakarta: Gramedia.

Muliadi. (2004). Konstruksi kausatif dalam bahasa Indonesia. Dalam *Linguistika*. Vol. 11 No. 21, September 2004. Medan: Universitas Simatera Utara.

Payne, Thomas E. (1997). Describing morphosyntax: A guide for field linguists. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 173–186

Sari, Wilda Mahya. (2015). Aliansi gramatikal dalam bahasa Aceh : Kajian tipologi sintaksis. Master's Thesis. Medan: Program Studi Linguistik, Universitas Sumatera Utara.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. (1976). Syntax and semantics, Vol VI. The grammar of causative construction. New York: Academic Press.

Song, Jae Jung. (2001). Linguistic typology: Morphology and syntax. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education.