

The Analysis of Stab Subtype with Comparative Study between English and Buginese Construction

Farida ¹, Jumardin Muchtar ²

¹Universitas Negeri Makassar, Kota Makassar, Sulawesi Selatan, Indonesia

²Universitas Hasanuddin, Kota Makassar, Sulawesi Selatan, Indonesia

*faridaidha74@gmail.com

Abstract.

This study compares English and Buginese grammar constructions using Dixon's approach to assess the grammar of the STAB subtype. The researcher also wants to characterize and calculate the frequency of different sorts of categorical comparisons. This is a descriptive qualitative approach. Affected C (STAB Subtype) refers to a pointed or bladed Manip that penetrates below the surface of the Target, such as pierce, prick, stab, dig, sting, knife, spear; cut, prune, mow, saw, slice, chop, hack. In constructs I and III, all of these verbs appear. According to the Dixon's hypothesis, there are twelve Stab subtypes of verbs that can be used in textual construction, including stab, slice, cut, prune, mow, saw, chop, dig, pierce, prick, spear, and hack. There are six verbs in Buginese that pertain to the STAB subtype. Appacokengngi, angngampallasa, Meloka, Makkai, Nacui, and Matoddo' are the names of the animals.

Keywords: grammar construction, stab subtype, comparative.

Introduction

Language is a communication tool. It allows people to share ideas in their minds by expressing them in language. Many language types are spoken in the world. One of them is English as an international language which is used by many people around world. English as the most widely spoken language will be a good thing to compare with other language, the local language spoken by most people in South Sulawesi, Indonesia that is Bugis language.

According to Wikipedia (2011), Bugis language is one of the Austronesian language families. It is said that about five million people live around South Sulawesi. The Buginese language is Bahasa Ugi and people who speak Basa Ugi are called To Ugi.

Every language has its own meaning, related to the meaning. So that to compare both Bugis and English language, it will cover it by using semantic perspective. Because each language universally has the semantic side.

According to Muchtar (2021), in order to assess grammar, one must have good writing skills. Receptive and productive abilities are the two types of talents that can be classified. Listening and reading abilities were receptive skills that kids needed to have in order to communicate verbally and in writing. It attempts to improve pronunciation, master audio listening exercise, and learn new vocabulary, whereas productive abilities, like as speaking and writing, were acquired by someone who wanted to generate languages. Because a person must work both orally and considerably in writing, it was usually more difficult than other skills.

Grammar, as a component of language, plays a function in sentence construction and always regulates the use of language (Farisatma 2017). Grammar is a rule in a language; without it, the interlocutor will be unable to grasp what we intend, resulting in linguistic misunderstandings. Grammatical construction is another aspect of grammar. Construction grammar seeks to describe how a language's grammatical organization works at all levels, including morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and discourse level. They've been incorporated into the model more explicitly. These four elements are combined to construct a sentence and are also utilized in speech analysis.

The verb is the most important part of making a sentence. Dixon (2005) categorizes verbs as motion verbs, rest verbs, impact verbs, and giving verbs. Affect items are transitive verbs in their most basic form. According to Hopper and Thompson (1980), an Agent moves or manipulates something (the Manip role) such that it comes into contact with something or someone (the target role). The activity will physically affect either the manip or the target (or both, on rare occasions). Affect verb syntactic roles: if the verb is transitive, there are two roles: A (transitive subject) and O (transitive object), however if the verb is intransitive, there is only one role: S (intransitive subject) (intransitive subject). Therefore, The following is an example of an impact verb construction: With that stick, I. John (Agent) hit the chair (Target) (Manip). II. I (Agent) smashed that stick (Manip) into the table (Target), III. The rain washed my hair (Manip) (Target). The researcher finds that building I focuses on the goal, construction II focuses on the manipulation, and construction III is a one-of-a-kind construction based on this example. When a person does not do it on purpose, Construction III occurs.

The stab subtype of effect C, affect-c, refers to a pointed or bladed Manip that penetrates below the surface of the Target, such as pierce, prick, stab, dig, sting, knife, spear; cut, prune, mow, saw, slice, chop, hack. In constructs I and III, all of these verbs appear (although it is not terribly common for something to slice or chop or specially to saw or prune accidentally, in III). Most stab verbs are marginal for Construction II, with the Manip as O, simply because their meanings focus on the effect on the Target, which should be in the O slot (however, it is possible to say He stabbed his dagger into the ground, with focus on the dagger, since here the Target, the ground, is not critically affected by the activity). Because the meaning of the verb contains definition of an archetypical Manip, Construction II is least likely with spear and knife, verbs derived from nouns; however, the Manip can be in O slot when it is not cognate with the verb, e.g. She speared the garden fork into her foot.

Based on Dixon's theoretical framework, the research question is 1. Can theory be used such as affect verb construction in other language? 2. Can the affect verb especially the STAB subtype be compared to Buginese language? Therefore, researcher is interested in comparing the STAB subtype verbs in English and Bugis language in the written aspect.

This research has been linked to a number of earlier investigations. In the short story "the setar," Nakhavaly (2012) concentrated on the analysis of grammatical voice. Mohammadpour (2012) investigated the verb and verb phrase in Boier Ahmadi lori using X-bar Syntax. Fu (2016) then turned his attention to semantic fuzziness and its translation techniques. Concern with the complement of the sound-class verb formation by Itagaki (2017). Finally, Asrumi (2014) discusses the semantic relationship of denominal, deverbal, and deadjectival verbs in the Osing language with other arguments. However, none of the prior studies have looked on STAB subtype verbs, which is based on Dixon's idea. The focus of this study was on STAB subtype verbs in English and Bugis. The goal of this study is to help readers who want to learn both English and Bugis, especially in terms of semantics and syntax.

Method

To collect data, the researcher use a qualitative descriptive method. Furthermore, this research explains the semantic and grammatical construction similarities and differences of the STAB subtype verb in English and Buginese.

Data Collection

The STAB subtype verb in English and Buginese is the center of this study's findings. The writing component was chosen by the researcher to be relevant to both English and Buginese data. Then, using multiple dictionaries and reference books, find data in English. In addition, the researcher conducts an in-depth interview with people who speak Buginese as their first language to acquire information about the Buginese language.

Data Analysis

The researcher employs a variety of strategies when examining data. To begin, data on the English and Buginese languages is gathered through in-depth observation and interviews. Second, the amount of data obtained is lowered; the researcher reduces the amount of data collected in English and Buginese. The data is then presented and compared in terms of semantic and grammatical composition using STAB subtype verbs in English and Buginese. Furthermore, when examining the data, Dixon's theory is applied. The meaning of the verb subtype STAB in English is determined using the Oxford Dictionary, while the meaning of the verb subtype STAB in Buginese is determined using information gathered through in-depth observations and interviews. Finally, as a conclusion to the research, the researcher draws various conclusions as the key points of analysis after doing the analysis.

Finding & Discussion

There are five Stab subtype verbs in English, while in Buginese language, there are five verbs. because verbs of Buginese language that has only one meaning in English. There are 4 using transitive verbs verb as shown in the table below:

Table 1: Comparative English and Bugis construction

| Language | Colum / number | Constraction |
|----------|---------------------|--|
| English | Colum 1 Number 1 | I. Andi (Agent) stabbed the trunk of banana tree (Target) with his badik (Manip) |
| | | II. Andi (Agent) stabbed with his badik (Manip) to |

| | | |
|----------|---------------------|---|
| | | The trunk of banana tree (Target) |
| | | III. That his badik (Manip) stabbed the trunk of banana tree (Target) |
| Buginese | Colum 2 Number 1 | I. Andi (Agent) Nappacokengngi Akko Pong Otti e (Target) bangkunna (Manip). |
| | | II. Andi (Agent) nappacokengi Bangkunna (Manip) Akko pong otti e (Target) |
| | | III. Bangkunna (Manip) nappacokengi Akko pong otti e (Target) |
| English | Colum 3 Number 2 | I. Special Forces (Agent) can hack a computer (Target) with their brains (Manip). |
| | | II. Special Forces (Agent) can hack with their brains (Manip) hack a computer (Target). |
| | | III. With their brains (Manip) can hack a computer (Target). |
| Buginese | Colum 4 number 2 | I. Pasukang khusus e.(Agent) wedding nabobolo i siaga-siaga komputer (Target) nasaba Akkigunangngi akkale'na (Manip) |
| | | II. Pasukang khusus e.(Agent) wedding nabobolo i nasaba Akkigunangngi akkale'na (Manip) siaga-siaga komputer (Target) |
| English | Colum5 Number 3 | I. Lina (Agent) is mowing grass (Target) with her hands (Manip). |
| | | II. Lina (Agent) is mowing with her hands (Manip) grass (Target). |
| | | III. with her hands (Manip) is mowing grass (Target). |
| Buginese | Colum 6 Number 3 | I. Lina (Agent) mabbaja serri i (Target) na pake limanna (Manip). |
| English | Colum 7 Number 4 | I. I (Agent) will dig the garden (Target) with a hoe (Manip). |
| | | II. I (Agent) will dig with a hoe (Manip) the garden (Target) |

| | | |
|----------|----------------------|--|
| | | III. with a hoe (Manip) will dig the garden (Target) |
| Buginese | Colum 8 Number 4 | I. Iya'(Agent) melo makkai tana dare' (Target) pake bingkung (Manip). |
| | | II. Iya' (Agent) melo makkai pake bingkung (Manip) tana dare' e (Target). |
| English | Colum 9 Number 5 | I. The bee (Agent) has stung my stepbrother (Target) with its stab (Manip). |
| | | II. The bee (Agent) has stung with its stab (Manip) my stepbrother (Target). |
| | | III. With its stab (Manip) has stung my stepbrother (Target). |
| Buginese | Colum 10 Number 5 | I. Antaung (Agent) na toddoi Silengsureng kaporoku (Target) sibawa patoodo'na (Manip) |

Column 1 Number 1 & Column 2 Number 1

Here, there are 3 construction parts in example column 1 number 1 in English has same with the example construction of Buginese language. In here, the verb of Nappacokengi has synonym, namely napatoddo' but has a different function. Nappacokengi is a transitive verb and napatoddo is an intransitive verb. In terms of the same meaning such as stabbing.

Column 3 Number 2 & Column 4 Number 2

English construction example in column 4 number 2 has 3 constructions compared to Bugis language section in the column 4 number 2 which only has 2 constructions.

Column 5 Number 3 & Column 6 Number 3

Example construction in column 5 Number 3 is I. Lina (Agent) is mowing grass (Target) with her hands (Manip), II. Lina (Agent) is mowing with her hands (Manip) grass (Target). III. with her hands (Manip) is mowing grass (Target) then the Example construction of Bugis Language in Column 6 Number 3 as follow I. Lina (Agent) mabbaja serri i (Target) na pake limanna (Manip). in the example above there is a difference in the STUB subtype between English and Bugis. If STUB subtype Buginese version contains 3 construction types, the meaning cannot be detected because this section only has 1 construction type.

Column 7 Number 4 & Column 8 Number 4

Column 7 Number 4 has 3 English Construction types and then Column 8 Number 4 only has 2 types of construction in Buginese language.

Column 9 Number 5 & Column 10 Number 4

Column 9 Number 5 has 3 English Construction types and then Column 10 Number 5 only has 1 types of construction in Buginese language.

Conclusion

According to the facts above, the researcher discovered that there are twelve Stab subtypes verbs that may be used in written construction, which is based on Dixon's theory. Stabbing, slicing, cutting, pruning, mowing, sawing, chopping, digging, piercing, pricking, spearing, and hacking are only a few examples. There are six verbs in Buginese that allude to the Rub subtype. Those appacokengngi, angngampallasa, gampang natembus, Mabbaja', Meloka Makkai, Nacui, Matoddo', Mabbaja', Meloka Makkai, Nacui, Matoddo', Mabbaja', Meloka Makkai, Nacui, Matoddo', Mabbaja', Meloka Makkai

Stab subtype verbs in English can be used in Constructions I, II, and III grammatically. Then there are many types of Bugis language constructions, such as three constructions in Column 2 Number 1, two constructions in Column 4 Number 2 and two constructions in Column 8 Number 4, one construction in Column 6 Number 3 and one building in Column 10 Number 5. It's all about the language's unique characteristics.

Because Syntax is constructed from sentence meaning, Semantics and Syntax are tightly related, according to the facts above. Then, applying to Dixon's theory, Dixon's theory may demonstrate that constructs I, II, and III can be applied to English Stab subtype verbs, but that not all of them occur in Buginese, and that only some constructions can be formed as previously indicated. Finally, this subject is beneficial to those interested in studying Semantics, Grammar, and Syntax.

Reference

- Asrumi. (2014). The semantic relation of denominal, deverbal, and deadjectival verbs with other arguments in the Osing language. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 6(2): 62-80.
- Dixon, R. M. W. (2005). *A Semantic approach to English Grammar*. Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Farisatma, Nasmilah, & Rahman, F. (2017). Applying Group Work to Improve Student's Grammar Achievements. *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research -IJIR*, 3(5), 1971-1975.

- Fu. (2016). Semantic fuzziness and its translation strategies. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 8(2): 199-208.
- Hopper, P. J., and Thompson, S. A. 1980. 'Transitivity in grammar and discourse', *Language*, 56: 251-99.
- Itagaki. (2017). Complement of The Sound-Class Verb Construction. *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics*, 5(1): 29-41
- Mohammadpour F. (2012). Examination of Verb and Verb Phrase in Boier Ahmadi Lori Based on X-bar Syntax. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 4(3): 509-522
- Muchtar, J. (2021). Grammatical Errors in English Informal Essays by The Sixth Semester of English Literature Students. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 4(1), 41-45. <https://doi.org/10.34050/elsjish.v4i1.12747>
- Nakhavaly F. (2012). The Analysis of Grammatical Voice in the Short Story "The Setar". *International Journal of Linguistics*, 4(4): 171-179.