

Aplicative Construction in Lamalera Dialect of Lamaholot Language

¹Yosef Demon, ²Wayan Pastika, ³Ketut Artawa, ⁴I Nyoman Udayana

¹yosefdemon_bataona@yahoo.com Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Flores

²wayanpastika@unud.ac.id Faculty of Arts, Udayana University

³artawa56@yahoo.com Faculty of Arts, Udayana University

⁴udayana@yahoo.com Faculty of Arts, Udayana University

Abstract—The applicative construction is limited as (i) the creation of a new argument of inner objects and (ii) the advancement of a peripheral constituent (locative, instrumental, benefactive, and source) occupying the position of the core argument (object). Thus, applicative constructs include the creation of new objects and the advancement of peripheral arguments occupying the core argument.

Each language has a strategy in getting around the applicative construction. Agglutinative languages for example, deal with morphological applicative construction. Unlike Lamalera dialect of Lamaholot language(LDLL) which is not an agglutinative language. Lamalera dialect of Lamaholot language has a morphophonological strategy such as sound alternation or internal modification and syntactic strategy of word order. Both LDLL applicative construction strategies will be presented in this article.

Keywords: Applicative, locative, instrumental, benefactive, vocal alternation, internal modification

1. Preliminary

Applicative construction is a universal linguistic phenomenon. Almost every language in the world has an applicative construction. Applicative construction is very diverse and unique. The reason is that every language has specificity in getting around the formation of applicative construction.

Applicative construction is a phenomenon of the creation of a new argument that previously occupied the argument (constituency) rather than the core of the argument. The applicative construction can also be stated to be the advance of a constituent that used to be a peripheral constituent to the core cluster constituent (Payne, 1997: 186, Erawati, 2015: 73-78).



The impact of forwarding (progressing) or creating arguments (constituents) instead of the core into this core is the occurrence of syntactic change and semantic change.

Agglutinative languages deal with applicative morphological constructs (affixation process), whereas isolative and fusion languages have different strategies. The Lamalera dialect of Lamaholot language (abbreviated to LDLL) is not included in all three languages. How does LDLL's strategy deal with applicative construction? This paper discusses the strategy.

2. Discussion

2.1 Cross-Language Applied Building

It is a derivational process that emphasizes the improvement of the number of arguments, and / or the addition of a new argument to the basic verbs (Katamba 1993: 270; Bresnan and Moshi 1988: 3; Shibatani in: Shibatani and Thompson 1996: 159 -160). Trask also states that applicative construction is the process of creating new objects, namely the object (inner) is not direct (underlying indirect object) (Trask, 1993: 18-19; Spencer, 1991: 287). In addition, Haspelmath also stated that applicative is the creation of a new object in the functional structure of a verb or a shift from non-object into an object function (Haspelmath, 2002: 216).

Based on the opinion of the linguists it can be said that there is really no difference of opinion between applicability and applicative construction. Applicative (applicative construction) is a process of raising or adding the valence of a verb with the strategy (a) the creation of a new argument, the underlying indirect object, or (2) the promotion or preposition of a peripheral argument into a core argument. This new argument is created or put forward, or raised from the peripheral element into the function of the object through the applying mechanism.

The application does not only refer to the increase of verb or argument addition only, but embodies the transfer or action trace of grammatical functions (agent to patient). The existence of verbs as predators of clauses becomes very important because verbs are the core (heading) clauses that have the capability of requiring the presence of arguments in a semantic clause.



Increased verbal valence in agglutinative languages occurs through morphological (affixation) processes. The increase of verb valence through morphological processes can be observed in the following Indonesian clause example.

- (1a) *Ibu menyeberang di jalan*
(1b) *Ibu menyeberangi jalan*

The crossed verb predator in clause (1a) requires one core argument. The only core argument in the intransitive clause serves as a subject and acts as an agent. In contrast to clause (1a), clause (1b) has a cross-verb predator requiring the presence of two core arguments, ie the mother functioning as a subject, acting as an agent, and as an object, acting as a theme. The FN path in clause (1b) is the object, while the FN in the path of clause (1b) actually serves as an adjunct and a locative role. In this case, it can be noted that the constituents in the previous path are ajung or non-core arguments raised through the morphological process into core arguments. This improvement is in tune with the addition of the affix (*meng-*)-*i* to the cross-verb predicator. The presence of the suffix *-i* demands the presence of a new argument. The presence of this new argument is a logical consequence of verb valence.

Validation of a peripheral argument into a core argument requires a revaluation of either structure, syntactic or semantic structure. This is closely related to the concept of the object, both direct object and indirect object. Both concepts of objects in applicative construction need to be reinforced. Syntactically, the concept of direct objects and indirect objects is different, as well as in the semantic aspect.

Shibatani (Shibatani and Thompson, 1996: 158-159) state that the term indirect object (IO) proposed by Chuck (1977) implies the meaning of the user (beneficiary). Nevertheless, there needs to be a clear distinction between DO and IO with respect to applicative construction. Applicative construction is an encoding of locations, instruments, and other peripheral elements as DO. Comrie (1983: 60-61) reveals that DO and IO should be semantically defined. DO is what is directly affected by the action (revealed in the verb), and IO is what is indirectly affected. Since DO and IO are semantically defined, the constituent position in the clause becomes uncertain.



The consent of Mary in clause (2), for example, either in the position of following the verb directly as in (2a) and in the final position (2b) is still called IO. Similarly, the book constituents, both in (2a) and (2b), remain DO.

1) Semantic definition

(2a) *Jhon gave Mary a book*

IO DO

(2b) *Jhon gave a book to Mary*

DO IO

If DO and IO are syntactically limited then DO is a constituent that directly follows a verb (transitive), and IO is a constituent that indirectly follows a verb (transitive). In view of this syntax, DO at (2c) is Mary's constituent, whereas IO is a book. In clause (2d) the DO constituent is a book, whereas the IO constituent is Mery.

2) The province is syntactically

(2c) *Jhon gave Mary a book*

DO IO

(2d) *Jhon gave a book to Mary*

DO IO

If in linguistics the terms IO and DO are used then the intended is always semantic understanding, as in (2a-2b). However, the syntactic DO treatment is not outstanding but in transformational analysis it is often used.

The rules laid out by traditional linguists are related to the terms DO and IO as in the rules of passivity. Passive rules as in clauses (3b) and (3c) state that IO (Mary) and DO (a book) in clause (2a-2b) both have the potential to be subject to passive sentences.

(3a) *Jhon gave mary a book*

OTL OL

(3b) *Mery was given a book by Jhon*

(3c) *A book was given to Mary by Jhon*

Easier understanding of the use of both concepts then this paper is more likely to use the concept of objects semantically. In addition to providing a firm assurance about the position of objects in a clause, the concept of applicative and benefactive constructions are also necessarily considered into account. Both these constructs are part of the verb valence enhancement, but need to be explained so that the two constructions are clear.



Applicative and benefactive constructions tend to be used to refer to specific grammatical elements such as verbal affixes. These verbal affixes have a tendency to raise the verb valence in the previous case and the noun forms expressing the beneficiary in the next case. The applicative construction is used to refer to the grammatical construction as seen in example (a) quoted from Shibatani (Sibhatani and Thompson, 1996: 159-160).

Applicative

1) Indonesia language

- (5a) Saya menduduk-i kursi
(5b) Saya duduk di kursi

2) Ainulanguage:

- (6a) *Poro cise e-horari*
besar rumah APL- tinggal

'Dia meninggali rumah besar'

- (6b) *Poro cise ta horary*
besar rumah ditinggal
'Dia tinggal di rumah besar'

3) Chichewa language (Alsina dan Mchombo, 1990)

- (7a) *Anyani a-na-yend-er-a ndodo*
2-baboon 2s- PAST-jalan-APL-FV 9-tongkat
'Baboon-baboon menjalani tongkat'
- (7b) *Anyani a-na-yend-a ndi ndodo*
2-baboon 2s- PAST-jalan-FV dengan 9-tongkat
'Baboon-baboon berjalan dengan tongkat'

Benefaktif

4) English :

- (8a) *John bought Mary a book*
John beli Mery ART buku
'John membelikan Meri buku'

- (8b) *John bought a book for Mary*
John beli ART buku untuk Meri
'John membeli buku untuk Meri'

5) Indonesia language

- (9a) Dia membuatkan saya kursi itu
(9b) Dia membuat kursi itu untuk saya

6) Jepanglanguage

- (10a) *Boku wa hanako ni kon ko kat-t yat-ta*
1TG TOP-Hanako DAT-buku AKU-beli-KON beri- PAST
'Saya membelikan Hanako sebuah buku'

- (10b) *Boku wa Hanako no tame ni kon o kat-t yat-ta*
1TG TOP-Hanako GEN demi DAT-buku AKU-beli-KON beri-PAST
'Saya membeli buku untuk Hanako'

Shibatani (1976) states that benefactive construction is a construction in which the user (beneficiary or beneficary) is interpreted as an argument. This separation looks like in clause



(5a-7a), in the adjacent as in clause (5b-7b). Thus, clause (5a-70a) is an example of applicative construction, whereas clause (8-10) is an example of benefactive construction. Shibatani concludes that the applicative construction and benefactive constructions are slightly different constructions although the two constructs are (a) widened from the diathesis, and (b) defined as the nominal status with respect to core / peripheral or argument differences. Nevertheless, Baker (in Shibatani and Thompson, 1996: 160) argues that both constructs are generally the same. Both are collectively called applicative constructs. Artawa (1998: 45) also argues that the benefactive is included in the applicative. Artawa mentions that applicative construction can be a locative, instrumental, benefactive, source, and recipient.

Shibatani states, although different, some languages such as Chichewa use the same verbal affix for applicative construction and benefactive construction. The important difference between the two constructs is that applicative constructs generally permit intransitive construction, whereas benefactive constructions rarely permit intransitive base construction. Based on observations, applicative constructs on an intransitive basis are more acceptable than benefactive constructs on an intransitive basis (rarely acceptable in one language across languages). The following sample data is quoted from Shibatani (Shibatani and Thompson, 1996: 160-161):

1) Applicative with basic intransitive

- (11a) *Otto we-wohut ein altes Haus* (Jerman language)
Otto APL-tiggal ART tua rumah
'Otto meninggali rumah tua'
- (11b) *Saya menjatuh-i kucing* (Indonesian language)
- (11c) *Paropei kotan e-arpa* (Ainu language)
kampung APL-pergi
'Dia pergi ke Kampung Horobtesu'
- (11d) *Msodzi a-ku-phik-ir-a nthiko* (Chichewa language)
1-nelayan 1s-pres masak-APL-FV 3sendok
'Nelayan itu memasak dengan sendok' (Alsina dan Mchombo, 1990)

2) Benefactive with basic intransitive

- (12a) * *Otto ging Karin auf den Marktplatz* (Jerman language)
Otto pergi Karin ke ART-pasar
'Oto pergi ke pasar untuk Karin'
- (12b) * *Saya datang-kan ana ke pasar* (Indonesian language)
- (12c) * *I went Maryy to the market* (English)
1TG pergi Mary ART-pasar
'Saya pergi ke pasar untuk Mery'
- (12d)**Msodzi a ku-phik-ir-a ana* (Chichewa language)
1-nelayan is -pres-masak-ben-FV 2-anak



‘Nelayan memasak untuk anak itu’

Clause (12a-12d) is a non-grammatical clause. Although the morphosyntactic behavior of applicative constructions / benefactive constructs varies across languages, benefactive constructions on an intransitive basis are not grammatical in multiple languages. English and German, for example, do not have a benefactive affix for verbs, while Indonesian and Chichewa languages have benefactive markers. Beneficiaries (users / beneficiaries) are manifested as the main objects of double object construction (English, Indonesia, Chichewa) or as IO (German). In addition, formal considerations, such as cognitively, illustrate that in addition to similarities in applicative verb forms or benefactive verbs, it is also determined by lexical information. The following Indonesian examples show acceptable and unacceptable applicative construction or at least questionable.

- (13a) Saya meninggal-i rumahnya
(13b) *Saya meninggal-i Jakarta (Shibatani dalam Sihabatani dan Thompson, 1996 : 163)

Applicative constructions are often used to refer to a derivational process that includes raising valence in Bantu languages (Artawa, 1998: 43; 2004: 66). The Chichewa language (Alsina and Mchombo in Artawa, 1998: 44; 2004: 68-69) has a syntactic process. Applicative construction in Chichewa language has two distinct characteristics, namely (a) new thematic role incorporated into the structure of the argument, (b) verbs undergoing a morphological modification, ie suffix with applicative morphemes as object creation. In the syntactic process the basic IO (object oblik) is raised as a real object (the object is born). Verbs in an applicative construction contain a distinctive inflection that expresses the semantic relation of the birth object. The following instrumental constructions are quoted from Trask (in Artawa, 1998:44,2004: 67).

- (14a) *Nuru Ø-tilanzile: nama ka: chisu*
Nuru SUB-potong daging dengan pisau
'Nuru memotong daging dengan pisau'
- (14b) *Nuru Ø-tilangile: nama ka: chisu*
Nuru SUB-potong-APL daging dengan pisau
'Nuru memotong daging dengan pisau'

Clause (14b) shows the instrument oblique *ka: chisu* appears as DO and is marked on a verb with a tick-infix, an instrumental memorable morpheme. The object is promoted as the



subject of a passive clause in that language. The basic assumption is that applicative construction is the process of object creation can be maintained in the accusative language. Unlike the case with the languages which are syntactically ergative language, the Balinese language, for example, is an analytic ergative language so that the term applicative construction is referred to as subject creation (Artawa, 1998: 44).

Other linguists, such as Austin (1993) used the term as an alternative form of transitiational alternation in Australian languages. According to Austin, intransitive verbs in Australian languages can be transcribed through ordinary lexical processes. The two transcendental patterns known in Australian languages are causative construction and applicative construction. Austin concludes that the derivational process of transitive verbs of intransitive root verbs is enhanced by adding a suffix to the verb.

Seen from the affective aspects of causative and applicative suffix affixes, the Australian languages are grouped into (a) languages having two or more suffixes, and (b) languages having one suffix. The first group languages have a tendency to use one suffix to non-volitional verbs to form the causative constructs and the other suffix to form applicative constructs. Languages that have only one suffix, suffixes can be used to construct causative constructions or applicable constructs depending on their basic form. If the suffix is added to the basic verbs the volitional will form an applicative verb and if added to the non-volitional base verb it will produce the causative verb (Artawa 1998: 44, 2004: 6).

Unlike the Australian languages that have clear categories of word categories, the Balinese language, for example, has many verbs derived from pre-categorical forms. The derived verbs of this pre-cursory form can be intransitive or transitive. Applicative verbs in Balinese can be formed from pre-categorical forms, intransitive verbs and transitive verbs. The affix used to derive the applicative verbs in Balinese is the suffix *-in* and *-ang*. The suffix *-ang* is used only to derive applicative verbs from transitive verbs (Artawa, 1998: 44). Here is an example of a Balinese applicative verb derived from a pre-categorical, intransitive and transitive verb (Artawa, 1998: 44-45).

(15) Applicative Verb BB

Pre-categorical		applicative verbs
<i>tegak</i>	'sit'	<i>tegak-in</i> 'be sat'
<i>eling</i>	'cry'	<i>eling-in</i> 'be cried'



<i>kecos</i>	'jump'	<i>kecon-in</i>	'be jumped'
Intransitif			
<i>teka</i>	'come'	<i>teka-in</i>	'be come'
<i>demen</i>	'like'	<i>deme-in</i>	'be liked'
<i>ulung</i>	'fall'	<i>ulung-in</i>	'be fallen'
Transitif			
<i>silih</i>	'lend'	<i>silih-in</i>	'be lent'
<i>jemak</i>	'take'	<i>jemak-in</i>	'be taken'
<i>tagih</i>	'get'	<i>tagih-in</i>	'be gotten'

Applicative verbs are dominated by the suffix -in. The suffix -ang used to derive transitive verbs from pre-cratic forms or intrasnitical verbs would result in causative verbs, not applicative verbs. Quantitatively, the number of causative verbs formed from transitive verbs is very limited in Balinese (Artawa, 1998: 45; 2004: 69).

2.2 LDLL Applicative Construction

Lamalera dialect of Lamaholot language is not an isolative language. Lamalera dialect of Lamaholot language has a number of affixes (prefix, infix, and suffix) to form categories of words other than verbs. Thus, LDLL does not have verbal affixes as a key requirement in dealing with the formation of applicative constructs.

Applicative construction is the creation of new objects and / or peripheral argumentation (peripherals such as locative, instrument, source, receiver, and benefactive) into object arguments. Lamalera dialect of Lamaholot language has applicative constructions such as applicative locative, benefactive and recipient. Other peripheral arguments such as instrumental and source cannot be formed into constructs. The prepositioning of the peripheral argument indicates an unusual feature, that is, it can float in any consecutive position in the clause. The applicative construction in the LDLL is tackled with syntactic and morphological strategies. The implementation of the two strategies will be presented below.

2.2.1 Locative Applicative Construction

Predisposing of the locative peripheral argument in the LDLL may indicate applicative construction but does not characterize the applicative construction. Predisposing of the peripheral peripheral argument may characterize (i) advanced attachment, (ii) preposition of peripheral arguments occupying the position of the object argument, and (iii) the creation of a new object



argument. The phenomenon of preparing the LDLL locative peripheral argument can be observed in the following description.

1) Locative preference

Locative preoccupation in this case is an adjunct in all successive positions in a clause as an unusual feature.

- (16a) *Kame heru rae lali ole*
1JINK jumpa 3J di.bawah kebun
'Kami bertemu mereka di kebun'
- (16a¹) *Lali ole kame heru rae*
di.bawah kebun 1JINK jumpa 3J
'Di kebun kami berjumpa mereka'
- (16b) *Ema=k r=ai me veli levotala*
ibu-POSS1TG 3J=pergi kebun di.sana Levotala
'Ibuku pergi ke kebun di Lewotala'
- (16b¹) *Veli levotala ema=k r=ai me*
di sana Levotala Ibu-POSS1TG 3J=pergi kebun
'Di Lewotala ibuku pergi ke kebun'

Clause (16a-16b) is an intransitive verbal clause with free basic verbs indicator, that is, *heru* 'meet', and *r = ai* 'go'. Both these verbs are equipped with *lali ole* 'in the garden', and the complement *me veli levotala* 'garden in Lelata'. Clause (16a-16b) indicates that the forward attachment occupies the initial position of the clause. This forward preposition does not cause the syntactic structure to change nor does it cause the semantic structure to change. The proposed locative is a pragmatic phenomenon (the speaker wants to suppress or intensify it).

2) Locative prepositioning becomes the core argument

This phenomenon suggests that the attribution of locative peripheral arguments occupies the position of the object. This phenomenon can be observed in the following example.

- (16c) *Tata=k tobo di kdera nepen* (Demon,2006)
kakak=POSS1TG duduk di kursi tadi
'Kakakku duduk di kursi tadi'
- (16c¹) *Tata=k tobud kdera nepen*
kakak-POSS1TG duduk kursi tadi
'Kakakku menduduki kursi tadi'

In contrast to clause (16a1-16b1), clause (16c1) shows the sound change /o/ into sound /u/. This sound change is a morphologic strategy with vowel alternation or internal modification (Ramchand, 2008: 155; Haspelmath, 2002: 183). It is stated that there is a choice or there is a change in the vowel sound / o / which shows that the intransitive trait turns into a sound / u / which



exhibits a transitive feature. The locative placement in the cadre 'in the seat' (16c) becomes the core contiuent (object) clause (16c1).

3) Creation of new objects

This phenomenon states that there is the creation of objects in an intransitive clause, as observed in the following example.

- (16d) *Bele=k hebo di vate*(Demon,2006)
nenek=POSS1TG mandi di pantai

'Nenekku mandi di pantai'

- (16d¹) *Bele=k hebu ari=k di vate*
nenek=ku mandi adik-POSS1TG di pantai
'Nenekku memandikan adikku di pantai'

Clause (16d1) is an example of the creation of a new object through a morphological process with a vocal alternation technique or an internal modification. The change or choice of the sound /o/ is the feature of intransitive verbs transformed into the sound /u/ as the feature of transitive verbs. Internal alternatives or modifications (vowels) occur in tandem with the creation of a new object of 'sister' as the object of the clause.

4) Racing and replacement of roles

This phenomenon suggests that there is a tendency to put forward the peripheral argument locative occupying the position of the object, the object of the base clause is shifted to a locative. The following will be an example.

- (16e) *Mio livo vai di botel*
2J isi air di botol
'Kamu mengisi air di botol'

- (16e¹) *Mio livu botel na vai*
2J isi botol dengan air
'Kamu mengisi botol dengan air'

The locative adjunctive *livo di botel* 'in the bottle' shifts the position of the base clause object to oblique. The alternation or internal modification (vowel) sound /o/ is changed into sound /u/. There is no verbal valence change, only replacement of positions and roles. Clause term (16e) positions clause object (16e1). The basic clause object (16e) *vai* 'water' shifts and occupies a locative position. Clauses (16e) and (16e1) exemplify an applicative construction phenomenon and the replacement of positions and roles.



2.2.2 Benefactive Applicative Construction

Beneficial construction implies the creation of a new object by raising the peripheral-related argument occupying the position of the core constituent. Beneficial applications in BLDL can be observed in the following clauses.

- (17a) *Nae lulu oe nei goe*
3TG gulung tikar untuk 1TG
'Dia menggulung tikar untuk saya'
(17a¹) *Nae lulu goe oe*
3TG gulung 1TG tikar
'Dia menggulung tikar untuk saya'
(17b) *Bapa=k gambar kotelema nei ari=k*
bapak=POSS.1TG gambar ikan paus untuk adik=POSS.1TG
'Bapakku menggambar ikan paus untuk adikku'
(17b¹) *Bapa=k gambar ari=k kotelema*
bapak=POSS1TG gambar adik=POSS1TG ikan paus
'Bapakku menggambarkan adik ikan paus'

Clause transitive verb (17a) is *lulu* 'curl' and the drawing image 17b requires two core constituents. The constituents *nae* 'dia' and *bapa*'my father 'in clauses (17a-17b) as subjects serve as agents and constituents *oe* mat 'and *kotelema* 'whale'as a direct object acting as a theme, and a peripheral constituent *neigoe*'for me'and *neiari=k*'for my younger brother'as oblique.

Oblique or oblique raising in each clause occupying the direct object position does not result in morphological changes in the verb. The verbs *lulu* 'curl' and *gambar*'drawing' image show the addition of argument (applicative) with a zero internal modification strategy, syntactically referred to as a word order strategy. Oblique objects will occupy the position of the indirect object, acting as benefactive, and positioned following the verb predator while the direct object remains as the direct object, acting as the theme, but its position follows the indirect object. The following clause exemplifies a reinforcement of the above exposure.

- (18a) *Rae mula bunga nei ema=ri*
3J tanam bunga untuk ibu=POSS3J
'Mereka menanam bunga untuk ibu mereka'
(18a¹) *Rae mula ema=ri bunga*
3J tanam ibu=POSS3J bunga
'Mereka menanam bunga untuk ibu mereka'
(18b) *Goe baca sura nei ema=k*
1TG baca surat untuk ibu=POSS1TG
'Saya membaca surat untuk ibu'
(18b¹) *Goe baca ema=k sura*



1TG baca ibu=POSS1TG surat
'Saya membacakan ibuku surat'

Clause (18a-18b) predicts a transitive-free base verb and is a basic clause. The clause verb predictor (18a-18b) is *mula* 'planting' and *baca* 'reading' requires the presence of two core constituents, *rae* 'they' and *goe* T as the subject of clauses, positioned before verbs (praverba), acting as agents and constituents *bunga* 'flowers', and *sura* 'letters' as objects, positioned after verbs (postverba) serve as themes, and a peripheral constituent is *nei ema = ri* 'for their mother' and *nei ema = k* 'for my mother' role as oblique. The obstituent preposition of the oblique object becomes the core constituent as an indirect object, positioned after the verb (posverba) and acts as a benefactive, shifting the position of the direct object that previously positions following the verbs to follow the indirect object and still functions as a direct object and acts as the theme. The strategy of zero internal modification or word order becomes the cornerstone of verbal valence change.

- (19a) *Nae kantar lagu tou nei guru=ree*
3TG nyanyi lagu satu untuk guru=POSS3J
'Dia menyanyi satu lagu untuk guru mereka'
- (19a¹) *Nae kantar guru=ree lagu tou*
3TG nyanyi guru=POSS3J lagu satu
'Dia menyanyikan guru mereka satu lagu'
- (20a) *Ema=k bei vai nei bapa=k*
ibu=POSS1TG tuang air untuk bapak=POSS1TG
'Ibuku menuang air untuk ayahku'
- (20b¹) *Ema=k bei bapa=k vai*
ibu=POSS1TG tuang bapak=POSS1TG air
'Ibu menuangkan bapak air/

Clause (19a-20a) is a basic clause predicated on a transitive verb. As for the predators of each verb, the clauses *kantar* 'singing' and *bei* 'pouring' require two obligatory constituents present. The two compulsory constituents are *nae* 'h/she' and *ema = k* 'my mother' as the subject, positioned before the verb (praverba), acting as an agent and *lagu tou* 'one song' and *vai* 'water' as objects, positioned after the verb (postverba), acting as a theme and a peripheral constituency, that is, *nei guru ree* 'for their teacher', and *bapa=k* 'for my father'. The improvement or promotion of the peripheral constituents of the *nei guru ree* 'foro their teacher' and *bapa= k* 'for my father' who previously served as an adjunct, ending clause, and acted as oblique objects became the core constituents, ie functioning as objects, as benefatively does not cause verb to change, but leads to verbal valence changes, syntactic changes and semantic changes.



From the analysis of peripheral constituent enhancement which occupies the position of the core constituent of the clause it can be said that there is no inherent change of verb (zero internal modification). Nevertheless, there is a change of verb valence from two places to three places, syntactic structure changes such as the increment of peripheral constituents into direct objects shifting the position of the object directly to the basic clauses following or after the direct object and semantic changes ie the increment of the oblique object into the direct object and acting as benefactive. Empty internal changes (zero internal modification) and word order in the clause become the verb valence determinant.

2.2.3 Acceptor's Applicative Construction

Oblique of the receiving oblique object as the clause core constituent can also occur in the BLDL clause. This can be observed in the following example.

- (21a) *Kame nei/soro doi di ana n=aw(p)e*
1JEKS beri/kasih uang di anak 3TG=itu
'Kami memberi uang di anak itu'
- (21a¹) *Kame soro/nei ana n=aw(p)e doi*
1JEKS beri/kasih anak 3TG=itu uang
'Kami memberi anak itu uang'
- (21b) *Moe tutu koda tou nei/soro rae*
2TG cerita dongeng satu beri/kasih 3J
'Engkau menceritakan sebuah dongeng untuk mereka'
- (21b¹) *Moe tutu rae koda tou*
2TG cerita 3J dongeng satu
'Engkau menceritakan mereka dongeng'

The verb clause predicate (21a-21b) is *nei / soro* 'give' and *tutu* 'tell' requires two core constituents. The two constituents are *tite* 'us' and *moe* 'engkau' as subjects, positioned before verbs (praverba) and act as agents, *doi* 'money' and *koda* 'fairy tales' as objects of position after verbs (posverba) play a theme with a peripheral constituency in *ana n=aw(p)e* 'in the child' and *nei / soro rae* 'give for them'. The peripheral constituents will be put forward after the position of verbs (posverba), functioning as the direct object, acting as the receiver not causing a change of verb (zero internal modification), but causing verbal valence to change, syntactic and semantic structures to change. The direct object of the previous clause will shift the position following the indirect object, while its function still remains as a direct object. Improvements can also be observed in the following examples.

- (21c) *Goe gnato sura nei/soro ema=k*



1TG kirim surat beri/kasih ibu=POSS1TG

‘Saya mengirim surat untuk ibuku’

(21c¹) *Goe gnatu ema=k sura*

1TG kirim ibu=POSS1TG surat

‘Saya mengirimkan ibuku surat’

Preaching the oblique object in the base clause (21c) causes the verb to change through the morphophonemic process or changes in vowel alternation or internal modification sound /o/ into sound /u/. The change raises the valence of the ascending verb from two to three, the syntactic structure changes, the oblique object becomes the direct object, positions after verb (posverba) or follows the verb, shifts the position of the direct object. The position of the direct object of the previous clause is after or following the verb after the direct object or following the direct object. Likewise, oblique objects will act as benefactive while the direct object remains the theme.

3. Conclusion

The applicable constructs in the LDLL can be interpreted as (i) preparing the peripheral argument occupying the position of the object argument, (ii) the creation of a new object of the intransitive clause. Suggestion and creation of new arguments in a clause are usually marked by changes in verb predators. This is not found in the example constructions in the LDLL. Nevertheless, LDLL has a particularity in expressing applicative constructs with (i) morphophonemic strategies with vowel alternation techniques or internal modification and (ii) syntactic strategies with word order techniques.

The internal alternation or modification strategy states that there is a change of vowel /o/ into /u/. Syntactic strategy with word order technique states that no morphological changes in verb or predators are called zero internal modification. No apparent morphological changes but sequential order changes into an applicative construction indicator. Locative applicative construction is characterized by a vocal alternation strategy or internal modification whereas the benefactive and recipient applicative constructions are characterized by syntactic strategy with a technique of sequential order or an empty internal modification.

References

Alsina dan Mcombo,S.A. 1988. *Lexical Mapping In The Chichewa Applicative Construction*. Ms : Standford University.



- Artawa, I. K. 2004. *Balinese Language A Typological Description*. Denpasar : Bali CV Bali Media Adhikarsa.
- Artawa, I. K. "Ergativity and Balinese Syntax. 1998. *Linguistic Studies Of Indonesian And Another Languages In Indonesia*" Part ,II ,III . Vol. 42 ,43 dan 44. Jakarta : Badan Penyelenggara Seri Nusa Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya.
- Austin,P. 1993. *Transitivity Alternation In Australian Aboriginal Languages*. Ms : La Trobe University.
- Bresnan, J dan L. Moshi. *Applicative in Kivungo (Chaga) : Implications for Argument Structure and Syntax*. California : System Sciences Laboratory Palo Alto Reserch Centre.
- Comrie, B. 1983, 1989. *Language Universal and Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Demon, Y. 2006. "Tipologi Sintaksis Bahasa Lamaholot Dialek Lamalera". (tesis). Denpasar : Universitas Udayana
- Erawati, N. K. R. 2015. *Memahami Klausa dan Kalimat Teks Bahsa Jawa Kuna*. (disertasi). Denpasar : Dharma Pura. Jln. Ida Bagus Oka, Gang Clurit 2.
- Haspelmath, M. 2002. *Understanding Morphology*. London: Arnold.
- Katamba,F. 1993. *Morphology*. London : Mcmillan Pres Ltd.
- Payne, T. E. 1997, 2002. *Describing Morphosyntax: A Guide for Field Linguists*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Ramchand, G.C. 2008. *Verb Meaning and The Lexicon. A First Phase Syntax*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press
- Shibatani, M., ed. 1976. *Syntax and Semantic: The Grammar of Causative Construction*. New York : Academic Press.
- Shibatani, M. 1996. Applicative and Benefactives. A Cognitive Account. Dalam Shibatani, M dan Thompson, S. A., ed. *Grammatical Construcstion: Their Form and Meaning*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Hlmn. 157-194
- Spencer, A. 1991. *Morphological Theory*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press
- Trask, R. L. 1993. *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics*. London : Routledge.

