The Break Subtype of Affect-H in English And Buginese: Revisiting Dixon's Theoretical Framework

Nurul Fadhilah[1*], Abdul Hakim Yassi[1], Harlinah Sahib[1]

[1]Hasanuddin University, Indonesia
*Correspondence: nurnur910@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research is to analyze the differences and the similarity of The Break Subtype of Affect-H in grammatical and semantical construction. This research use descriptive qualitative method. Primary data are the data in English and Buginese. To collect the data in English the researcher use C Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) and to collect data in Buginese language, the researcher recorded some native speakers of Buginese while using the break verbs in Buginese language. The secondary data are the data that were taken from journals, e-books, and articles. The collected data were analyzed by using Dixon's theory of Break Subtype of Affect-H. The result of this research shows that there are 14 words in Buginese that are identical with the "Break" verb. They are mappakkasolang, ma'jemmu', mapperra', maruttung, massope/makkape', mappue', mappacippe, mappareppa', malleppoang, mappa'bettu, mappaleppo', mappaddempung, and ma'bettu. Construction I of break verb have the same meaning as construction II of mappakkasolang verb. They both means that someone break something by using another instrument. Construction II of break verb and mappakkasolang verb have different meanings. The sentence in Buginese means that someone break something on the table, but no conclusion can be taken about how someone broke the thing. As for the sentence in English it is obvious that someone accidentally put his/her nail inside a piece of wood and break it. Construction III of break verb is applicable but in the other hand, construction III of mappakkasolang verb is not a common way of saying that something is broken because another thing accidentally break it, as in Buginese sentence the role of breaking something is usually done by human, animals, disaster, or weather.

1. Introduction

The objective of this research is to analyze the differences and the similarity of The Break Subtype of Affect-H in grammatical and semantical construction. This research uses descriptive qualitative method. Primary data are the data in English and Buginese. To collect the data in English the researcher uses C Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) and to collect data in Buginese language, the researcher recorded some native speakers of Buginese while using the break verbs in Buginese language. The secondary data are the data that were taken from journals, e-books, and articles. The collected data were analyzed by using Dixon's theory of Break Subtype of Affect-H. The result of this research shows that there are 14 words in Buginese that are identical with the "Break" verb. They are *mappakkasolang*, *ma'jemmu'*, *mapperra'*, *maruttung*, *massope/makkape'*, *mappue'*, *mappacippe*, *mappareppa'*, *malleppoang*, *mappa'bettu*, *mappaleppo', mappaddempung,* and *ma'bettu*. Construction I of *break* verb have the same meaning as construction II of *mappakkasolang* verb. They both means that someone break something by using another instrument. Construction II of *break* verb and *mappakkasolang* verb have different meanings. The sentence in Buginese means that someone break something on the table, but no conclusion can be taken about how someone broke the thing (Tahir, et al., 2018). As for the sentence in English it is obvious that someone accidentally put his/her nail inside a piece of wood and break it. Construction III of *break* verb is applicable but in the other hand, construction III of *mappakkasolang* verb is not a common way of saying that something is broken because another thing accidentally break it, as in Buginese sentence the role of breaking something is usually done by human, animals, disaster, or weather (Jihad, et al, 2021)

Language is a system that consists of the creation, acquisition, maintenance, and application of complex communication systems. Language, according to Hartari et al. (2018), is also a system for conveying ideas and feelings through sounds, gestures, and signs or marks (Hartari, et al., 2018; Suherman, 2018; Bachriani, et al., 2018). In addition, Idris et al., (2020:382) stated that People utilize language to communicate their emotions, sentiments, and opinions. Grammar is an important aspect of language. According to Bambrook (2002:1), grammar is a significant aspect of the English language in general, and its use facilitates proper analysis of some of the most basic metalinguistic statements in common use. It is obvious that some people have ignored grammar because they believe there is no need to learn grammar as long as they can communicate with one another (Weda, et al., 2021). People will never be able to communicate clearly if they do not understand grammar. People will avoid misunderstandings if they use proper grammar when expressing their ideas.

The other important aspect of learning English is understanding the meaning. Through semantics, according to Jessen (2013:62), people could increase their knowledge about different meaning of different words in any language. Furthermore, Palmer (2001: 1-2) main of linguistic that study of meaning in language, but sometimes the meaning is difficult to be found. This case can happen because semantic term is related between phenomenon in the world or context. Which is semantic called as "Science" of meaning. Meanwhile, according to Dixon (1994:18) semantic term is part of linguistic approach that is dependent because must be combined with syntactic to analyze grammar of language.

The motion verb system is built on a foundation of basic motion verbs Lindsey (2011:18). In addition, A verb is referring to an action or state (Blaszack, 2018:76). Furthermore, Dixon (2005: 96) stated that verbal concept naturally divides into two sorts; primary and secondary. However Melansari (2015), she stated that the meanings of motion verbs in English and Wolio are not always the same; there can be a subtle or even significant difference. Moreover, Affective verbs are further subdivided into eight subtypes, and I will look at the verbs from the first six of these subtypes Butler and Arista (2008). Dixon's theoretical framework also classify the "Break" verbs as the part of Affect-h (Primary A verb). Dixon's theory can be used to classify and analyze words in English but there is no deeper explanation or proof that this theory can be applied Buginese Language.

Affect verbs are constructed in five kinds of construction. One of the constructions, construction II, is formed with Agent, Manip, Preposition, and Target. In English the example will be, Dewi breaks that stick on the table, this sentence has the same construction with this sentence in Buginese, La sarip nasolangi kacae okko tange'e. These two different sentences have the different meaning. According to Dixon (1991:119), the first sentence in English means that Dewi hits that stick on the table and that stick is broken, but in Buginese that sentence above means that Sarip is breaking a glass while standing at the door. Due to this problem, the researcher is interested to conduct this research.

2. Methods

In obtaining the data, the researcher used descriptive qualitative method. The researcher collected and analyzed some data to compare English verb "Break" and its related verbs in Buginese language. Saleh et al., (2021) stated that Both of languages were analyzed by using Dixon's theoretical framework. The characteristic of this method is the researcher did not use variable. The researcher reported the events that occurred Kothari (2004:3) and according to Mack (2005:1), the power of qualitative research is potentially to give complex textual description about how the human experience as outline in research.

In this research, the researcher will use several steps to take information from primary and secondary data; Primary data are the data in Buginese. To collect the primary data in Buginese language, the researcher recorded some native speakers of Buginese while using the break verbs in Buginese language. The secondary data are the data that were taken from journals, e-books, and articles.

The Technique of data collection is a technique or method used by the researcher to collect primary and secondary data. Data collection was carried out by obtain the information related to the research in achieving the objectives of the research. The researcher observed the background of the Buginese speakers that will provide the examples of the use of Buginese Language, the researcher did some interview to the native speakers about their background and their competence in using Buginese Language in their daily basis, the researcher recorded the native speakers while using the "Break" verbs in Buginese Language, also during the interview, the research did the note taking to underlined any important information that occur in the process of the data collecting.

After the process of data collection, the researcher will analyze it. The process of data analysis were; transcribing the data that has been collected by recording the users of Buginese Language. The number of transcribed data were

reduced by selecting the data that is identical with each other, the data were analyzed according to Dixon's theory in terms of semantical and grammatical construction, after the analysis, the conclusion was taken according to the result of the analysis.

3. Result and Discussion

The main finding in this study is the "Break" subtype of affect H in English and Buginese. *Affect-h* the *Break* subtype involves an *Agent* causing some object (the Breaking role) to lose its physical unity. For example, *break, crush, squash, destroy, damage, wreck, collapse, tear, split, chip, crack, crash; burst, explode, Blow* NP *up, let* NP *off, and erupt.* According to Dixon (1991:118), *Break* verbs occur in construction I, II, and III but not IV or V. Breaking role is focused on the object and must be in O slot; it can be identified with either *Target* or *Manip*.

I. John (Agent) broke the vase (Target = Breaking) (with that stick (Manip))

II. John (Agent) broke that stick (Manip = Breaking) (on the table (Target))

III. John's stick (Manip) broke the vase (Target = Breaking)

According to Dixon (2005:118) *break* verbs occur in construction I, II, and III; *crush, squash, and destroy* used only in transitive constructions I and III; *damage and wreck* occur in transitive I, II, and III; *tear, split, chip, crack, and smash* occur in construction I, II, III and in intransitive constructions; *burst* shows similar possibilities with *tear, split, chip, crack, and smash; explode and blow up* occur in I and also intransitively; *let off* has a meaning similar to transitive sense of *explode* and confined to I; *erupt* only occurs intransitively simply because people have not yet found a way of causing volcanoes to erupt.

There are 14 words in Buginese that are related with the "Break" verb. They are *mappakkasolang, ma'jemmu', mapperra', maruttung, massope/makkape', mappue', mappacippe, mappareppa', malleppoang, mappa'bettu, mappaleppo', mappaddempung,* and *ma'bettu.* The researcher found 26 data related to these Buginese words.

The following is the comparison between English and Buginese language "Break" subtype of Affect-H in terms of semantic and grammatical construction. The data presented as follows:

Table 1. Construction type of *break* verb and *mappakkasolang* verb

Language	Construction	Sentence		
English	I	I (Agent)	Just broke his heart (Target)	With a letter opener (Manip)
	II	I (Agent)	Just broke a nail (Manip)	In a piece of wood (Target)
	III	The ball (Manip)	Breaks his nose (Target)	
Buginese	I	Mappakkasolang oto-oto (Target)	Ka (Agent)	Pake aju (Manip)
	II	Mappakkasolang polopeng (Manip)	Ka (Agent)	Yase'na mejangngE (Target)
	III	Mappakkasolang penne i (Target)	Palungengku (Manip)	

Break verb has reference to separate or cause to separate into pieces as a result of a blow, shock, or strain. The word *mappakkasolang* in Buginese is similar to the word *break*. Interestingly, the structure of the sentence in table 60 showed that the composition of *mappakkasolang* is not in the same order as in *break* verb. In construction I of *break* verb, Agent appears before Target while in construction I of *mappakkasolang* Target appears first, before Agent. As in construction II of *break* verb Agent also appears before Marget while in construction II of *mappakkasolang* Manip appears

before Agent. This is also happened in construction III, where in *break* verb Manip appears before Target while in *mappakkasolang* verb Target appears before Manip.

Construction I of *break* verb have the same meaning as construction II of *mappakkasolang* verb. They both means that someone break something by using another instrument. Construction II of *break* verb and *mappakkasolang* verb have different meanings. The sentence in Buginese means that someone break something on the table, but no conclusion can be taken about how someone broke the thing. As for the sentence in English it is obvious that someone accidentally put his/her nail inside a piece of wood and break it. Construction III of *break* verb is applicable but in the other hand, construction III of *mappakkasolang* verb is not a common way of saying that something is broken because another thing accidentally break it, as in Buginese sentence the role of breaking something is usually done by human, animals, disaster, or weather.

Dixon (1991) stated that the word *break* appears in construction I, II, and III, *crush, squash* and *destroy* appear construction I and III, *damage* and *wreck* appear in construction I, II and III, *tear, split, chip, crack,* and *smash* appear in construction I, II, III and in intransitive construction, *burst* appears in construction III and in intransitive construction, *explode* and *blow up* appear in construction I and in intransitive construction, *explode* and *blow up* appear in construction I and intransitive construction, *let off* appears in construction I, *erupt* appears in intransitive construction, also *explode* and *blow up* appear in construction IV with (at) before the target. While the identical words in Buginese, *mappakkasolang* appears in construction I, *ma'jemmu'* and *mapperra'* appear in construction I and II, *maruttung* appears in construction III and intransitive construction, *mappacippe'* appears in construction I, *massope'/makkape'* appear in construction I, *mappareppa'* appears in construction I, *mappue'* appears in construction I, *mappa'bettu, mappaleppo',* and *mappa'dempung* appear in construction I and intransitive construction, *ma'bettu* as *erupt* appears in intransitive construction in case it is related to volcanoes or *bulu'* in Buginese. According to Dixon (1991) this is simply because people have not yet found a way of causing volcanoes to erupt.

4. Conclusion

After discussing the phenomenon of the data the researcher has drawn the conclusion. Firstly there are seventeen "Break" subtype verb of Affect-H in English whereas Buginese has less variants related verbs. It can be inferred that semantically two or more verbs in English have related or equivalent or identical meaning with one verb in Buginese. in line with Frostad (2006), In causative locative descriptions, posture verbs are also used. Furthermore, The Bugis states, in particular, had a well-organized system of envoys with diplomatic rights and privileges Abdin (1971:168). This happened due to the influence of cultural background where the language is spoken. There are 14 words in Buginese that are identical with the "Break" verb. They are *mappakkasolang*, *ma'jemmu'*, *mapperra'*, *maruttung*, *massope/makkape'*, *mappue'*, *mappacippe*, *mappareppa'*, *malleppoang*, *mappa'bettu*, *mappaleppo'*, *mappaddempung,* and *ma'bettu*. Some of these words can be used in the same construction that is used in English sentence in Dixon's theoretical backgrounds and some of them cannot. The word *break* and *mappakkasolang* have the same meaning but if sentences in construction II, and III are made out of these words the sentence can have significantly different meaning.

Secondly, English and Buginese "Break" subtype of affect-H have similarities and differences. Grammatically there are three main constructions that are similar to both language in line with Dixon's theory. In the other hand those constructions order that is used in English and Buginese are not completely the same. English "Break" subtype of affect-H has more variants of construction that Buginese "Break" subtype of Affect-H.

References

Abidin, A. Z. (1971). Notes on the Lontara as Historical Sources. *Indonesia*, (12), 159-172.

Apreliah, Reza. (2016). Dixon's Carry Subtype of Motion Verbs in English and Barru Buginese. Thesis. Post Graduate Program: Hasanuddin University.

Bachriani, B., Yassi, A. H., & Rahman, F. (2018). A Comparative Study of Euphemism in English and Buginese: Pragmatic Stylistics Contexts. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, *1*(4), 429-440. https://doi.org/10.34050/els-jish.v1i4.5760

Bambrook, G. (2002). *A Local Grammar of Definition Sentences*. University of Birmingham.

Błaszczak, J., Czypionka, A., & Klimek-Jankowska, D. (2018). Why are verbal nouns more verbal than finite verbs?: new insights into the interpretation of the P200 verbal signature. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, *3*(1).

Butler, C., Arista, J. M. (2008). *Deconstructing Constructions*. John Benjamins: Publishing.

Dixon, R. M., & Robert Malcolm Ward, D. (1991). *A New Approach to English Grammar, on Semantic Principles*. Clarendon Press.

Dixon, R. M. (2005). *A semantic approach to English grammar*. Oxford University Press.

Frostad, B. H. (2006). *Syntactic and Semantic Aspects of Some Verbs of Motion and Location in Äiwoo* (Master's thesis).

Hautli-Janisz, A. (2014). *Urdu/Hindi Motion Verbs and Their Implementation in a Lexical Resource* (Doctoral dissertation).

Hartari, A. R. (2018). Dixon's Sit Subtype of Rest Verbs in English and Buginese. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, *1*(1), 21-27.

Idris, A. M. S., Adliah, A., & Alfina, S. (2020). Multilingual Interaction in Classroom Context. *ETERNAL (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal)*, *6*(2), 381-393.

Jessen, M. (2013). Semantic Categories in the Domain of Motion Verbs by Adult Speakers of Danish, German, and Turkish. *Linguistik online*, *61*(4).

Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. New Age International.

Lindsey, T. S. (2011). *Bulgarian Verbs of Motion: Slavic Verbs in a Balkan Context*. University of California, Berkeley.

Mack, N. (2005). Qualitative Research Methods: A data collector's field guide.

Melansari, N. (2015). Motion Verbs in English and Wolio Language: A Semantic Point of View. *Unpublished Thesis. Makassar: Universitas Hasanuddin*.

Palmer, M., Gildea, D., & Xue, N. (2010). Semantic Role Labeling. *Synthesis Lectures on Human Language Technologies*, *3*(1), 1-103.

Saleh, N. J., Yassi, A. H., & Rahman, F. (2021). Strategy of Apology in Buginese: A Sociolinguistic Study. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, *4*(2), 188-196.

Suherman, L. A. (2018). The Analysis of Metaphorical Domain on English "Stab Verb" in Corpora. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, *1*(1), 52-58. https://doi.org/10.34050/els-jish.v1i1.4190

Tahir, D., Rahman, F., & Rahman, A. (2018). The Study of Buginese Reciprocal Verb in the Boegineesche Chrestomathies Manuscript. *Am. J. Humanit. Soc. Sci. Res*, *2*(08), 48-54.

Weda, S., Atmowardoyo, H., Rahman, F., & Sakti, A. E. F. (2021). Linguistic aspects in intercultural communication (IC) practices at a higher education institution in Indonesia. *Eroupean Language Scientific Journal*, *14*, 2-6.