



Argument Structure in Riau Malay Language (RML)

Azhary Tambusai^{1*}, Khairawati², Khairina Nasution³

^{1*}University of Muslim Nusantara Al-Washliyah Medan, Indonesia

^{2,3}University of Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia

*Corresponding e-mail: azharytambusai60@gmail.com

Abstract: The term argument in the study of linguistic typology, especially at the syntactic level, refers to nomina phrase elements that precede and/or follow the clause predicate. This study aims to explain the structure of arguments in Riau Malay Language. The method used is descriptive qualitative. The approach used in this study is a linguistic typology approach, especially grammatical typology. The theory used in this study follows Manning and Alsina (1996) and Jufrizal (2002, 2004, and 2012). The results of the study show that the structure of the RML argument can be realized through predication in the form of verbal and non-verbal predicates. There are RML predications that consist of intransitive verbal predicates that require one core argument, transitive verbs that contain transitive verbs that require two core arguments, and bi-transitive verbs that require more than two arguments. Transitivity in RML can be formed through (a) causative construction and (b) applicative construction. Causative constructions in RML include the suffixes {-kan}, {per-}, {-i} and affix combinations such as {memper-kan}. The suffix {-i} in RML is more productive in forming applicative verbals.

Keywords: Linguistic Typology, Riau Malay Language (RML), Argument Structure.

INTRODUCTION

The development of technology and information has had a positive impact on human life, but also has a negative impact on the local wisdom of people in remote areas. One of the negative impacts that is deeply felt is the further erosion of regional languages. Riau Malay Language is an example of a regional language which will slowly be eroded by today's developments. In interacting, it is often found that many vocabularies that were previously used are now no longer found. Situations like this if allowed to continue slowly will result in the language being lost.

Riau Malay Language is one of the regional languages in Indonesia. Riau is a province in Indonesia which is located in the central part of Sumatra Island, which is along the coast of the Malacca Strait. Its capital is Pekanbaru. RML was given a position as the root of the national language and became the Indonesian language. In general, RML linguistic research has been dominated by traditional and structural linguistic theories and approaches since 1980. Previous studies have not based their studies on a specific typological approach to language. In general, the basic structure of RML sentences is SVO (Subject-Verb-Object), but there are also those with VSO (Verb-Subject-Object) and VS (Verb-Subject) structures. In the variety of customs and literature, clauses consisting of VOS (Verb-Object-Subject) are still found.

The research that will be carried out is on the structure of the RML argument which is carried out using the theory of grammatical typology. The theoretical framework presented in this study

relates to the grammatical behavior of RML (the morphological process of RML verbs with affixes and the structure of clause arguments). The term argument in the study of linguistic typology is related to the study of syntax which focuses on noun phrases that precede and/or follow clause predicates. This means that arguments are similar in meaning to the subject and/or object of a clause.

In traditional linguistics, clauses are divided into subjects and predicates. Another opinion states that a sentence consists of a predicator with one or more arguments which is called predication. The sentence, thus, can be formulated into an argument, predicator and argument. A clause structure that has two arguments, one of which is identified as the agent (perpetrator) and the other as the patient (sufferer). Agents and patients are marked by grammatical features in a language called grammatical direct objects. Three other grammatical direct objects that follow agent and patient are beneficiary, instrumental, and locative (Palmer: 1996 and Jufrizal: 2012). Furthermore, he added that in the basics of grammatical theory it is said that the elements that make up a sentence are the predicate and there are other elements in the sentence that act as arguments from the predicate.

The term predication is a construction in the form of a clause (a simple sentence) consisting of a predicate and its argument (see Kac in Shibatani (ed): 1976; Acherman and Webelthuth: (1998 and Lyons: (1987). Furthermore, in Givon's functional grammar (1984). explicitly equates predication with the types of verbs used in language. He views that predication is not just a semantic concept but a syntactic concept, namely that verbs are characterized semantically by semantic direct objects (semantic rules) in arguments in different situations. they state. Then the participants also see the characteristics of the grammatical role in the clause, such as subject, object directly or indirectly. The view of modern linguist states that a sentence consists of a predicator with one or more arguments. So, sentences can be formulated as arguments-predicator-arguments.

A predicate (transitive) can require one or more objects so that objects can be categorized as the main object (direct object) and the second object (indirect object) (Donohue: 1999 and Jufrizal: 2004). In line with that Culicover (1997), Jufrizal (2004), and Basariah (2011) state that in general there are two types of arguments, namely (1) subject arguments whose presence in a sentence is the most independent part of a verb and (2) arguments associated with certain verbs. This last argument according to the theory of Relational Grammar (and also Traditional Grammar) is called an object. So the object in a transitive clause is the core argument (next to the subject). An object is an argument that undergoes the action declared by a transitive verb. Arguments that experience the action expressed by the verb occupy the second position in the hierarchy of grammatical functions after the subject (Verhaar, 2000; Alsina, 1996 and Jufrizal, 2004). The direct object and indirect object must appear together in clauses with bi-transitive verbs. Across languages there are not many verbs that demand three arguments simultaneously. The verb *give* in English, 'beri' in Indonesian, and several other equivalent verbs are examples of bi-transitive verbs (Jufrizal: 2004).

In line with the opinions above, Alsina (1996) says that a predicate expresses the relationship between participants in a clause. The participant is called the predicate argument. Each predicate (verbal and non-verbal) has a logical relationship with its arguments. The attachment and linkage of information that becomes the argument of the predicate and the predicate itself forms a structure, which is called the structure of the argument. The argument structure is also the minimum information the predicate needs to derive its syntactic framework. The relationship of grammatical functions (subject, object, oblique) with predicate arguments is not random or unexpected. Whether the argument is expressed as a subject, object, etc. is determined in part by the semantics of the predicate.

Furthermore, according to Manning's idea (1996) the notion of argument structure given by Alsina (1996) is seen more as a semantic embodiment than syntax. Manning places the problem of argument structure as an embodiment of syntax. To him, the grammatical structure and the structure

of the argument are the direct result of the grammaticalization of two different sets of relations. The grammatical structure is the result of the grammaticalization of discourse roles, while the argument structure is the result of the grammaticalization of semantic prominence.

Both Alsina (1996) and other experts who see argument structure as a matter of semantics, and Manning (1996) who see argument structure as a manifestation of the syntactic level, both have a well-founded theoretical basis. These two points of view actually have a meeting point, the connection between semantic matters and syntactical matters in the argument structure was also put forward by Van Valin Jr and La Polla (1999) who stated that the term argument actually refers to semantic arguments (arguments based on causes and factors), while the core argument is an understanding that refers to the syntactic level. In this study, the structure of the argument is syntactically and grammatically seen by paying attention to its attachment as a form of semantic matter.

Argument structure is also closely related to valences. In linguistics, the notion of valence is generally associated with transitivity. Hopper and Thomson (1982) allude to transitivity structurally and traditionally. To them, structural transitivity is a structure related to a predicate and two non-oblique arguments. Subject and direct object at any level. Traditional transitivity, namely overall transitivity in clauses, refers to the transfer of action from agent to patient (Katamba: 1993 and Jufrizal: 2004). Katamba also adds that basically valence is determined by the behavior of verbs. Therefore, verbs can be called intransitive, transitive (having one argument), and bi-transitive (having two arguments). Based on a more semantic study, Hopper and Thomson (1982) suggest that transitivity is **bringing** or **moving** an action from a semantic agent to a semantic patient. In fact, transitivity cannot only be seen based on research on the number of syntactic arguments (syntactic valence), but also has to be seen in a *macrorole* (semantic valence or *macrorole* valence. A distinction must, thus, be made between (S-transitivity); the number of syntactical arguments, and M-transitivity; the number of macrorole (semantic) arguments. One way to make transitivity is through causativeness.

In terms of cross-language, it is found that causative equality can be syntactically and analytically expressed. The examples of lexical causative and analytic causative are as follows:

- (1) *Juanita broke the vase*
- (2) *I made him work*

In examples (1 and 2) it is a lexical causative construction. The word *Juanita* (subject) is the cause (causer) and *the vase* (object) is the recipient of the cause (causee). The example (2) is analytic causative construction. The word *I* is the subject and is the cause (causer), while the pronoun *him* is the object which is the recipient of the cause (causee).

Artawa (1988) gives an example of the use of causative in the Balinese language by using the causative conjunction *because* to combine two clauses that show a cause-and-effect relationship such as:

- (3) *Dana tusing teka mai kerana motor ne usak.*
'Dana did not come here because her motorbike broke down'

Goddard (1998), Comrie (1983 and 1989, and Artawa (1998) divide causativeness into (1) analytic causative (periphrastic) (2) morphological causative and (3) lexical causative. In one camp, it has been argued that the component responsible for the causative alternation is the lexicon (Hale and Keyser 1986, Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995, Reinhart 2002, and Reinhart and Silowi 2005; Koontz-Garboden 2009).

The term applicative is often used to refer to the derivational processes involved in increasing valence in Bantu languages. The opinion that applicative construction is the process of

creating objects can be maintained in accusative language, but this is not the case in languages which are syntactically ergative languages, such as Balinese. In Balinese, applicative construction refers to the construction of subject creation as stated by Artawa (1998). Applicative verbs in Balinese can be formed from precategoryals, intransitive verbs, and transitive verbs. The affixes used to derive applicative verbs in this language are /-in/ and /-ang/ suffixes. The suffix /-ang/ can only be used to derive applicative verbs from transitive verbs. Some examples of Balinese applicative verbs are derived from precategoryal, intransitive, and transitive. (Artawa: 1998).

A. Applicative verbs in Balinese

Intransitive Applicative	verbs
teka 'come'	teka-in 'come'
demen 'like'	demen-in 'like'
Transitive	Verb applicative
silih 'borrow'	silih-in 'borrow'
jemak 'take'	jemak-in 'take'

The applicable verbs above are all marked with a {-in} suffix. Furthermore, Artawa argues that applicative constructs can be locative, instrumental, benefactive, source, and recipient.

B. Valence and transitivity of verbs

A valence relates to verbs which usually occupy predicate elements to bind arguments. According to the ideas of Happer and Thomson (1982) valence is used to refer to the number of nominal arguments in a clause at whatever level someone wants to call them. This limitation indicates that the number of nominal arguments is determined by the verb that occupies the position of the clause predicate. Next Van Valin, Jr. and La Polla (1999 and 2000) and Jufriзал (2004) say that syntactic valence is traditionally equated with transitivity. To them, the number of arguments bound/taken by the verb is called valence. The syntactic valence of a verb is the number of morphosyntactically implied arguments that the verb takes. The semantic valence of a verb is the number of semantic arguments that a particular verb can take. The two types of valence are somewhat different. The word *rain* (verb) in English, for example, semantically does not require arguments, but syntactically it requires one argument because every English language requires a subject. For example, *it rained* or *it is raining*. Several grammatical processes can be considered as mechanisms for changing verb valence, namely passiveness, causativeness, and others.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study includes a review of grammatical typology at the level of morphosyntax. This research is a synchronous qualitative descriptive research. Sources of data come from (1) informants (2) grammatical books and examples of research results. The data comes from the use of RML both orally and in writing. Data collection was carried out using the speaking method (Herman et al, 2022, Subroto: 1992, and Purba et al, 2022) and the listening method (Sudaryanto: 1993, Black & Champion: 1999, Denzin & Lincoln: 1997, Sehen: 2004, and Bungin: 2003). For data analysis, the distribution method was used with basic techniques for direct elements and advanced techniques for dissipation techniques, replacement techniques, expansion techniques and transformation techniques. Argument structure has been widely studied in relation to clauses in various theories and areas, for example Thoha: 2000, Sedeng: 2011, Jufriзал: 2004, Wood: 2012, Ardianto: 2015, Fauzi and Mulyadi: 2020, and Jo, 2021.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. The Argument Structure of RML

The structure of RML arguments is determined by the morphology and syntax of RML. Morphological rules also determine the syntactical properties and the rules that accompany them. For example, starting with a study of the morphological formation of verbs which can later determine the number of arguments in the RML clause. Based on previous research, it is known that RML clauses are formed with one predicate and its arguments. In addition, it is known that RML sentence predicates can be verbal and non-verbal. both as forming arguments to form complete sentences.

The following are examples of arguments contained in the RML clause.

(4) *Abah-nyo peng- alai*

father-POS3TP PRE-alai

'His father is a trader'

(5) *Oang tu sangat bijaksane.*

person Dem Adv Adj

'That person is very wise'

(6) *Anak gadis- nyo di negeri oang.*

girl- POS3TP Pre country people

'His daughter is in another country'

The examples (4-6) of the RML above consist of complete clauses whose predicate is non-verbal with one argument noun phrases serving as the subject. In example (4) the predicate is the noun *pengalai* 'trader' and the subject argument is *Abahnya* 'his father'. In example (5) the subject argument is *oang tu* 'that person' and the predicate is *bijaksane* 'wise' which is an adjective. In this case the word *sangat* 'very' is an adverb. *Gadisnyo* 'His daughter' (6) is a subject argument with a predicate in the form of a prepositional phrase *di negeri oang* 'in the other country'.

The RML predicate in these non-verbal predicated examples does not have morphological markers on each of its elements so that only spoken speech distinguishes sentences from phrases. Based on the description above, it can be seen that the non-verbal clause predicate RML (nominal, numeral, adjective, and prepositional) has one argument positioned behind the predicate and functions as a grammatical subject. This non-verbal predicate requires an argument (subject) to form the predication. Elements that are not arguments (of the predicate) may be added to the predication.

For more details, the structure of the non-verbal predicate argument for RML can be seen in the following RML prediction.

Table 1. RML Predication

Predication	Adjutant
Argument + Predicate (subject) (nominal) (adjective) (numeral) (preposition)	+ elements are not arguments

There are also RML predictions that consist of verbal predicates, both intransitive and transitive, with one argument. Intransitive verbal predicates require an element of the Noun Phrase argument that can function as a subject (and also an agent/patient). Examples of RML using intransitive verbs are as follows:

- (7) *Tuti be-teriak keras-keras.*
tuti AKT-shouted loudly
'Tuti shouted loudly'
- (8) *Curut lari ke pinggi sawah.*
'The rat ran to the edge of the rice field'
- (9) *Nina jatuh.*
'Nina fell'
- (10) *Budak tu me- nangis.*
child AKT'-cried
'The child is crying'

In example (7) the predicate */beteriak/* 'shouted' has one argument *Tuti*. *Tuti* is both a subject and an agent. The word *loudly* does not include arguments. The intransitive verbal predicate *beteriak* has one argument only (and can be added to other non-argument elements). In example (8) the *curut* 'rat' is the only argument of the predicate run which functions as both subject and agent. Meanwhile, */to the edge of the fields/* is an element not an argument. Unlike the two previous examples, the word *nina* (9) is the only argument of an intransitive verb */fell/* which functions as a subject but also acts as a patient because it is influenced by the semantics of the verb. As for example (10), the word */menangis/* 'crying' is the predicate of the word */budak tu/* which is the agent's argument. For more details, the structure of predicate arguments with RML intransitive verbs can be seen in the following table.

Table 2. Predication of RML Intransitive Verbs

Predication	Adjutant
Argument + predicate (agent / pasien) (intransitive verb)	+ elements are not arguments

Furthermore, predication in RML can also consist of transitive verbs. These transitive verbs, like the previous explanation, are mono-transitive and bi-transitive and there are also so-called semi-transitive verbs (verbs whose objects are arbitrary) (see Alwi, 2000: 91-93). Mono-transitive verbs require two arguments, bi-transitive verbs require more than two arguments while semi transitive verbs have one argument (maybe more than one). For more details on RML predicates that have transitive verb predicates, see the examples below:

- (11) *Budak tu minum ae lemon.*
'The boy drinks lemonade'
- (12) *Abah- nyo me- makan bubuR.*
father-POS3TP AKT- eats porridge
'The father eats porridge'
- (13) *Inyo mem-bawak-kan anak-nyo hadiah.*
PRO3TP ACT-brings-CAU child-POS3TP gift
'He brought his child a present'
- (14) *Betine tu me- nido-kan bayi- nyo di ayunan.*
female household member ACT-sleeping-CAU baby-POS3TP Pre swing
'The woman put the baby to sleep in the swing'

In example (11) there is a transitive verb predicate *minum* 'drink' with the argument *budak tu* 'the boy' acts as the subject (also agent) and the other argument is *ae lemon* 'lemonade'.

Semantically the verb *minum* ‘drink’ may not require an argument (object) *ae lemon*, but syntactically the verb requires an object/patient argument. Thus the presence of the *ae lemon* in (11) is arbitrary (semantically) although syntactically it is mandatory (see La Polla 2002 and Jufrizal 2012). Therefore the verb *minum* ‘drink’ can be classified as a semi-transitive verb.

The verb *memakan* ‘eats’ (12) is a predicate that requires two arguments, namely *abahnyo* ‘the father’ which functions as a subject (and also agent) and *bubuR* ‘porridge’ which functions as an object/patient. The presence of *bubuR* in example (12) is mandatory both semantically and syntactically. The verb *memakan* ‘take’ on predication (12) include exatransitive verbs that require two arguments. As for the verbs in the form of predications (13-14) are bi-transitive verbs, namely verbs that require more than two arguments. Furthermore, the verb *anaknyo* ‘his child’ in example (13) also requires three arguments, namely *He* ‘inyo’ as S/A (Subject/Agent), *gift* (Object 1) and, (Object 2), while in example (14) the predicate of the verb *menidokan* ‘put to sleep’ requires three arguments, namely *betine tu* ‘the woman’ (S/A), *baby* (Object/patient), and *swing* OBL (Oblique). Judging from the verbal construction, example (13) is referred to as a beneficial construction.

Based on the description above, it can be seen that predication in RML consisting of transitive verbs requires two or more arguments. The presence of these arguments in a transitive sentence is mandatory. Unless the verb consists of semii-transitive verbs, the predicate may only use one argument. For more details, the predication and argument structure of the RML transitive verb can be seen below.

Table 3. Predication of RML Intransitive Verbs

Predication	Adjutant
Argument (1) + predicate + (Argument(2)) (subject) (object) (semi transitive)	
Argument (1) + predicate + Argument (2) (subject) (object) (eka transitive)	+elements are not arguments
Argument (1) + predicate + Argument + (2) + Argument (3) (object 1) (object 2) (bi-transitive)	

The discussion about the argument structure here only discusses the arguments contained in the RML predication, therefore the core of the problem is the forming element (argument) which is only the predicate (in terms of construction). Based on the example stated above, RML found simple predicates and complex predicates. Simple predicates are non-verbal predicates consisting of nominal, adjective, numeral and prepositional forms, while complex predicates are verbal predicates consisting of both intransitive and transitive verbs in the form of semi-transitive, mono-transitive and bi-transitive.

B. Causative Construction of RML

Every language has ways to express causative and causative constructions that are unique. Every language has different grammatical constructions in expressing causativeness. To form a causative construction can be done through analytic causative, lexical causative, and morphological

causative. The discussion of causative here is related to morphological causative. The morphological causative is the study of the relationship between non-causative predicates and causative ones which are marked by morphological devices, such as affixation. The affixes used to mark positivity in RML are the suffixes {-kan}, {peR-}, {-i} and affix combinations such as {mempeR-kan}. The affix {-kan} is a productive affix in quantifying RML, while the affixes {-i} and {peR-} can also be used as causative but the number is limited. To clarify the use of causative contained in the RML, you can see the examples below:

(a) Causative with {-kan}

The basic forms of causative verbs marked by {-kan} can be verbs, adjectives, nouns, and pre categories.

1. Verb

<i>munduR</i> 'backward'	<i>munduRkan</i> 'rewind'
<i>jatuh</i> 'fall'	<i>jatuhkan</i> 'drop'
<i>baleh</i> 'back'	<i>balehkan</i> 'back'
<i>ambek</i> 'take'	<i>ambekkan</i> 'take'
<i>ingat</i> 'remember'	<i>ingatkan</i> 'remindr'

2. Adjektiva

<i>besaR</i> 'big'	<i>besaRkan</i> 'enlarge'
<i>jeRnih</i> 'clear'	<i>jeRnihkan</i> 'clarify'
<i>elok</i> 'good'	<i>elokkan</i> 'fix'
<i>panjang</i> 'long'	<i>panjangkan</i> 'lengthen'
<i>rendah</i> 'low'	<i>rendahkan</i> 'low'

For more details on the morphological causative study with /- right/ in RML, see the examples below.

(15) *Ae tu jeRnih.*

water ART clear

'The water is clear'

(16) *Ae tu aku jeRnih- kan.*

water ART FP clear- CAU

'I clear the water'

(17) *Aku men- jeRnih- kan ae tu.*

FP ACT- clear- CAU water ART

'I clear the water'

The predicate of the original clause (15) in the example above is a clear adjective . If the adjective is marked with a suffix {-kan}, and given or without a prefix {meN-} it creates a transitive verb that has a causative meaning. This can be seen in example (16) which shows that the complementary agent (cause) is presented, namely *I* (17). In this construction, the subject of the clause is not causative, i.e. *ae tu* (15) no longer functions as a grammatical subject but functions as a topic derived from the basic construction through topicalization. Thus, *causee* is marked as an object or topic. This fact is also supported by example (17), both of which are optional constructions (the usual form) of causative clauses in RML. The causative construction in (17) is marked by a nasal prefix (which is a verbal prefix in RML) but shows that the cause is both an agent and a grammatical subject, while cause is an object in the RML causative hierarchy.

Below will be displayed examples of basic RML clauses that have an intransitive verb predicate accompanied by its causative.

- (18) *Pakcik balek ke kampung.*
uncle returned Pre village
'Uncle returned to the village'
- (19) *Pakcik kami balek- kan ke kampung.*
uncle POS1PLU returned- CAU Pre village
'Uncle we returned to the village'
- (20) *Kami mem- balek- kan pakcik ke kampung.*
1PLU ACT- pulang-CAU uncle Pre village
'We returned uncle to the village'

The examples above show that causative verbal clauses with intransitive verb predicates show that the affixing of the suffix {-kan} to the verb creates a causative meaning (causative verb). The grammatical subject of the basic clause is and *uncle* (18).causative agent *we* (19), the grammatical subject of the base clause is marked as an object. The grammatical subject of the causative construction is the causative agent. This situation also applies to causative constructions where the verb is marked with a nasal prefix (see example (20)).

RML causative clauses are not always derived from basic clauses like the one above, but causative clauses can also be derived from pre categories like the following examples.

- (21) *Gulo tu kami letak- kan.*
sugar ART PRO1PLU put- CAU
'The sugar is put by us'
- (22) *Kami me- letak- kan gulo tu.*
PRO2PLU ACT put- CAU sugar ART
'We put the sugar'

The basic verb in the form of precategory in example (21) is *letak* 'location'. This precategory form can be transitive with the suffix {-kan}. The verb produced by the suffixation is a causative verb. Thus, the precategory form can also be the basis for the formation of causative verbs.

Furthermore, the causative behavior with the suffix {-kan} can also be done with basic verbs which are transitive verbs. For example, can be seen in the examples below.

- (23) *Adek minum susu.*
'The sister drinks the milk'
- (24) *Mak minum- kan adek susu.*
Mother drinks- CAU sister milk
'Mother feeds milk to sister'
- (25) *Mak me- minum- kan susu untuk adek.*
Mother ACT drink- CAU milk Pre sister
'Mother feeds milk to sister'
- (26) *Mak me- minum- kan adek susu.*
Mother ACT drink- CAU sister milk
'Mother feeds milk to sister'

Sentence construction (23) is not a causative construction, while sentences (24-26) are causative sentences. In example (23), the word *adek* 'sister' is both a grammatical subject and an agent. In the causative sentence (24) the causative agent *mak* 'mother' occupies the subject position, while *adek* (in the basic clause acts as agent and subject) becomes Indirect Object, and in examples

(25 and 26) *adek* also functions as Indirect Object which is marked with a preposition *for*. *Milk* which is a direct object in the clause is not causative but as a direct object in the benefactive clause. In example (26) the benefactive predicate is filled with a verb with a nasal prefix.

In addition to the RML affixes mentioned above, the {peR-} prefix can also derive causative verbs from transitive verbs or adjectives. To causativise this type of verb, the presence of {-kan} is arbitrary (usually not present), whereas to causativise transitive verbs, the presence of {-kan} is mandatory, an example is as follows:

- (27) *Tulis-an- nyo jelas*
 write-SUF PRO1FP clear
 'The writing is clear'
- (28) *Tulis- an- nyo aku per- jelas*
 write- SUF POS3TP PRO1FP ACT clear
 'I clarified the writing'
- (29) *Aku (mem-) per- jelas (-kan) tulis- an- nyo.*
 I ACT clear- CAU write- SUF POS3TP
 'I clarified the writing'
- (30) *Aku per- jelas tulis- an- nyo.*
 I ACT clear write- SUF- POS3TP
 'I clarified the writing'

The sentences in example (27) are basic sentences that are not causative with an adjective predicate. The other sentences are sentences with causative construction in RML. The causative meaning of the sentence is marked morphologically by the prefix {peR-} and the suffix {-kan}. In examples (28-30) the causative sentence is derived from the predicate adjective with the affix {peR-(-kan)}. The parenthesis placed on the suffix {-kan} indicates the presence of this suffix is arbitrary. The causticization with the join affix {memper-kan} in RML is a less productive causativization. For example, in RML there is the word *memperingatkan* 'warn' which consists of /*mempeR-* + *ingat* + *-kan*/. Not all transitive verbs can be causative with this confix, while the function of the suffix {-kan} as a causative marker is more productive.

Based on the description above, it can be concluded that the origin/base of the causative predicate in RML can be in the form of (a) intransitive predicates (including adjectival predicates) (b) transitive predicates and (c) precategorial predicates. In this regard, RML can causativise intransitive predicates and some transitive verbs. Furthermore, it is suspected that in RML, bi-transitive verbs cannot be causative because the morphological causative behavior in RML gives rise to bi-transitive verbs. The same thing is also found in the Minangkabau language where the intransitive verb can be causative. Artawa (1998: 41) says that a number of languages cannot causatively intransitive (volitional) verbs. Volitional intransitive verbs are those that want the subject to behave as an agent. It can, thus, be said that RML can lead to causative intransitive verbs morphologically with the causative prefix {-kan}.

(b) Causative with {-i}

It was previously known (in the suffixation section) that the suffix {-i} in RML can be attached with nouns, action verbs, or with state verbs to form transitive verbs. If this suffix is attached to a state verb or an intransitive action verb, you will get a transitive verb which means 'causative'. Usually the suffix {-i} is often combined with {meN-}, {di-} or {teR-}. One of the things that underlies the study of causticity with the suffix {-i} typologically is that the function of the verb

gives rise to the meaning 'causative'. The use of the suffix {-i} which lowers the causative verb in RML is less productive. For more details on causativization with the suffix {-i} in RML, see the examples below:

- (31) *Umah tu koto.*
house ART dirty
'The house is dirty'
- (32) *Umah tu inyo koto- i.*
house ART PRO3TP dirty APL
'He made a mess of the house'
- (33) *Inyo me- koto- i umah tu.*
PRO3TP ACT dirty CAU house ART
'He made a mess of the house'

Sentence (34) above is a sentence with a predicate adjective that is not causative. As for examples (36) is a causative sentence with the morphological end of the suffix {-i}. Sentences with predicated adjectives can be made into transitive verbal sentences with causative meanings by adding the suffix {-i} to their adjectives. Almost all adjectives when they get the suffix {-i} reduce transitive verbs to mean 'causative'. However, in the use of everyday language, the causative with the suffix {-i} is rarely used. Instead, the use of the suffix {-kan} is more often used.

The subject of the base clause (not causative) which has an intransitive verb predicate and the patient of the base clause which has a transitive verb predicate merge with the patient of the causative predicate. This occurs in the RML morphological causative strategy. Based on this argument structure approach, the structure of the RML causative argument can be described as follows:

Intransitive basis:

- (34) *duduk-kan* 'MENYEBABKAN' <ag ps 'duduk' <ps>>
duduk-CAU
duduk-kan 'cause' <ag ps 'sit' <ps>>
sit-CAU

transitive basis:

- (35) *peR-dagang-kan* 'MENYEBABKAN' <ag ps 'dagang' <ag ps>>
CAU-dagang
peR-dagang-kan 'cause' <ag ps 'trade' <ag ps>>
CAU-trade

In example (34) above, the patient of the basic clause is united with the patient of the causative predicate. This is also shown by the example (35), that the basic clause predicate patient merges with the causative predicate patient. In accordance with the structure of this argument, RML has similarities with one version of the Chichewa transitive causative and Balinese causative, namely the basic clause patient merges with the causative predicate patient. However, in RML it is also found that the basic clause agent (which becomes the cause in the causative clause) does not always appear as an arbitrary oblique, but only prepositional causal arguments may be omitted. If the cause is present without a preposition it cannot be omitted.

RML has no way of causativeizing bi-transitive verbs morphologically if you look at the examples below:

(36) *Tuti me- manggil uang tuo tu andung.*

tuti ACT- call old man ART grandma

'Tuti called the old woman Grandma'

* (37) *Tuti me- manggil- kan uang tuo tu andung.*

tuti ACT- call- CAU old man ART grandma

'Tuti called the old woman Grandma'

The examples above are bi-transitive sentences in RML which cannot be morphologically causative. Sentence (37) is not grammatical because the causative suffix {-kan} appears in the bi-transitive vderb *memanggil* 'call'. The grammatical hierarchical approach (except with regard to bi-transitive positivity) can be applied to morphological positivity of RML.

Furthermore, the morphological causative behavior of RML can be carried out based on the argument structure approach (Alsina et al (ed.): 1997), namely the mapping between the argument structure and grammatical functions, namely the patient in the RML causative clause is mapped to an object, and the agent as the highest thematic direct Object is mapped to subject, and arguments that are not mapped to either of the two are mapped as oblique relations.

The two approaches above are used to express the causticity of accusative language, so it can be assumed that RML has grammatical characteristics as accusative language. However, RML also, among other things, has the characteristic that indirect object is a causative clause (can be with or without prepositions), namely indirect object with prepositions that may or may not be omitted. In connection with the description above, it can be said the strategies for causative RML as accusative language can be done through a grammatical hierarchy approach and an argument structure approach.

C. Applicative Construction of RML

Before explaining the process of applying RML, it is better to see first what is meant by applicative construction. The applicative constructions are sentence constructions that encode location, instrument, and other peripheral elements as direct object. The terms applicative and benefactive are usually used to refer to specific grammatical elements of verbal affixes that increase valence in the previous case and nominal forms that express beneficiaries in the next case.

Examples of applicative constructions in Indonesian can be seen below.

(38) *Saya meninnggal-i rumahnya.*

'I leave his house'

*(39) *Saya meninggal-i Jakarta.*

'I live in Jakarta'

The applicative construction in example (38) is *meninggali* 'leave' which means 'continuously'. This applicative verb is formed from the intransitive verb *live*.

In the previous discussion about causative RML, it has been argued that the suffixes {-kan} and {-i} act as causative suffixes. The suffixes {-kan} and {-i} also function as verbs with applicative meaning. Applicative verbs in RML can be derived from precatatorial, intransitive and transitive verbs.

Some RML derivative verbs that have applicative meanings can be seen below.

Pra categorial

Jual 'jual'

Sell

Applicative verb

Juali 'jual'

sell it

<i>Tangis</i> 'tangis'	<i>Tangisi</i> 'tangisi'
Cry	cry
<i>Sepak</i> 'sepak'	<i>Sepaki</i> 'sepaki'
Kick	kick it
Intransitive	
<i>Datang</i> 'datang'	<i>Datangi</i> 'datangi'
Come	visit
<i>Singgah</i> 'singgah'	<i>Singgahi</i> 'singgahi'
Visit	visit
<i>Masuk</i> 'masuk'	<i>Masuki</i> 'masuki'
Enter	insert
Transitive	
<i>Antar</i> 'antar'	<i>Antari</i> 'antari'
Drop off	Drop off
<i>Tanam</i> 'tanam'	<i>Tanami</i> 'tanami'
Plant	plant
<i>Tulis</i> 'tulis'	<i>Tulisi</i> 'tulisi'
Write	write down

The suffix {-i} in RML seems to be more productive in forming applicative verbs, while the suffix {-kan} is more productive in forming causative verbs. The suffix {-kan} can only apply a limited number of transitive verbs. The applicative construction of RML which includes locative, instrumental, benefactive, source, and recipient.

(a) intransitive constructions

- (40) *Atok tido di bale-bale.*
 grandfather sleep Pre bale-bale
 'Grandfather sleeps on bale-bale'
- (41) *Bale-bale atok tido- i.*
 bale-bale kakek tidur- APL
 'Bale-bale is slept by grandpa.'
- (42) *Atok me- tido- i bale-bale.*
 kakek ACT tidur- APL bale-bale
 'Grandfather sleeps on bale-bale'

The sentence in example (40) is an intransitive sentence. The grammatical relations in the examples and (41) are the subject *Atok* 'grandfather' and the locative oblique *in bale-bale*. The intransitive verb *tido* 'put to sleep' is transitive by giving the marker /-i/. The process of deriving transitive constructs as found in examples (41 and 42) is the process of creating objects. In this case the oblique relation at (40) appears as an object in applicative sentences both in verbal constructions without affixes (41) and in marked verb predicates {meN-} (42). Example (40) is an example of a RML intransitive sentence that has an oblique-locative relation that shows the purpose. As far as the data found, there are no intransitive verbs that can be applied with the suffix {kaN-} in RML.

Based on the examples above, it can be concluded that the application in RML is transitive and includes the process of creating appearances of objects taken from locative oblique related nouns. The object can be used as the subject of (grammatical) passive sentences. Sentence (41) is an applicable sentence with a verb without a nasal prefix (a sentence construction like this is a passive

diathesis sentence). In this example, *bale-bale* is the object and *Atok* is the subject (and also the agent).

(b) Transitive Constructions

The following are examples of applying RML derived from transitive base sentences that have locative obliques.

(43) *Mak Long meng- isi kueh di pot.*

mak long ACT- fill cake Pre panci

'Mak Long fills the cake in the pot'

(44) *Panci Mak Long isi- i kueh.*

panci wak long isi- APL kue

'Wak long's pot is filled with cake

(45) *Mak Long me- isi- i panci kueh.*

mak ulung ACT-isi- APL panci kue

'Mak Long fills a cake pan

Basic sentence (not applicable) in example (43) above is a transitive sentence with the locative oblique marked with the preposition *di*. The application of transitive sentences that have locative oblique is done by affixing the applicative suffix /i/ to the transitive verb. The nouns related to locative oblique become indirect object in applicative sentences, both in verb constructions without nasal prefixes and in verb constructions with nasal prefixes. The grammatical relations in example (43) are subject *Mak Long*, direct object *kueh* 'cake' and locative oblique *di panci* 'in pan', while in example (44) *pan* appears as indirect object, *kueh* as direct object, and *mak long* remains as subject. This sentence is an applicable sentence with a verbal construction without a nasal prefix. The example (44) consists of subject *Mak Long*, direct object *kueh*, and indirect object *pan*..

The application of the locative oblique transitive basic construction shows the process of creating a new object, namely the appearance of indirect object originating from the original sentence's locative oblique related noun. This fact is in accordance with the opinion which says that one of the applicative meanings is the creation of objects. This kind of finding is in accordance with the opinion of Artawa (1998) who says that applicative construction as a process of creating objects can be maintained in accusative languages, but this is not the case in syntactically ergative languages. Based on the description above, it can be concluded that RML transitive. verbs that can be applied with the suffix {-i} morphologically (basic sentences related to oblique locative) are few in RML.

CONCLUSION

The structure of the RML argument is the entanglement in the RML clause. The structure of RML arguments can be established through predications in the form of verbal and non-verbal predicates (nominal, pronominal, adjectival, prepositional and numeral). Non-verbal predicates do not have morphological markers on each of their elements so that only verbal utterances differentiate sentences from phrases. Clause predicates non-verbal RML requires an argument (subject) to form a predication. Elements that are not arguments can be added to the predication. RML predications consist of intransitive verbal predicates that require one core argument, transitive verbs that consist of transitive single verbs that require two arguments core, while dual transitive verbs require more than two arguments. Transitivity in RML can also be formed through (1) causative construction and (2) applicative construction. Causative construction in RML by using the suffixes {-kan}, {peR-}, {-i} and a combination of affixes such as {memper-kan}. The use of the suffix {-i} which lowering the

causative verb RML is less productive. The suffix {-i} in RML is more productive in forming applicative verbs.

References:

1. Acherman, F. and Webelhuth, G. (1998). *A Theory of Predicates*. California: CSLI.
2. Ardianto, A. (2015). *Argument Structure in Student Scientific Writing Discourse*. LITERA, 14(1)
3. Alsina, A. (1996). *The RDirect Objecte of Argument Structure in Grammar: Evidence from Romance*. California: CSLI.
4. Alwi, H., Dardjowidjojo, S., Lapoliwa, Moeliono, AM. (2000). *Indonesian Standard Grammar*. Jakarta: Language Center.
5. Artawa, I K. (1998). "Syntactical Flexibility in Languages: Balinese, Sasak, and Indonesian" in PELBBA 10. (Editor: Purwo, BK). Jakarta: Atmajaya University.
6. Basaria, Ida. (2011). *Relations and Grammatical Direct Objects of Pakpak Dairi Language: Typology Study* (Dissertation). Medan: Doctoral Program (S3) Linguistics, University of North Sumatra.
7. Black, JA and Champion, DJ (Koeswara, E., Salim, D., Ruzhendi, A.: Translator). (1999). *Methods and Problems of Social Research*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
8. Chaer, A. (2007). *General Linguistics*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
9. Chiaka, T. (2000). *Aspect and Argument Structure in Japanese*. Disertasi. Tokyo: Department of Linguistics University of Manchester.
10. Comrie, B. (1983). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
11. Cuervo, M. C. (2015). "Causation without a CAUSE". *Syntax* 18:388-424
12. Culicover, P.W. (1997). *Principles and Parameters: An Introduction to Syntactic Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
13. Denzin, N. K. and Yvonna S. L. (1997). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publication.
14. Donohue, M. (1999). *A Grammar of Tukang Besi*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
15. Dude, B. (2003). *Qualitative Research Data Analysis*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
16. Embick, D. (2004). "Uncausative Syntax and Verbal Alternations". In the *Uncausativity Puzzle: Explorations of the syntax-Lexicon Interface*, edited by Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopou, and Martin Everaert, 137-158. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
17. Fauzi, M. and Mulyadi. (2020). Struktur Argumen Struktur Argumen Bahasa Melayu Dialek Akit Pulau Padang Kepulauan Meranti. *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya, Direct Object*. 16, No. 2 Februari.
18. Givon, T. (1984). *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction*. vol. 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
19. Goddard, C. (1998). *Semantic Analysis: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
20. Hale, K. and Jay, K. (1986). *Some Transitivity Alternations in English*. In *Lexicon Project Working Papers 7*. Cambridge, MA: Center for Cognitive Science, MIT.
21. Harley, H. (1995). *Subjects, Events and Licensing*. Dissertation., Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
22. Harley, H. (2008). "On the causative construction." In *The Oxford Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, edited by Shigeru Miyagawa and Mamoru Saito, 20–53. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

23. Herman, van Thao, N., and Purba, N. A. (2021). Investigating Sentence Fragments in Comic Books: A Syntactic Perspective. *World Journal of English Language, Vol. 11, No. 2. PP. 139-151*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v11n2p139>
24. Herman, H., Purba, R., Sijabat, P. A., Saputra, N., Muhammadiyah, M., & Thao, N. V. (2022). Investigating the Realization of Speech Function in a Speech through Systemic Functional Linguistics Perspective. *Script Journal: Journal of Linguistics and English Teaching, 7(01)*, 31-41. <https://doi.org/10.24903/sj.v7i01.917>
25. Hopper, P.J. and Thompson, S.A. (editor). (1982). *Syntax and Semantics: Studies in Transitivity*. (Vol.15). New York: Academic Press.
26. Jo, J. (2021). Selection and Argument Structure: The case of Morphological Causatives in Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics, Vol. 30 Issue 2, P141-175. 35p*
27. Jufriзал. (2004). *Struktur Argumen dan Aliansi Gramatikal Bahasa Minangkabau (Disertasi)*. Denpasar: Program Doktor (S3). Linguistik Universitas Udayana.
28. _____. (2012). *Tatabahasa Minangkabau: Deskripsi dan Telaah Tipologi Linguistik*. Padang: UNP Press.
29. Katamba F. (1993). *Morphology*. London: Macmilland.
30. Koontz-Garboden, A. (2009). "Anticausativization" Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 27:77–138.
31. Lavine, James E., and Leonard H. B. (2019). "A New Argument for the Lexical Underspecification of Causers." *Linguistic Inquiry* 50:803–824.
32. Levin, Beth, and Malka Rappaport Hovav. (1995). *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
33. Lyons, J. (1987). *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
34. Mallinson, G. & Blake, B.J. (1981). *Language Typology: Cross-Linguistic Studies in Syntax*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
35. Manning, C. D. (1996). *Ergativity: Argument Structure and Grammatical Relations*. California: CSLI.
36. Palmer, F.R. (1996). *Grammatical Direct Objects and Relation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
37. Pesetsky, D. (1995). *Zero Syntax: Experiencers and Cascades*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
38. Purba, R., Van Thao, N., Herman, Sitohang, D. R., & Thi Quynh Trang, P. (2022). How to Attract Viewers through Advertisement Slogans? A Case on Figurative in Semantic Study. *Universal Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 2(1)*, 1–5. DOI: [10.31586/ujssh.2022.213](https://doi.org/10.31586/ujssh.2022.213)
39. Ramchand, G. (2008). *Verb Meaning and the Lexicon: A First-Phase Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
40. Reinhart, T. (2002). The Theta System: An overview. *Theoretical Linguistics* 28:229–290.
41. Reinhart, T. and Siloni, T. (2005). The Lexicon-Syntax Parameter: Reflexivization and other Operations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36:389–436
42. Sedeng, I. (2011). *Pembentukan Verba Bersufiks {-kan} Bahasa Indonesia, Struktur Argumen, Struktur Logis, dan Makna Sufiks {-kan}*. Linguistika: Buletin Ilmiah Program Magister Linguistik Universitas Udayana. VDirect Object.. 18 Sept. ISSN 2656-6419.
43. Seken, I Ketut. (2004). *Being Polite in Balinese: An Analysis of Balinese* (Dissertation). IKIP Malang.
44. Shibatani, M. (editor). (1976). *Syntax and Semantics: The Grammar of Causative Construction*. New York: Academic Press.

45. Son, M. (2006). *Causation and syntactic decomposition of events*. Dissertation. University of Delaware.
46. Subroto, D. E. (1992). *Introduction to Structural Linguistic Research Methods*. Surakarta: Sebelas Maret University.
47. Van Valin Jr., R.D. and La Polla, R.J. (1999). *Syntax: Structure, Meaning, and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
48. Verhaar, JWM. (2000). *General Linguistic Principles*. Yogyakarta: UGM
49. Woods, J. (2012). *Icelandic Morphosyntax and Argument Structure*. New York University: Department of Linguistics.