

PASSIVIZATION IN SASAK KUTO-KUTE DIALECT OF NORTH LOMBOK

Nurul Azizah¹, Sri Mahawan², Nurachman Hanafi³

University of Udayana¹, University of Muhammadiyah Mataram², University of Mataram
nurulazizah_filla@yahoo.com¹, srimahawan@yahoo.com², nurachmanhanafi@unram.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Passivization is generally defined as the process of passifying active sentences form into passive. This paper discusses a brief description of passivization in Sasak *Kuto-Kute* (KK) dialect in North Lombok by looking at its morphological properties. The data was collected using a set of structured questionnaire of Indonesian active and passive sentences as the guideline. To confirm the data, interviews and note taking were also conducted with some of the native speakers. From the observation it was found that so far there are two types of passive construction in Sasak KK dialect namely canonical and adversative passive. Unlike other dialects of Sasak, in KK dialect the canonical passive can be formed in three ways: using the prefix *ta-*, particle *paq* and the base word only (zero marker). For the adversative passive form, KK dialect uses two types of marker: confix *ke-* *-an* and suffix *-in*. Interestingly, the canonical passive in Sasak KK dialect marked by prefix *ta-* can also form a passive-causative construction (derived from the causative sentences) which is marked by the prefix *ta-* and suffix *-ang*. Another interesting fact found in the dialect is that the passive form of Sasak KK dialect with zero marker cannot become intransitive form.

Key words: *passivization, Sasak Kuto-Kute dialect, passive properties, canonical, adversative, passive-causative.*

INTRODUCTION

Kuto-Kute (KK) is one of the 5 (five) major Sasak dialects spoken in North Lombok by 215,518 speakers (the official website of North Lombok). However, unlike the other four dialects (*Ngeno-Ngene, Meno-Mene, Ngeto-Ngete, Meriak-Meriku*), KK is different not only in term of phonology but also morphology and syntax. Phonologically, the words do not end in fonem /ə/ sound but in /a/ as can be seen on the words ‘man’ (/mamə/ → /mama/) and ‘woman’ (/ninə/ → /nina/) (Supriadi, 2012: 2). Sukri (2008) notes that KK dialect is rich in morphological phenomena. One of them is within the derivational process, where he found that some word classes (nominals, adjectives and numerals) in KK dialect form intransitive verbs, for instance: (a) *anak* ‘child’ → *menganak* ‘to give birth.’ whereas transitive verbs are only derived from verbs: (b) *peta* ‘look’ → *memeta* ‘to look for’. Syntactically, the construction of basic sentences in KK dialect has a

number of variations according to the permutation test (Azizah, 2017: 3-5).

One interesting phenomenon, that encourages us to discuss in this context, is passivization. According to Blake (1994) and Dixon (1994), passive can be described as a counterpart of an active. Palmer (1994) stated that in English active sentence, the Agent is marked as the subject (S) and the patient as the Object (O) by word order and agreement of the Subject and the verb. Furthermore, Hanafi (2013) added that there are several passive properties that can be found across languages, such as:

- a. The subject of the passive clause is a direct object in the corresponding active
- b. The subject of the active clause is expressed as an agentive adjunct in the passive clause or deleted
- c. The subject of the active clause is expressed as an obligatory agent but without a preposition in the passive clause

d. The verb in the passive clause can be marked passive or unmarked.

Hanafi (2013:60) also divided passive constructions into four types: canonical, inverted, accidental and adversative passive. Canonical passive is known as the most standard form of passive where it is usually marked by the movement of the Agent to an Oblique and the Patient to a Subject (grammatical subject). Inverted passive is seen to be identical with the active form in terms of the word order with exception that the verb is morphologically unmarked as passive or without a prefix and there is no adjective adjunct after the basic verb. Accidental passive is a form of passive that focuses on the events occur accidentally while

adversative passive is a passive construction in which in Indonesian marked by the attachment of confix *ke--an* to a verb.

In comparison with other Sasak dialects, particularly with Ngeno-Ngene dialect which is supported by a great number of speakers, this dialect is coded with *te-* prefix on its verb when undergoing passivisation in the form of a canonical passive. Conversely, KK dialect presents that the passive sentences can be made either by using the prefix *ta-* on the verb as in (1b), particle *paq* before its basic verb (2b), or morphologically unmarked on its basic verb in (3b). These can be seen below:

| Active: | Passive: |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| (1) a. Amaq mengadu montorku | (1) b. Montorku ta-kadu siq Amaq |
| (2) a. Tukang pantoq paku ene | (2) b. Paku ene paq pantoq siq tukang |
| (3) a. Inaq meaq Jaja | (3) b. Jaja peaq siq Inaq |

Note that sentences (1a)-(3a) are the active forms, whereas sentences (1b)-(3b) are their passive forms. In passivising the active ones, there are two processes involving revaluations. Firstly, the promotion of Object (*montor*, *paku* and *jaja*) to Subject position in (1b)-(3b), the verb takes either *te-* prefix, preceded by *paq* or unmarked prefix to show it. Secondly, as a result of its promotion, the initial Subject or the Agent (*Amaq*, *Tukang*, and *Inaq*) demotes to Oblique position coded by *siq*.

From the given examples, it is worth mentioning that canonical passive sentences in KK dialect are able to show three different markers reflected from three canonical passives. These variations, although belong to the same dialect, can still be found in five different areas of North Lombok, namely: Tanjung, Pemenang, Gangga, Bayan and Kayangan. For practical reasons, this study is limited only to the KK dialect spoken in Tanjung,

especially in Sigar Penjalin and Prawira villages to represent such a dialect in North Lombok.

METHOD

The method used in this study is a descriptive one because it describes and examines a language phenomenon by looking at the passive properties used in Sasak KK dialect in North Lombok, mainly in Tanjung (Sigar Perjalin and Prawira villages). The data were collected using a set of structured questionnaire of Indonesian active and passive sentences as the guideline. Triangulation was done in the form of interviews and note-taking with some of the native speakers from Tanjung in order to confirm the data.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. FINDINGS

Based on the data analysis, it was found that in KK dialect there are two types of passive: canonical and adversative

passive. The canonical passive in Sasak KK dialect is marked by prefix *ta-*, particle *paq* and zero marker (\emptyset) either attached to or followed by the base verb, which then is followed by the adjunct phrase *isiq* or *siq*. The adjunct phrase can be deleted when the sentence becomes intransitive form, though not all canonical passive form can be altered into intransitive form. The data showed that the passive construction with zero marker (\emptyset) cannot be formed into intransitive sentence. Interestingly, it turns out that the use of prefix *ta-* and particle *paq* as a passive marker in canonical passive are used by the people in the area of Prawira village, while the zero marker (\emptyset) are found to be used by the speakers in Sigar Penjalin village.

As for the adversative passive, KK dialect uses two types of marking. First is the marker of confix *ke- -an* being attached to the base verb in which it can also be discovered in other Sasak dialects. Second is the use of suffix *-in* or *-an*. Another interesting phenomenon found in the data is that canonical passive sentences marked with prefix *ta-* in KK dialect can appear in the form of passive-causative construction by adding suffix *-ang* to the verb. The suffix *-ang* in this case is recognized as the causative marker. However, to form a passive-causative construction, the passive sentence must be derived from a causative construction. Below is summary of two passive constructions in Sasak KK dialect in Table 1.

Table 1: Passive constructions in Sasak Kuto-Kute Dialect

| No. | Constructions | Markers |
|-----|---------------------|---|
| 1. | Canonical Passive | Prefix <i>ta-</i> , particle <i>paq</i> and \emptyset |
| 2. | Adversative Passive | Confix <i>ke- -an</i> , suffix <i>-in</i> or <i>-an</i> |

B. DISCUSSION

1. Canonical Passive

As been stated previously, the canonical passive in KK dialect is marked by either prefix *ta-*, particle *paq* or zero marker (\emptyset). For the passive form marked with prefix *-ta* and particle *paq* the data are gathered from Prawira village while the data for unmarked passive form are collected in Sigar Penjalin village. The examples of canonical passive marked by prefix *ta-* are demonstrated below:

- 1)
 - a. Amang-ku goaq kakang-ku
 Father-POSS.1sg ACT.call brother-POSS.1sg
 "My father called my brother"
 - b. Kakang-ku ta-goaq isiq amang-ku
 Brother-POSS.1sg PASS-call by father-POSS.1sg
 "My brother was called by my father"
 - c. Kakang-ku ta-goaq
 Brother-POSS.1sg PASS-call
 "My brother was called"

- 2)
 - a. Amaq meng-(k)adu montor-ku
 Father ACT-use motorcycle-POSS.1sg
 "Father used my motorcycle"
 - b. Montor-ku ta-kadu siq amaq
 Motorcycle-POSS.1sg PASS-use by father
 "My motorcycle was used by father"
 - c. Montor-ku ta-kadu
 Motorcycle-POSS.1sg PASS-use
 "My motorcycle was used"

Sentences *a* are the active forms which takes zero marker (basic verb) for sentence *1a* and uses the nasal prefix *me-* for sentence *2a*. In this case, *Amangku* and *Amaq* are the subject while *kakangku* and *montorku* are the object. Notice that the word *Amangku* and *kakangku* come from the word *Amaq* and *Kakaq*. In KK dialect spoken in Tanjung, the /ʔ/ sound at the end of a word changes to /ŋ/ sound when it is being attached to the clitic *-ku*. In sentences *b*, *Kakangku* and *Montorku* are being promoted into subject position while *Amangku* and *Amaq* are being demoted to

‘by phrase’ or agentive adjunct marked by the word *isiq/siq*. The verbs in the passive forms are marked by prefix *-ta*. The usage of prefix *-ta* as passive marker allows the agentive adjunct to be deleted and make the sentences into intransitive (sentences c).

Another type of canonical passive is the one denoted by particle *paq*. This is illustrated in (3) – (4) below:

3)

- a. *Bapuq* *keang* *kelambing-ku*
 Grandpa ACT.wore shirt-POSS.1sg
 “Grandpa wore my shirt”
- b. *Kelambing-ku* *paq* *keang* *isiq* *Bapuq*
 Shirt-POSS.1sg PASS worn by Grandpa
 “My shirt was worn by grandpa”
- c. *Kelambing-ku* *paq* *keang*
 Shirt-POSS.1sg PASS worn
 “My shirt was worn”

4)

- a. *Aku* *peaq* *bale-n* *kekit*
 I ACT.made house-POSS.3sg bird
 “I made the house bird”
- b. *Bale-n* *kekit* *paq* *peaq* *siq* *aku*
 House-POSS.3sg PASS made by me
 “The house bird was made by me”
- c. *Bale-n* *kekit* *paq* *peaq*
 House-POSS.3sg PASS made
 “The house bird was made”

The active forms are shown in sentences *a* while the passive are sentences *b*. This form of passive uses the particle *paq* as its passive marker that stands alone and placed before the verb. In these two examples, the active verbs are unmarked. *Bapuq* and *Aku* in the active sentences are the subject while *kelambingku* and *balen kekit* are the object. In the passive sentences, *Kelambingku* and *balen kekit* are promoted to grammatical subject while *Bapuq* and *Aku* are demoted to agentive adjunct preceded by the word *isiq/siq*. The agentive adjunct can be deleted and form the sentences into intransitive sentences (sentences *c*).

In KK dialect in Sigar Penjalin village, the canonical passive form are unmarked. Below are the examples of canonical passive with zero marker:

5)

- a. *Andi* *mem-(b)aca* *kitab*
 Andi ACT-recite Koran
 ‘Andi recited the Koran’
- b. *Kitab* \emptyset *baca* *isiq* *Andi*
 Koran PASS.recited by Andi
 “The Koran was recited by Andi”
- c. * *Kitab* \emptyset *baca*
 Koran PASS.recited
 “The Koran was recited”

6)

- a. *Ina* *men-jauq* *jaja*
 Ina ACT-bring cookies
 “Ina brought cookies”
- b. *Jaja* \emptyset *jauq* *siq* *Ina*
 Cookies PASS-bring by Ina
 “The cookies were brought by Ina”
- c. * *Jaja* \emptyset *jauq*
 Cookies PASS-bring
 “The cookies were brought”

Sentences *a* are the active forms while sentences *b* are the passive forms. *Andi* and *Ina* in sentences *a* are the subjects whereas *kitab* and *jaja* are the objects. Unlike in the other forms of canonical passive, the active verb in this type of canonical passive are marked with prefix *me-*, occurring in the form of its allomorphs *mem-* and *men-*. Notice that the active verb *memaca* comes from the basic word *baca* where the /b/ may or may not disappear when attached to prefix *me-*. On the other hand, in the passive sentences the word *Kitab* and *Jaja* takes the subject position which force the initial subjects (*Andi* and *Ina*) to be demoted into agentive adjunct following the word *isiq/siq*. Here, the passive form of the sentences are unmarked and takes the basic form of the verbs. However, it turns out that the agentive adjunct in this type of canonical passive cannot be deleted. This can be seen

on sentences *c* which are considered as ungrammatical.

2. Adversative Passive

Another type of passive construction in KK dialect is adversative passive. Adversative passive is formed from a derivation of intransitive into transitive through applicativeness. In this dialect, it was found in the data that the adversative passive can be formed in two ways: using the confix *ke-* *-an* and suffix *-in*. The examples can be seen below:

7)

- a. Maling tama baq bale-n Andi
 Thief enter into house-POSS Andi
 "A thief enter into Andi's house"
- b. Bale-n Andi ke-tama-yan maling
 House-POSS Andi AD-come-LOC thief
 "Andi's house was entered into by a thief"

8)

- a. Nyambuq geran leq Ia
 Water guava fall on 3sg
 "Water guava fall on him"
- b. Ia geran-in siq nyambuq
 3sg AD.fall-LOC by guava
 "He was fallen on by water guava"

Based on the examples above, although KK dialect has more types of marker but the process of forming adversative passive is similar to those found in Indonesian and Javanese (see Hanafi, 2013: 69-70). The formation of adversative passive in KK dialect comes directly from intransitive sentences without being formed into a transitive active sentence first; like those found in some languages such as Sundanese. Sentences *a* are the intransitive active forms and sentences *b* are the adversative passive forms. Notice that the obliques in the intransitive sentences are promoted directly into subject position in the passive sentences, which demoted the subjects of intransitive sentences into agentive adjuncts (by phrase).

3. Passive – Causative Construction

Passive – Causative construction in KK dialect can only be formed out of canonical passive marked by prefix *ta-*. This type of passive is actually derived from causative sentences, where the causative form is marked by the suffix *-ang*. Below are the examples of passive-causative construction in KK dialect.

9)

- a. Siti ng-geran-ang piring
 Siti ACT-drop-CAUS plate
 "Siti dropped the plate"
 "Siti caused the plate to fall"
- b. Piring ta-geran-ang siq Siti
 Plate PASS-drop-CAUS by Siti
 "The plate was dropped by Siti" (literally)
 "The plate was caused to fall by Siti"
- c. Piring ta-geran-ang
 Plate PASS-drop-CAUS
 "The plate was caused to fall"

10)

- a. Azkar ny-aro-ang jejojaq-nya
 Azkar ACT-break-CAUS toy-POSS3sg
 "Azkar broke his toy" (literally)
 "Azkar caused the toys to be broken"
- b. Jejojaq-nya ta-saor-ang siq Azkar
 Toy-POSS3sg PASS-break-CAUS by Azkar
 "The toy was broken by Azkar" (literally)
 "The toy was caused to be broken by Azkar"
- c. Jejojaqnya ta-saor-ang
 Toy-POSS3sg PASS-break-CAUS
 "The toy was caused to be broken"

Sentences *a* are the active causative sentences where *Siti* and *Azkar* are the subject while *piring* and *jejojaqnya* are the object. The verbs in those sentences (*geran* and *saor*) is marked active by the prefix *ng-* and *ny-* and marked causative by the suffix *-ang*. Note that the /s/ disappears when the prefix *ny-* is being attached to the word *saor*. Sentences *b* are the passive-causative construction where the prefix *ta-* is used as the passive marker while the suffix *-ang* is known as the causative marker. The object of the active sentences are promoted to subjects in passive

sentences which resulted in the demotion of the subjects of the active sentences into agentive adjunct (by phrase) in the passive sentences. In this case the 'by phrase' in the passive sentences can be omitted.

CONCLUSION

From the preliminary research of passive sentences in KK dialect, it was found that so far there are two types of passive construction in Sasak KK dialect namely canonical and adversative passive. Unlike other dialects of Sasak, in KK dialect the canonical passive can be formed in three ways: using the prefix *ta-*, particle *paq* and the base word only (zero marker). The verbs of canonical passives that use prefix *ta-* and particle *paq* can be derived from either an active basic verb or an active nasal verb, however for the third type of canonical passive (zero marker) the verb must be derived from an active nasal verb. The first two types of canonical passive forms (using prefix *-ta* and particle *paq*) can be formed into intransitive sentences while the one with the zero marker cannot.

For adversative passive form, KK dialect uses two types of marker: confix *ke- -an* and suffix *-in*. The formation of adversative passive in KK dialect comes directly from intransitive sentences without being formed into a transitive active sentence first. The obliques in the intransitive sentences are promoted directly into subject position in the passive sentences, which demoted the subjects of intransitive sentences into agentive adjuncts (by phrase).

It turns out that the canonical passive in Sasak KK dialect registered by prefix *ta-* can also form a passive-causative construction (derived from the causative sentences) which is marked by the prefix *ta-* as the passive marker and suffix *-ang* as the causative marker.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to thank Suliadi and Herman Habibi for their help and support

in gathering the data and for the discussions during the writing of this article. This paper was initially presented at the International Austronesian Seminar in Bali (2017), but it had never been published in any proceedings or journals.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad Supriadi. (2012). *Passivization in Sasak Kuto-Kute Dialect: A Variety Spoken in Northern Lombok*. (Skripsi). Mataram: Universitas Mataram.
- Azizah, Nurul. (2017). *Konstruksi Kalimat Dasar Dialek Kuto-Kute dan Tipologi Sintaksis*. Prosiding Seminar Internasional Austronesia, Universitas Udayana, Denpasar (Bali).
- Blake, Barry J. (1994). *Case*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Dixon, RMW. (1994). *Ergativity*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Hanafi, Nurachman. (2013). *Syntax*. Mataram: Mataram University Press (5th edition).
- Johandi, Lalu Mohamad. (2017). *An Analysis of Sasak Syntactic Structure on the Forms of Passivization as Used in Ngeno-Ngene Dialect at Rarang Village of East Lombok*. The Indonesian Journal of Language and Language Teaching (IJOLT) Vol. 2 No. 2, Mei 2017 pp. 60 – 81.
- Muhid, Abdul. (2014). 'A Syntactical Analysis of Passive Construction in Sasak Language Pujut Dialect; A Field Study at Batujai and Sukarara Central Lombok'. In *Humanitatis Journal on Language and Literature Vol.1 No.1*. Diakses dari https://www.academia.edu/13007237/A_Syntactical_Analysis_of_Passive_Construction_in_Sasak_Language_Pujut_Dialect_A_Field_Study_at_Batujai_and_Sukarara_Central_Lombok pada 26 Agustus 2017.

Palmer, F.R. (1994). *Grammatical Roles and Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosdiana. (2008). *A Descriptive Study on Derivational Affixes in Sasak Kuto-Kute Dialect in Gondang*. Unpublished SPd. Thesis. Mataram: Universitas Mataram.

Sukri. (2008). *Sistem Morfologi Bahasa Sasak Dialek Kuto-Kute: Kajian Transformasi Generatif*. Unpublished Dissertation. Denpasar: Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Udayana.

Wati, Laili. (2004). *Passivization of Kelayu Ngeno-Ngene Dialect*. Unpublished S.d Thesis. Mataram: Universitas Mataram.