

Semantic Aspect of Deletion Argument in Javanese Subordinative Conjoining Clause

F.X. Sawardi

Indonesian Language and Letters Department
Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Sebelas Maret
Surakarta, Indonesia
sawardi2012@gmail.com

Hesti Widyastuti

Indonesian Language and Letters Department
Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Sebelas Maret
Surakarta, Indonesia
hesti_w@staff.uns.ac.id

Abstract— *The same constituent in conjoining clauses is deleted in the second clause. These deletions are determined by two conditions: syntactic condition and semantic condition. The syntactic conditions are that both constituent occupy the same syntactic functions. While semantic conditions are the same elements occupying certain roles in the main clause. This article discusses the deleted constituent in conjoining subordinate clauses. The addressed problems are among others: (i) in which clause, semantic conditions are applicable to? (ii) what kind of semantic roles, the deleted argument refer to? (iii) what are the differences between semantic conditions and syntactic conditions in conjoining clause?*

Keywords—*deletion, argument, basic linguistic theory*

I. INTRODUCTION

Syntax generally refers to sort of rules in constituting a single clause. In determining syntactic behavior, the conjoining clauses can be used as a measuring means. In conjoining between clauses, the same constituent clause is deleted following certain rules. The constituent clauses observed in this article are the those of which typically in arguments form. The argument is identified with S (subject to intransitive clause), A (transitive clause agent argument) and O (transitive clause object argument). Dixon (1994, 2010, 2012) bearing in such deletion, it is solely controlled by syntactic rules, thus it sees the relations between the set up deletion constituent and formulated constituent through syntactic functions, S, A, and O. The three alignment types of arguments establish language type: accusative and ergative language types. The deletion was then applied to determine one another alignment, i.e. S with A, or S with O.

Not all of the deletion in arguments of the Javanese language, as will be described in section IV, are syntactically determined. In case the syntactic rule is tested with the passivation, some Javanese sentences unfollow the accusative or ergative language rules. Therefore, this article will show that the deletion of arguments shall take a role as determinant as the accusative language only in a language with coordinative clauses in unmarked conditions.

The problems being addressed in this article among others: (i) in what clauses the deletion argument is conditioned by semantic factors?; (ii) What semantic roles become the references to the deleted argument?; (iii) In what clauses both the semantic and syntactic conditions can be applied to?.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Basic Linguistic Theory

Dixon (1994) was the first who termed the arguments S, A, O (Subject, Agent, and Object) in clause analysis. The three types alignments of arguments establish the type of language known as accusative and ergative languages. The term O is replaced by P (Patient) by Comrie (1989), followed by Artawa (1998a, 1998b, 1998c), Jufriзал (2007, 2012) and others. One of the basis in determining the alignments for S, A, and O is the deletion of arguments in aligned clause or what further known as pivot. Pivot is used in determining language types syntactically. According to Arka (1998), pivot is used as a subject feature ([+ core] [+ pivot]).

B. Argument

Arguments are the verb participants, which are widely used in syntactic analysis of various syntactic theories. The boundary between arguments and the non becomes a subject matter raised as the underlying issue. Linguistics Discovery Journal No. 12 of 2014 discuss issues of how to distinguish between an argument and adjunct (non-arguments) or boundary of argument and non-argument. In his introduction, Whichman (2014) emphasizes that the differentiation of arguments and non-argument actually are rooted in the theory of Contemporary Grammar. The arising question pertains the distinction between the two concepts among others: (i) whether the differentiation of arguments and the non is typologically beneficial; (ii) whether the distinction applicable universally; and (iii) whether the differentiation is needed in describing a language. The question of how to distinguish argument from the non-argument has been around since the 1970s and has always been a difficult matter to resolve. If a universal solution can never be obtained, it is difficult clearly argue that the differentiation of arguments and the non is relevant. The following statement is the differentiation of arguments and the non are relevantly found across languages, however, the determining criteria are in each individual language. The Linguistics Discovery No 12 of 2014 published five related articles written by Haspelmath (2014), Schaefer & Egbokhare (2014), Forker (2014), and Arka (2014). These articles concern the typical classifications between argument and the non. The deleted arguments in case being commonly understood between speaker and the interlocutor, is used as a marker of the core argument. Although this type relates to argument, however, it does not refer to typology. Arka (2017) notes on differentiating the core and oblique arguments. These articles are related to sort of ways distinguishing arguments from the non-argument.

III. METHOD

This article is the result of linguistic phenomena in setting up arguments form in the Javanese conjoined sentences. The data were the sentences used in the Jagad Jawa rubrics of the daily newspaper of Solo Pos and Mekar Sari a section of the Kedulatan Rakyat daily newspaper. The data were collected through using computer-assisted records, scanned and further classified as data which line with objectives of the study.

This study is about syntax especially from the perspective of linguistic typology. Song (2001: 4) explains that there are four stages in typological analysis. *First*, identification of the observed phenomena; *second*, typological classification on the observed phenomena; *third*, formulating generalization towards the classification; and *fourth*, explanation of the generalization. In this case, stage one is realized into a phenomenon that will be observed in this study is the deleted argument. The second stage, the typological classification applied to determine the type of accusative or ergative languages. Therefore, identifying arguments by referring to S, A, and O remains important. The third stage is its realization by determining the language of deletion argumentation following the accusative language pattern S = A, or ergative language pattern of S = O. The third stage explains whether all arguments follow the rules.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Results of the Study

There are two things governing the deleted arguments in Javanese language. The *first*, deletion is syntactically governed, and the *second*, deletion is also semantically governed. Syntactically, arguments can be deleted if they share the same syntactic functions. Semantically, the deleted argument will refer to a particular thematic role. Both of these rules will be described in the following sections, beginning with deletion of the coordinative conjoining followed by deletion on the subordinate conjoining.

1) The Deleted Argumentation in the Coordinative clause

In the deletion setting which is syntactically regulated, the relationship between the referred noun and the deleted noun is based on the same syntactic functions. The term function in this article refers to Dixon (1994, 2010a, 2010b, and 2012): S (intransitive subject), A (transitive verb agent) and O (transitive verb object). In the same function, one of the arguments can be deleted. Such deletion according to Dixon is formulated as S = S, A = A, O = O, as shown in below sample of sentences (1).

- (1) a. *Soleman klambèn lan metu saka omah.*
 Soleman wear and go out of house
 ‘Soleman wears clothes and leaves the house’
- b. *Rara Mendut meruhi kahanan banjur nubruk keris*
 Rara Mendut look around then hit keris
 ‘Rara Mendut looked around and then hit the keris’
- c. *Ibuné marani lan nyedhaki Angga*
 mother his/her come and approached Angga
 ‘Her mother came and approached Angga’

Sentences (1a), (1b), and (1c) are a combination of two coordinative clauses, which reflect shared-arguments and these shared-arguments occupy similar functions. The sentence (1a) reflects a shared-argument, Soleman, serves function as the S, and in the second clause, Soleman is deleted. The sentence (1b) reflects a shared-argument, *Rara Mendut*, serves function as the A in both clauses, whereas in the second clause, *Rara Mendut* is deleted. The shared-argument in sentence (1c) is *ibuné* 'her mother' and *Angga*. *Ibuné* serves function as A in the first and second clauses, *Angga* serves function as O in the first and second clauses. *Angga* is deleted in the first clause, and *ibuné* is deleted in the second clause. The conjoining between two clauses in the sentences of (1a) and (1b) and (1c) is the conjoined active clauses. From deleted arguments on the conjoining clauses (1a), (1b), and (1c) show that similar syntactic function is a condition which should be fulfilled for argumentation: the function S with S in the intransitive clause, A with A and O with O in the verb transitive.

If only the conjoining clause is joined between intransitive and transitive clauses, the occurring possibility will be the argument S is paired with A, or paired with O. Both possibilities are sought in relation to the language typology. Will it either be included into the accusative or ergative language types in the Javanese language?

From the conjoined coordinative clause data, it can be seen that the conjoined Javanese language clause tends to S with A compared to O. The following conjoined clauses exemplified in below samples.

- (2) a. *Sumantri banjur perang lan Ø n-telukaké*
 Sumantri then fought and Ø ACT-beat
ratu-ratu kang ng-lamar Dèwi Citrawati mau.
 The Kings who ACT-proposed Dewi Citrawati.
 'Sumantri then fought and defeated the kings who proposed Dewi Citrawati.'
- b. **Sumantri banjur perang lan Ø ratu-ratu kang nglamar Dèwi Citrawati mau*
 Sumantri then fought and Ø the kings who proposed Dewi Citrawati the
di-telukaké.
 PAS-defeat

The shared-argument in conjoined clause (2a) is *Sumantri*. In the first clause *Sumantri* serves function as S from predicate *perang* 'to wage a war', and serves function as A of the transitive predicate *nelukaké* 'beat'. In the second clause, argument A, *Sumantri*, is deleted. That the syntactic condition is a condition for conjoining clauses, indicated by the non-acceptance of the transitive passivation of *nelukaké* into *ditelukaké* 'defeated' in the sentence (2b).

If the transitive clause before the condition is valid. The following contrast sentence (3a) with (3b) show the syntactic behaviour of deleted argumentation (2a) and (2b) remains valid.

- (3) a. *Bocah mau n-jawil Tari terus m-layu*
 child the ACT-pinche Tari then ACT-berlari
 'The child pinches Tari then runs'
- b. * *Tari di-jawil déning bocah mau terus mlayu.*

The passivation of transitive clause in the first clause of the sentence leads the clause unacceptable. The sentence (3b) shows that the deleted argument in the clause (3a) is determined by the syntactic condition of S = A. Sentence (3b) is acceptable in a different sense. The deleted argument in the second clause refers to Tari, the O argument that has been shifted to a function like S due to the passivation process. The deletion reference became different.

Sentences (1b) and (1c) show that. In case the passive clause is conjoined with another passive clause there will be two occurring possibilities: (i) passivation is used to adjust the same O condition as A; and (ii) change the reference from A to O. The following sample of sentences (4) show that.

- (4) a. *Herman lan Sari n-terusaké lakun-é tanpa Ø di-jaluki dhuwit.*
 Herman and Sari ACT-continue journey-their tanpa Ø PAS-ask money
 'Herman and Sari continue the journey without being asked for money'
- b. *Selfi n-jupuk banyu putih, Ø di-ulungké Baskoro*
 Selfi ACT-take water, Ø PAS-give Baskoro
 'Selfi took water, given them to Baskoro'

The sentence (4a) conjoined active clause with passive clause. The shared-argument in conjoining between the clauses is *Herman lan Sari*. On the first clause *Herman lan Sari* serves a function as A of the predicate *n-teruskan* 'continue', and in the second clause the noun occupies the passive S function of the predicate *di-jaluki* 'being asked'. The passivation in the second clause serves to change O, thus it serves function like S, in that case it can be deleted. Different condition may occur, especially on the conjoining between clauses in (4b). The sentences(4b) is the conjoined form of the two active and passive clauses. The shared-argument in conjoining clause (4b) is *banyu putih* 'pure water'. In the first noun clause *banyu putih* occupies the O function of the active predicate *n-jupuk* 'take/took', and in the second clause the noun occupies the passive S function of the passive predicate *di-ulungké* 'given'. The deleted arguments on the sentence (4a) is syntactically governed and the deletion on sentence (4b) semantically governed. This can be proved by changing the active clause in sentences (4a) and (4b) to be passive. The active clause (4a) if in case it is shifted to passivity will last unacceptable, however, passivation of the sentence (4b) is acceptable. The sentence (5a) is a change from sentence (4a) and sentence (5b) is a change from sentence (4b)

- (5) a. **lakuné di-terusaké déning Herman lan Sari banjur tanpa Ø di-jaluki dhuwit.*
 Journey PAS-continue by Herman dan Sari then tanpa Ø PAS-aske money
 'The journey was continued by Herman and Sari without being asked for money'
- b. *Banyu putihé di-jupuk déning Selfi , Ø di-ulungké Baskoro*
 pure water PAS-take by Selfi , Ø PAS-give Baskoro
 'The pure water was taken by Selfi, given to Baskoro'

Even though there is a change from active to passive, the sentence (5b) remains acceptable. The deleted arguments in the second clause is not affected by passive-active syntactic processes. In the passivassion, syntactic function changes, the O argument becomes a passive S argument, however, the semantic role remains stable. The deleted arguments in sentence (4a) is semantically governed.

In conclusion, in conjoining between clauses in a coordinatively, the deleted argument is determined both syntactically and semantically. The deletion argument rules syntactically occur in conjoined basic / active clauses, and the deleted argument semantically occurs in the conjoined passive subordinative clause only.

2) The Deleted Argumentation in the Subordinate Clause

As the observation in conjoining the coordinative clause, observation in the subordinate clause is focused on alignment of the relations of S with A or S with O. The following example shows especially the conjoining between intransitive and transitive clauses. The relationship was tested by passivation. In the ellipsis of subordinative relationship, it is also seen the relationship of S = A as seen in the sentences (6a) and (6b), and (7a) and (7b).

- (6) a. *Dhèwèké mèh waé semaput nalika m-buka lawang ngarepan.*
 She/he almost faint when AKT-open door front
 'He almost fainted at the time opening the front door'
- b. **Dhèwèké mèh waé semaput nalika lawang ngarepan di-buka .*
 'he (she) almost fainted at the time the front door PAS-opened
- (7) a. *Sawisé m-pati-ni buta pirang-pirang, dumadakan Radèn Permadi ambruk (...)*
 Setelah ACT-kill-CAUS giant many suddenly Raden Permadi fell
 'After killing many giants, Raden Permadi suddenly fell'
- b. **Sawisé buta pirang-pirang di-pati-ni, dumadakan Radèn Permadi ambruk*
 After giants many PAS- kill-CAUS suddenly Raden Permadi fell

The shared-argument in sentence (6a) is *Dhèwèké* 'She/he'. In the first clause *Dhèwèké* occupies the S function of a predicate *semaput* 'fainted' and occupies function A in the second clause of the active predicate *m-buka* 'opening'. In the second clause the argument is deleted. If the second clause is passived, the conjoined clause is unacceptable. The sentence (6b) is a change in the passivation of the sentence (6a), and becomes an unacceptable sentence. Sentences (7a) and (7b) are examples parallel to sentences (6a) and (6b). The difference is, the transitive clause in sentence (6a) is located behind, while the transitive clause in (7a) is located at the beginning. The shared-argument in sentence (7a) is *Radèn Permadi*. In the first clause the noun is deleted and occupies the A function of the active transitive predicate *m-patin-ni* 'killing'. In the second clause occupies the S function of the intransitive predicate *ambruk* 'fell'. If the active clause in (7a) is passived, the conjoining becomes unacceptable as shown in the sentence (7b). From evidence of the sentences (6a) is changed (into 6b) and (7a) changed to (7b), it is concluded that the

deletion in the conjoining clause is governed by syntactic factors. If $S = A$, one of the arguments can be deleted. Changing to passivity is an obstacle to conjoining.

On the other hand, if the shared-argument occupies the S and O functions, the passivation should be realized in order that O becomes S. The following sentences (8a) and (8b) are proof of the deletion rule, which is controlled by syntactic factors.

- (8) a. *Nalika nyebrang dalam ngarep kampus, Ningsih di-tabrak mobil (...)*
 When cross street front campus kampus Ningsih PAS-tabrak mobil
 ‘On crossing the front street of the campus, Ningsih was hit by a car’
- b. *Masyarakat senang nalika di-gatèk-ké.*
 people happy when PAS-attention-CAUS’
 ‘People are happy, when being paid attention’

The shared argument in conjoining the sentence clause (8a) is *Ningsih*. In the first clause the noun occupies the S function of the intransitive predicate *nyebrang* ‘acrossing’. In the second clause, the noun is deleted and occupies the passive S function from the passive predicate ‘hit’. The passivation is undertaken to establish the shared-arguments which situates $S = O$ one of which can be deleted. The sentence (8b) shows similar case. The shared argument in sentence (8b) is *masarakat* ‘people/society’. In the first clause the noun occupies the S function of the intransitive predicate *seneng* ‘happy’, and in the second clause the noun is deleted and occupies the passive S function of the passive predicate *di-gatèkké* ‘is paid attention’. In reinforcing sentence (8a), passivation in the sentence (8b) is undertaken to establish a shared-argument which the initial condition $S = O$ can be deleted. On the sentences (6a) (7a), (8a), and (8b), the syntactic conditions required for the deleted argumentation on the conjoined clause is $S = A$; an argument which initial condition $S = O$ is passived into, for that reason it can be deleted.

Such conditions may not always be acceptable. There is a conjoining clause governed by semantic rules. As in the samples of sentences (9a) (9b) and (9c), the following are the semantic prescription rules. In this case certain semantic roles become references to the deleted arguments.

- (9) a. *Minah ny-suntak rasa anyelé marang Kusno karo Ø mbengok-mbengok*
 Minah AKT-express feel anger to Kusno by shout
 ‘Minah expressed her anger on Kusno by shouting’
- b. *Prabu Banaputra m-pasrahaké Dèwi Ragu marang Begawan Rawatmaja supaya di-ningkah*
 Prabu Banaputra AKT-entrust Dewi Ragu to Begawan Rawatmaja for PAS-marriage
 ‘Prabu Banaputra entrusted Dewi Ragu to Begawan Rawatmaja for marriage’
- c. *Saka keparengé Prabu Basuparicara, bayi di-paringaké marang Sang Dasabala, kapurih nggulawenthah.*
 at request Prabu Basuparicara, baby PAS-give to sang Dasabala, so that take care
 ‘At the request of King Basuparicara, the baby was given to Sang Dasabala, so that (Dasabala) would take care’

The deleted arguments in sentences (9a), (9b), and (9c) are governed by semantic factors, therefore, that passive-active changes in the main clause have no effect on the deleted argument reference. The shared-argument in sentence (9a) is *Minah*. In the first clause *Minah* occupies the A function of the predicate *ny-suntak* ‘expressed’, and in the second noun clause is deleted and is the S argument of the predicate *bengok-bengok* ‘shouting’. The reference argument is deleted from the predicate *bengok-bengok* always refers to the agent of the predicate *ny-suntak* ‘expressed’. The deleted argument in sentence (9b) is also semantically governed. The shared-argument in (9b) is *Dewi Ragu*. In the first clause occupies the O function of the active predicate *m-pasrahaké* ‘entrusted’, and the second clause is deleted, and occupies the passive function of S. The reference deletion is determined semantically, namely as a patient of the predicate *masrahaké* ‘entrusted’. The deleted arguments in sentence (9c) is syntactically governed. The shared-argument in sentence (9c) is *Sang Dasabala*. In the first clause the noun does not occupy the core argument of a passive predicate *di-paringi* ‘was given’, however, it becomes a reference of the deleted argument in the second clause. In the first noun clause *Sang Dasabala* serves a role as *beneficiary*. In the second clause the noun occupies argument A, from the transitive predicate *ng-gulawenthah* ‘take care’. That the deletion and reference relations are determined by semantic roles, this can be proved by passivation or otherwise returning to active from passive clauses. The sentences (10a), (10b) and (10c) are changes of sentences (9a), (9b), and (9c).

- (10) a. *Rasa anyelé di-suntak Minah marang Kusno karo Ø mbengok-mbengok*
 feel anger PAS-express Minah to Kusno while shout
 ‘Her annoyance was expressed by Minah to Kusno while screaming’

- b. *Dèwi Ragu di-pasrahaké Prabu Banaputra marang Begawan Rawatmaja supaya di-ningkah*
 Dewi Ragu PAS-submitt Prabu Banaputra to Begawan Rawatmaja for PAS-marriage
 ‘Dewi Ragu was submitted by Prabu Banaputra to Begawan Rawatmaja for marriage’
- c. *Saka keparengé Prabu Basuparicara, Sang Dasabala di-paringi bayi, kapurih ng-gulawenthah.*
 At request Prabu Basuparicara, Sang Dasabala PAS-give baby , so that ACT- take care
 ‘At the request of King Basuparicara, the Dasabala was given a baby, so that (Sang Dasabala) would take care’

Changes in the functioning position of those arguments can never change the deleted reference. Due to this fact, the relationship between deletion and reference is not determined by syntactic factors, however, by semantic factors. In sentences of (9a) and (10a) the deletion of argument always refers to the agent, *Minah*; in sentences (9b) and (10b) the deleted argument always refers to predicate to the patient, *Dèwi Ragu*; and in sentences (9c) and (10c) the deletion always refers to the *beneficiary*, Sang Dasabala. The semantic factor only occurs in the matrix clause. The deleted argument always occupies the subject function of the subordinate clause.

B. Discussion

Typologically it is important to distinguish between coordinative and subordinate clauses. Dixon (1994) suggests this but explains more about the difference between coordinative and subordinative relationships. Based on the coordinative data shows that the deletion / deletion in the coordinative relationship is in unmarked conditions, the deleted Javanese language argument as well as accusative language. The deletion occurs in language if S = A. That is, the syntactic condition is an absolute requirement for an deleted argument. In marked conditions, passivation is not always the same as Dixon's statement. The argument O is changed to the same as S intransitive. The sentence (4b) shows that.

In subordinate relationships, syntactic and semantic requirements occur in various conditions. In unmarked conditions, setting is determined syntactically as in sentence (6a), (7a). On the contrary, sentences (9a), (9b), and (9c) the relationship between the condition of both marked and unmarked matrix sentences determined nothing. What determines precisely the role of semantics, in which the deletion refers to agent, the deletion refers to patient, or the deletion refers to ‘benficiery’.

Only in the deleted arguments on unmarked conditions is the strong evidence of the Javanese language as an accusative language. The unmarked conditions can never be used as evidence.

IV. CONCLUSION

Javanese is an accusative language in terms of the deleted arguments of coordinative sentence in unmarked conditions. In subordinate sentences, some deletions are determined semantically, especially in matrix clauses. Therefore, the deletion in the subordinative clause can never be used as evidence and syntactic behavior.

Acknowledgment

This paper is part of an academic dissertation on ‘the Establishment of Compound Sentence Arguments in Javanese: A Reason for Syntactic Typology’. I wish to express my gratitude to the promoter, Prof. Dr. Sumarlam, M.Sc, and co-promoter Dr. Dwi Purnanto, M.Hum.

References

- Arka, I. W. (1998). *From Morphosyntax to Pragmatic in Balinese: A lexical-Funtional Approach (Disertation)*. Sedney: University of Sedney.
- Artawa, I. K. (1998). Ergativity and Balinese syntax part I. *Nusa* , 42, 1-63.
- Artawa, I. K. (1998). Ergativity and Balinese syntax part II. *Nusa* , 65-111.
- Artawa, I. K. (1998). Ergativity and Balinese syntax part III. *Nusa* , 113-169.
- Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universal and Linguistic Typology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Creissels, D. (2014). Cross-linguistic variation in the treatment of beneficiaries . *Linguistic Discovery* , 41-55.
- Dixon, R. (2010). *Basic linguistic theory I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Dixon, R. (2010). *Basic linguistic theory 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dixon, R. (2012). *Basic linguistic theory 3*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dixon, R. (1994). *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Forker, D. (2014). A canonical approach to the argument/adjunct distinction. *Linguistic Discovery* , 27-40.
- Haspelmath, M. (2014). Argumen and adjunct as language-particular syntactic categories and as comparative concepts. *Linguistic Discovery* , 3-11.
- Haspelmath, M. (2011). On S, A, P, T and R as Comparative concept for alignment typology. *Linguistic Typology* , 535-567.
- Jufrizal. (2007). Minangkabunese as S/A pivot language: the evidence based on typological study on interrogative construction. *Kolita 5* (pp. 63-74). Jakarta: Universitas Atma Jaya.
- Jufrizal. (2012). *Tata bahasa Minangkabau: deskriptif dan telaah tipologi linguistik*. Padang : Universitas Negeri Padang.
- Ronald P. Schaefer, Francis O. Egbokhare . (2014). Emai's Variable Coding of Adjuncts . *Linguistic Discovery* , 12-26.
- Song, J. J. (2001). *Linguistic typology: morphology and syntax*. England: Pearson Education Limited.