

Resultative Constructions in Toba Batak Language

Srisofian Sianturi^{1*} & Mulyadi²

¹Universitas HKBP Nommensen, Medan, Indonesia

²Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: Srisofian Sianturi, E-mail: sriofiansianturi@uhn.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Received: May 20th, 2019

Accepted: June 28th, 2019

Published: July 31st, 2019

Volume: 2

Issue: 4

DOI: 10.32996/ijllt.2019.2.4.7

KEYWORDS

Typology, Resultative Constructions, Phrase Resultatives, Toba Batak Language

ABSTRACT

This study discusses the expression of resultative constructions meaning in Toba Batak Language. The data were taken from interview, daily conversation, utterances in ceremonies and TBL folklore. The findings of the study are: 1) TBL applied three phrase resultatives e.g., adjectival resultative (APs), prepositional resultative (PPs) and noun resultative (NPs) constructions; 2) There are two types of resultatives in TBL, they are: weak resultatives (APs and PPs) and strong resultatives (APs and NPs) are found in TBL; 3) The results are not placed in the end of clause; and 4) The result is formed from morphological verb *MA-* + *verb* for adjectival resultative, *PP* + *adjective* for the Prepositional resultative constructions and *Ma-*+*verb*+*-an* for noun resultative construction.

1. INTRODUCTION

Toba Batak Language (TBL) is an Austronesia language spoken by speech community of Batak Toba in North Sumatera province in Indonesia. TBL is used by the speech community are mostly live in North Tapanuli, Samosir, Tarutung and Toba Samosir. Resultative construction is construction formed by past two events i.e. action and result. The resultative construct is one sentence that consists of the result of action (see Nedjalkov, 1988:28, and Bybee et al, 1994:54). Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988:6) stated that resultative is different from stative. The resultative expresses both a state and the preceding action it has resulted, while the stative expresses a state of a thing without any implication of its origin.

Nedjalkov (1988) classified resultatives into six diathesis types, they are: (1) subjective resultative is the underlying subject of the state is co-referential with the underlying subject of the preceding action; (2) objective resultative is co-referential with underlying object of the latter; (3) possessive resultative is formed from transitive verb exclusively; (4) oblique-objective resultative is the underlying subject of the resultant state is not co-referential with the underlying subject or objet of the previous event; and (5) impersonal-resultative construction consists of two subtypes: a) the objective-impersonal resultative and b) the subjective-impersonal resultative. Whereas, the resultative form are non-combined and combined resultatives. Nedjalkov also listed the structural types

of resultative forms into two, they are complex resultative forms and simple resultative forms.

Washio (1997) also classified the resultative constructions into three sub-types, they are: weak, strong and spurious. As described previously that the resultative constructions define as the result of action (main verb). Semantically, the weak resultative constructions provide the main predicate to determine the argument in the end (e.g., *The blacksmith hammered the metal flat*), while the strong resultative constructions that the meaning of adjective depend on verb meaning (e.g., *to paint the house white*). The other resultative constructions is spurious resultative or commonly called as pseudo-resultatives. It is not considered as real resultative because they resemble of adjective and adverb resultative construction (Washio, 1997). Furthermore, Washio (1997a:227) claims that unergative resultative is included to strong resultative.

The resultative constructions have been analyzed in some languages, such as in Balinese, Albanian and English. Arka (1998:392-396) found that the resultative in Balinese is formed in passive resultative form, whereas Kurani (2011) analyzed about the resultative meaning in Albanian and English. It was found that resultative constructions Albanian mostly in resultative clauses, such as: verb + ablative construction and gerund phrases, whereas in English, the resultative is occurred in secondary predicates.

2. METHODOLOGY

This study is descriptive qualitative research. The characteristic of this study is synchronic due to TBL as the language subject. The finding synchronic is the basis study in analyzing certain language phenomenon in certain time (Mahsun, 2005:117). This study highlights resultative construction in TBL. There are two types of data, i.e. primary data and secondary data. The primary data was taken from an interview, a daily conversation and utterances in Batak Toba ceremony. The secondary data of this study was taken from Toba Batak folklore “*Torsa-Torsa Hombung*”. The technique of collecting data was *teknik cakap* and *teknik simak* (Sudaryanto, 2015).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULT

The resultative construction is interpreted as the relation between causal and resultant. Every language has own resultative characteristics. Not all languages allow both weak and strong resultative constructions. TBL and English have both weak and strong resultative constructions but Italian only has weak resultative. The result performs in phrases such as: adjectival (APs), prepositional (PPs) and Noun (NPs). It can be shown in table 1 by Tsuzuki (2007) (cited from Chigusa).

Weak Resultatives

In TBL, the adjectival resultative constructions are mostly applied with the morphological verb. They can be seen as follows:

- (1) ***Ma-bosur** butuhana mangan*
full stomach-3TG eat
 “His/Her stomach eat full”

The resultative clause (1) is the adjectival resultative. Uniquely, TBL does not have similar structure to Indonesian and English language. One of differences is the main predicate in the end of clause, whereas Indonesian and English is commonly after the subject. In the resultative clause (1), *mabosur* becomes the result of main predicate. In the other hand, the resultative clause (1) is also called as weak resultative because *mabosur* is the result of *mangan*.

- (2) ***Ma-rumpak** hau i ditaba*
fallen tree DET cut-PAST down
 “The tree is cut down fallen”

The previous clause is an adjectival resultative construction. The clause is in passive form. The word *marumpak* is the result of predicate *ditaba*. This clause is not strong resultative but weak resultative because the main predicate is *ditaba* and the result is *marumpak*.

- (3) ***Ma-tolbak** gadu-gadu i dipangkur.*
broken rice fields DET hoed
 “The rice fields are hoed broken”

The clause (3) is also categorized as weak resultative because the main predicate is *dipangkur* and the result is *matolbak*. This clause is also called as adjectival resultative construction.

- (4) ***Ma-lekles** tano i dianjak.*
flat soil DET trampled
 “the soil are trampled flat”

This clause has similar category to clause (1), (2), and (3). It is called an adjectival resultative construction and require as weak resultative because the *dianjak* event strongly implies an entity’s becoming *malekles* as the result.

Strong Resultatives

Strong resultatives, in which the main predicate does not entail the end state of the event and the the resulting state is expressed only by AP or PP (Washio, 1997). The strong resultatives are applied in Toba Batak Language.

- (5) *Horbo, lombo dohot babi **mar-rumpah-an***
ma diseat.
Buffalo, cow and pig fallen PART
slaughtered
 “Buffalo, cow and pig are slaughtered fallen”

The clause (5) refers to strong resultative due to the fact that the meaning of verb *diseat* is completely independent with the meaning of noun *marrumpahan*. This resultative construction is categorized as noun resultative. It is different from adjectival and prepositional resultatives.

- (6) ***Ma-bugang** pat na i ditallik*
gaped leg Poss DET cut
 “His/Her leg is cut gaped”

Mabugang is the result of event *ditallik*. This clause is included into strong resultatives because the meaning of verb and the meaning of adjective are independent each other. On the other hand, if the verb *ditallik* can produce result in another meaning such as broken or busted.

- (7) ***Ma-nosak*** *ate-ate na manaon na hansit i*
 sucked heart Poss feel DET pain
 DET
 “Sucked on his heart with pain”

The clause above is called as adjectival resultative construction and categorized as strong resultative. The adjective word *manosak* indicates as the result of verb *manaon*. In fact, the result of state of *manaon* has a possibility changing into another adjectival resultant like *madetuk* (suffer) or *malengleng* (sore).

- (8) ***Ma-lala*** *indahan dilompa parhobas i*
 Mushy rice cooked chef DET
 “The rice is cooked mushy”

The clause (8) is the adjectival resultative construction. The adjective *malala* is the result of verb *dilompa*. There is no meaning connection between verb meaning and adjective meaning. The adjective result can be changed into another meaning like tasty or pasty. That is why, this clause is categorized as strong resultative.

These three clauses below are prepositional phrases. Prepositional phrases in resultative constructions are the unique characteristic of TBL because not all languages have this types of phrases.

- (9) ***Maradu mate*** *au mengkel mambege sarita na i*
 Until die me laugh heard story Poss
 DET
 “I laughed until die when heard his story”

The prepositional phrase in this resultative construction has the structure PP *maradu* + *adjective*. This is different from Kurani (2011) that analyzed English resultative constructions. English has pattern prepositional resultative with structure PP + infinitive. The meaning of die in this clause is not lexical meaning but it is metaphorical meaning. *Die* means laugh out loud. The respectively meaning is “the story makes him laugh out loud”. This clause is also called

as strong resultative because the verb meaning *mengkel* has possibility another result meaning like heehaw.

- (10) ***Maradu ias*** *didilat piring i*
 Until clean licked plate DET
 “licked the plate until clean”

The clause (10) is also categorized as prepositional resultative constructions. This prepositional resultative has structure PP + adjective. Actually the plate will be clean if it was washed but in this clause there is metaphorical meaning that doer felt famished.

- (11) ***Maradu marmera*** *bohi na i dipastapi ho*
 Until red face Poss DET slapped
 you
 “You slapped his face until red”

The prepositional phrase in this resultative construction has the structure PP *maradu* + *adjective*. This is also one of difference between English and TBL resultative constructions. English has pattern prepositional resultative with structure PP + infinitive. The respectively meaning is “You slapped his face until the face is red”. This clause is also called as strong resultative because the verb meaning *slapped* has possibility another result meaning like brushed.

5. DISCUSSION

From the analysis above, it is found out that the resultative construction in TBL has a quietly difference from another language such as English and German. The difference occurred in category of weak and strong resultatives. In English the weak and strong resultatives are applied in adjectival and prepositional resultative constructions. In German, the weak resultatives are only applied in prepositional resultative and strong resultatives are applied in both adjectival and prepositional resultative construction. In TBL, the weak resultatives are applied in both adjectival resultative and prepositional resultative construction, while strong resultatives are applied in adjectival resultative and noun resultative. Second finding, the result of the verb is not placed in the end of clause, but in the beginning of the clause. The third, the result is formed from morphological verb *MA-* + verb for adjectival resultative, PP + adjective for the

Prepositional resultative constructions and *Ma-+verb+-an* for noun resultative construction.

6. CONCLUSION

From the results discussed above, it can be concluded that:

1. TBL applied three phrase resultatives e.g., adjectival resultative (APs), prepositional resultative (PPs) and noun resultative (NPs) constructions.
2. There are two types of resultatives in TBL, they are: weak resultatives (APs and PPs) and strong resultatives (APs and NPs) are found in TBL.
3. The results are not placed in the end of clause but in the beginning.
4. The result is formed from morphological verb *MA-* + verb for adjectival resultative, PP + adjective for the Prepositional resultative constructions and *Ma-+verb+-an* for noun resultative construction.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Srisofian Sianturi was born in Simatupang 6th November 1985. She is a student of Linguistics in Doctoral Program North Sumatera University. She is a lecturer in English Department of Nommensen HKBP University.

Mulyadi is a lecturer in Doctoral Program, North Sumatera University. He is a vice chairman of Linguistics Department of Doctoral Program North Sumatera University.

REFERENCES

[1] Arka, I.W. (1998). Syntactic Ergativity in Balinese: An Argument Structure Based Theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory Journal* 16: 387-441.

[2] Bybee, J et al. (1994). *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago and London. The University of Chicago Press

[3] Chisuga, M. A Crosslinguistic Observation on Resultative Constructions (abstract). Available at: [www.soc.nii.ac.jp/elsj/2009forum/Morita\(final_abstract\).pdf](http://www.soc.nii.ac.jp/elsj/2009forum/Morita(final_abstract).pdf)

[4] Kurani, A. (2011). Resultative Constructions in Albanian and English. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 2.3: 316-322.

[5] Mahsun. (2005). *Metode Penelitian Bahasa*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.

[6] Nedjalkov. (1988). *Typology of Resultative Constructions*. Philadelphia. John Benjamins.

[7] Nedjalkov and Jaxontov. (1988). (in) *Typology of Resultative Constructions*. Philadelphia. John Benjamins.

[8] Sudaryanto, (2015). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.

[9] Washio, R. (1997). Resultatives, Compositionality, and Language Variation. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6,1: 1-49.

APPENDIX

TABLE

Table 1. Resultative Constructions by Tsuzuki (2007) (cited from Chigusa)

	En glis h	Ger man	Du tch	Frenc h	Italia n	TB L
Wea k resul tative	AP, PP	PP	AP , PP	PP	PP	AP ,PP
Stron g resul tative	AP, PP	AP, PP	AP ,PP	None xisten t	None xisten t	AP , NP