

Morphological Causative Constructions in Indonesian and Rembang Dialect of Javanese: A Typological Study

¹Siti Nur Hasisah, Agus Subiyanto, Ahmad Abu Rifai

Diponegoro University, Semarang, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Causative constructions occur in every language, including the Rembang dialect of Javanese. The causative constructions in this language are similar to those in Indonesian. However, in terms of the inflectional inventory, the Rembang dialect of Javanese is richer than the Indonesian language. This study aims to discuss the morphological causative construction in both, Rembang dialect of Javanese and Indonesian. This study is descriptive qualitative with a language typology approach. Sources of data came from oral and written data. The data analysis used a typological theory. The results show that the morphological causative in Indonesian is constructed with the suffix “-kan” only. Meanwhile, Rembang dialect of Javanese is much richer in affixes; it can be formed with the prefix “n-”, infix “-en”, infix “-in”, the suffix “-i”, the suffix “-no”, and the suffix “-ke”. These affixes increase the number of valences (arguments).

ARTICLE INFO

Paper type:
Research Article

Article history:
Received: 17/08/2021
Revised: 27/10/2021
Accepted: 27/10/2021

Keywords:

- Javanese
- Indonesian
- Morphological causative
- Language typology

1. Introduction

All languages possess various causative construction types. There are languages having complex causative constructions consisting of lexical, morphological, and analytical causatives. Others do not; they only have one or two. Based on the research carried out by the researchers, Indonesian and Rembang dialect of Javanese belong to agglutinative languages as they have three causative construction types. This type of language has an affixation process that can follow verbs whose role is to increase or decrease the number of arguments in a sentence related to verbs triggered by grammatical functions (verb valence).

In Indonesian, the phenomena of causativisation commonly apply causative verbs with the confix “*me-kan*”, as in the following examples.

- a) *Serli membuat lampu itu nyala* (Serli turns the lamp on)
- b) *Serli menyalakan lampu itu* (Serli turns the lamp on)

In sentence (a), Serli is the cause that makes the lamp light on, which is an effect. This is described as an analytic construction. Meanwhile, in sentence (b), namely “*Serli menyalakan lampu itu*”, “*menyalakan*” (turn on) is a word that has affixation in the form of the confix “*me-kan*” derived from the root word “*nyala*”. The verb “*menyalakan*” has an immediate effect. Sentences (a) and (b) have the same meaning, namely ‘the light is on’. This also occurs in the Javanese dialect of Rembang, which uses the suffix “*-ke/-no*” to replace the confix “*me-kan*” in Indonesian, as seen below.

- c) *Serli nggawe lampu kuwi murup* (Serli turns the lamp on)
- d) *Serli murupke/murupno lampu kuwi* (Serli turns the lamp on)

Sentence (c) is an analytical causative, composed of two predicates: “*Nggawe*” and “*murup*”, meaning “to make” and “to light up”. Meanwhile, sentence (d) is a morphological causative because

¹ Email Addresses: hazizahsn@gmail.com (Hasisah), subaling@gmail.com (Subiyanto), ahmadaburifai@gmail.com (Rifai)

the sentence uses the causative morphological marking, being the suffix “-ke” or “-no”, changing non-causative into causative verbs. Semantic factors are related to the difference between morphological causation and analytic causation, one of which is indirect causative or direct causative. Indirect causative is stated by analytical causative. Meanwhile, direct causality expression is stated by morphological causative—where the causative at a certain moment follows the direct causative (Comrie, 1989).

It seems that those examples are not yet interesting as the complexity is so common. It might be different if we take a look at these.

e) *Pak Wo mengiris jeruk dengan pisau* (Mr. Wo slices oranges with a knife)

f) *Pak Wo mengiriskan pisau pada jeruk* (Mr. Wo slices an orange with a knife)

The verb “*mengiris*” (slice) illustrates that the orange in example (e) is the direct target object. Meanwhile, “*mengiriskan*” (slice) in example (f) points out that the formal direct target object is a knife. Things like this become very notable in Indonesian as semantically there is a direct or indirect effect. Other examples can be seen below.

g) *Kakaknya membeli baju baru untuk Atiqa* (Atiqa’s sister bought new clothes for her)

h) *Kakaknya membelikan Atiqa baju baru* (Atiqa’s sister bought her a new dress)

If the analysis is executed by means of changing the valence order according to (Whaley, 1997), *baju baru* in example (g) is the direct object, while the direct object is Atiqa in example (h). The problem is that “*untuk Atiqa*” (for her) in example (g) can be omitted, while “*baju baru*” (new clothes) in example (h) cannot. This means that there is no increase in valence. In example (g), “*untuk Atiqa*” is syntactically not needed. Thus, example (g) has two arguments, while example (h) has three arguments. This matter is related to the cause of accessibility hierarchy. Example (g) has the following model; Example (g) *kakaknya > baju baru*. Meanwhile, example (h) is *kakaknya > Atiqa > baju baru*.

Based on observations in terms of morphological causative construction, there are differences between Indonesian and Rembang Javanese dialects which have quite a lot of forms and variations. However, the problem is the intransitive form. Moreover, the direct effect is also questioned whether semantically or not.

This study would reveal the morphological causative construction types in Indonesian and Rembang Javanese dialect: which one highlights this construction more? In addition, there are relatively few studies that discuss the comparison of Javanese constructions, especially in terms of the comparison of the causative elements of Indonesian morphology. Therefore, this study proposes to describe the forms of variations in Javanese and Indonesian languages in morphological causative construction and reveal their differences.

Studies on causative construction have been carried out by several researchers, such as Siagian and Afriani (2014) discussing the causative construction in the Toba Batak language. The causative kind of Toba Batak based on formal parameters is typologically marked by a complementary pair in the lexical causative; affixes “-hon”, “-I”, “pa-/par-“, “pa-“, “-hon”, and “pa-“ “- I” in morphological causative; and verbs “*mambahen*, *mangido*, *manuru*” in analytic causative. Meanwhile, in terms of semantic parameters, they are marked by (1) [*bernyawa*], (2) [*sengaja*], (3) [*kontak*], dan (4) [*manusia*] in true and permissive causative; and verb structure in direct and indirect causative. Lexical and morphological causatives are created syntactically by monoclausal structure. Meanwhile, the biclausal structure forms analytic causative.

Another study was conducted by Nimashita (2014), paying attention to the causative analysis of Japanese and Indonesian. In Japanese, causative forms can be divided into two types, namely morphological and lexical causative. Meanwhile, Indonesian has three types, namely analytic, morphological, and lexical causative. The construction of causative sentences in Japanese and Indonesian is derived from non-causative sentences by changing the predicate into a causative verb. The causative meaning in the two languages also shows differences, namely causative in Japanese can express the meaning of coercion, permission, and responsibility, while causative in Indonesian expresses the meaning of making something into its basic form. This study discusses the pattern of

causative formation of Japanese and Indonesian languages, while my research focuses on the pattern of causative formation of the morphology of Javanese and Indonesian. However, both analyze causative construction.

The next study conducted by Budiarta (2015) paid attention to causative construction of Kemak language. The results demonstrate that analytic causative construction is formed by the causative verb “*taut*” (make) with the predicate occupied by intransitive verbs, transitive verbs, and adjectives. Besides, the analytic causative construction can also be derived by the causative verb “*laka*” (order) which can only be followed by intransitive and transitive verbs. With intransitive verb predicate and transitive verb, this construction has an alteration form due to differences in terms of object position appearing after the causative verb “*buat*” and “*suruh*” or the intransitive-transitive verbs which act as the predicate.

The next research was conducted by Qomariana (2016). This study discusses the types of lexical, analytical, and morphological causative constructions that exist in the East Java area. The sixth research was held by Suryadi regarding the suffix “*-an*” in Indonesian. It is a typology study focusing on three rules regarding the suffix “*-an*”. The rules consist of the position of the ending “*-an*” can be called a suffix if it attaches to another root word and becomes polymorphemic; the rule of stability of form, namely the suffix “*-an*” does not change its form when combined with a word unit ending in a vowel phoneme or a consonant phoneme; the suffix “*-an*” is always an argument against the SVO concatenation; the suffix “*-an*” has the role of changing all forms of words into nouns except adverbial forms. The similarity between this research and the present study is that it examines language with a typology study. The difference lies in the object of research.

Other research was conducted by Asridayani (2017), conveying that Batak Toba Dialect in Bungo Regency is just almost the same as Batak Toba language (BTL) in Sumatera Utara. The similarities are; (1) the intransitive verbs are formed by adding the suffix “*-hon*”, (2) the intransitive verbs are formed by adding the suffix “*-I*” if the predicate is an adjective, and (3) the transitive verbs, intransitive verbs, and precatatorial are formed by adding the prefix “*pa-*”. BTL can also apply some verbs by adding the suffix “*-hon*” and the suffix “*-I*”. Its resultative construction is marked by prefix “*-di*” and prefix “*-tar*”.

Another study was conducted by Tampubolon and Mulyadi (2018), stating that the causative form in terms of causative construction in English is marked by the verb “*cause*”. Meanwhile, it is stated by “*membuat*” and “*menyebabkan*” in Indonesian.

Another study conducted by Ummah (2018) examined the patterns of constructing serial verbs in Madurese language and constituent structures. This research focused more on the formation of serial verb constructions, constituent structures, and structures in the Madurese language. It was revealed that Madurese language has sentence formation patterns in the form of V1 transitive + V2 transitive, V1 transitive + V2 intransitive, V1 intransitive + V2 transitive, and the last one is V1 intransitive + V2 intransitive.

The next study was carried out by Afriani (2018), stating that the formation of causative patterns in Indonesian has the form of patterns of formation of lexical, morphological, and analytical causatives. Meanwhile, English only has patterns of formation of lexical and analytical causatives. Second, in Haiman's pyramid of iconicity, the principle of typology proves helpful in examining two or more types of causation to be used to illustrate 'direct causes'. The three typologies, which are a study of functional syntax, can explain functions by involving various languages. The difference with the present study lies in the research object; this study discusses the pattern of analytical causative formation in Indonesian and English, while the present study talks about the pattern of causative formation in Javanese and Indonesian morphology. The similarities are both in the form of a typology study on causative construction.

The next research was conducted by Nurhayati (2018) concerning the pattern of analytic causative formation in Javanese and Indonesian. The findings suggest that the pattern of analytic causative formation in Javanese can be arranged with the verb “*nggawe*” (make) and has a biclausal element. This could be seen from their ability to determine polarity and other modalities for verbs. Meanwhile, in Indonesian which has a mono clausal structure, analytical causative can be arranged with various verbs, namely to order, to make, to ask, to cause, to invite, and to make. This research is a bit inaccurate in compiling and analysing sentences in Javanese language as it seems to impose on the diction used as a sample, meaning that Indonesian is translated literally to Javanese. In fact, the Javanese terms themselves exist. The difference with the present study is that study of Nurhayati (2018) focuses

on analytical causative constructions, while this study focuses on morphological causative constructions.

Hasibuan and Mulyadi (2019) conducted research related to the causative construction of syntactic typology studies in the Mandailing language. This study results in the finding that the Batak Mandailing language in the analysis results had causative affixes in its causative morphology, including “*ma-ko*”, “*pa-on*”, “*pa-kon*”, “*pa*”, and “*tar*”. Then, the study also describes an informal technique in the form of an explanation of the three parts of the morphosyntactic causative formation pattern consisting of lexical, morphological, and analytic. In lexical causation, the verb “*mambaen*” makes the elements of the causative verb. In addition, in terms of semantics, the same verbs were found but had different meanings. The difference in this study is that the object of that study is the Mandailing language and discusses the three causative constructions.

The next study was conducted by Nazara et al. (2019), focusing on causative construction of Nias language. Several points were drawn, one of which is that causative construction in Nias language is established through morpholexical operations involving affixes and words/pre-categories. Some causatives are specifically formed by using the prefix “*fe-*” or the allomorph “*f-*” to intransitive verbs. Some are derived from morpholexical operations involving the suffix “*-o*” and adjectives or the suffix “*-gö*” and pre-categorical. Both morpholexical operations involving prefixes and suffixes introduce a direct cause. Moreover, some causatives are also formed by the confix “*fa-...-ö*” which is attached to a transitive verb. This morphological operation changes the argument function from the direct cause to the indirect cause.

The next research was conducted by Umam (2019) with the title “Causative Construction in the Arabic Novel *Richlatu Ilal Ghad* by Taufik El-Hakim”. Several points revealed are (1) some lexical causative constructions can be found and the verb pattern used is type I, (2) morphological causative construction is revealed in pattern verbs II, IV, and X, and (3) analytic causative construction can be found in the verb pattern.

Another study was conducted by Umar et al. (2019). Causative construction of Aceh language was analysed thoroughly, and the results point out that based on the formal parameters, the construction consists of morphological and lexical causatives. Meanwhile, based on the semantic parameter, it is defined as analytic causative. This construction is produced by the combination of clause and conjunction “*kerna*” or “*seubap*”; using analytic causative verb “*peugot*” and “*geuyu*”; applying morphological causative affix “*meu-*”, “*peu-*”, and “*seu-*”; and using specific lexical causative possessing causative meanings.

Sianturi and Mulyadi (2020) also researched causation, especially analytic ones from the Toba Batak language. They found that the analytic causative construction in the language was formed by biclausal and was characterized by the verbs “*mambahen*, *manuru*, *mandasdasi*, *manarea*, *mangarodi*, *mamompom*, *mangido*”, and “*manjalo*”. Based on empirical evidence, causative analytic language in each sentence and the semantic meaning of causative verbs in the Toba Batak language would be different if the *Sangajo* element is intentional. Toba Batak language generally has SVVO and SVOV models. In addition, the results of both analyses state that to form one sentence, complex sentences with two clauses can be used. The difference between this research and the present study is that the object of the research is the Toba Batak language and the focus of the present study is analytical causative analysis in the Rembang dialect of Javanese and Indonesian.

In this study, the authors focus on analysing Indonesian and Rembang dialects of Javanese. This dialect was chosen because it has several quite different features compared to other dialects in the Javanese language. For example, the Rembang dialect uses the suffix “*-nem*” to express first person possessiveness, while other dialects do not (Rahmania, 2015). In addition, there are also some other affixes used as morphological markers for causatives in this Rembang dialect. Geographically Rembang is mostly a coastal area in which there are a lot of fishing communities using unique lexicons in their speech. Communication that occurs in these fishing communities often uses simple and effective language patterns to give emphasis of an utterance, such as by using a certain particle.

Theoretical Framework

This study applied causative construction theory. According to Comrie (1981), there are three ways to express causation, namely analytic, morphological, and lexical causatives. This is supported by Song (2001: 257) claiming that causative construction has three types, namely lexical, morphological,

and syntactic. This study focuses on the second type of causative, namely morphological causation. This type pays attention to a construction in which the cause predicate is in the form of a derived morpheme or affix, while the effect predicate (cause) is expressed in the form of a basic lexical verb where the affix is attached. Causative morphemes are not only in the form of suffixes, but can also be in the form of prefixes (prefixes), insertions (infixes), and confixes.

Constructions whose verbs are described by affixes are morphological causative constructions, for instance, "*Bela membahagiakan Rama*" (Bela makes Rama happy). "*-kan*" is a characteristic of morphological causative formation patterns. According to Whaley (1997), the movement from indirect to direct object is included in the level of causation, increasing with the sequence of analytical-morphological-lexical causative formation. If a text uses a morphological instrument, for example, the affixation process, then the pattern of formation is morphologically causative (Comrie, 1989).

The occurrence of causative morphology is characterized when there is an affixation process between non-causative and causative predicates. A causative that has a separate predicate or verb to describe the cause and effect is an analytical causative, and if there is no relationship between the event caused and the cause with a new standard feature (morphology) it is called a lexical causative.

2. Methods

This descriptive qualitative research applied a typological approach aiming to analyze the morphological causative construction in the Rembang dialect and Indonesian. The data were in the forms of fragments of speech and sentences considered to contain morphological causative forms in the Rembang dialect and Indonesian. To collect the data, we used an observation method with listening and note-taking techniques, and the data were then cross checked with researchers' language intuition as one of the researchers is also a native speaker of the dialect.

The data were spoken texts containing morphological causatives from native speakers of the Rembang dialect, and also the written texts from some newspapers. There are five respondents used as the data sources taken as the sample. The respondents were selected based on some criteria: (1) they are native speakers of Rembang dialect of Javanese, who are between 30 to 60 years old, (2) they have good competence in Indonesian and the Rembang dialect, (3) they have no problem with their speech organs, (4) they use Rembang dialect in their daily communication.

The data obtained from the respondents were analysed using Comrie's (1989) typological theory. The technique used for analysing the morphological markers is based on the typological theory of causative construction. By using this technique, we can reveal linguistic units to see the role of the markers in forming causative constructions.

3. Results and Discussion

a. Morphological Causative Construction in Indonesian Language

In Indonesian, the phenomena of causativisation commonly apply causative verbs with suffix "*-kan*". The morphological causative construction can be explained as follows.

1) Suffix "*-kan*"

Suffix "*-kan*" is a morphological causative construction marker in Indonesian. Causative morphology has a direct effect. The root forms that can be followed by the suffix "*-kan*" are adjectives and verbs, as seen in the following examples.

- a) *Gelas itu retak* (The glass is cracked)
- b) *Aji meretakkan gelas itu* (Aji cracks the glass)
- c) *Gelas itu diretakkan Aji* (The glass is cracked by Aji)

Clause (a) is a non-causative clause whose predicate is an adjective, namely "*retak*" (cracked). When the suffix "*-kan*" is added to clause (b), the predicate which was originally the adjective "*retak*" becomes a transitive verb "*meretakkan*". It then requires the presence of an agent in the form of a cause. So, the suffix "*-kan*" functions to increase the number of arguments.

Here, if the agent is absent, then the sentence becomes unacceptable. Furthermore, clause (c) has the same meaning as clause (b). The difference is that clause (b) has an active predicate, while clause

(c) has a passive predicate. In addition, in clause (b), *Aji* which is the cause is located at the beginning of the clause. Meanwhile, in clause (c), the position of caused (*gelas itu*) is placed at the beginning of the clause.

Clauses (b) and (c) are then concluded to have different objects. In example (b), the object is the cause because it is placed at the beginning of the sentence. Meanwhile, in example (c), the object is the cause. Another example of the suffix “-kan” in verbs can be seen below.

- a) *Serli membuat lampu itu mati* (Serli turns the lamp on)
- b) *Serli mematikan lampu itu* (Serli turns the lamp off)

In clause (a), “Serli” is the cause that makes the lamp turn off as an effect. This is called an analytic construct. Meanwhile, in clause (b), “*mematikan*” (turn on) is a word that has an affixation in the form of adding the confix “*me -kan*” to the root word “*mati*”. The verb “*mematikan*” has an immediate effect. Examples (a) and (b) have the same meaning, i.e. the light is off.

The common complexity of both is probably making them not interesting. It might be different in the following examples.

- a) *Pak Wo mengiris jeruk dengan pisau* (Mr. Wo slices oranges with a knife)
- b) *Pak Wo mengiriskan pisau pada jeruk* (Mr. Wo slices oranges with a knife)

The verb “*mengiris*” (slice) illustrates that “*jeruk*” (orange) in example (a) is the direct target object, while “*mengiriskan*” (slice) in example (b) has a different direct target object, namely “*pisau*” (knife). This is very notable in Indonesian as semantically, there is a direct or indirect effect. Other examples:

- c) *Kakaknya membeli baju baru untuk Atiqa* (Atiqa’s sister bought new clothes for her)
- d) *Kakaknya membelikan Atiqa baju baru* (Atiqa’s sister bought her a new dress)

If the analysis is carried out by means of changing the valence order according to Whaley (1997), then in example (a), “*baju baru*” (new clothes) are the direct object. Meanwhile, in example (b), the direct object is “Atiqa”. The problem is that “*untuk Atiqa*” (for Atiqa) in example (a) can be removed, while “*baju baru*” (new clothes) in example (b) cannot.

This means that there is no increase in valence. In example (a), “*untuk Atiqa*” (for Atiqa) syntactically does not have to be present. Thus, example (a) has two arguments, while example (b) has three arguments. This matter is related to the cause accessibility hierarchy; example (a) has “*kakaknya*” (Atiqa’s sister) and “*baju baru*” (new clothes), while example (b) has “*kakaknya*” (Atiqa’s sister), “Atiqa” (Atiqa/her), and “*baju baru*” (new clothes).

b. Morphological Causative Construction in Rembang Javanese Dialect

Morphological causative construction in Standard Javanese is different from causative construction in Rembang dialect. This can be seen from some agents used in the data analysis below. In Standard Javanese, to say “*tak*” is “*dak*”, “*mok*” is “*kok*”, and “*di*” remains “*di*”. Moreover, related to prefixes that express causation, there are also differences.

In Standard Javanese, for instance, the suffix “-ake” is used. Meanwhile, the Rembang dialect uses the suffix “-ke”. Besides, there are other suffixes such as the suffix “-no” and “-I”. This shows that the morphological causative construction of Rembang dialect is more varied compared to Standard Javanese. In this study, morphological causative constructions in Indonesian and Standard Javanese would also be compared.

If the morphological causative construction in Indonesian can be formed with the suffix “-kan” only, then the Rembang dialect is more diverse. The construction can be formed with affixation forms in the form of prefixes, infixes, and suffixes. These include the following: prefix “n-“, infix “-en”, infix “-in”, suffix “-i”, suffix “-no”, and suffix “-ke”.

1) Prefix “n-“

Prefix “n-“ in the Rembang dialect of Javanese (RDJ) points out causative meanings. The root form that can be marked by this prefix is verbs, as seen in the following examples.

- a) *Roji nyengek adhine* (RDJ)
Roji membuat menangis adiknya (Indonesian)
 (Roji makes his brother cry)
- b) *Adhine dicengek Roji* (RDJ)
Adiknya dibuat menangis oleh Roji (Indonesian)
 (His brother is made to cry by Roji)
- c) *Adhine dicengek* (RDJ)
Adiknya dibuat menangis (Indonesian)
 (His brother is made to cry)

Example (a) is a causative clause with the predicate of the transitive verb “*nyengek*”. Its basic form is “*cengek*” which gets the prefix “*n-*” with the allomorph (*ny-*) so that it becomes “*nyengek*”. In a passive situation, the verb “*cengek*” gets the affix “*di-*” so that it becomes “*dicengek*”. In example (b), if there is no agent in the form of Roji, the sentence is still acceptable. “*Ne*” (his) refers to Roji, so the sentence becomes like example (c). Meanwhile, in example (a), if there is no causative agent for Roji, then the sentence is unacceptable since it requires a causal agent.

**Nyengek Adhine*

In clause (a), the object is the cause as it is placed at the beginning of the sentence. Meanwhile, in example (b), the object is the caused. In addition to allomorphs (*ny-*), in the Rembang dialect, there is another form of the prefix “*n-*” in the form of allomorphs (*ng-*) which also shows causation. Here are the examples.

- a) *Lek Sarimin ngenyek Sabar* (RDJ)
Lek sarimin membuat sepele Sabar (Indonesian)
 (Sarimin insults Sabar)
- b) *Sabar dienyek Lek Sarimin* (RDJ)
Sabar dibuat sepele oleh Lek Sarimin (Indonesian)
 (Sabar is insulted by Sarimin)
- c) *Sabar dienyek* (RDJ)
Sabar dibuat sepele (Indonesian)
 (Sabar is insulted)
- d) *Sabar tak enyek* (RDJ)
Sabar aku buat sepele (Indonesian)
 (I insult Sabar)
- e) *Sabar mok enyek* (RDJ)
Sabar kamu buat sepele (Indonesian)
 (You insult Sabar)

Example (a) is a causative clause with the predicate of the transitive verb “*ngenyek*”. Its basic form is “*enyek*” which gets the prefix “*n-*” with the allomorph (*ng-*) so that it becomes “*ngenyek*”. When it is in a passive situation, the verb “*enyek*” gets the affix “*di-*” so that it becomes “*dienyek*” as in example (b). In example (b), if there is no agent in the form of “*Sabar*”, the sentence cannot be accepted (**dienyek Lek Sarimin*). This raises the question: who is “*dienyek*” or insulted? Thus, the sentence is not acceptable.

Example (c) is acceptable although there is no agent in the form of “*Lek Sarimin*”; it is still acceptable and becomes an intransitive sentence. Meanwhile, in example (a), if there is no causal agent in the form of “*Sabar*”, then the sentence is unacceptable as sentences with transitive verbs require a causal agent. The object in clause (a) is the cause because it is placed at the beginning of the sentence. Meanwhile, in example (b), the object is the caused.

Furthermore, example (d) and example (e) are causative clauses with intransitive verb predicates so that they do not require an object. The basic form of “*enyek*” becomes “*tak enyek*” and “*mok enyek*” in situations before getting the affix “*ng-*” such as for example (a) which requires another object or agent after it. This shows that the affix “*ng-*” can increase the number of arguments or increase the degree of valence.

If it is viewed from the productivity aspect, the affix “*ng-*” is more productive compared to “*ny-*”

” if it is applied to the adjectives. This can be seen in the examples below.

- a) *Ngorting* (RDJ)
membuat diskon (Indonesian)
(make discount)
- b) **Nyorting*

In example (a), when applied to the root word “*karting*”, the affix (*ng-*) has the meaning of making a discount. When the affix (*ny-*) is applied to the same root word, it becomes meaningless as in the example (b).

2) Infix “-en”

In addition to prefixes, there is also an infix “-en” in Rembang Javanese dialect which shows a causative meaning. The basic form that can be marked in this infix is an adjective. The following are the examples.

- a) *Lisa wedi* (RDJ)
Lisa takut (Indonesian)
(Lisa is scared)
- b) *Lisa tak wedeni* (RDJ)
Lisa aku buat takut (Indonesian)
(I scare Lisa)
- c) *Lisa mok wedeni* (RDJ)
Lisa kamu buat takut (Indonesian)
(You scare Lisa)
- d) *Lisa diwedeni Samsul* (RDJ)
Lisa dibuat takut oleh Samsul (Indonesian)
(Lisa is scared by Samsul)

Example (a) is a non-causative clause with a predicate in the form of the adjective “*wedi*” (scared). When given the infix “-en” in clauses (b) and (c), the adjective “*wedi*” that becomes “*wedeni*” needs agents in the form of “*tak*”, “*mok*” and “*di*”. Also, clause (d) also requires an additional agent in the form of the cause namely “*Samsul*”. So, besides having a causative function, that causative “-en” also functions to increase the number of valences or arguments in a sentence. In the example above, if there is no additional agent, the sentence becomes unacceptable as the example below.

**Lisa wedeni*

The infix “-en” can only be applied to adjectives, not to nouns. If “-en” is inserted, the root word “*watu*”, either at the end or at the beginning of the word, will become meaningless as in the example below.

**watenu* **wenatu*

3) Infix “-in”

Besides the infix “-in” in the Javanese language, there is also an infix “-in” which shows a causative meaning. The basic form that can be marked in this infix is a verb. Here are the examples.

- a) *Sliramu tak tulis ing atiku* (RDJ)
Dirimu aku tulis di hatiku (Indonesian)
(I write you down in my heart)
- b) *Sliramu tinulis ing atiku* (RDJ)
Dirimu aku buat tertulis di hatiku (Indonesian)
(I make you written down in my heart)

Example (a) is a clause with a transitive verb. When an infix “-in” is added to clause (b), the verb “*tulis*” become “*tinulis*”. It then no longer needs any agent, namely in the form of cause “*tak*”. Also,

clauses (a) and (b) require additional agents in the form of causes “*sliramu*”. So, the causative “-in” also functions to decrease valences or reduce and increase arguments. In example (a) above, if there is no addition of an agent in the form of “*tak*”, the sentence becomes unacceptable.

**Sliramu tulis ing atiku*

The infix “-in” can only be attached to transitive verb forms; it cannot be applied to intransitive verbs, nouns, or adjectives. For example, if the infix “-in” is applied to the noun “*lawang*”, it becomes “*linawang*” if it is inserted in the middle of the beginning of the word; it becomes “*lawinang*” if it is inserted in the middle of the end of the word. Both words become meaningless. This is the same when applied to adjectives, for example, in the word “*nesu*”. If it is given the infix “-in” in the middle of the beginning of the word, it becomes “*ninesu*”. Then, if it is added in the middle of the end of the word, it becomes “*nesinu*”. These two words have no meaning whatsoever. So, it can be said that this infix is less productive. The infix “-in” can only be applied as a passive sentence. Other examples are as follows.

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| a) <i>Mantene tak tanpa kanthi sae</i> | (RDJ) |
| <i>Saya membuat pengantinnya diterima dengan baik</i> | (Indonesian) |
| (I made the bride accepted well) | |
| b) <i>Mantene mok tanpa kanthi sae</i> | (RDJ) |
| <i>Kamu membuat pengantinnya diterima dengan baik</i> | (Indonesian) |
| (You made the bride accepted well) | |
| c) <i>Mantene ditampa kanthi sae</i> | (RDJ) |
| <i>Pengantinnya diterima dengan baik</i> | (Indonesian) |
| (The bride is well accepted) | |
| d) <i>Mantene tinampa kanthi sae</i> | (RDJ) |
| <i>Pengantinnya dibuat diterima dengan baik</i> | (Indonesian) |
| (The bride is made to be accepted well) | |

In the four examples above, there are clauses with transitive verbs. When given the infix “-in”, the verb “*tampa*” in clause (d) becomes “*tinampa*”. This clause, which previously required an agent in the form of a cause “*tak*”, “*mok*”, and “*di*”, no longer needed them. Also, clause (d) requires an additional agent in the form of causal “*kanthi sae*”.

If the caused element, namely “*kanthi sae*” in clauses (a), (b), and (c), is omitted, then it can still be accepted—but not in clause (d). If there is no additional agent for “*kanthi sae*”, the sentence becomes less acceptable. Therefore, besides functioning as a causative, the infix “-in” can also increase the number of valences or arguments. The examples also point out that this infix can only function in passive sentences.

4) Suffix “-i”

The suffix “-i” in Rembang Javanese demonstrates a causative meaning. The root or basic forms that can be marked with this suffix are nouns and adjectives. Below are the examples.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) <i>Lawang iku bolong</i> | (RDJ) |
| <i>Pintu itu berlubang</i> | (Indonesian) |
| (The door has a hole) | |
| b) <i>Lawang iku mok bolongi</i> | (RDJ) |
| <i>Pintu itu kau buat berlubang</i> | (Indonesian) |
| (You make the door has a hole) | |
| c) <i>Lawang iku tak bolongi</i> | (RDJ) |
| <i>Pintu itu aku buat berlubang</i> | (Indonesian) |
| (I make the door has a hole) | |
| d) <i>Lawang iku di bolongi Budi.</i> | (RDJ) |
| <i>Pintu itu dibuat berlubang</i> | (Indonesian) |
| (The door is made to have a hole) | |

Example (a) is a non-causative clause with a predicate in the form of a noun “*bolong*”. When given the suffix “-i” in active clauses (b), (c), and (d), the noun “*bolong*” becomes “*bolongi*”—requiring an agent in the form of cause “*tak*”, “*mok*”, and “*di*”. Clause (d) also requires an additional agent in the form of cause “*Budi*”. So, causative “-i” also functions to increase valences or arguments. In the example above, if there is no additional agent, the sentence becomes unacceptable.

**lawang iku bolongi*.

Examples of adjectives can be seen below.

- a) *Bathik kae abang* (RDJ)
Batik itu berwarna merah (Indonesian)
(That batik is red)
- b) *Aku ngabangi bathik kae* (RDJ)
Aku membuat merah batik itu (Indonesian)
(I make the batik red)
- c) *Bathik kae tak abangi* (RDJ)
Batik itu aku buat merah (Indonesian)
(The batik is made red by me)
- d) *Bathik kae mok abangi* (RDJ)
Batik itu kau buat merah (Indonesian)
(The batik is made red by you)
- e) *Bathik kae di abangi Siroj* (RDJ)
Batik itu dibuat merah oleh Siroj (Indonesian)
(The batik is made red by Siroj)

Example (a) is a non-causative clause with an adjective predicate, namely “*abang*”. When the suffix “-i” is added to clauses (b), (c), (d), and (e), the adjective “*abang*” requires an additional agent in the form of a cause. So, the causative suffix “-i” can function as an addition to the number of arguments. The productivity of the suffix “-i” is not as productive as the suffix “-no” and suffix “-ke”.

**Batik kae abangi*

Clauses (b) and (c) have the same meaning. The difference between clause (b) and (c) lies in the form of the sentence. Example (b) is an active sentence while example (c) is a passive sentence.

5) Suffix “-no”

The suffix “-no” in Rembang Javanese shows a causative meaning. The basic form that can be marked with this suffix is the verb. Here are some examples.

- a) *Wedhus iku ucul* (RDJ)
Kambing itu lepas (Indonesian)
(The goat is loose)
- b) *Aku nguculno wedhus iku* (RDJ)
Aku membuat lepas kambing itu (Indonesian)
(I let go of the goat)
- c) *Wedhus iku tak uculno* (RDJ)
Kambing itu aku buat lepas (Indonesian)
(I let go of the goat)
- d) *Wedhus iku mok uculno* (RDJ)
Kambing itu kamu buat lepas (Indonesian)
(You let go of the goat)
- e) *Wedhus iku di uculno* (RDJ)
Kambing itu dibuat lepas (Indonesian)
(The goat is made loose)

Example (a) is a non-causative clause with the predicate verb “*ucul*”. When the suffix “-no” is

added to clauses (b), (c), (d), and (e), the adjective “*ucul*” requires additional agents in the form of causes. So, the causative suffix “*-no*” can function as an addition to arguments. Clauses (b) and (c) have the same meaning.

The difference between clauses (b) and (c) lies in the form of the sentence. Example (b) is an active sentence, while example (c) is a passive sentence. In addition, in example (b), the cause “*aku*” is at the beginning of the sentence, while in example (c), the caused “*wedhus iku*” is at the beginning of the sentence. The suffix “*-no*” is more productive than the suffix “*-i*”.

6) Suffix “*-ke*”

The suffix “*-ke*” in Rembang Javanese points out a causative meaning. The basic form that this suffix can follow is verb. The use of these suffixes is shown in the following examples.

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) | <i>Wedhus iku ucul</i> | (RDJ) |
| | <i>Kambing itu lepas</i> | (Indonesian) |
| | (The goat is loose) | |
| b) | <i>Aku nguculke wedhus iku</i> | (RDJ) |
| | <i>Aku membuat lepas kambing itu</i> | (Indonesian) |
| | (I let go of the goat) | |
| c) | <i>Wedhus iku tak uculke</i> | (RDJ) |
| | <i>Kambing itu aku buat lepas</i> | (Indonesian) |
| | (I let go of the goat) | |
| d) | <i>Wedhus iku mok uculke</i> | (RDJ) |
| | <i>Kambing itu kamu buat lepas</i> | (Indonesian) |
| | (You let go of the goat) | |
| e) | <i>Wedhus iku di uculke</i> | (RDJ) |
| | <i>Kambing itu dibuat lepas</i> | (Indonesian) |
| | (The goat is made loose) | |

Example (a) is a non-causative clause with the predicate verb “*ucul*”. When the suffix “*-ke*” is added to clauses (b), (c), (d), and (e), the verb “*ucul*” requires an additional agent in the form of a cause. So, the causative suffix “*-ke*” can function as an addition to arguments as well. Clauses (b) and (c) have the same meaning. The difference between clauses (b) and (c) lies in the form of the sentence. Example (b) is an active sentence, while example (c) is a passive sentence. In addition, in example (b), the cause “*aku*” is at the beginning of the sentence, while in example (c), the caused “*wedhus iku*” is at the beginning of the sentence.

The suffixes “*-ke*” and “*-no*” cannot be applied to nouns, for example, to “*wajan*” (pan). When it is added with “*-ke*” or “*-no*” behind, “*wajan*” becomes “*wajanke*” and “*wajanno*”. These two words do not have any meaning. This proves that the two suffixes cannot be applied to any noun form in the Rembang Javanese dialect.

Furthermore, the suffixes “*-ke*” and “*-no*” have the same use. The difference is only seen in the physical form. In daily life, Javanese Rembang speakers use the suffix “*-no*” more frequently than “*-ke*”. The suffix “*-no*” is more dominantly used so that it becomes its characteristic in the Rembang area. The suffix “*-ke*” here is similar to the suffix “*-ake*” in Standard Javanese. Rembang people prefer to say “*-ke*” rather than “*-ake*”. According to the local people, this is easier and it is a habit that the Javanese there like to abbreviate to make it simpler. In terms of productivity, these two suffixes are equally productive because they can be included in various types of verbs in the Rembang Javanese dialect.

3. Conclusion

Based on the analysis and discussion that has been carried out, conclusion drawn is that the differences in morphological causative constructions in Indonesian only consist of the suffix “*-kan*”, Meanwhile, the morphological causative construction in Rembang dialect consists of the prefix “*n-*”, infix “*-en*”, infix “*-in*”, suffix “*-i*”, suffix “*-no*”, and suffix “*-ke*”. Among the suffix “*-i*”, suffix “*-no*”,

and suffix “-ke”, the one whose productivity is smallest is the suffix “-i”. Then, the prefix “n-” has two allomorphic forms, namely “ny-” and “ng-”.

The form and function of the suffix “-ke” in Rembang Javanese dialect are almost the same as the suffix “-ake” in Standard Javanese. Those that can be the basis in Indonesian are: transitive verbs, intransitive verbs, and adjectives. Meanwhile, in the Rembang Javanese dialect, those that can be used as basic verbs are transitive verbs, intransitive verbs, nouns, and adjectives. Moreover, the similarity between the morphological causative constructions of Indonesian and the Rembang Javanese dialect is that the affixes can function as markers of causative constructions and serve to escalate the number of arguments in a sentence related to verbs triggered by grammatical functions.

References

- Afriani, S. H. (2018). *Kausatif dalam Bahasa Indonesia Dan Bahasa Inggris: Sebuah Telaah Tipologis*.
Asridayani, A. (2018). Analisis Konstruksi Kausatif Verbal Dialek Batak Toba Di Kabupaten Bungo Provinsi Jambi. *Krinok: Jurnal Linguistik Budaya*, 2(2).
- Budiarta, I Wayan. (2015). Konstruksi Kausatif Analitik Bahasa Kemak. *Retorika: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 35-51
- Comrie, B. (1981). *Language Universal and Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Blackview.
- Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universal and Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hasibuan, I. A., & Mulyadi. (2019). Konstruksi Kausatif dalam Bahasa Mandailing: Kajian Tipologi Sintaksis. *Nusa* 14 (3).
- Nazara, Wa'özisökhi, dkk. (2019). Causative Construction in the Language of Nias. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 208-216.
- Nimashita, H. (2014). *Analisis Kontrasif Verba Kausatif di Dalam Bahasa Jepang dan Bahasa Indonesia*. Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Nurhayati, T. (2018). *Konstruksi Kausatif Analitik dalam Bahasa Jawa dan Bahasa Indonesia*, SEJ (School Education Journal) 8 (2).
- Qomariana, Y. (2016). Causative Constructions in Javanese, Denpasar, *Lingual, Journal of Language and Culture* 1 (1).
- Rahmania, S. A. (2015). Ragam Dialek pada Masyarakat Tuter Kabupaten Demak. *International Seminar Language Maintenance and Shift* V. 382-386
- Siagian, B. A. (2014). *Konstruksi Kausatif Bahasa Batak Toba*. Tesis, Universitas Sumatera Utara.
- Sianturi, S. (2020). *Analytical Causative Construction in Batak Toba Language*, Macrothink Institute, Education and Linguistics Research, 6 (1).
- Song, Jae Jung. (2001). *Linguistic Typology: Morphology and Syntax*. London: Routledge.
- Tampubolon, S. O. & Mulyadi (2018). Konstruksi Kausatif Analitik dalam Bahasa Inggris dan bahasa Indonesia. *Medan: School Education Journal* Volume 8 no. 1 juni 2018.
- Umam, K. Konstruksi Kausatif dalam Novel Berbahasa Arab Richlatu Ilal-Ghad Karya Taufik El Hakim. *PRASASTI: Journal of Linguistics*, 4(2), 125-134.
- Umar, Neni, dkk. (2019). Causative Construction of Acehnese Language: A Typological Approach. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 74-89
- Ummah, Khothibhatul. (2018). *Pola Pembentuk Kontruksi Verba Serial Bahasa Madura dan Struktur Konstituen(Kajian Tipologi Bahasa dan Struktur Konstituen Teori X-Bar)*. Poceedings.upi. E-ISSN: 2655-1780.
- Whaley, L. J. (1997). *Introduction to Typology: The Unity and Diversity of Language*. USA: Sage Publication.