APLIKATIF
Journal of Research Trends in Social Sciences and Humanities
https://rcsdevelopment.org/index.php/aplikatif/index
Vol. 1 No.2, December 2022

Received: 24-11-2022 **Accepted: 15-12-2022** **Published: 31-12-2022**

Bahasa Bugis: Inflectional Morphology in the Verb

Nurhadi Hamka[1*], Ahmad Rivani Talaohu[1], La Ode Achmad Suherman[2]

[1]Universitas Khairun, Indonesia

[2]Universitas Muhammadiyah Buton, Indonesia

*Correspondence: nurhadihamka@unkhair.ac.id

ABSTRACT

In this paper, I discuss some morphological processes of inflection in Bahasa Bugis particularly verb, in order to scrutinize some problems that appear in the analysis under a morphemic framework. To have a better understanding towards the analysis of the inflectional case, I will employ an approach of Paradigm Function Morphology by Stump (2001). As a result, inflectional occur depends on the aspect and the person. There are three main aspects found; durative, perfective, and conditional. Of which, durative has four subcategories; durative (repeated), durative (feature & repeated), durative (similar), and durative (repeated & similar). Moreover, perfective aspect is also found to have one subcategory called perfective (past & similar). On the other hand, an interesting phenomenon found in person where the second person differentiated by the pragmatic meaning; more polite and less polite. Finally, through PFM, we can capture the mappings, block by block, show how morphosyntactic features are realized by the exponents in the language.

KEYWORDS: Bahasa Bugis; Inflectional Morphology; Paradigm Function Morphology

INTRODUCTION

In this paper, I discuss some morphological processes of inflection in Bahasa Bugis particularly verb, in order to scrutinize some problems that appear in the analysis under a morphemic framework. To have a better understanding towards the analysis of the inflectional case, I will employ an approach of Paradigm Function Morphology by Stump (2001). Therefore, the structure of this paper will be as follows: first, a brief explanation of the profile Bahasa Bugis; second, regarding the morphological process, the paper will then examine the person of the language and assign them into the respected pragmatic meaning, i.e., politeness. Third, this paper will then discuss the process of inflectional that mainly affected by the person (first person, second person(s), and third person) and three kinds of aspects with two of them are found interestingly unique.

Bahasa Bugis Profile

To begin with, Bahasa Bugis (hence referred to as BB) is the language of the Buginese people who reside in the eastern region of Indonesia known as South Sulawesi province, which is located in the south-western peninsula of Celebes island (Sulawesi in modern Indonesia) (Pelras, 1996). According to Pelras (1996), BB is a member of the Austronesian language family and is spoken in many of the province's regencies, including Bone, Pinrang, Soppeng, Wajo, Parepare, Sidrap, Barru, and Sinjai (the latter of which is the origin of the writer). And that BB is said to have more speakers than the three largest ethnic groups in the region—Makassar, Mandar, and Toraja—with about 3.6 million speakers (SIL International, 2001 as stated in Arka, 2007). (Pelras, 1996).

The word "Buginese" itself is a translation of the Malay word "Bahasa Bugis." BB is referred to as "Basa Ugi" in Buginese, whereas the Buginese people are referred to as "To Ugi." Because there are few written documents of the early history of this language, nothing is known about it. The epic creation myth of the Bugis people, Sureq Galigo, is the earliest documented account of BB. Lontara, which also refers to the old script and historical records, is another form of written Buginese (Pelras, 1996). The earliest historical accounts of Lontara, which originate from around the 17th century and are believed to have been inspired by mythology, are not regarded as trustworthy historical sources, according to Pelras. B.F. Matthews, a missionary, became the first European to learn Buginese before the arrival of the Dutch in the 18th century when he translated the Bible into the language. His published literature and folklore pieces, as well as the dictionaries and grammar books he prepared, continue to be important sources of knowledge on both languages (Pelras, 1996).

The inflectional case of the BB language, according to Nurhayati, & Nurkholik (2018), including sinjai dialect, is rich and complex and needs to be thoroughly examined. As a starting point for the analysis, the author uses three different verbs in this study (see table 1). The pronouns first person, second person, and third person are examined in the context of person. The second person pronouns are further divided into categories based on their pragmatic meaning, politeness (more polite and less polite), which is an important distinction that requires a comprehensive analysis (see table 2). The author also notes that there are three different types of language aspects: conditional, perfective, and durative. While discussing the durative aspect, the author discovers a number of phenomena that have prompted comments. Of these, four subcategories—durative (repeated), durative (future & repeated), durative (similar), and durative (repeated & similar) — appear in BB. The perfective aspect, on the other hand, is also discovered to have a subcategory, and in this instance, it is discovered to be perfective (past and similar) (see table 2).

The inflection occurs through aspect and person, as seen in the table 2. We can see that in the conditional aspect, *paq* stands for the first person, *piq* for the second person which is more polite, *po* for the second person that is less polite, and *pi* is to indicate third person of the aspect. In the perfective aspect, *naq* is indicating first person and happened to be the general form for perfective aspect. For perfective aspect second person more polite, the general form is *niq* and *no* is a general form for second person less polite. Furthermore, it can be seen that *ni* is happened to be the general form to express perfective aspect as the third person.

In a durative aspect in which it happens in a certain duration of time where the action is not yet finished (continued action), the rule is that the first person will be indicated as *kaq* in which it happened to be the general rule for the whole durative

subcategories (Durative (repeated), Durative (future & repeated), Durative (similar), Durative (repeated & similar)). As for the second person, *kiq* is used to indicate more polite and *ko* for less polite and intimacy. These rules are also applied as the general rules for all subcategory of durative aspects. Furthermore, durative aspect employ *ki* to indicate third person of which the rule can also be generally used in the whole durative aspects. From these durative aspects, we gain some information that inflection happened mostly through this aspect, for instance: *si* means: again which indicate repeated action in the durative situation, *to* means too in which it indicates similarity. Whereas *pasi* means would again that identifying the action that would happened in the future and repeated. While *tosi* is used to indicate repeated and similar action which the author translated as too again.

Table 1. *Root/stem = Mannasu (Cook)*

Aspect	Person				Meaning
	First Person	Second Person		Third Person	
		More polite (mp)	*Less polite (lp)*		
Durative	mannasu-kaq	mannasu-kiq	mannasu-ko	mannasu-ki	Cooking
Perfective	mannasu-naq	mannasu-niq	mannasu-no	mannasu-ni	Have cooked
Conditional	mannasu-paq	mannasu-piq	mannasu-po	mannasu-pi	If (subjcet) cook
Durative (repeated)	mannasu-si-kaq	mannasu-si-kiq	mannasu-si-ko	mannasu-si-ki	Cooking again
Durative (future & repeated)	mannasu-pasi-kaq	mannasu-pasi-kiq	mannasu-pasi-ko	mannasu-pasi-ki	Would be cooking again
Durative (similar)	mannasu-to-kaq	mannasu-to-kiq	mannasu-to-ko	mannasu-to-ki	Cooking too
Durative (repeated & similar)	mannasu-tosi-kaq	mannasu-tosi-kiq	mannasu-tosi-ko	mannasu-tosi-ki	Cooking too again
Perfective (past & similar)	mannasu-to-naq	mannasu-to-niq	mannasu-to-no	mannasu-to-ni	Have cooked too

Table 2. Root/stem = Massessa (Wash)

Aspect	Person				Meaning
	First Person	Second Person		Third Person	
		More polite (mp)	*Less polite (lp)*		
Durative	massessa-kaq	massessa-kiq	massessa-ko	massessa-ki	Washing
Perfective	massessa-naq	massessa-niq	massessa-no	massessa-ni	Have washed

Conditional	massessa-pak	massessa-piq	massessa-po	massessa-pi	If (subjcet) wash
Durative (repeated)	massessa-si-kaq	massessa-si-kiq	massessa-si-ko	massessa-si-ki	Washing again
Durative (future & repeated)	massessa-pasi-kaq	massessa-pasi-kiq	massessa-pasi-ko	massessa-pasi-ki	Would be washing again
Durative (similar)	massessa-to-kaq	massessa-to-kiq	massessa-to-ko	massessa-to-ki	Washing too
Durative (repeated & similar)	massessa-tosi-kaq	massessa-tosi-kiq	massessa-tosi-ko	massessa-tosi-ki	Washing too again
Perfective (past & similar)	massessa-to-naq	massessa-to-niq	massessa-to-no	massessa-to-ni	Have washed too

Table 3. *Root/stem = Mabbaca (Read)*

Aspect	**Person**				**Meaning**
	First Person	**Second Person**		**Third Person**	
		More polite (mp)	***Less polite (lp)***		
Durative	mabbaca-kaq	mabbaca-kiq	mabbaca-ko	mabbaca-ki	Reading
Perfective	mabbaca-naq	mabbaca-niq	mabbaca-no	mabbaca-ni	Have read
Conditional	mabbaca-paq	mabbaca-piq	mabbaca-po	mabbaca-pi	If (subjcet) read
Durative (repeated)	mabbaca-si-kaq	mabbaca-si-kiq	mabbaca-si-ko	mabbaca-si-ki	Reading again
Durative (future & repeated)	mabbaca-pasi-kaq	mabbaca-pasi-kiq	mabbaca-pasi-ko	mabbaca-pasi-ki	Would be reading again
Durative (similar)	mabbaca-to-kaq	mabbaca-to-kiq	mabbaca-to-ko	mabbaca-to-ki	Reading too
Durative (repeated & similar)	mabbaca-tosi-kaq	mabbaca-tosi-kiq	mabbaca-to-si-ko	mabbaca-to-si	Reading too again
Perfective (past & similar)	mabbaca-to-naq	mabbaca-to-niq	mabbaca-to-no	mabbaca-to-ni	Have read too

Table 4. *Aspect*

Aspect		
Imperfective		Politeness Meaning
Durative (repeated)	**-si-**	

Durative (future & repeated)	**-pasi-**	
Durative (similar)	**-to-**	
Durative (repeated & similar)	**-tosi-**	
Perfective (past & similar)	**-to-**	
1st person Durative	**-kaq**	
2nd person Durative	**-kiq**	*more polite*
	-ko	*less polite*
3rd person Durative	**-ki**	
1st person Perfective	**-naq**	
2nd person Perfective	**-niq**	*more polite*
	-no	*less polite*
3rd person Perfective	**-ni**	
1st person Conditional	**-paq**	
2nd person Conditional	**-piq**	*more polite*
	-po	*less polite*
3rd person Conditional	**-pi**	

Pragmatic meaning on second person

Mahmud (2008) examined the politeness of BB's use of pronouns and affixes to demonstrate a well-mannered and respectful demeanor. In this essay, the author uses the morphological process to explain it. Table 2 shows that there are three different second person tenses: second person durative, second person perfective, and second person conditional. Each of these tenses is distinguished by its pragmatic meaning, which includes the idea of politeness.

In the excerpt 1, we can observe that the verbs have the suffixes *kiq, ko, niq, no, piq*, and *po*. These person-specific prefixes, like *kiq* and *ko*, denote second-person durative; *niq* and *no*, second-person perfective; and *piq* and *po*, second-person conditional. From this point on, *Ko* is the less courteous discursive component that addresses the second person, whereas *Kiq* is the more. The same thing happened with *niq* and *piq*, which are frequently employed in formal settings and are meant to express respect in the perfective and conditional aspects, respectively. *No* and *po*, on the other hand, are regarded less polite and are used to convey intimacy (for example see the following excerpt 1).

Given that *kiq* and *ko* are second-person durative aspects, a verb with the suffix *na - namattama* (signifying a sudden action) is used to emphasize the activity *mabbaca* is continuing in this sentence. On the other hand, *niq* and *no* are perfective aspects in the second person. When the verb is followed by the prefix *niq* or *no*, it means the activity *massessa* (wash) is complete. The conjunction *nappa* (then) emphasize that when the previous action has ended, the subsequent circumstance *deqna jalang wae* (the water does not run) begins. Additionally, the prefixes *piq* and *po* denote a second-person conditional aspect since they offer a choice conditional, such as if the second person cooks (*mannasupiq*), then the third person wants to eat.

With reference to the instances, it is clear that those second persons are appropriate in the same words and contexts. The only distinction between them is the pragmatic meaning that each individual carries, which refers to the idea of politeness. At the same time, we can see that the polite individual is denoted by the vowel {-i-}, in contrast to the vowel {-o-} which denotes an intimate but impolite relationship. Thus, it can be said that the second person (durative, perfective, and conditional) is influenced by the person's pragmatic meaning.

Excerpt 1.

– 2nd person durative

- *kiq* → *mabbacakiq* *pale* *na-mattama anaq-anaqe*
  read.2p.drv.**mp** infact while.come.progressive children.that

- *ko* → *mabbacako* *pale* *na-mattama anaq-anaqe*
  read.2p.drv.**lp** infact while-come progressive children.that

---

– 2nd person perfective

- *niq* → *massessaniq* *nappa* *deqna* *jalang wae*
  wash.2p.prv.**mp** then stop water runs

- *no* → *massessano* *nappa* *deqna* *jalang wae*
  wash.2p.prv.**lp** then stop water runs

– 2nd person conditional

- *piq* → *mannasupiq* *na* *eloki* *manre*
  cook.2p.con.**mp** then want.3p eat

- *po* → *mannasupo* *na* *eloki* *manre*
  cook.2p.con.**lp** then want.3p eat

An analysis of PFM

In this part, the author then applies PFM theory by Stump (2001) to explains an inflection in BB. The analysis in this PFM will be based on the dataset from table 1.2 above.

1) [[[STEM] :I] :II]

Looking at the paradigm forms in table 1.2, the author now present the defining features that are relevant for the paradigm:

2)

a. [ASPECT α: {drv.rep, drv.fut&rep, drv.sim, drv.rep&sim, pfv.past&sim, drv, pfv, con}]

b. [PERSON β: {1P, 2P.mp, 2P.lp, 3P}]

The lexeme can be listed as having the following common property of its CONTENT paradigm, where α and β are values of morphosyntactic features of ASPECT and PERSON respectively.

3) LEXEME: <MASSESSA, σ: {α, β}>

A. Basic Stem Choice

From the form paradigm, we can see that **massessa** is the root or basic stem. We can also see that the forms share the following blocks:

4) [[[STEM] :I] :II]
ASPECT PERSON

We can then have the following correspondence or mapping between contents and forms of the paradigm, which is actually the **Basic Stem Choice Rule**:

5) CONTENT FORM PROPERTIES FORM REALIZATION

[[[STEM] :I] :II]

PF(<MASSESSA, σ: {α, β}>}>) = PF(Stem(<L, σ{α, β}>)) =
[[[massessa] :I] :II]

Can be abbreviated as:

6) PF(<MASSESSA, σ>}>) = PF(<[X], σ>) → massessa

That is, X is a stem part of the blocks given in (4)

Now, we can formulate our realization rules which capture the mappings, block by block, show how morphosyntactic features are realized by the exponents.

B. Rule of Exponence

7)

BLOK I.$_{\textbf{aspect}}$

a) I. PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv.fut&rep}>) = PF (Stem(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv.fut&rep}>)) → X***pasi***

b) I. PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv.rep}>) = PF (Stem(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv.rep}>))
→ X***si***

c) I. PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv.rep&sim}>) = PF (Stem(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv.rep&sim}>)) → X***tosi***

d) I. PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{prv.past&sim}>)

I. PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv.sim}>) = PF (Stem(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv.sim V prv.past&sim}>)) → X***to***

e) I. PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{ }>) = PF (Stem(<MASSESSA, σ:{ }>))
→ X (DEFAULT)

8)

BLOK II.$_{\text{person}}$

a) II. PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{con, 1P}>) = PF(Stem(<MASSESSA, σ:{con, 1P}>))
→ X***paq***

b) II. PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{con, 2P.mp}>) = PF(Stem(<MASSESSA, σ:{con, 2P.mp}>)) → X***piq***

c) II. PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{con, 2P.lp}>) = PF(Stem(<MASSESSA, σ:{con, 2P.lp}>)) → X***po***

d) II. PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{con, 3P}>) = PF(Stem(<MASSESSA, σ:{con, 3P}>))
→ X***pi***

e) II. PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{prv, 1P}>) = PF(Stem(<MASSESSA, σ:{prv, 1P}>))
→ X***naq***

f) II. PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{prv, 2P.mp}>) = PF(Stem(<MASSESSA, σ:{prv, 2P.mp}>)) → X***niq***

g) II. PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{prv, 2P.lp}>) = PF(Stem(<MASSESSA, σ:{prv, 2P.lp}>)) → X***no***

h) II. PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{prv, 3P}>) = PF(Stem(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv, 3P}>))
→ X***ni***

i) II. PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv, 1P}>) = PF(Stem(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv, 1P}>))
→ X***kaq***

j) II. PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv, 2P.mp}>) = PF(Stem(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv, 2P.mp}>)) → X***kiq***

k) II. PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv, 2P.lp}>) = PF(Stem(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv, 2P.lp}>)) → X***ko***

l) II. PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv, 3P}>) = PF(Stem(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv, 3P}>))
→ X***ki***

m) II. PF(<MANNASU, σ:{ }>) = PF (Stem(<MANNASU, σ:{ }>))
→ X (DEFAULT)

9) Syncretism

In the paradigm, it is observed that syncretism is occured, which means that there are specific rules which are just like other specific rules that take precedence over the general or canonical Paradigm Linkage Rule. Thus, by using the Rule of Referral, the syncretism could be realized.

Rule of referral:

If PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{prv.past&sim}>), → PF(STEM(<MASSESSA, σ:{prv.past&sim}>)) = X*to*

THEN PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv.sim}>) = PF(STEM(<MASSESSA, σ:{prv.past&sim}>))

10) Demonstration of the paradigm linkage and realization rules

a. *massessapasikaq*

To generate the form *massessapasikaq,* the input-output PF process is outlined as follows.

INPUT: <MASSESSA, σ:{drv.fut&rep, 1p}>

$PF._{stem}$ (<MASSESSA, σ:{drv.fut&rep, 1p}>) = [II :[I :[**Stem**(<X, σ>)]]] [II :[I :[*massessa*(<X, σ>)]]] (stem output)

BLOCK I: $PF._{aspect}$

a) $PF._{I}$ (<MASSESSA, σ:{**drv.fut&rep**, 1p}>) = [II :[<X***pasi***, σ>)]] (Rule)

$PF._{I}$ (<MASSESSA, σ:{**drv.fut&rep**, 1p}>) = [II :[<*massesa****pasi***, σ>)]] (Output)

BLOCK II: $PF._{person}$

i) $PF._{II}$ (<MASSESSA, σ:{**drv.fut&rep**, **1p**}>) = [<X***kaq***, σ>)] (Rule)

$PF._{II}$ (<MASSESSA, σ:{**drv.fut&rep**, **1p**}>) = [<*massesa****pasikaq***, σ>)] (Output)

OUTPUT: <*massesa****pasikaq***, σ:{drv.fut&rep, 1p}>

b. *massessatonaq*

To generate the form *massessatonaq,* the input-output PF process is outlined as follows.

BLOCK I: $PF._{aspect}$

1. INPUT: <MASSESSA, σ:{**prv.past&sim**, 1p}>

2. d) I. PF_{I}(<MASSESSA, σ:{prv.past&sim}>)
[[[massessa]***to***]: II]

PF_{I}(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv.sim}>) = PF (Stem(<MASSESSA, σ:{drv.sim V prv.past&sim}>)) → X***to***

[[*massessato*]: II]

3. OUTPUT: [II: [< *massessato,* σ:{prv.past&sim}>]]

BLOCK II: $PF._{person}$

i) $PF._{II}$ (<MASSESSA, σ:{**prv.past&sim**, **1p** }>) = [<X***naq***, σ>)] (Rule)

$PF._{II}$ (<MASSESSA, σ:{ **prv.past&sim**, **1p**}>) = [<*massesa****to******naq***, σ>)] (Output)

Putting together all rules, we get the following:

PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{prv.past&sim, 1p}>) = [[<*massessa*, σ> : I] : II] (Stem Choice)

PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{**prv.past&sim**, 1p}>) = [<*massessato*, σ> :] : II] (Syncretic exponence; rule 7d)

PF(<MASSESSA, σ:{**prv.past&sim**, 1p}>) = [<*massessatonak*, σ> :] (Deafult)

Conclusion

All in all, the whole discussions and analysis presented above have lead us to a general understanding about the inflections of the verb in BB. In the language, inflectional occur depends on the aspect and the person. There are three main aspects found; durative, perfective, and conditional. Of which, durative has four subcategories; durative (repeated), durative (feature & repeated), durative (similar), and durative (repeated & similar). Moreover, perfective aspect is also found to have one subcategory called perfective (past & similar). On the other hand, an interesting phenomenon found in person where the 2nd person differentiated by the pragmatic meaning; more polite and less polite. Eventually, through PFM, we can capture the mappings, block by block, show how morphosyntactic features are realized by the exponents in the language.

References

Arka, I. W. (2008). *Local autonomy, local capacity building and support for minority languages: Field experiences from Indonesia. Language Documentation & Conservation Special Publication*, 1, 66-92.

Mahmud, M. (2008). *Politeness in Bugis*. Ph.D. Thesis, The Australian National University.

Mahmud, M. (2011). *Politeness Practices In Bugis Society. Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra*, 23(1), 19-29.

Nurhayati, U., & Nurkholik, N. (2018). *The Morphological Processes of Bugis Language (A Morphological Study Of Bugis Language Through Latoa Script)*. IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature, 6(1).

Pelras, C. (1997). *The Bugis*. John Wiley & Sons..

Sil International, Indonesia Branch. (2001). *Languages of Indonesia*. Jakarta: SIL International, Indonesia Branch.

Stump, G. T. (2001). *Inflectional morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spencer, A. (2004). Generalized paradigm function morphology. Ms., University of Essex.

List of abbreviations:

drv	: durative
pfv	: perfective
con	: conditional
rep	: repeated
fut	: future
sim	: similar
mp	: more polite
lp	: less polite
1p	: 1st person
2p	: 2nd person
3p	: 3rd perso