PRAGMATIC ALTERNATIVE CONSTRUCTION (FRONTING, LEFT DISLOCATION, AND TOPICALIZATION) IN LAMALERA DIALECT

Yosef Demon[1]   I Wayan Pastika[2] Ketut Artawa[3]   I Nyoman Udayana[4]
Universitas Flores[1]   Udayana University[2,3,4]
yosefdemon_bataona@yahoo.com[1]

How to Cite: Demon.Y. (2017) Pragmatic alternative construction (fronting, left dislocation, and topicalization) in Lamalera Dialect. RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa 3(2). 239-246

Abstract

Left dislocation construction, fronting construction and topicalization construction are universal linguistic alternations. Nevertheless these three constructions have characteristics that are very different from one language to another. This distinction depends on the language system of every language. This research data is obtained from the result of conversation between speakers of Lamaholot dialect of Lamalera. The result of data analysis proves that LDLL has three alternative constructions. The use of real language in everyday communication, this alternative construction ear has a gradative usage frequency. Left dislocation construction has the lowest usage frequency while the construction of precision and topicalization construction is significant. However, the construction of forging and parsing differed from one to another. Left dislocation construction is the advancement of peripheral arguments while topicalization construction is the construction of core argument prediction. The construction of topicalization is a passive-like construction (derivative construction).

Keywords: Left dislocation construction, fronting construction and topicalization construction

INTRODUCTION

One of the methodologies of the system of languages is universally based on the degree of protrusion of the subject or topic (Li and Thompson, 1976: 457-489; Parera, 1991: 138). Li and Thompson declare that a language is categorized as a language that accentuates the subject if the most dominant clause of the basic structure is disclosed is the subject-predicate structure. Conversely, a language is said to be the language that accentuates the topic of having the most dominant clause of the basic clause is the topic-comments.

Assumptions Li and Thompson imply the meaning that in languages that feature subjects also have topics and in languages that feature topics also have a subject. The languages that feature subjects like English, and German, languages featuring topics such as Chinese and Lahu languages, languages featuring subjects and topics, such as Japanese and Korean, and languages does not feature subjects or topics, such as Tagalok and Illokano.

The grouping of these languages is based on typological assumptions and demands that there are a number of well-researched languages grounded in the topic and that a number of well-researched languages also rely on the subject. This stipulates that it does not mean the topic and subject or subject and topic are not related at all. If observed it can be said that the real subject is a topic that ***grammaticalization***. Most behavioral topics are similar to subject behavioral traits in a number of languages or cross-language (Li, 1976: 460-484).

The division of languages into prominent or subject-focused topics should be based on a number of differentiating features. The features contained in the topical languages are (a) the topic is marked in the structure of birth, (b) the topic tends to control the choreality, (c) the rules of subject creation such as passivity are rarely found, (d) 'double subject' constructions the topic-oriented is the basic structure.

The mention of 'double subjects' has a distinctive position in languages that characterize topical projections. The syntactic construction structure in these types of languages is usually a clause that has two adjacent FNs. These two FNs occupy the left position of the verb or preverb, one of the FN carries the function of the topic and the other carries the subject function. If so, then this clause has two subjects or multiple subjects. The following will illustrate the example adopted from Li and Thompson in Artawa (1998: 66; 2004: 99).

1a) *Sakana wa tat ga oisili* (Jepang)

ikan   TOP penggigit merah SUB enak

'Ikan (TOP) penggigit merah enak'

1b *Neiké shu   yezé   da*   (China)

itu   pohon daun-daun besar''

'Pohon itu (TOP) daun-daun besar'

Example (1a-1b) describes the use of topics and subjects in Japanese and Chinese. The subject of *Sakana* 'fish' in Japanese (1a) is interpreted with wa while the subject of tat 'red bite' is observed with ga. Example (1b) states that the topic in the clause is, *Neiké shu* 'that tree', and the subject clause is *yeze* 'leaves'. The topics in these clauses can be swept away and replaced with the use of pauses. The topic on (1a-1b) is positioned at the beginning of the clause. In relation to the construction of the topic of comments in languages highlighting the topic is unmarked construction, whereas in subject-highlighting languages, the topic construction is a marked construction.

According to Gundel (in Artawa, 1998: 66, 2004: 100, Horn, 2006: 175-183) typology, the topic construction is included in the construction of 'double subjects'. Dual subject construction is a basic sentence in a standardized variety of languages highlighting the topic. Unlike the languages that highlight the subject, such constructions are the preferred form of choice.

Artawa (1998: 68, 2004: 100) states that Gundel's views and studies are similar to those of Li and Thompson (1976). In tune with the study of language typology that accentuated the subject, Li and Thompson stated that Indonesian is grouped as one of the languages that accentuate the subject. Nonetheless, Li and Thompson point out that Tagalok is one of the languages in the Austronesian Language family that is not a prominent language of the topic.

Left dislocation and topicalization really very closely related to the concept of the subject. Subject according to Artawa (1998: 68; 2004: 103, Erteschik, 1997: 1-6; Gervain, J. and Zemplén, G., in Leonie Cornips, L. and Karen P. Corrigan, K.P., ed.) traditionally the subject of a clause is understood as an element that specializes about what that phrase is. If this opinion is agreed it can be said that passive sentences should be understood as a matter of 'patient' rather than 'agent'.

This is possible because passivation is a syntactic process for moving patients into subjects and agents will be adjunct. In a language like English, the subject is generally characterized as a core contingent that positions the beginning of the clause. Nevertheless, it is undeniable that not all of the initial clause constituents are subject. Facts of language data show that this phenomenon tends to be known as the release of left or left dislocation and topicalization. The following examples illustrate the release to the left (Artawa, 1998: 68; 2004: 104, Clackson, 2007: 65).

2a) *Mary, she come yesterday*

'Mary, dia datang kemarin'

2b) *Mary I   know*

'Mary saya tahu'

The clause (2a) reflects the phenomenon of 'left to left dislocation, whereas example (2b) is a penicprocessory phenomenon. At a glance these two clauses show the similarities and differences. As for the difference is in the construction of 'left-wipe' there is a pronoun which refers to the noun phrase that precedes whereas in the construction of penopicalan is not the case. Pronouns she in construction (2a) is an anaphoric form referring to the FN Mary that preceded it. If example (2a-2b) is an example in English then the following will present examples of the phenomenon of leaching to the left and topicalization in Balinese (Artawa, 1998; 2004: 104).

The Balinese language, one of the Austronesian languages has some left-hand construction pattern (see Artawa, 1998: 68-70). According to Artawa some of the construction patterns of disposal to the left of bahasa Bali are as follows:

3a) *I wayan ia malaja jani*

ART wayan 3TG belajar sekarang

'Mengenai wayan, ia belajar sekarang'

3b) *Macan   anak mula galak*

Harimau orang telah galak

'Mengenai harimau mereka biasanya galak'

3c) *Murid-e   ento, guru-ne   ramah*

Murid-def itu,   guru-POSS3TG ramah

'Mengenai murid itu gurunya ramah'

3d) *Sari, panak-ne   ngeling*

Sari, anak-POSS3TG tangis

'Mengenai sari, anaknya menangis'

3e) *Anak-e   ento, bapan-ne   ngae   umah*
Orang-def itu   bapak-POSS3TG AKT-buat rumah

'Mengenai orang itu, bapaknya membuat rumah'

The clause (3a) is an example of a left-handed construction. FN I Wayan which is released to the left is a definite FN (limited) and followed by a full clause he is not learning it now. The FN released to the left is the FN which uses the pronoun form. Example (3b) shows that the FN released to the left in clause (3b) is a general FN. However, the left release mechanism is the same as clause (3a). In addition, the release to the left may also state ownership alignment as seen in example (3c-3e). When observed, it appears that clause predicate (3c) is a verbal clause whereas clause (3d-3e) is a nominal clause. Nevertheless, the release to the left is still permitted or allowed.

Artawa further (1998: 70; 2004: 106, Faarlund : 2004:231) states that topicalization is often understood as a syntactic pragmatic process that converts non-topic elements into topics. The copied element must be a true core constituent and not a non-oblique or oblique constituent (referring to the locative and instrumental phrase). If the oblique constituent is placed at the beginning of the sentence, then the construction is not a penloping but only a fronting process. The following examples show the phenomenon of fronting (Artawa, 1998: 70; 2004: 107).

4a) *John bought some fruit in the market.*

'John membeli beberapa buah di pasar'

4b) *In the market John bought some fruit.*

'Di pasar John membeli beberapa buah'

Example (4b) shows that the constituent is not the in the market 'in the market' core is raised or put forward in the initial position of the clause. This preposition does not exhibit symptoms of topicalization but is a symptom of ordinary attachment. The following will be presented with examples of topicalization in Balinese.

4c) *Tiang ngaba   buku-ne   ento*

1TG AKT-bawa buku-DEF itu

'Saya membawa buku itu'

4d) *Buku-ne   ento tiang ngaba.*

Buku-DEF itu 1TG   bawa

'Buku itu saya bawa'

Example (4d) indicates that the constituents released to the left of the book-ne *ento* 'book' are the core constituents that serve as objects. This core constituent then undergoes forwarding or raising to the starting position of the clause and shifting the subject of the 'my' base clause subject. The presence of the *buku-ne ento* 'book' will be the topic in the clause and followed by the complete clause of the ngaba pole I am carrying as a comment.

Toracetic references according to Gundel (Artawa 1998: 66, 2004: 100) and Artawa (1998: 68; 2004: 103; Casielles-Suarez, 2004: 71-88;) of left-dislocation, topicalization, and fronting can be used as guidance in the study of the LDLL clauses. These three phenomena are presented in the following sequence.

METHOD

The data of this article is verbal data. This verbal data is obtained through observation, observation and conversation. Observations were made to the communication between speakers of BLDL. The interception is also done communication between speakers about something. Conversations are made between speakers or between researchers and speakers.

The result of the filing is a list of clauses containing clauses that show the phenomenon of putting forward, the release to the left and topicalization. Observations, observations and conversations are done without the knowledge of the speaker. This is done with consideration of the originality of the data.

DISCUSSION

Preparation, the release to the left and penopikalan is a universal linguistic phenomenon. Nevertheless, these three constructions are very typical according to the language system. The three constructions are presented below.

The Fronting Construction in Lamalera Dialect

Pragmatically, another form of alternation in speech is preaching (Kidway, 2000: 118, Cinque, 2005:276; Rowlett, 2007:182). The phenomenon of putting forward is another alternative construction when one wants to intensify certain constituents that are considered important. The forward form in the BLDL can be considered in the following examples.

5a) *Kame heru-ve lali   ole-mio*

1JEKS temu=3J di.bawah kebun-POSS1JEKS

'Kami bertemu mereka di kebun kamu'

5a¹) *Lali   ole-mio   kame heru-ve*

Di.bawah kebun-POSS1JEKS 1JEKS temu=3J

'Di kebun kamu, kami bertemu mereka'

Example (5a) is an intransitive base clause. The basic clause has a praverba constituent as a subject equipped with a non-core constituent in the form of a *lali ole mio* 'in your garden.' In the context of spoken speech, the tendency of the speakers to intensify the constituents is not the core as a locative adjective.

If the locative interest is intensified, then the locative adjunctive constituent will be put forward in the initial position of the clause as in example (5a1) *Lali ole mio kame heru=ve* 'In your garden we meet them'. Inner locative forward displacement does not affect the structure of the constituent and is very much in line with the localized locale feature that can float to any consecutive position in a clause.

5b) *Nae tobo-la   di lango one*

3TG duduk=3TG di rumah dalam

'Dia duduk di dalam rumah'

5b¹) *Di lango one   nae tobo-la*

Di rumah dalam 3TG duduk=3TG

'Di dalam rumah, dia duduk'

Suggestion is also seen in example (5b1). The constituents put forward are locative in the lango one 'inside the house'. The proposition of the locative suggests that it is the locative locale that wants to be intensified and not the other constituents. Suggestion also does not affect the structure of the constituent clause.

5c) *Kame m-eke   m-enu di dapu-ree*

1JEKS 1JEKS=makan 1JEKS=minum di dapur-POSS3J

'Kami makan-minum di dapur mereka'

5c¹) *Di dapu ree, kame   m-eke   m-enu*

Di dapur-POSS3J 1JEKS 1JEKS=makan 1JEKS=minum

'Di dapur mereka, kami makan-minum'

Normally a constituent is not a core always experiencing forwarding to the starting position of the clause. It also looks like in the clause (5c1). Local locomotives in dapu ree 'in their

own kitchen' get the intensity and experience the emphasis on the initial position of the clause. Suggestion does not affect the clause kosntituen structure. The construction of the forwarding alternation has a low intensity of use.

Left Dislocation Construction in Lamalera Dialect

The frequency of transition in expressing the mind by using other sentence units often occurs in communicating situations. The use of left-handed alternation construction (left dislocation) is a blur of BLDL speakers as seen in the following examples.

6a) *Tue, nae beso-la   viapnee pe pana-va bali*

Pastor, 3TG datang=3TG tadi   itu jalan=3TG lagi

'Pastor, dia datang tadi itu berangkat lagi'

6b) *Guru vakahae, rae r-ai levoleba hode gaji -ree*

Guru semua,   3J   3J=pergi levoleba ambil gaji-POSS3J

'Semua guru, mereka ke Lewoleba ambil gaji mereka'

6c) *Kresi vakahae, rae r-eve tobi lali   ole*

Anak kecil semua, 3J=petik asam di.bawah kebun

'Semua anak kecil, mereka memetik asam di kebun'

In oral communication often the speaker switches using the release form to the left dislocation. Left dislocation form is a pragmatic sentential construction. This means that construction only occurs in speech situations and not in official situations. Pragmatically speaking the speaker wants to intensify the constituents placed at the beginning of the clause.

For example, (6a) states that someone wants to say that a so-called tue 'pastor' with features such as *beso=la viapnee* 'came yesterday' and *pana*=va 'departed again' refers to *'pastor'* and not someone else. Left-to-left construction has features such as anaphoric forms contained in the following clauses.

The anaphoric form in the full clause which follows the initial constituent of example (6a) is *nae* 'him' in *nae beso=la viapnee pe pana=va bali* 'he came yesterday it was already departing again'. The anaphoric pronouns nae 'dia' refers to the nouns that are at the beginning

of the clause *tue* 'pastor'.

Example (6b) shows that the intensified constituent is the teacher *vakahae* 'all teachers'. Someone wants to inform their conversational partners that what is suppressed is a group of *vakahae* teachers 'all teachers' with features such as those who go to Lewoleba and who will receive a salary and not a group of others.

The anaphoric form contained in the following clause is their 'rae' which refers or refers to the constituent that is at the beginning of the vakahae teacher clause of 'all the teachers'. The same mechanism is similar to example (6c). The emphasized constituent is the vakahae categorization of 'all the little children'. The anaphoric form found in the following clause is their 'rae' with a character like 'picking acid in the garden'.

Looking at the phenomenon of a left release as seen in example (6a-6c) it can be said that in fact left-wing construction is a pragmatic sentence construction and its frequency of use is low. This is because this form is a form of choice when a speaker wants to intensify someone or something by adding additional information in the form of anaphoric characteristics and forms in the clauses that follow.

Topicalization Construction in Lamalera Dialect

Another alternative construction is topicalization. The construction of forging is often referred to as a forward construction (Haegeman 1993: 165,). This alternation construction is often used in oral speech. This alternation construction is used to express the intensity or emphasis on a constituent. In contrast to construction, such as leaching to the left and forwarding, topicalization is a form of preparing the core constituent especially the object to the beginning of the clause. The prepositioning of constituents to the beginning of the clause can be observed in the following examples.

7a) *Goe hope labu nei   nae*

  1TG beli baju untuk 3TG

  'Saya membeli baju untuk dia'

7a[1]) *Labu goe hopi-ro   nei   nae*

  Baju 1TG beli=3TG untuk 3TG

  'Baju dia belikan untuk dia'

7a[2]) *Nae goe hopi-ro   labu*

  3TG 1TG beli=3TG baju

  'Dia saya belikan baju'

Example (7a) is a transitive verbal clause. The 'buy' verb predator requires the presence of two core constituents, an FN preverb *goe* 'I' as the subject and an FN of the *labu* skirt post as an object. The core constituent of the object is often preached as seen in the clause (7a1). Example (7a2) which undergoes compression is a non-core constituent, ie, oblique *nei* 'for him'. This preposition affects the status of kosntituen previously oblik elevated to the position of the core constituent occupies the initial position of the clause Nae goe hopi-ro gourd 'She I buy clothes'. Example phenomena (7a2) tend to be classified as topicalization.

Topicalization participate in effect on the order of words and structure of constituents. The order of words in the clause will be the OSV and the constituent structure into a preverb OS. It is claimed that although it has risen to the starting position replacing the previous subject's position but the core constituents remain as objects and not as subjects.

The topics in example (7a1) are marked by the use of the -ro-enclosed form in the *hopi=ro* verb predator referring to the topic rather than to the subject. This control also illustrates the choreality between the topic and the verb so that the verb is conformed. In addition it appears that there are two FNs located before the verb, so it looks like a double subject. If there are two FNs located before the verb predator then the earliest FN Nae 'dia' is the topic and the second FN praverba goe 'me' is the subject. This is possible because praverba constituents are the subject in BLDL.

7b) *Ike   bisa   tena-kame*

  Ikan memecahkan perahu kami'

  'Ikan memecahkan perahu kami'

7b[1]) *Tena-kame   ike bisa-ko*

  Perahu-POSS1JEKS ikan pecah

  'Perahu kami, ikan pecahkan'

Example (7b) is a transitive clause, a predefined verb in this clause requiring the presence of two arguments ie an FN before a verb or preverb as the subject and a FN after or a postverb as an object. In this example the object is put forward to shift the position of the subject. Suggestions as in Example (7b1) *Tena=kame ike bisa=ko* 'Our boat, was broke by fish ' will change the order of words previously SVO changed into VSO. In addition, the posverba

object shifts the position into a pre-subject object. If so, then there are two FNs before the verb, an FN has a topic feature and another FN has a subject feature.

Fronting of objects reflecting the topic is marked by the -kk-co-enclical form of the ko-verb expressing the intensity on the topic of our 'tena kame' of the boat'and controlling the choreality. There is a match between verbs and topics that are marked with the -kk-enklitik marker. Despite the constituents' preoccupation the object remains the object and never the subject. The constituents subject to the BLDL are the Ike 'Fish' preverb constituents as seen in example (7b) *Ike tou tena lema* 'Fish solve our boat'.

7c) *Rae taje nae na kajo*

    3J pukul 3TG dengan kayu

    'Mereka memukul dia dengan kayu'

7c¹) *Nae rae taja-ro na kajo*

    3TG 3J pukul dengan kayu

    'Dia, mereka pukul dengan kayu'

The predominance of fronting construction also occurs in the clause (7c). The preposition of the core constituent of the object in the clause (7c1) indicates that there is a change of speech from SVO to OSV. Previous object position postverb change position pre-subject *Nae rae taja-ro na kajo* 'He they hit with wood'. This stipulates that there are two FNs before the verb. A FN *Rae* 'They' has a topic characteristic and an other FN has a subject feature. The fronting of the object to shift the position of the subject raises the topic with the form of the *-ro* attribute on the predicate of the verb *taja=ro* 'hitting it' and simultaneously describes the hallarality between the topic and the encoder of the verb predator.

If it is observed then it appears there are two FN praverba ie an FN at the beginning of the clause with the characteristic of the topic and a FN praverba with the characteristics of the subject. The core constituent of the object despite experiencing the preposition at the beginning of the sentence but the features of fixed objectivity. In addition to affecting the word order, the constituent structure also changes. The praverba object turns into a pre-subject object.

7d) *Tata-k n-eve kame vulu moto*

    Kakak-POSS1TG 3TG=petik 1JEKS sayur kelor

'Kakakku memetikan kami sayur kelor'

7d¹) *Kame tata-k n-eve-kem vulu moto*
    1JEKS kakak-POSS1TG 3TG=petik sayur kelor

'Kami, kakakku petikan sayur kelor'

7d²) *Vulu moto tata-k n-eve nei kame*
    Sayur kelor, kakak-POSS1TG 3TG=petik untuk 1JEKS

'Sayur kelor, kakakku petik untuk kami'

Example (7d) is a transitive base clause. The verb predictor of this clause is the *n=eve* 'quote' which calls for the presence of three core constituents, an FN on the left or preverb serves as the subject, an FN is on the right immediately after the verb predator as an indirect object and an FN after an indirect object Is a direct object. Pragmatic interests such as the emphasis on who or what the object of action or intensity about for whom something is given, often affects the speaker to do the preparing, as seen in the example (7d1-7d2).

Example (7d1) shows the indirect object of our *'kame'* experiencing a raise. This enhancement causes the base clause subject to shift to the right position of the constituent undergoing forwarding. This also occurs in the indirect object placement of moto 'vegetable kelor'. Preparing these two objects (indirect and direct) causes changes such as changes in the order of words from SVO (basic clause) to VSO and the change of object position from postverba position to pre-subject position.

The objecting of the object in the example (7d1) is marked by the enklitik -kem form in the verb predator *n = eve = kem* 'plucking' while simultaneously reflecting the hallarality between the topic and the predator encoder of the verb. In addition there appear to be two FN praverba, an FN located at the beginning of a topic-characterized clause and a FN praverba that characterizes the subject. Segmentally, forwarding is characterized by a sequential order while the suprasegmental typically uses a pause to be a marker. So there is an interval of pronunciation between the constituents spoken with the subject clause.

Alternative construction analyzes such as left release or left dislocation in examples (6a-6c), emphasis or enhancement in Examples (6d-6e), and penopicalan in Example (7a-7d) illustrate that LDLL has such phenomena. These

three constructs are often used speakers in speech situations but these three frequencies vary. Left dislocation or left dislocation, for example, has a low usage frequency meaning rarely used. While the construction of constituen and topicalization very often used.

Although both of these constructions are very often used but they differ in essence. Predictions further sharpen the upgrading of non-core constituents such as ajung (locative and instrument) occupying the initial position rather than occupying the subject position. Topicalization is the upgrading of the core constituent especially the object (indirect and direct) occupy the initial position of the clause. It is this emphasis that reflects the typical in LDLL.

Pragmatically, the results of the analysis illustrate that LDLL is not a language that exhibits the characteristic of topic creation, not as a language that shows left-to-front or fronting features. This is consistent with the characteristic languages of topics such as (a) the topic is marked in the structure of birth, (b) the topic tends to control the choreality, (c) the rules of subject creation such as passivity are rarely found, (d) Topics are basic structures (Cassile, E and Suarez, 2005: 54; Lee, 1976: 460-484; Everaert, M and Henk Van Riemsdijk, 2005: 2406).

Pragmatic facts show that the construction of LDLL alternations is a topic-but the basic structure of the LDLL clause is the subject's prominent language. A number of considerations underlying this statement are (a) grammatically the basic structure of the LDLL clause constructs the subject-predicate, (b) putting the object into position or shifting the position of the subject as the embodiment of the penorikalan but the construct is a derivative construct rather than a base construct, (c) It changes the structure of constituents and changes the order of words but does not alter the semantic clause, (d) the structure of the 'double subject' topicalization is not the basic clause structure of the LDLL, and (e) there is no morphosynthetic marker for the element the topic says. The enclosure separation of the verbs as in the examples (7a1-a2, b1, c1, d1-d2) is not a topic marker but rather a marker of emphasis or a marker of intensity on the topic and illustrates the choreference of reality.

Referring to the facts found in the LDLL and referring to the typological typology of languages with respect to pragmatic functions (see Li and Thomposn in Li, 1976) it can be concluded that BLDL is the subject's promoinent language. LDLL has the basic structure of the subject-predicate constructed clause. Penopikalan in LDLL is an alternative construction.

CONCLUTION

Data analysis on examples of the LDLL clause proves that: Left release construction has a low usage frequency. This alternative construction is rarely used because of the efficiency aspects of speech. It is said to have a low usage frequency due to the repetition of pronouns which is an antecedent or anaphoric form of a previously mentioned passage or phrase. The repetition of this pronoun form generates wastefulness that seems boring. However, it is often used as an alternative form of speech.

Suction construction is an attempt to advance non-core arguments or the promotion of peripheral arguments such as locative and instrumental occupying the starting position of the clause. Preparing or promoting these peripheral arguments does not affect the syntactic structure and semantic structure of clauses. So putting it forward is an ordinary phenomenon. This preparing is done on the basis of consideration of the intensity aspect. Speakers want to emphasize peripheral constituents such as locative and instrumental to the speech partner.

Topicalization in passing similar to other alternative construction such as the release to the left and fronting. Nevertheless penopicalan construction further sharpens the preposition of the core argument occupying the initial position of the clause. The displacement or transposition of this place has an impact on the shifting position of the previous clause argument. The previous clause argument shifts to the right and still occupies the praverba position. Other impacts are revaluation of constituent structures, syntactic revaluation, and semantic revaluation.

The structural revaluation describes a change in the position of the object occupying the initial position of the clause shifting the argument S / A basic clause so that it looks like a clause that has two FN praverba. The syntactic revaluation states the P / O canonical position in a LDLL is a posverba rather than a pre-subject. The sequence of two successive FNs in a clause describes a double subject, the initial FN of the clause is S and FN praverba is a comment. Se-

mantic revaluation states that the meaning of the verb predator of the basic clause is actively transformed into a basic meaning.

Alternative constructions, such as leaching to the left and forwarding do not reflect revaluation as in penopicalan construction. These three alternative constructions have different usage frequencies. Alternative construction of low-left discharge frequency of use, construction of forwarding and penis have sufficient frequency. Although the construction of fronting and topicalization have the same usage frequency but both are different and the principle. Construction of forwarding is an ordinary improvement phenomenon, while construction of penopicalan is a derivative construction phenomenon which tends to be equal to passivation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCE

Artawa, I. K. 2004. Balinese Language A Typological Description. Denpasar : Bali CV Bali Media Adhikarsa.

Artawa, I. K. Ergativity and Balinese Syntax. 1998. Linguistic Studies Of Indonesian And Another Languages In Indonesia Part ,II ,III. Vol. 42 ,43 dan 44. Jakarta : Badan Penyelenggara Seri Nusa Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya.

Bisara, Y.K. A Grammar of Solor-Lamaholot, A Language of Flores-Eastern Indonesia. 2016. Australia : Departement of Lingusitics School of Humanities. The Faculty of Arts. The University of Adelaide (*dissertation*)

Casielles,E.-Suarez. The Syntax-Information Structure Interface. Evidence from Spanish and Englis. 2004. New York : Routledge Taylor & Francis Group 270 Madison Avenue, NY 10016 www.routledge-ny.com

Cinque, G. 2005:276. Italian Syntax and Universal Grammar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Clackson,J. Indo-Eoropean Linguistic An Introduction. 2007. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Erteschik, N.,-Shir. The Dynamics of Focus Structure. 1997. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Faarlund, J.T. 2004 :231. The Syntax of Old Norse. With a survey of the inflectional Morphology and a Complete Bibliography. New York : Oxford University Press Inc.

Gervain, J. and Zemplén, G., In Leonie Cornips, L. and Karen P. Corrigan, K.P., ed. 2005. Syntax And Variation and Reconciling The Biological The Social. Amasterdam : John Benjamins

Gundel, J.K. dan Fretheim, T., in Laurence R. Horn, L.,R and Ward, G (ed). The Handbook of Pragmatics. 2006. Oxford: Blackwell.

Haegeman, L. 1993. *An Introduction to Goverment an Binding Theory.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Haegeman, L., dalam Zanuttini, R., Campos, H., Herburger, E., dan Portner, P., ed. 2007. Crosslinguistic Research in Syntax and Semantics. Negation, Tense, and Clausal Architecture. Washington, D.C. : Georgetown University Press,

Lee, E. H., dan Shimojo, M. 2015. Mismatch of topic between Japanese and Korean. J East Asian Linguist (2016) 25:81–112 DOI 10.1007/s10831-015-9138-x. Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2015. Down load on 22 April 2017

Li, Charles N., and Sandra A. Thompson 1976. "Subject and Topic: A New Typology of Language." In Charles N. Li, ed., *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press.

Kidway, A. XP-Adjunction in Universal Grammar. 2000. *Scrambling and Binding in Hindi-Urdu.* New York : Published by Oxford University Press, Inc.

Parera, J.D. 1988. *Sintaksis.* Jakarta : PT Gramedia Pusataka Utama

Rowlett, P. 2007. The Syntax of French. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press