Saturday, December 15, 2012

Workshop on 'special genres' in and around Indonesia

This workshop will be about exploring the creativity and diversity of oral and 'oral-like' genres in and around Indonesia - focusing on (but not limited to) the playful side of language use in the archipelago. Some ideas include riddles, word-games and ludlings, secret languages, text messaging and Facebook chat (bahasa Alay), jargons, ideophones, proverbs, ritual speech, poetry and songs.

Omission of object verbal markers in Amele: different data between Haia and Huar dialects

Masahiko NOSE
(Shiga University)
mnosema@gmail.com

Abstracts
This study concerns the grammatical differences between dialects of Amele. Previously, Roberts (1987) described the grammar of Amele, mainly based on Haia dialect, whereas Nose (2012) investigates the descriptive grammar of Amele, based on Huar dialect. These two dialects have phonological and other grammatical differences, and Capell claimed that their variations can be explained y by the dialect differences. According to Roberts (1987:10), there are four dialects in Amele. They are Haia (the most prestigious), Amele, Huar, and Jagahala. The four dialects are mutually intelligible except the Jagahala dialect, which is more closely related to the neighboring Isebe languages. Huar, the author (Nose)'s field, is almost same grammatical behaviors as Haia dialect, but markers of transitive and ditransitive are peculiar.

Roberts (1987:280) pointed out that there is verbal agreement with direct and indirect objects, as shown in (1a). They are called DO (direct object clitic) and IO(indirect object clitic), respectively.

(1) a. Uqa jo   ceh-ad-ut-en.
        3s   house   build -3p(DO)-3s(IO)-3s.remote past
        "He built houses for her"
     b. Uqa jo   ceh-it-on
        3s   house   build-3s(IO)-3s.remote past

In the sentence of Huar dialect (1b), the DO marker is lacking (in some cases, IO can be omitted). This type of omission has been pointed out by Capell (1969:103), "South of the Amele group these constructions (object markings) are not found." However, the omission is either IO or DO, and both cannot be omitted.

This study observes this type of omissions among transitive, ditransitive and other related constructions

(causative and applicative), and tries to explain them in terms of pragmatic viewpoints. Finally, this study claims that they are not classified in dialect differences, but their variations can be explained by the pragmatic motivation that Haia discourse allows flexible usages of verbal agreement.

References

Capell, Arhtur. 1969. *A survey of New Guinea languages*. Sydney: Sydney University Press.

Nose, Masahiko. 2012. Advantages of using parallel texts in describing the languages of Papua New Guinea. 12th International Language, Literature and Stylistics Symposium. 18-20th, Oct, 2012, Trakya University, Turkey.

Roberts, John R. 1987. *Amele.* London: Croom Helm.